

DEISSMANN, A.- BIBLE STUDIES

by Deissmann a

Deissmann's groundbreaking studies using recently discovered papyri and inscriptions to illuminate the language, culture, and social world of the New Testament, showing how everyday Greek documents shed light on biblical vocabulary.

31 Chapters

Table of Contents

1. 000 - Content
2. 0000 - AUTHOR'S PREFACE TO THE ENGLISH EDITION
3. 00000 - FROM THE PREFACE TO THE GERMAN EDITION
4. 000000 - TRANSLATOR'S NOTE.
5. 0000000 - THE PRINCIPAL ABBREVIATIONS.
6. 01 - PROLEGOMENA TO THE BIBLICAL LETTERS AND EPISTLES
7. 01.01 - PROLEGOMENA TO THE BIBLICAL LETTERS AND EPISTLES.
8. 01.02 - PROLEGOMENA TO THE BIBLICAL LETTERS AND EPISTLES.
9. 01.03 - PROLEGOMENA TO THE BIBLICAL LETTERS AND EPISTLES.
10. 01.04 - PROLEGOMENA TO THE BIBLICAL LETTERS AND EPISTLES.
11. 02 - CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE HISTORY OF THE LANGUAGE OF THE GREEK BIBLE.
12. 02.01 - CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE HISTORY OF THE LANGUAGE OF THE GREEK BIBLE.
13. 03 - FURTHER CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE HISTORY OF THE LANGUAGE OF THE GREEK BIBLE
14. 03.01 - FURTHER CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE HISTORY OF THE LANGUAGE OF THE GREEK BIBLE
15. 04 - An Epigraphic Memorial of the Septuagint.
16. 04.01 - An Epigraphic Memorial of the Septuagint.
17. 05 - NOTES ON SOME BIBLICAL PERSONS AND NAMES
18. 05.01 - HELIODORUS.
19. 05.02 - BARNABAS
20. 05.03 - MANAËN.
21. 05.04 - SAULUS PAULUS
22. 06 - GREEK TRANSCRIPTIONS OF THE TETRAGRAMMATON.
23. 07 - SPICILEGIUM
24. 07.01 - THE CHRONOLOGICAL STATEMENT IN THE PROLOGUE TO JESUS SIRACH
25. 07.02 - THE SUPPOSED EDICT OF PTOLEMY IV. PHILO-PATOR AGAINST THE EGYPTIAN JEWS.
26. 07.03 - THE "LARGE LETTERS" AND THE "MARKS OF JESUS" IN GAL. 6.
27. 07.04 - A NOTE TO THE LITERARY HISTORY OF SECOND PETER.
28. 07.05 - WHITE ROBES AND PALMS.
29. 08 - Footnotes
30. 09 - LXX APOCRYPHA REFERENCES
31. 10 - Source Materials Referenced in Deissmann's Bible Studies

000 - Content

CONTENTS.

PREFACE TO THE ENGLISH EDITION EXTRACT FROM THE PREFACE TO Bibelstudien
TRANSLATOR'S NOTE

ABBREVIATIONS I. PROLEGOMENA TO THE BIBLICAL LETTERS AND EPISTLES II.
CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE HISTORY OF THE LANGUAGE OF THE GREEK BIBLE III.
FURTHER CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE HISTORY OF THE LANGUAGE OF THE GREEK BIBLE
Introductory Remarks (i.) Notes on the Orthography 1. Variation of Vowels 2. Variation of
Consonants (ii.) Notes on the Morphology

1. Declension

2. Proper Names

3. Verb (iii.) Notes on the Vocabulary and the Syntax 1. So-called Hebraisms 2. So-called
Jewish-Greek "Biblical" or "New Testament" Words and Constructions 3. Supposed Special
"Biblical" or "New Testament" Meanings and Constructions 4. Technical Terms 5. Phrases and
Formulae 6. Rarer Words, Meanings and Constructions IV. AN EPIGRAPHIC MEMORIAL OF
THE SEPTUAGINT V. NOTES ON SOME BIBLICAL PERSONS AND NAMES

1. Heliodorus

2. Barnabas

3. Manaen 4. Saulus Paulus VI. GREEK TRANSCRIPTIONS OF THE TETRAGRAMMATON VII.
SPICILEGIUM 1. The Chronological Statement in the Prologue to Jesus Sirach 2. The Supposed
Edict of Ptolemy IV. Philopator against the Egyptian Jews 3. The "Large Letters" and the "Marks of
Jesus" in Galatians 6 4. A Note to the Literary History of Second Peter 5. White Robes and Palms

INDEXES

0000 - AUTHOR'S PREFACE TO THE ENGLISH EDITION

AUTHOR'S PREFACE TO THE ENGLISH EDITION.

Having been honoured by a request to sanction an English translation of my *Bibelstudien* and *Neue Bibelstudien*, I have felt it my duty to accede to the proposal. It seems to me that investigations based upon Papyri and Inscriptions are specially calculated to be received with interest by English readers. For one thing, the richest treasures from the domain of Papyri and Inscriptions are deposited in English museums and libraries; for another, English investigators take premier rank among the discoverers and editors of Inscriptions, but particularly of Papyri; while, again, it was English scholarship which took the lead in utilising the Inscriptions in the sphere of biblical research. Further, in regard to the Greek Old Testament in particular, for the investigation of which the Inscriptions and Papyri yield valuable material (of which only the most inconsiderable part has been utilised in the following pages), English theologians have of late done exceedingly valuable and memorable work. In confirmation of all this I need only recall the names of F. Field, B. P. Grenfell, E. Hatch, E. L. Hicks, A. S. Hunt, F. G. Kenyon, J. P. Mahaffy, W. R. Paton, W. M. Ramsay, H. A. Redpath, H. B. Swete, and others hardly less notable. Since the years 1895 and 1897, in which respectively the German *Bibelstudien* and *Neue Bibelstudien* were published, there has been a vast increase of available material, which, again, has been much more accessible to me as a Professor in the University of Heidelberg than it was during my residence at Herborn. I have so far availed myself of portions of the more recent discoveries in this English edition; but what remains for scholars interested in such investigations is hardly less than enormous, and is being augmented year by year. I shall be greatly pleased if yet more students set themselves seriously to labour in this field of biblical research. In the English edition not a few additional changes have been made; I must, however, reserve further items for future Studies. With regard to the entries *κυριακός* (p. 217 ff.), and especially *λατρίον* (p. 124 ff.), I should like to make express reference to the articles *Lord's Day* and *Mercy Seat* to be contributed by me to the *Encyclopaedia Biblica*. Finally, I must record my heartiest thanks to my translator, Rev. Alexander Grieve, M.A., D. Phil., Forfar, for his work. With his name I gratefully associate the words which once on a time the translator of the *Wisdom of Jesus Sirach* applied with ingenuous complacency to himself: *πολλὸν ἠγρυπνῶσαν καὶ πιστὴν μὴν προσενεγκάμενος*.

ADOLF DEISSMANN.

HEIDELBERG, 27th December, 1900.

00000 - FROM THE PREFACE TO THE GERMAN EDITION

FROM THE PREFACE TO THE GERMAN EDITION.

Bible Studies is the name I have chosen for the following investigations, since all of them are more or less concerned with the historical questions which the Bible, and specially the Greek version, raises for scientific treatment. I am not, of course, of the opinion that there is a special biblical science. Science is method: the special sciences are distinguished from each other as methods. What is designated "Biblical Science" were more fitly named "Biblical Research". The science in question here is the same whether it is engaged with Plato, or with the Seventy Interpreters and the Gospels. Thus much should be self-evident. A well-disposed friend who understands something of literary matters tells me that it is hardly fitting that a younger man should publish a volume of "Studies": that is rather the part of the experienced scholar in the sunny autumn of life. To this advice I have given serious consideration, but I am still of the opinion that the hewing of stones is very properly the work of the journeyman. And in the department where I have laboured, many a block must yet be trimmed before the erection of the edifice can be thought of. But how much still remains to do, before the language of the Septuagint, the relation to it of the so-called New Testament Greek, the history of the religious and ethical conceptions of Hellenic Judaism, have become clear even in outline only; or before it has been made manifest that the religious movement by which we date our era originated and was developed in history—that is, in connection with, or, it may be, in opposition to, an already-existent high state of culture! If the following pages speak much about the Septuagint, let it be remembered that in general that book is elsewhere much too little spoken of, certainly much less than was the case a hundred years ago. We inveigh against the Rationalists—often in a manner that raises the suspicion that we have a mistrust of Reason. Yet these men, inveighed against as they are, in many respects set wider bounds to their work than do their critics. During my three years' work in the Seminarium Philippinum at Marburg, I have often enough been forced to think of the plan of study in accordance with which the bursars used to work about the middle of last century. Listen to a report of the matter such as the following :— 1

"With regard to Greek the legislator has laid particular stress upon the relation in which this language stands to a true understanding of the N.T. How reasonable, therefore, will those who can judge find the recommendation that the Septuagint (which on the authority of an Ernesti and a Michaelis, is of the first importance as a means towards the proper understanding of the N.T.), has been fixed upon as a manual upon which these lectures must be given! And how much is it to be wished that the bursars, during the year of their study of this book, should go through such a considerable part of the same as may be necessary to realise the purposes of the legislator!" I am not bold enough to specify the time when academical lectures and exercises upon the Septuagint again be given in Germany. 2 But the coming century is long, and the mechanical conception of science is but the humour of a day! . . . I wrote the book, not as a clergyman, but as a Privatdocent

at Marburg, but I rejoice that I am able, as a clergyman, to publish it.

G. ADOLF DEISSMANN.

HERBORN: DEPARTMENT OF WIESBADEN, 7th March, 1895.

000000 - TRANSLATOR'S NOTE.

TRANSLATOR'S NOTE. In addition to the supplementary matter specially contributed to the present edition by the Author, the translation shows considerable alterations in other respects. Not only has the smaller and later volume, Neue Bibelstudien, 1897, found a place in the body of the book, but the order of the Articles has been all but completely changed. It has not been thought necessary to furnish the translation with an index of Papyri, etc., more especially as the larger Bibelstudien had none; but there has been added an index of Scripture texts, which seemed on the whole more likely to be of service to English readers in general. The translator has inserted a very few notes, mainly concerned with matters of translation. For the convenience of those who may wish to consult the original on any point, the paging of the German edition has been given in square brackets, the page-numbers of the Neue Bibelstudien being distinguished by an N. In explanation of the fact that some of the works cited are more fully described towards the end of the book, and more briefly in the earlier pages, it should perhaps be said that a large portion of the translation was in type, and had been revised, before the alteration in the order of the Articles had been decided upon. The translator would take this opportunity of expressing his most cordial thanks to Professor Deissmann, who has taken the most active interest in the preparation of the translation, and whose painstaking revision of the proofs has been of the highest service. A word of thanks is also due to the printers, The Aberdeen University Press Limited, for the remarkable accuracy and skill which they have uniformly shown in the manipulation of what was often complicated and intricate material.

ALEXANDER GRIEVE.

FORFAR, 21st January, 1901.

000000 - THE PRINCIPAL ABBREVIATIONS.

THE PRINCIPAL ABBREVIATIONS.

AAB. = Abhandlungen der Koniglichen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin.

Benndorf u. Niemann, see p. 157, note 1.

BU. = Aegyptische Urkunden aus den Koeniglichen Museen zu Berlin, Berlin, 1892 ff.

CIA. = Corpus Inscriptionum Attibarum.

CIG. = Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum.

CIL. = Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum.

Clavis3, see p. 88, note 5.

Cremer, see p. 290, note 2.

DAW. = Denkschriften der K. K. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Wien.

Dieterich (A.), see p. 322, note 8.

Dittenberger, see p. 93, note 2.

DLZ. = Deutsche Literaturzeitung.

Fick-Bechtel, see p. 310, note 4.

Field, see p. 284, note 2.

Fleck. Jbb. = Fleckeisen's Jahrbacher.

Frankel, see p. 84, note 2.

GGA. = Gottingische gelehrte Anzeigen.

HApAT. = Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zu den Apocryphen des A.T., 6 Bde., Leipzig, 1851-60.

Hamburger, see p. 271, note.

HC. = Hand-Commentar zum N.T.

Hercher, see p. 4, note 1.

Humann u. Puchstein, see p. 309, note 1.

IGrSl., see p. 200, note 1.

IM Ae., see p. 178, note 5.

Kennedy, see p. 213, note 1.

Kenyon, see p. 323, note 1.

Lebas, see Waddington.

Leemans, see p. 322, note 6.

Letronne, Recherches, see p. 98, note 3. Recueil, see p. 101, note 6.

Lumbroso, Recherches, see p. 98, note 2.

Mahaffy, see p. 336, note 1.

Meisterhans, see p. 124, note 1.

Meyer = H. A. W. Meyer, Kritisch exegetischer Kommentar über das N.T.

Notices, xviii. 2, see p. 283, note 3.

Parthey, see p. 322, note 5.

Paton and Hicks, see p. 131, note 1.

PER., see p. 179, note 2.

Perg., see p. 178, note 4.

Peyron (A.), see p. 88, note 1.

R-E2 = Real-Encyclopädie für protest.

Theologie und Kirche von Herzog, 2. Aufl., Leipzig, 1877 ff.

Schleusner = J. F., Novus Thesaurus philologico-criticus sive lexicon in LXX et reliquos interpretes graecarum cos ac scriptores apocryphos V. T., 5 voll., Lipsiae, 1820-21.

Schmid (W.), see p. 64, note 2.

Schmidt (Guil.), see p. 291, note 1.

Scharer, see p. 335, note 2.

Swete = The Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint, edited by H. B. Swete, 3 voll., Cambridge, 1887-94.

Thesaurus = H. Stephanus, Thesaurus Graecae Linguae, edd. Hase, etc., Paris, 1831-65.

Thayer, see p. 176, note 3.

ThLZ. = Theologische Literaturzeitung.

Tromm. = Abrahami Trommii concordantiae graecae versionis vulgo dictae LXX interpretum . . . , 2 tomi, Amstelodami et Trajecti ad Rhenum, 1718.

TU. = Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur.

Waddington, see p. 93, note 1.

Wessely, see p. 322, note 7.

Wetstein, see p. 350, note 1.

Winer⁷, or Winer-Lunemann = G. B.

Winer, Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Sprachidioms, 7 Aufl. von G. Lunemann, Leipzig, 1867. [9th English edition, by W. F. Moulton, Edinburgh, 1882 = 6th German edition.]
Winer-Schmiedel = the same work, 8th Aufl. neu bearbeitet von P. W. Schmiedel, Gottingen, 1894 ff.

ZAW. = Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft.

Z KG. = Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte.

01 - PROLEGOMENA TO THE BIBLICAL LETTERS AND EPISTLES

I.

PROLEGOMENA TO THE BIBLICAL LETTERS AND
EPISTLES.

γινεσθεδοκιμοιτραπεζιται

01.01 - PROLEGOMENA TO THE BIBLICAL LETTERS AND EPISTLES.

i.

PROLEGOMENA TO THE BIBLICAL LETTERS AND EPISTLES.

1. Men have written letters ever since they could write at all. Who the first letter-writer was we know not.³ But this is quite as it should be: the writer of a letter accommodates himself to the need of the moment; his aim is a personal one and concerns none but himself,—least of all the curiosity of posterity. We fortunately know quite as little who was the first to experience repentance or to offer prayer. The writer of a letter does not sit in the marketplace. A letter is a secret and the writer wishes his secret to be preserved; under cover and seal he entrusts it to the reticence of the messenger. The letter, in its essential idea, does not differ in any way from a private conversation; like the latter, it is a personal and intimate communication, and the more faithfully it catches the tone of the private conversation, the more of a letter, that is, the better a letter, it is. The only difference is the means of communication. We avail ourselves of far-travelling handwriting, because our voice cannot carry to our friend: the pen is employed because the separation by distance does not permit a tête-à-tête.⁴ A letter is destined for the receiver only, not for the public eye, and even when it is intended for more than one, yet with the public it will have nothing to do: letters to parents and brothers and sisters, to comrades in joy or sorrow or sentiment—these, too, are private letters, true letters. As little as the words of the dying father to his children are a speech—should they be a speech it would be better for the dying to keep silent—just as little is the letter of a sage to his confidential pupils an essay, a literary production; and, if the pupils have learned wisdom, they will not place it among their books, but lay it devoutly beside the picture and the other treasured relics of their master. The form and external appearance of the letter are matters of indifference in the determination of its essential character. Whether it be written on stone or clay, on papyrus or parchment, on wax or palm-leaf, on rose paper or a foreign postcard, is quite as immaterial⁵ as whether it clothes itself in the set phrases of the age; whether it be written skilfully or unskilfully, by a prophet or by a beggar, does not alter its special characteristics in the least. Nor do the particular contents belong to the essence of it. What is alone essential is the purpose which it serves: confidential personal conversation between persons separated by distance. The one wishes to ask something of the other, wishes to praise or warn or wound the other, to thank him or assure him of sympathy in joy—it is ever something personal that forces the pen into the hand of the letter-writer.⁶ He who writes a letter under the impression that his lines may be read by strangers, will either coquet with this possibility, or be frightened by it; in the former case he will be vain, in the latter, reserved;⁷ in both cases unnatural—no true letter-writer. With the personal aim of the letter there must necessarily be joined the naturalness of the writer's mood; one owes it not only to himself and to the other, but still more to the letter as such, that he yield himself freely to it. So must the letter, even the shortest and the poorest, present a fragment of human naivete—beautiful or trivial, but, in any case, true.⁸ 2. The letter is older than literature.

As conversation between two persons is older than the dialogue, the song older than the poem, so also does the history of the letter reach back to that Golden Age when there was neither author nor publisher, nor any reviewer. Literature is that species of writing which is designed for publicity: the maker of literature desires that others will take heed to his work. He desires to be read. He does not appeal to his friend, nor does he write to his mother; he entrusts his sheets to the winds, and knows not whither they will be borne; he only knows that they will be picked up and examined by some one or other unknown to him and unabashed before him. Literature, in the truest essence of it, differs in no way from a public speech; equally with the latter it falls short in the matter of intimacy, and the more it attains to the character of universality, the more literary, that is to say, the more interesting it is. All the difference between them is in the mode of delivery. Should one desire to address, not the assembled clan or congregation, but the great foolish public, then he takes care that what he has to say may be carried home in writing by any one who wishes to have it so: the book is substituted for oral communication. And even if the book be dedicated to a friend or friends, still its dedication does not divest it of its literary character,—it does not thereby become a private piece of writing. The form and external appearance of the book are immaterial for the true understanding of its special character as a book: even its contents, whatever they be, do not matter. Whether the author sends forth poems, tragedies or histories, sermons or wearisome scientific lucubrations, political matter or anything else in the world; whether his book is multiplied by the slaves of an Alexandrian bookseller, by patient monk or impatient compositor; whether it is preserved in libraries as sheet, or roll, or folio: all these are as much matter of indifference as whether it is good or bad, or whether it finds purchasers or not. Book, literature, in the widest sense, is every written work designed by its author for the public.^{9 3} The book is younger than the letter. Even were the oldest letters that have come down to us younger than the earliest extant works of literature, that statement would still be true. For it is one which does not need the confirmation of historical facts—nay, it would be foolish to attempt to give such. The letter is perishable—in its very nature necessarily so; it is perishable, like the hand that wrote it, like the eyes that were to read it. The letter-writer works as little for posterity as for the public of his own time; ¹⁰ just as the true letter cannot be written over again, it exists in but a single copy. It is only the book that is multiplied and thus rendered accessible to the public, accessible, possibly, to posterity. Fortunately we possess letters that are old, extremely old, but we shall never gain a sight of the oldest of them all; it was a letter, and was able to guard itself and its secret. Among all nations, before the age of literature, there were the days when people wrote, indeed, but did not yet write books. ¹¹ In the same way people prayed, of course, and probably prayed better, long before there were any service-books; and they had come near to God before they wrote down the proofs of His existence. The letter, should we ask about the essential character of it, carries us into the sacred solitude of simple, unaffected humanity; when we ask about its history, it directs us to the childhood's years of the pre-literary man, when there was no book to trouble him. ⁴ When the friend has for ever parted from his comrades, the master from his disciples, then the bereaved bethink themselves, with sorrowful reverence, of all that the departed one was to them. The old pages, which the beloved one delivered to them in some blessed hour, speak to them with a more than persuasive force; they are read and re-read, they are exchanged one for another, copies are taken of letters in the possession of friends, the precious fragments are collected: perhaps it is decided that the collection be multiplied—among the great unknown public there may be some unknown one who is longing for the same stimulus which the bereaved themselves have received.

And thus it happens now and then that, from motives of reverent love, the letters of the great are divested of their confidential character: they are formed into literature, the letters subsequently become a book. When, by the Euphrates or the Nile, preserved in the ruins of some fallen civilisation, we find letters the age of which can only be computed by centuries and millenniums, the science of our fortunate day rejoices; she hands over the venerable relics to a grateful public in a new garb, and so, in our own books and in our own languages, we read the reports which the Palestinian vassals had to make to Pharaoh upon their tablets of clay, long before there was any Old Testament or any People of Israel; we learn the sufferings and the longings of Egyptian monks from shreds of papyrus which are as old as the book of the Seventy Interpreters. Thus it is the science of to-day that has stripped these private communications of a hoary past of their most peculiar characteristic, and which has at length transformed letters, true letters, into literature. As little, however, as some unknown man, living in the times of Imperial Rome, put the toy into the grave of his child in order that it should sometime be discovered and placed in a museum, just as little are the private letters which have at length been transformed into literature by publication, to be, on that account, thought of as literature. Letters remain letters whether oblivion hides them with its protecting veil, or whether now reverence, now science, or, again, reverence and science in friendly conspiracy, think it well to withhold the secret no longer from the reverent or the eager seeker after truth. What the editor, in publishing such letters, takes from them, the readers, if they can do anything more than spell, must restore by recognising, in true historical perspective, their simple and unaffected beauty. 5. When for the first time a book was compiled from letters,—it would be reverential love, rather than science, that made the beginning here—the age of literature had, of course, dawned long ago, and had long ago constructed the various literary forms with which it worked. That book, the first to be compiled from real letters, added another to the already existent forms. One would, of course, hardly venture to say that it forthwith added the literary letter, the epistle,¹² to the forms of published literature; the said book only gave, against its will, so to speak, the impetus to the development of this new literary *eidos*.¹³ The present writer cannot imagine that the composition and publication of literary treatises in the form of letters was anterior to the compilation of a book from actual letters. So soon, however, as such a book existed, the charming novelty of it invited to imitation. Had the invitation been rightly understood, the only inducement that should have been felt was to publish the letters of other venerable men, and, in point of fact, the invitation was not seldom understood in this its true sense. From almost every age we have received such collections of “genuine,” “real” letters—priceless jewels for the historian of the human spirit. But the literary man is frequently more of a literary machine than a true man, and thus, when the first collection of letters appeared, it was the literary, rather than the human, interest of it which impressed him; the accidental and external, rather than the inscrutably strange inmost essence of it. Instead of rejoicing that his purblind eye might here catch a glimpse of a great human soul, he resolved to write a volume of letters on his own part. He knew not what he did, and had no feeling that he was attempting anything unusual; ¹⁴ he did not see that, by his literary purpose, he was himself destroying the very possibility of its realisation; for letters are experiences, and experiences cannot be manufactured. The father of the epistle was no great pioneer spirit, but a mere paragraphist, a mere mechanic. But perhaps he had once heard a pastoral song among the hills, and afterwards at home set himself down to make another of the same: the wondering applause of his crowd of admirers confirmed him in the idea that he had succeeded. If then he had achieved his aim in the matter of a song, why should he not do the

same with letters? And so he set himself down and made them. But the prototype, thus degraded to a mere pattern, mistrustfully refused to show its true face, not to speak of its heart, to this pale and suspicious-looking companion, and the result was that the epistle could learn no more from the letter than a little of its external form. If the true letter might be compared to a prayer, the epistle which mimicked it was only a babbling; if there beamed forth in the letter the wondrous face of a child, the epistle grinned stiffly and stupidly, like a puppet. But the puppet pleased; its makers knew how to bring it to perfection, and to give it more of a human appearance. Indeed, it happened now and then that a real artist occupied an idle hour in the fashioning of such an object. This, of course, turned out better than most others of a similar kind, and was more pleasant to look at than an ugly child for instance; in any case it could not disturb one by its noise. A good epistle, in fact, gives one more pleasure than a worthless letter, and in no literature is there any lack of good epistles. They often resemble letters so much that a reader permits himself for the moment to be willingly deceived as to their actual character. But letters they are not, and the more strenuously they try to be letters, the more vividly do they reveal that they are not.¹⁵ Even the grapes of Zeuxis could deceive only the sparrows; one even suspects that they were no true sparrows, but cage-birds rather, which had lost their real nature along with their freedom and pertness; our Rhine-land sparrows would not have left their vineyards for anything of the kind. Those of the epistle-writers who were artists were themselves most fully aware that in their epistles they worked at best artificially, and, in fact, had to do so. "The editor requests that the readers of this book will not forget the title of it: it is only a book of letters, letters merely relating to the study of theology. In letters one does not look for treatises, still less for treatises in rigid uniformity and proportion of parts. As material offers itself and varies, as conversation comes and goes, often as personal inclinations or incidental occurrences determine and direct, so do the letters wind about and flow on; and I am greatly in error if it be not this a thread of living continuity, this capriciousness of origin and circumstances, that realises the result which we desiderate on the written page, but which, of course, subsequently disappears in the printing. Nor can I conceal the fact that these letters, as now printed, are wanting just in what is perhaps most instructive, viz., the more exact criticism of particular works. There was, however, no other way of doing it, and I am still uncertain whether the following letters, in which the materials grow always the more special, the more important, the more personal, are fit for printing at all. The public voice of the market-place and the confidential one of private correspondence are, and always continue to be, very different." Herder,¹⁶ in these words, which are a classical description of the true idea of a letter, claims that his book has, in fact, the character of actual letters, but is nevertheless quite well aware that a printed (that is, according to the context, a literary) letter is essentially different from a letter that is actually such. It is easy to understand how the epistle became a favourite form of published literature in almost all literary nations. There could hardly be a more convenient form. The extraordinary convenience of it lay in the fact that it was, properly speaking, so altogether "unliterary," that, in fact, it did not deserve to be called a "form" at all. One needed but to label an address on any piece of tittle-tattle, and lo! one had achieved what else could have been accomplished only by a conscientious adherence to the strict rules of artistic form. Neither as to expression nor contents does the epistle make any higher pretensions. The writer could, in the matter of style, write as he pleased, and the address on the letter became a protective mark for thoughts that would have been too silly for a poem, and too paltry for an essay. The epistle, if we disregard the affixed address, need be no more than, say a feuilleton or a causerie. The zenith of epistolography may always be looked upon as assuredly

indicating the decline of literature; literature becomes decadent—Alexandrian, so to speak—and although epistles may have been composed and published by great creative spirits, still the derivative character of the movement cannot be questioned: even the great will want to gossip, to lounge, to take it easy for once. Their epistles may be good, but the epistle in general, as a literary phenomenon, is light ware indeed. 6. Of collections of letters, bearing the name of well-known poets and philosophers, we have, indeed, a great profusion. Many of them are not “genuine”; they were composed and given to the world by others under the protection of a great name.¹⁷ A timid ignorance, having no true notion of literary usages, inconsiderately stigmatises one and all of these with the ethical term forgery; it fondly imagines that everything in the world can be brought between the two poles moral and immoral, and overlooks the fact that the endless being and becoming of things is generally realised according to non-ethical laws, and needs to be judged as an ethical adiaphoron. He who tremulously supposes that questions of genuineness in the history of literature are, as such, problems of the struggle between truth and falsehood, ought also to have the brutal courage to describe all literature as forgery. The literary man, as compared with the non-literary, is always a person under constraint; he does not draw from the sphere of prosaic circumstance about him, but places himself under the dominion of the ideal, about which no one knows better than himself that it never was, and never will be, real. The literary man, with every stroke of his pen, removes himself farther from trivial actuality, just because he wishes to alter it, to ennoble or annihilate it, just because he can never acknowledge it as it is. As a man he feels indeed that he is sold under the domain of the wretched “object”. He knows that when he writes upon the laws of the cosmos, he is naught but a foolish boy gathering shells by the shore of the ocean; he enriches the literature of his nation by a Faust, meanwhile sighing for a revelation; or he is driven about by the thought that something must be done for his unbelief—yet he writes Discourses upon Religion. And thus he realises that he is entangled in the contradiction between the Infinite and the Finite,¹⁸ while the small prosperous folks, whose sleepy souls reek not of his pain, are lulled by him into the delightful dream that we only need to build altars to truth, beauty, and eternity in order to possess these things; when they have awaked, they can but reproach him for having deceived them. They discover that he is one of themselves; they whisper to each other that the sage, the poet, the prophet, is but a man after all —wiser, it may be, but not more clever, or better, than others. He who might have been their guide—not indeed to his own poor hovel but to the city upon the hill, not built by human hands—is compensated with some polite-sounding phrase. The foolish ingrates! Literature presents us with the unreal, just because it subserves the truth; the literary man abandons himself, just because he strives for the ends of humanity; he is unnatural, just because he would give to others something better than himself. What holds good of literature in general must also be taken into account in regard to each of its characteristic phenomena. Just as little as Plato’s Socrates and Schiller’s Wallenstein are “forgeries,” so little dare we so name the whole “pseudonymous”¹⁹ literature. We may grant at once, indeed, that some, at least, of the writings which go under false names were intentionally forged by the writers of them; pseudonymity in political or ecclesiastical works is in every case suspicious, for no one knows better how to use sacred and sanctifying ends than does the undisciplined instinct of monarchs and hierarchs, and the followers of them. But there is also a pseudonymity which is innocent, sincere, and honest,²⁰ and if a literary product permits of any inferences being drawn from it respecting the character of the writer, then, in such a case of pseudonymity, one may not think of malice or cowardice, but rather of modesty and natural timidity. Between the genuine²¹

and the pseudonymous epistle there does not exist the same profound and essential difference as between the epistle and the letter. The epistle is never genuine in the sense in which the letter is; it never can be so, because it can adopt the form of the letter only by surrendering the essence. An epistle of Herder, however like a letter it may look, is yet not a letter of Herder: it was not Herder the man, but Herder the theological thinker and author, that wrote it: it is genuine in an ungentle sense—like an apple-tree which, flourishing in September, certainly has genuine apple blossoms, but which must surely be altogether ashamed of such in the presence of its own ripening fruits. Literary “genuineness” is not to be confounded with genuine naturalness. Questions of genuineness in literature may cause us to rack our brains: but what is humanly genuine is never a problem to the genuine man. From the epistle that was genuine in a mere literary sense there was but a step to the fictitious epistle; while the genuine letter could at best be mimicked, the genuine epistle was bound to be imitated, and, indeed, invited to imitation. The collections of genuine Letters indirectly occasioned the writing of epistles: the collections of genuine epistles were immediately followed by the literature of the fictitious epistle.

01.02 - PROLEGOMENA TO THE BIBLICAL LETTERS AND EPISTLES.

ii.

PROLEGOMENA TO THE BIBLICAL LETTERS AND EPISTLES.

7. In the foregoing remarks on questions of principle, the author has in general tacitly presupposed the literary conditions into which we are carried by the Graeco-Roman civilisation, and by the modern, of which that is the basis.²² These inquiries seem to him to demand that we should not summarily include all that has been handed down to us bearing the wide, indefinite name of letter, under the equally indefinite term Literature of letters (Brieflitteratur), but that each separate fragment of these interesting but neglected compositions be set in its proper place in the line of development, which is as follows—real letter, letter that has subsequently become literature, epistle, fictitious epistle. Should it be demanded that the author fill up the various stages of this development with historical references, he would be at a loss. It has been already indicated that the first member of the series, viz., the letter, belongs to pre-literary times: it is not only impossible to give an example of this, but also unreasonable to demand one. With more plausibility one might expect that something certain ought to be procured in connection with the other stages, which belong in a manner to literary times, and, as such, can be historically checked. But even if the broad field of ancient “letters” were more extensively cultivated than has hitherto been the case, still we could establish at best no more than the first known instance of a subsequent collection of real letters, of an epistle or of a fictitious epistle, but would not reach the beginnings of the literary movement itself. The line in question can only be drawn on the ground of general considerations, nor does the author see how else it could be drawn. No one will question that the real letter was the first, the fictitious epistle the last, link in the development; as little will any one doubt that the epistle must have been one of the intervening links between the two.²³ The only uncertainty is as to the origin of the epistle itself; it, of course, presupposes the real letter, being an imitation of it; but that it presupposes as well the collection of real letters, as we think probable in regard to Greek literature, cannot be established with certainty for the history of literature in general. As a matter of fact, the epistle, as a form of literature, is found among the Egyptians at a very early period, and the author does not know how it originated there. The Archduke Rainer’s collection of Papyri at Vienna contains a poetical description of the town of Pi-Ramses, dating from the 12th century B.C., which is written in the form of a letter, and is in part identical with Papyrus Anastasi III. in the British Museum. This MS. “shows that in such letters we have, not private correspondence, but literary compositions, which must have enjoyed a wide circulation in ancient Egypt; it thus affords us valuable materials towards the characterisation of the literature of ancient Egypt”.²⁴ If, therefore, we can hardly say that the epistle first originated among the Greeks, yet, notwithstanding the above facts, we may assume that it might arise quite independently under the special conditions of Greek Literature, and that, in fact, it did so arise.

8. Now whatever theory one may have about the origin of the epistle among the Greeks, that question is of no great importance for the problem of the historian of literary phenomena in general, viz., the analysis into their constituent parts of the writings which have been transmitted to us as a whole under the ambiguous name of "letters". What is important in this respect are the various categories to which those constituent parts must be assigned in order that they may be clearly distinguished from each other. We may, therefore, ignore the question as to the origin of these categories—like all questions about the origin of such products of the mind, it is to a large extent incapable of any final solution; let it suffice that all these categories are represented among the "letters" that have been transmitted from the past. The usage of scientific language is, indeed, not so uniform as to render a definition of terms superfluous. The following preliminary remarks may therefore be made; they may serve at the same time to justify the terms hitherto used in this book.

Above all, it is misleading merely to talk of letters, without having defined the term more particularly. The perception of this fact has influenced many to speak of the private letter in contradistinction to the literary letter, and this distinction may express the actual observed fact that the true letter is something private, a personal and confidential matter. But the expression is none the less inadequate, for it may mislead. Thus B. Weiss,²⁵ for instance, uses it as the antithesis of the pastoral letter (*Gemeindebrief*); a terminology which does not issue from the essence of the letter, but from the fact of a possible distinction among those to whom it may be addressed. We might in the same way distinguish between the private letter and the family letter, i.e., the letter which a son, for instance, might send from abroad to those at home. But it is plain that, in the circumstances, such a distinction would be meaningless, for that letter also is a private one. Or, take the case of a clergyman, acting as army chaplain in the enemy's country, who writes a letter²⁶ to his distant congregation at home; such would be a congregational letter—perhaps it is even read in church by the *locum tenens*; but it would manifestly not differ in the slightest from a private letter, provided, that is, that the writer's heart was in the right place. The more private, the more personal, the more special it is, all the better a congregational letter will it be; a right sort of congregation would not welcome paragraphs of pastoral theology—they get such things from the *locum tenens*, for he is not long from college. The mere fact that the receivers of a letter are a plurality, does not constitute a public in the literary sense, and, again, an epistle directed to a single private individual is not on that account a private letter—it is literature. It is absurd, then, to define the specific character of a piece of writing which looks like a letter merely according to whether the writer addresses the receivers in the second person singular or plural;²⁷ the distinguishing feature cannot be anything merely formal (formal, moreover, in a superficial sense of that word), but can only be the inner special purpose of the writer. It is thus advisable, if we are to speak scientifically, to avoid the use of such merely external categories as congregational letter, and also to substitute for private letter a more accurate expression. As such we are at once confronted by the simple designation letter, but this homely term, in consideration of the indefiniteness which it has acquired in the course of centuries, will hardly suffice by itself; we must find an adjunct for it. The term true letter is therefore used here, after the example of writers²⁸ who are well able to teach us what a letter is. When a true letter becomes literature by means of its publication, we manifestly obtain no new species thereby. To the historian of literature, it still remains what it was to the original receiver of it—a true letter: even when given to the public, it makes a continual protest against its being deemed a thing of publicity. We must so far favour it as

to respect its protest; were we to separate it in any way from other true letters which were fortunate enough never to have their obscurity disturbed, we should but add to the injustice already done to it by its being published. A new species is reached only when we come to the letter published professedly as literature, which as such is altogether different from the first class. Here also we meet with various designations in scientific language. But the adoption of a uniform terminology is not nearly so important in regard to this class as in regard to the true letter. One may call it literary letter,²⁹ or, as has been done above for the sake of simplicity, epistle—no importance need be attached to the designation, provided the thing itself be clear. The subdivisions, again, which may be inferred from the conditions of origin of the epistle, are of course unessential; they are not the logical divisions of the concept epistle, but simply classifications of extant epistles according to their historical character, i.e., we distinguish between authentic and unauthentic epistles, and again, in regard to the latter, between innocent fabrications and forgeries with a “tendency”. Furnished with these definitions, we approach the immense quantity of written material which has been bequeathed to us by Graeco-Roman antiquity under the ambiguous term ■πιστολα■, epistulae. The sheets which we have inherited from the bountiful past, and which have been brought into confusion by legacy-hunters and legal advisers, so to speak, perhaps even by the palsied but venerable hand of their aged proprietrix herself, must first of all be duly arranged before we can congratulate ourselves on their possession. In point of fact, the work of arrangement is by no means so far advanced as the value of the inheritance deserves to have it.³⁰ But what has already been done affords, even to the outsider, at least the superficial impression that we possess characteristic representatives, from ancient times, of all the categories of ■ποιστολα■, which have been established in the foregoing pages.

01.03 - PROLEGOMENA TO THE BIBLICAL LETTERS AND EPISTLES.

iii.

PROLEGOMENA TO THE BIBLICAL LETTERS AND EPISTLES.

9. We can be said to possess true letters from ancient times—in the full sense of the word possess—only when we have the originals. And, in fact, the Papyrus discoveries of the last decade have placed us in the favourable position of being able to think of as our very own an enormous number of true letters in the original, extending from the Ptolemaic period till far on in mediaeval times. The author is forced to confess that, previous to his acquaintance with ancient Papyrus letters (such as it was—only in facsimiles), he had never rightly known, or, at least, never rightly realised within his own mind, what a letter was. Comparing a Papyrus letter of the Ptolemaic period with a fragment from a tragedy, written also on Papyrus, and of about the same age, no one perceives any external difference; the same written characters, the same writing material, the same place of discovery. And yet the two are as different in their essential character as are reality and art: the one, a leaf with writing on it, which has served some perfectly definite and never-to-be-repeated purpose in human intercourse; the other, the derelict leaf of a book, a fragment of literature. These letters will of themselves reveal what they are, better than the author could, and in evidence of this, there follows a brief selection of letters from the Egyptian town of Oxyrhynchus, the English translation of which (from Greek) all but verbally corresponds to that given by Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt in their edition of the Oxyrhynchus Papyri.³¹ The author has selected such letters as date from the century in which our Saviour walked about in the Holy Land, in which Paul wrote his letters, and the beginnings of the New Testament collection were made.³²

I.

Letter from Chaireas to Tyrannos.³³

A.D. 25-26.

“Chaireas to his dearest Tyrannos, many greetings. Write out immediately the list of arrears both of corn and money for the twelfth year of Tiberius Caesar Augustus, as Severus has given me instructions for demanding their payment. I have already written to you to be firm and demand payment until I come in peace. Do not therefore neglect this, but prepare the statements of corn and money from the . . . year to the eleventh for the presentation of the demands. Good-bye.”
Address : “ To Tyrannos, dioiketes “.

II.

Letter of Recommendation from Theon to Tyrannos.³⁴

About A.D. 25.

“Theon to his esteemed Tyrannos, many greetings. Herakleides, the bearer of this letter, is my brother. I therefore entreat you with all my power to treat him as your protege. I have also written to your brother Hermias, asking him to communicate with you about him. You will confer upon me a very great favour if Herakleides gains your notice. Before all else you have my good wishes for unbroken health and prosperity. Good-bye.” Address: “To Tyrannos, dioiketes”.

III.

Letter from Dionysios to his Sister Didyme.³⁵

A.D. 27.

“Dionysios to his sister Didyme, many greetings, and good wishes for continued health. You have sent me no word about the clothes either by letter or by message, and they are still waiting until you send me word. Provide the bearer of this letter, Theonas, with any assistance that he wishes for. . . . Take care of yourself and all your household. Good-bye. The 14th year of Tiberius Caesar Augustus, Athyr 18.” Address : “ Deliver from Dionysios to his sister Didyme “.

IV.

Letter from Thaeisus to her mother Syras.³⁶

About A.D. 35.

“Thaeisus to her mother Syras. I must tell you that Seleukos came here and has fled. Don’t trouble to explain (?). Let Lucia wait until the year. Let me know the day. Salute Ammonas my brother and . . . and my sister . . . and my father Theonas.”

V.

Letter from Ammonios to his father Ammonios.³⁷

A.D. 54.

“Ammonios to his father Ammonios, greeting. Kindly write me in a note the record of the sheep, how many more you have by the lambing beyond those included in the first return. . . . Good-bye. The 14th year of Tiberius Claudius Caesar Augustus, Epeiph 29.”

Address: “To my father Ammonios”.

VI.

Letter from Indike to Thaeisus.³⁸ Late First Century.

“Indike to Thaeisus, greeting. I sent you the bread-basket by Taurinus the camel-man; please send me an answer that you have received it. Salute my friend Theon and Nikobulos and Dioskoros and Theon and Hermokles, who have my best wishes. Longinus salutes you. Good-bye. Month Germanikos 2.” Address: “To Theon,³⁹ son of Nikobulos, elaiochristes at the Gymnasion “.

VII.

Letter of Consolation from Eirene to Taonnophris and Philon.⁴⁰

Second Century.

“Eirene to Taonnophris and Philon, good cheer. I was as much grieved and shed as many tears over Eumoiros as I shed for Didymas, and I did everything that was fitting, and so did my whole family,⁴¹ Epaphrodeitos and Thermuthion and Philion and Apollonios and Plantas. But still there is nothing one can do in the face of such trouble. So I leave you to comfort yourselves. Good-bye. Athyr 1.”

Address: “To Taonnophris and Philon”.

VIII.

Letter from Korbolon to Herakleides.⁴²

Second Century.

“Korbolon to Herakleides, greeting. I send you the key by Horion, and the piece of the lock by Onnophris, the camel-driver of Apollonios. I enclosed in the former packet a pattern of white-violet colour. I beg you to be good enough to match it, and buy me two drachmas’ weight, and send it to me at once by any messenger you can find, for the tunic is to be woven immediately. I received everything you told me to expect by Onnophris safely. I send you by the same Onnophris six quarts of good apples. I thank all the gods to think that I came upon Plution in the Oxyrhynchite nome. Do not think that I took no trouble about the key. The reason is that the smith is a long way from us. I wonder that you did not see your way to let me have what I asked you to send by Korbolon, especially when I wanted it for a festival. I beg you to buy me a silver seal, and to send it me with all speed. Take care that Onnophris buys me what Eirene’s mother told him. I told him that Syntrophos said that nothing more should be given to Amarantos on my account. Let me know what you have given him that I may settle accounts with him. Otherwise I and my son will come for this purpose. [On the verso] I had the large cheeses from Korbolon. I did not, however, want large ones, but small. Let me know of anything that you want, and I will gladly do it. Farewell. Payni 1st. (P.S.) Send me an obol’s worth of cake for my nephew.”

Address: “To Herakleides, son of Ammonios.”

10. But we must not think that the heritage of true letters which we have received from the past is wholly comprised in the Papyrus letters which have been thus finely preserved as autographs. In books and booklets which have been transmitted to us as consisting of ■πιστολα■, and in others as well, there is contained a goodly number of true letters, for the preservation of which we are indebted to the circumstance that some one, at some time subsequent to their being written, treated them as literature. Just as at some future time posterity will be grateful to our learned men of to-day for their having published the Papyrus letters, i.e., treated them as literature, so we ourselves have every cause for gratitude to those individuals, for the most part unknown, who long ago committed the indiscretion of making books out of letters. The great men whose letters, fortunately for us, were overtaken by this fate, were not on that account epistolographers; they were letter-writers —like, the strange saints of the Serapeum and the obscure men and women of the Fayyûm. No doubt, by reason of their letters having been preserved as literature, they have often been considered as epistolographers, and the misunderstanding may have been abetted by the vulgar notion that those celebrated men had the consciousness of their celebrity even when

they laughed and yawned, and that they could not speak or write a single word without imagining that amazed mankind was standing by to hear and read. We have not as yet, in every case, identified those whom we have to thank for real letters. But it will be sufficient for our purpose if we restrict ourselves to a few likely instances. The letters of Aristotle († 322 B.C.) were published at a very early period: their publication gave the lie, in a very effective manner, to a fictitious collection which came out shortly after his death.⁴³ These letters were “true letters, occasioned by the requirements of private correspondence, not products of art, i.e., treatises in the form of letters”.⁴⁴ This collection is usually considered to be the first instance of private letters being subsequently published.⁴⁵ It is therefore necessary to mention them here, though, indeed, it is uncertain whether anything really authentic has been preserved among the fragments which have come down to us;⁴⁶ by far the greater number of these were certainly products of the fictitious literary composition of the Alexandrian period.⁴⁷—The case stands more favourably with regard to the nine letters transmitted to us under the name of Isocrates († 338 B.C.).⁴⁸ The most recent editor⁴⁹ of them comes to the following conclusions. The first letter, to Dionysios, is authentic. The two letters of introduction, Nos. 7 and 8, to Timotheos of Heracleia and the inhabitants of Mitylene respectively, bear the same mark of authenticity: “so much detail, which, wherever we can test it, we recognise to be historically accurate, and which, to a much greater extent, we are not at all in a position to judge, is not found in forgeries, unless they are meant to serve other than their ostensible purposes. There can be no talk of that in the case before us. In these letters some forms of expression occur more than once (7, 11 = 8, 10), but there is nothing extraordinary in that. If Isocrates wrote these we must credit him with having issued many such compositions.”⁵⁰ These genuine letters of Isocrates are of interest also in regard to their form, as they show “that Isocrates applied his rhetorical style also to his letters. . . . Considered from the point of view of style, they are not letters at all.”⁵¹ The author considers this fact to be very instructive in regard to method; it confirms the thesis expressed above, viz., that in answering the question as to what constitutes a true letter, it is never the form which is decisive, but ultimately only the intention of the writer; there ought not to be, but as a matter of fact there are, letters which read like pamphlets; there are epistles, again, which chatter so insinuatingly that we forget that their daintiness is nothing but a suspicious mask. Nor need one doubt, again, the genuineness of the second letter—to King Philip: “its contents are most undoubtedly personal”.⁵² Letter 5, to Alexander, is likewise genuine, “truly a fine piece of Isocratic finesse: it is genuine —just because it is more profound than it seems, and because it covertly refers to circumstances notoriously true”.⁵³ The evidence for and against the genuineness of letter 6 is evenly balanced.⁵⁴ On the other hand, letters 3, 4 and 9 are not genuine; are partly, in fact, forgeries with a purpose.⁵⁵ This general result of the criticism is likewise of great value in regard to method: we must abandon the mechanical idea of a collection of letters, which would lead us to inquire as to the genuineness of the collection as a whole, instead of inquiring as to the genuineness of its component parts. Undiscerning tradition may quite well have joined together one or two unauthentic letters with a dozen of genuine ones; and, again, a whole book of forged “letters” may be, so to speak, the chaff in which good grains of wheat may hide themselves from the eyes of the servants: when the son of the house comes to the threshing-floor, he will discover them, for he cannot suffer that anything be lost.—The letters of the much-misunderstood Epicurus († 270 B.C.) were collected with great care by the Epicureans, and joined together with those of his most distinguished pupils, Metrodorus, Polyænus, and Hermarchus, with additions from among the letters which these had received from other friends,⁵⁶

majority of these letters of Cicero are “truly confidential outpourings of the feelings of the moment,”⁷² particularly those addressed to Atticus—“confidential letters, in which the writer expresses himself without a particle of constraint, and which often contain allusions intelligible to the receiver alone. In some parts they read like soliloquies.”⁷³ The authenticity of the letters to Brutus, for instance, has been disputed by many, but these assailants “have been worsted on all points, and the authenticity is now more certain than ever. The objections that have been urged against this collection, and those, in particular, which relate to the contradictions between Cicero’s confidential judgments upon individuals and those he made publicly or in utterances of other times, are of but little weight.”⁷⁴

11. The fact that we know of a relatively large number of literary letters, i.e., epistles, of ancient times, and that, further, we possess many such, is a simple consequence of their being literary productions. Literature is designed not merely for the public of the time being; it is also for the future. It has not been ascertained with certainty which was the first instance of the literary letter in Greek literature. Susemihl⁷⁵ is inclined to think that the epideictic triflings of Lysias († 379 B.C.) occupy this position—that is, if they be authentic—but he certainly considers it possible that they originated in the later Attic period. Aristotle employed the “imaginary letter” (fictiver Brief) for his *Protreptikos*.⁷⁶ We have “didactic epistles” of Epicurus, as also of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, and we may add to these such writings of Plutarch as *De Conjugalibus Praeceptis*, *De Tranquillitate Animi*, *De Animae Procreatione*⁷⁷—literary productions to which one may well apply the words of an ancient expert in such things,⁷⁸ ο μ τ ν λ θειαν πιστολα λ γοιντο ν, λ λ συγγρ μματα χα ρειν χοντα προσγεγραμμ νον, and ε γ ρτις ν πιστολ σοφ σματα γρ φεικα υσιολογ ας, γραφειμ ν, ο μ ν πιστολ ν γρ φει.⁷⁹ Among the Romans, M. Porcius Cato († 149 B.C.) should probably be named as one of the first writers of epistles;⁸⁰ the best known, doubtless, are Seneca and Pliny. L. Annaeus Seneca⁸¹ († 165 A.D.) began about the year 57—at a time when Paul was writing his “great” letters—to write the *Epistulae Morales* to his friend Lucilius, intending from the first that they should be published; most probably the first three books were issued by himself. Then in the time of Trajan, C. Plinius Caecilius Secundus⁸² († ca. 113 A.D.) wrote and published nine books of “letters”; the issue of the collection was already complete by the time Pliny went to Bithynia. Then came his correspondence with Trajan, belonging chiefly to the period of his governorship in Bithynia (ca. September 111 to January 113). The letters of Pliny were likewise intended from the first for publication, “and hence are far from giving the same impression of freshness and directness as those of Cicero”;⁸³ “with studied variety they enlarge upon a multitude of topics, but are mainly designed to exhibit their author in the most favourable light”;⁸⁴ “they exhibit him as an affectionate husband, a faithful friend, a generous slaveholder, a noble-minded citizen, a liberal promoter of all good causes, an honoured orator and author”;⁸⁵ “on the other hand, the correspondence with Trajan incidentally raises a sharp contrast between the patience and quiet prudence of the emperor and the struggling perplexity and self-importance of his vicegerent”.⁸⁶ “All possible care has likewise been bestowed upon the form of these letters.”⁸⁷

There are several other facts illustrative of the extremely wide dissemination of the practice of epistle-writing among the Greeks and Romans. The epistle, having once gained a position as a literary *eidōs*, became differentiated into a whole series of almost independent forms of composition. We should, in the first place, recall the poetical epistle⁸⁸ (especially of Lucilius,

Horace, Ovid); but there were also juristic epistles—a literary form which probably originated in the written *responsa* to questions on legal subjects;⁸⁹ further, there were *epistulae medicinales*,⁹⁰ gastronomic “letters,”⁹¹ etc. In this connection it were well to direct particular attention to the great popularity of the epistle as the special form of magical and religious literature. “All the Magic Papyri are of this letter-form, and in all the ceremonial and mystic literature—to say nothing of other kinds—it was the customary form. At that time the pioneers of new religions clothed their message in this form, and even when they furnish their writings with a stereotype title of such a kind, and with particularly sacred names, it would yet be doing them an injustice simply to call them forgers.”⁹²

12. A very brief reference to the pseudonymous epistolography of antiquity is all that is required here. It will be sufficient for us to realise the great vogue it enjoyed, after the Alexandrian period, among the Greeks and subsequently among the Romans. It is decidedly one of the most characteristic features of post-classical literature. We already find a number of the last-mentioned epistles bearing the names of pretended authors; it is, indeed, difficult to draw a line between the “genuine” and the fictitious epistles when the two are set in contrast to letters really such.⁹³ As may be easily understood, pseudonymous epistolography specially affected the celebrated names of the past, and not least the names of those great men the real letters of whom were extant in collections. The literary practice of using assumed or protective names was found highly convenient by such obscure people as felt that they must make a contribution to literature of a page or two; they did not place their own names upon their books, for they had the true enough pre-sentiment that these would be a matter of indifference to their contemporaries and to posterity, nor did they substitute for them some unknown Gaius or Timon: what they did was to write “letters” of Plato or Demosthenes, of Aristotle or his royal pupil, of Cicero, Brutus or Horace. It would be superfluous in the meantime to go into particulars about any specially characteristic examples, the more so as the present position of the investigation still makes it difficult for us to assign to each its special historical place, but at all events the pseudonymous epistolography of antiquity stands out quite clearly as a distinct aggregate of literary phenomena. Suffice it only to refer further to what may be very well gleaned from a recent work,⁹⁴ viz., that the early imperial period was the classical age of this most unclassical manufacturing of books.

01.04 - PROLEGOMENA TO THE BIBLICAL LETTERS AND EPISTLES.

iv.

PROLEGOMENA TO THE BIBLICAL LETTERS AND EPISTLES.

13. The author’s purpose was to write Prolegomena to the biblical letters and epistles: it may seem now to be high time that he came to the subject. But he feels that he might now break off, and still confidently believe that he has not neglected his task. What remains to be said is really implied in the foregoing pages. It was a problem in the method of literary history which urged itself upon him; he has solved it, for himself at least, in laying bare the roots by which it adheres to the soil on which flourished aforetime the spacious garden of God—Holy Scripture. To the investigator the Bible offers a large number of writings bearing a name which appears to be simple, but which nevertheless conceals within itself that same problem —a name which every child seems to understand, but upon which, nevertheless, the learned man must ponder deeply if ever he will see into the heart of the things called by it. “Letters”! How long did the author work with this term without having ever once reflected on what it meant; how long did it accompany him through his daily task in science without his observing the enigma that was inscribed on its work-a-day face! Others may have been more knowing: the author’s experiences were like those of a man who plants a vineyard without being able to distinguish the true vine-shoots from the suckers of the wild grape. That was, of course, a sorry plight—as bad as if one were to labour upon Attic tragedies without knowing what an Attic tragedy is. One may, indeed, write a letter without necessarily knowing what a letter is. The best letter-writers have certainly not cherished any doctrinaire opinions on the subject. The ancient Greek and Latin “guides to letter-writing”⁹⁵ appeared long after Cicero: neither did the Apostles, for that matter, know anything of Halieutics. But if one is to understand those literary memorials in the Bible which have come to us under the name of “letters,” and to make them intelligible to others, the first condition is, of course, that one must have an historical comprehension of his purpose, must have previously divested the problematic term of its

problematic

character:

ο■γ■ρ■πειδ■πιστολ■προσαγορε■εται■νικ■ν■ματι,■δηκα■πασ■ντ■ν■κατ■τ■νβ■ονφερο
 μ■νων■πιστολ■νε■ςτις■στιχαρακτ■ρκκα■μ■απροσηγορ■α,■λλ■δι■φοροι,καθ■ς■φην.96

If we rightly infer, from an investigation of ancient literature, that the familiar term “letter” must be broken up—above all, into the two chief categories real letter and epistle, then the biblical “letters” likewise must be investigated from this point of view. Just as the language of the Bible ought to be studied in its actual historical context of contemporary language;⁹⁷ just as its religious and ethical contents must be studied in their actual historical context of contemporary religion and civilisation⁹⁸—so the biblical writings, too, in the literary investigation of them, ought not to be placed in an isolated position. The author speaks of the biblical writings, not of the biblical literature. To apply the designation literature to certain portions of the biblical writings would be an illegitimate procedure. Not all that we find printed in books at the present day was literature from

the first. A comparison of the biblical writings, in their own proper character, with the other writings of antiquity, will show us that in each case there is a sharp distinction between works which were literature from the first and writings which only acquired that character later on, or will show, at least, that we must so distinguish them from each other. This is nowhere more evident than in the case under discussion. When we make the demand that the biblical “letters” are to be set in their proper relation to ancient letter-writing as a whole, we do not thereby imply that they are products of ancient epistolography; but rather that they shall be investigated simply with regard to the question, how far the categories implied in the problematic term letter are to be employed in the criticism of them. We may designate our question regarding the biblical letters and epistles as a question regarding the literary character of the writings transmitted by the Bible under the name letters,⁹⁹ but the question regarding their literary character must be so framed that the answer will affirm the preliterate character, probably of some, possibly of all. The latter has been maintained by F. Overbeck,¹⁰⁰—at least in regard to the “letters” in the New Testament. He thinks that the Apostolic letters belong to a class of writings which we ought not to place in the province of literature at all;¹⁰¹ the writer of a letter has, as such, no concern with literature whatever,—“because for every product of literature it is essential that its contents have an appropriate literary form”.¹⁰² The written words of a letter are nothing but the wholly inartificial and incidental substitute for spoken words. As the letter has a quite distinct and transitory motive, so has it also a quite distinct and restricted public—not necessarily merely one individual, but sometimes, according to circumstances, a smaller or larger company of persons: in any case, a circle of readers which can be readily brought before the writer’s mind and distinctly located in the field of inward vision. A work of literature, on the other hand, has the widest possible publicity in view: the literary man’s public is, so to speak, an imaginary one, which it is the part of the literary work to find.¹⁰³ Though Overbeck thus indicates with proper precision the fundamental difference between the letter and literature, yet he has overlooked the necessary task of investigating whether the Apostolic letters—either as a whole or in part—may not be epistles, and this oversight on his part is the more extraordinary, since he quite clearly recognises the distinction between the letter and the epistle. He speaks, at least, of “artificial letters,” and contrasts them with “true letters”;¹⁰⁴ in point of fact, he has the right feeling,¹⁰⁵ that there are some of the New Testament letters, the form of which is quite obviously not that of a letter at all, viz., the so-called Catholic Epistles: in some of these the form of address, being so indefinite and general, does not correspond to what we expect in a letter, and, in fact, constitutes a hitherto unsolved problem. Hence he is inclined to class them along with those New Testament writings “which, in their own proper and original form, certainly belong to literature,¹⁰⁶ but which, in consideration of the paucity of their different forms, must not be thought of as qualifying the New Testament to be ranked historically as the beginning of that literature”. Easy as it would have been to characterise the “letters,” thus so aptly described, as epistles, Overbeck has yet refrained from doing this, and though he seems, at least, to have characterised them as literature, yet he pointedly disputes¹⁰⁷ the contention that Christian literature begins with “the New Testament,”—that is, in possible case, with these letters,—and he expressly says that the “artificial letter” remains wholly outside of the sphere of this discussion.¹⁰⁸

14. The present writer would assert, as against this, that “in the New Testament,” and not only there but also in the literature of the Jews as well as of the Christians of post-New-Testament times, the transmitted “letters” permit of quite as marked a division into real letters and epistles, as

is the case in ancient literature generally.

14. Most investigators of the New Testament letters seem to overlook the fact that this same profound difference already manifests itself clearly in the “letters” found among the writings of pre-Christian Judaism. Looking at the writings of early Christianity from the standpoint of literary history, we perceive that Jewish literature¹⁰⁹ was precisely the literary sphere from which the first Christians could most readily borrow and adopt something in the way of forms, εἶδη, of composition.¹¹⁰ If, therefore, the existence of the εἶδος of the epistle can be demonstrated in this possibly archetypal sphere, our inquiry regarding the early Christian “letters” manifestly gains a more definite justification. Should the doubt be raised as to whether it is conceivable that a line of demarcation, quite unmistakably present in “profane” literature, should have also touched the outlying province of the New Testament, that doubt will be stilled when it is shown that this line had actually long intersected the sphere of Jewish literature, which may have been the model for the writers of the New Testament. Between the ancient epistles and what are (possibly) the epistles of early Christianity, there subsists a literary, a morphological connection; if it be thought necessary to establish a transition-link, this may quite well be found in the Jewish epistles. The way by which the epistle entered the sphere of Jewish authorship is manifest: Alexandria, the classical soil of the epistle and the pseudo-epistle, exercised its Hellenising influence upon Judaism in this matter as in others. We know not who the first Jewish epistolographer may have been, but it is, at least, highly probable that he was an Alexandrian. The taking over of the epistolary form was facilitated for him by the circumstance that already in the ancient and revered writings of his nation there was frequent mention of “letters,” and that, as a matter of fact, he found a number of “letters” actually given verbatim in the sacred text. Any one who read the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah with the eyes of an Alexandrian Hellenist, found, in Jeremiah 29:1-32 (the prophet’s message to the captives in Babylon),¹¹¹ something which to his morbid literary taste seemed like an epistle. As a matter of fact, this message is a real letter, perhaps indeed the only genuine one we have from Old Testament times; a real letter, which only became literature by its subsequent admission into the book of the Prophet. As it now stands in the book, it is to be put in exactly the same class as all other real letters which were subsequently published. In its origin, in its purpose, LXX Jeremiah 29:1-32 [MT Jeremiah 47:1-7], being a real letter, is non-literary, and hence, of course, we must not ask after a literary prototype for it. The wish to discover the first Israelitic or first Christian letter-writer would be as foolish as the inquiry regarding the beginnings of Jewish and, later, of Christian, epistolography is profitable and necessary; besides, the doctrinaire inquirer would be cruelly undeceived when the sublime simplicity of the historical reality smiled at him from the rediscovered first Christian letter—its pages perhaps infinitely paltry in their contents: some forgotten cloak may have been the occasion of it—who will say? LXX Jeremiah 29:1-32 [MT Jeremiah 47:1-7] is not, of course, a letter such as anybody might dash off in an idle moment; nay, lightnings quiver between the lines, Jahweh speaks in wrath or in blessing,—still, although a Jeremiah wrote it, although it be a documentary fragment of the history of the people and the religion of Israel, it is still a letter, neither less nor more. The antithesis of it in that respect is not wanting. There has been transmitted to us, among the Old Testament Apocryphal writings, a little book bearing the name Πιστολόγιον. If LXX Jeremiah 29:1-32 [MT Jeremiah 47:1-7] is a letter of the prophet Jeremiah, this is an Epistle of “Jeremiah”. Than the latter, we could know no more instructive instance for the elucidation of the distinction between letter and epistle, or for the proper appreciation of the idea of pseudonymity in ancient literature. The Greek epistolography of

the Alexandrian period constituted the general literary impulse of the writer of the Epistle of "Jeremiah," while the actual existence of a real letter of Jeremiah constituted the particular impulse. He wrote an epistle,—as did the other great men of the day: he wrote an epistle of "Jeremiah," just as the others may have fabricated, say, epistles of "Plato". We can distinctly see, in yet another passage, how the motive to epistolography could be found in the then extant sacred writings of Judaism. The canonical Book of Esther speaks, in two places, of royal letters, without giving their contents: a sufficient reason for the Greek reviser to sit down and manufacture them, just as the two prayers, only mentioned in the original, are given by him in full!¹¹²

Having once gained a footing, epistolography must have become very popular in Greek Judaism; we have still a whole series of Graeco-Jewish "letters," which are unquestionably epistles. The author is not now thinking of the multitude of letters, ascribed to historical personages, which are inserted in historical works¹¹³; in so far as these are unauthentic, they are undoubtedly of an epistolary character, but they belong less to the investigation of epistolography than to the development of historical style. We should rather call to mind books and booklets like the Epistle of Aristeas, the two¹¹⁴ epistles at the beginning of the 2nd Book of Maccabees, the Epistle of "Baruch" to the nine and a half tribes in captivity, attached to the Apocalypse of Baruch,¹¹⁵ perhaps the twenty-eighth "Letter of Diogenes,"¹¹⁶ and certain portions of the collection of "letters" which bears the name of Heraclitus.¹¹⁷

15. Coming, then, to the early Christian "letters" with our question, letter or epistle? it will be our first task to determine the character of the "letters" transmitted to us under the name of Paul. Was Paul a letter-writer or an epistolographer? The question is a sufficiently pressing one, in view of the exceedingly great popularity of epistolography in the Apostle's time. Nor can we forthwith answer it, even leaving the Pastoral epistles out of consideration, and attending in the first place only to those whose genuineness is more or less established. The difficulty is seen in its most pronounced form when we compare the letter to Philemon with that to the Romans; here we seem to have two such heterogeneous compositions that it would appear questionable whether we should persist in asking the above disjunctive question. May not Paul have written both letters and epistles? It would certainly be preposterous to assume, a priori, that the "letters" of Paul must be either all letters or all epistles. The inquiry must rather be directed upon each particular "letter"—a task the fulfilment of which lies outside the scope of the present methodological essay.¹¹⁸ But, as it is, the author may here at least indicate his opinion.

It appears to him quite certain that the authentic writings of the Apostle are true letters, and that to think of them as epistles¹¹⁹ is to take away what is best in them. They were, of course, collected, and treated as literature—in point of fact, as literature in the highest sense, as canonical—at an early period. But that was nothing more than an after-experience of the letters, for which there were many precedents in the literary development sketched above. But this after-experience cannot change their original character, and our first task must be to ascertain what this character actually is. Paul had no thought of adding a few fresh compositions to the already extant Jewish epistles, still less of enriching the sacred literature of his nation; no, every time he wrote, he had some perfectly definite impulse in the diversified experiences of the young Christian churches. He had no presentiment of the place his words would occupy in universal history; not so much as that they would still be in existence in the next generation, far less that one day the people would look upon them as Holy Scripture. We now know them as coming down from the centuries with the

literary patina and the nimbus of canonicity upon them; should we desire to attain a historical estimate of their proper character, we must disregard both. Just as we should not allow the dogmatic idea of the mass to influence our historical consideration of the last Supper of Jesus with His disciples, nor the liturgical notions of a prayerbook-commission to influence our historical consideration of the Lord's Prayer, so little dare we approach the letters of Paul with ideas about literature and notions about the canon. Paul had better work to do than the writing of books, and he did not flatter himself that he could write Scripture; he wrote letters, real letters, as did Aristotle and Cicero, as did the men and women of the Fayyûm. They differ from the messages of the homely Papyrus leaves from Egypt not as letters, but only as the letters of Paul. No one will hesitate to grant that the Letter to Philemon has the character of a letter. It must be to a large extent a mere doctrinaire want of taste that could make any one describe this gem, the preservation of which we owe to some fortunate accident, as an essay, say, "on the attitude of Christianity to slavery". It is rather a letter, full of a charming, unconscious naivete, full of kindly human nature. It is thus that Epicurus writes to his child, and Moltke to his wife: no doubt Paul talks of other matters than they do—no one letter, deserving the name, has ever looked like another—but the Apostle does exactly what is done by the Greek philosopher and the German officer.

It is also quite clear that the note of introduction contained in Romans 16:1-27 is of the nature of a true letter. No one, it is to be hoped, will make the objection that it is directed to a number of persons—most likely the Church at Ephesus; the author thinks that he has made it probable that the number of receivers is of no account in the determination of the nature of a letter.¹²⁰ But the Letter to the Philippians is also as real a letter as any that was ever written. Here a quite definite situation of affairs forced the Apostle to take up his pen, and the letter reflects a quite definite frame of mind, or, at least, enables us to imagine it. The danger of introducing into our investigation considerations which, so far as concerns method,¹²¹ are irrelevant, is, of course, greater in this case. Some reader will again be found to contend that, in contrast to the private letter to Philemon, we have here a congregational letter: some one, again, who is convinced of the valuelessness of this distinction, will bring forward the peculiarity of the contents the letter is of a "doctrinal" character, and should thus be designated a doctrinal letter. This peculiarity must not be denied—though, indeed, the author has misgivings about applying the term doctrine to the Apostle's messages; the "doctrinal" sections of the letters impress him more as being of the nature of confessions and attestations. But what is added towards the answering of our question letter or epistle? by the expression "doctrinal" letter—however pertinent a term? If a letter is intended to instruct the receiver, or a group of receivers, does it thereby cease to be a letter? A worthy pastor, let us say, writes some stirring words to his nephew at the university, to the effect that he should not let the "faith" be shaken by professorial wisdom; and he refutes point by point the inventions of men. Perhaps, when he himself was a student, he received some such sincere letters from his father against the new orthodoxy which was then, in its turn, beginning to be taught. Do such letters forthwith become tractates simply because they are "doctrinal"?¹²² We must carefully guard against an amalgamation of the two categories doctrinal letter and epistle. If any one be so inclined, he may break up the letter into a multitude of subdivisions: the twenty-one or forty-one τμήματα of the old theorists¹²³ may be increased to whatever extent one wishes. The author has no objection to any one similarly breaking up the Pauline letters into several subdivisions, and subsuming some of them under the species doctrinal letter; only one should not fondly imagine

that by means of the doctrinal letter he has bridged over the great gulf between letter and epistle. The pre-literary character even of the doctrinal letter must be maintained. This also holds good of the other Letters of Paul, even of the "great Epistles". They, too, are partly doctrinal; they contain, in fact, theological discussions: but even in these, the Apostle had no desire to make literature. The Letter to the Galatians is not a pamphlet "upon the relation of Christianity to Judaism," but a message sent in order to bring back the foolish Galatians to their senses. The letter can only be understood in the light of its special purpose as such.¹²⁴ How much more distinctly do the Letters to the Corinthians bear the stamp of the true letter! The second of them, in particular, reveals its true character in every line; in the author's opinion, it is the most letter-like of all the letters of Paul, though that to Philemon may appear on the surface to have a better claim to that position. The great difficulty in the understanding of it is due to the very fact that it is so truly a letter, so full of allusions and familiar references, so pervaded with irony and with a depression which struggles against itself—matters of which only the writer and the readers of it understood the purport, but which we, for the most part, can ascertain only approximately. What is doctrinal in it is not there for its own sake, but is altogether subservient to the purpose of the letter. The nature of the letters which were brought to the Corinthians by the fellow-workers of Paul, was thoroughly well understood by thereceivers themselves, else surely they would hardly have allowed one or two of them to be lost. They agreed, in fact, with Paul, in thinking that the letters had served their purpose when once they had been read. We may most deeply lament that they took no trouble to preserve the letters, but it only shows lack of judgment to reproach them on this account. A letter is something ephemeral, and must be so by its very nature;¹²⁵ it has as little desire to be immortal as a *tete-et-tete* has to be minuted, or an alms to be entered in a ledger. In particular, the temper of mind in which Paul and his Churches passed their days was not such as to awaken in them an interest for the centuries to come. The Lord was at hand; His advent was within the horizon of the times, and such an anticipation has nothing in common with the enjoyment of the contemplative book-collector. The one-sided religious temper of mind has never yet had any affection for such things as interest the learned. Modern Christians have become more prosaic. We institute collections of archives, and found libraries, and, when a prominent man dies, we begin to speculate upon the destination of his literary remains: all this needs a hope less bold and a faith less simple than belonged to the times of Paul. From the point of view of literature, the preservation even of two letters to the Corinthians is a secondary and accidental circumstance, perhaps owing, in part, to their comparative lengthiness, which saved them from immediate destruction. The Letter to the Romans is also a real letter. No doubt there are sections in it which might also stand in an epistle; the whole tone of it, generally speaking, stamps it as different from the other Pauline letters. But nevertheless it is not a book, and the favourite saying that it is a compendium of Paulinism, that the Apostle has, in it, laid down his Dogmatics and his Ethics, certainly manifests an extreme lack of taste. No doubt Paul wanted to give instruction, and he did it, in part, with the help of contemporary theology, but he does not think of the literary public of his time, or of Christians in general, as his readers; he appeals to a little company of men, whose very existence, one may say, was unknown to the public at large, and who occupied a special position within Christianity. It is unlikely that the Apostle would send copies of the letter to the brethren in Ephesus, Antioch or Jerusalem; it was to Rome that he despatched it: nor did the bearer of it go to the publishers in the Imperial City,¹²⁶ but rather to some otherwise unknown brother in the Lord—just like many another passenger by the same ship of Corinth, hastening one to that house,

another to this, there to deliver a message by word of mouth, here to leave a letter or something else. The fact that the Letter to the Romans is not so enlivened by personal references as the other letters of Paul is explained by the conditions under which it was written: he was addressing a Church which he did not yet personally know. Considered in the light of this fact, the infrequency of personal references in the letter lends no support to its being taken as a literary epistle; it is but the natural result of its non-literary purpose. Moreover, Paul wrote even the “doctrinal” portions in his heart’s blood. The words *ταλαπυρος γινθρωπος* are no cool rhetorical expression of an objective ethical condition, but the impressive indication of a personal ethical experience: it is not theological paragraphs which Paul is writing here, but his confessions.

Certain as it seems to the author that the authentic messages of Paul are letters, he is equally sure that we have also a number of epistles from New Testament times. They belong, as such, to the beginnings of “Christian literature”. The author considers the Letter to the Hebrews as most unmistakably of all an epistle. It professes, in chap. Hebrews 13:22, to be a *λογος παρακλησεως*, and one would have no occasion whatever to consider it anything but a literary oration—hence not as an epistle¹²⁷ at all—if the *πιστειλα* and the greetings at the close did not permit of the supposition that it had at one time opened with something of the nature of an address as well. The address has been lost; it might all the more easily fall out as it was only a later insertion. The address is, indeed, of decisive importance for the understanding of a letter, but in an epistle it is an unessential element. In the letter, the address occupies, so to speak, the all-controlling middle-ground of the picture; in the epistle it is only ornamental detail. Any given *λογος* can be made an epistle by any kind of an address. The Epistle to the Hebrews stands on the same literary plane as the Fourth Book of Maccabees, which describes itself as a *φιλοσοφητατος λογος*; the fact that the latter seems to avoid the appearance of being an epistle constitutes a purely external difference between them, and one which is immaterial for the question regarding their literary character.—The author is chiefly concerned about the recognition of the “Catholic” Epistles, or, to begin with, of some of them at least, as literary epistles. With a true instinct, the ancient Church placed these Catholic Epistles as a special group over against the Pauline. It seems to the author that the idea of their catholicity, thus assumed, is to be understood from the form of address in the “letters,” and not primarily from the special character of their contents.¹²⁸ They are compositions addressed to Christians—one might perhaps say the Church—in general. The catholicity of the address implies, of course, a catholicity in the contents. What the Church calls catholic, we require only to call epistle, and the unsolved enigma with which, according to Overbeck,¹²⁹ they present us, is brought nearer to a solution. The special position of these “letters,” which is indicated by their having the attribute catholic instinctively applied to them, is due precisely to their literary character; catholic means in this connection literary. The impossibility of recognising the “letters” of Peter, James and Jude as real letters follows directly from the peculiarity in the form of their address. Any one who writes to the elect who are sojourners of the Diaspora in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia, or to the twelve tribes which are of the Diaspora, or even to them which have obtained a like precious faith with us, or to them that are called, beloved in God the Father and kept for Jesus Christ, must surely have reflected on the question as to what means he must employ in order to convey his message to those so addressed. Quite similarly does that other early Christian epistle still bear the address to the Hebrews; quite similarly does the author of the epistle at the close of the Apocalypse of Baruch write to the nine-and-a-half tribes of the Captivity, and Pseudo-Diogenes,

ep. 28,130 to the so-called Hellenes. The only way by which the letters could reach such ideal addresses was to have them reproduced in numbers from the first. But that means that they were literature. Had the First Epistle of Peter,¹³¹ for instance, been intended as a real letter, then the writer of it, or a substitute, would have had to spend many a year of his life ere he could deliver the letter throughout the enormous circuit of the countries mentioned. The epistle, in fact, could only reach its public as a booklet; at the present day it would not be sent as a circular letter in sealed envelope, but as printed matter by book-post. It is true, indeed, that these Catholic Epistles are Christian literature: their authors had no desire to enrich universal literature; they wrote their books for a definite circle of people with the same views as themselves, that is, for Christians; but books they wrote. Very few books, indeed, are so arrogant as to aspire to become universal literature; most address themselves to a section only of the immeasurable public—they are special literature, or party literature, or national literature. It is quite admissible to speak of a literary public, even if the public in question be but a limited one—even if its boundaries be very sharply drawn. Hence the early Christian epistles were, in the first instance, special literature; to the public at large in the imperial period they were altogether unknown, and, doubtless, many a Christian of the time thought of them as esoteric, and handed them on only to those who were brethren; but, in spite of all, the epistles were designed for some kind of publicity in a literary sense: they were destined for the brethren. The ideal indefiniteness of this destination has the result that the contents have an ecumenical cast. Compare the Epistle of James, for instance, with the Letters of Paul, in regard to this point. From the latter we construct the history of the apostolic age; the former, so long as it is looked upon as a letter, is the enigma of the New Testament. Those to whom the “letter” was addressed have been variously imagined to be Jews, Gentile Christians, Jewish Christians, or Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians together; the map has been scrutinised in every part without any one having yet ascertained where we are to seek—not to say find—the readers. But if Diaspora be not a definite geographical term, no more is the Epistle of “James” a letter. Its pages are inspired by no special motive; there is nothing whatever to be read between the lines; its words are of such general interest that they might, for the most part, stand in the Book of Wisdom, or the Imitation of Christ. It is true, indeed, that the epistle reveals that it is of early Christian times, but nothing more. There is nothing uniquely distinctive in its motive, and hence no animating element in its contents. “James” sketches from models, not from nature. Unfortunately there has always been occasion, among Christians, to censure contentions and sins of the tongue, greed and calumny; indignation at the unmercifulness of the rich and sympathy with the poor are common moods of the prophetic or apostolic mind; the scenes from the synagogue and the harvest-field are familiar types—the epistle, in fact, is pervaded by the expressions and topics of the aphoristic “wisdom” of the Old Testament and of Jesus. Even if it could be demonstrated that the writer was alluding to cases which had actually occurred, yet we cannot perceive how these cases concern him in any special way; there is no particular personal relation between him and those whom he “addresses”. The picture of the readers and the figure of the writer are equally colourless and indistinct. In the letters of Paul, there speaks to us a commanding personality—though, indeed, he had no wish to speak to us at all; every sentence is the pulse-throb of a human heart, and, whether charmed or surprised, we feel at least the “touch of nature”. But what meets us in the Epistle of James is a great subject rather than a great man, Christianity itself rather than a Christian personality. It has lately become the custom, in some quarters, to designate the book as a homily. We doubt whether much is gained by so doing, for the term homily, as applied to any of the

writings of early Christianity, is itself ambiguous and in need of elucidation; it probably needs to be broken up in the same way as "letter". But that designation, at least, gives expression to the conviction that the book in question is wholly different in character from a letter. In the same way, the recognition of the fact that the Catholic Epistles in general are not real letters, is evinced by the instinctive judgment passed on them by the Bible-reading community. The Epistle of James and particularly the First Epistle of Peter, one may say, are examples of those New Testament "letters" which play a most important part in popular religion, while the Second Letter to the Corinthians, for instance, must certainly be counted among the least-known parts of the Bible. And naturally so; the latter, properly speaking, was adapted only to the needs of the Corinthians, while later readers know not what to make of it. They seek out a few detached sayings, but the connection is not perceived; in it, truly, they find some things hard to be understood. But those epistles were adapted to Christians in general; they are ecumenical, and, as such, have a force the persistence of which is not affected by any vicissitude of time. Moreover, it also follows from their character as epistles that the question of authenticity is not nearly so important for them as for the Pauline letters. It is allowable that in the epistle the personality of the writer should be less prominent; whether it is completely veiled, as, for instance, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, or whether it modestly hides itself behind some great name of the past, as in other cases, does not matter; considered in the light of ancient literary practices, this is not only not strange, but in reality quite natural.—Finally, we may consider the Pastoral Epistles and the Seven Messages in the Apocalypse in regard to the question whether they are epistles. Though it seems to the author not impossible that the former have had worked into them genuine elements of a letter or letters of Paul, he would answer the question in the affirmative. The Seven Epistles of the Book of Revelation, again, differ from the rest in the fact that they do not form books by themselves, nor constitute one book together, but only a portion of a book. It is still true, however, that they are not letters. All seven are constructed on a single definite plan,—while, taken separately, they are not intelligible, or, at least, not completely so; their chief interest lies in their mutual correspondence, which only becomes clear by a comprehensive comparison of their separate clauses: the censure of one church is only seen in its full severity when contrasted with the praise of another.

16. There is now no need, let us hope, of demonstrating that the distinction between letters and epistles does not end in mere judgments as to their respective values. We would be the last to ignore the great value of, say, the Epistle of James or the Epistles of Peter; a comparison of these writings with the Epistle of Jeremiah, for example, and many of the Graeco-Roman epistles, would be sufficient to guard us against that. In regard to the latter, one must frequently marvel at the patience of a public which could put up with the sorry stuff occasionally given to it as epistles. The more definitely we assign to the New Testament epistles a place in ancient epistolography, the more clearly will they themselves convince us of their own special excellence. But our distinction proves itself, as a principle of method, to be of some importance in other respects, and we may, in conclusion, gather up our methodological inferences in brief form as follows (some of these have already been indicated here and there).

(1) The historical criticism of early Christian writings must guard against conceiving of the New Testament as a collection of homogeneous compositions, and must give due weight to the pre-literary character of certain parts of it. The literary portions must be investigated in regard to their formal similarity with Graeco-Latin and Jewish literature; further, this line of connection must

be prolonged well into the Patristic literature. The much-discussed question, whether we should view the whole subject as the History of Early Christian Literature or as the Introduction to the New Testament, is a misleading one; the alternatives contain a similar error, the former implying that some, the latter that all, of the constituent parts of the New Testament should be considered from a point of view under which they did not originally stand: the former, in regarding even the real letters as literature; the latter, in seeking its facts in a historical connection in which they did not take their rise. The history of the collection and publication of the nonliterary writings of primitive Christianity, and the history of the canonisation of the writings which subsequently became literature, or were literary from the first, constitute, each of them, a distinct field of study.

(2) The letters of Paul afford a fixed starting-point for the history of the origin of the early Christian "letters". We must ask ourselves whether it is conceivable that the literary temperament and the epistles which were its outcome can be older than the letters of Paul.

(3) The collection and publication¹³² of the letters of Paul was indirectly influenced by the analogy of other collections of letters¹³³ made in ancient times.¹³⁴ The only possible motive of such collecting and publishing was reverential love. Once the letters of Paul had been collected and treated as literature, they in turn, thus misconceived, produced a literary impulse. We must, then, carefully weigh the possibility that their collection and publication may form a terminus post quem for the composition of the early Christian epistles.

(4) The sources by means of which we are enabled to judge of the knowledge of the New Testament letters which was possessed by Christians of the post-apostolic period, the so-called testimonia, and specially the testimonia e silentio, have an altogether different historical value according as they relate to letters or epistles.¹³⁵ The silentium regarding the letters (most striking of all, externally considered, in the Book of Acts), is really explained by the nature of the letter as such, and cannot be employed as an evidence of spuriousness. A. silentium, on the other hand, regarding epistles is, on account of their public character, to say the least, suspicious. The distinction between letters and epistles has also perhaps a certain importance for the criticism of the traditional texts.

(5) The criticism of the Letters of Paul must always leave room for the probability that their alleged contradictions and impossibilities, from which reasons against their authenticity and integrity have been deduced, are really evidences to the contrary, being but the natural concomitants of letter-writing. The history of the criticism of Cicero's letters,¹³⁶ for instance, yields an instructive analogy. The criticism of the early Christian epistles must not leave out of account the considerations which are to be deduced from the history of ancient epistolography.

(6) The exegesis of the letters of Paul must take its special standpoint from the nature of the letter. Its task is to reproduce in detail the Apostle's sayings as they have been investigated in regard to the particular historical occasions of their origin, as phenomena of religious psychology. It must proceed by insight and intuition, and hence it has an unavoidable subjective cast. The exegesis of the early Christian epistles must assume a proper historical attitude with regard to their literary character. Its task is not to penetrate into the knowledge of creative personalities in the religious sphere, but to interpret great texts. As the element of personality is wanting in its object, so must that of subjectivity disappear from its procedure.

(7) The value of the New Testament “letters,” as sources for the investigation of the Apostolic age, varies according to their individual character. The classic value of the letters of Paul lies in their being actual letters, that is to say, in their being artless and unpremeditated; in this respect also, they resemble those of Cicero.¹³⁷ The value of the epistles as sources is not to be rated so highly, and, in particular, not for the special questions regarding the “constitution” and the external circumstances of Christianity; many details are only of typical value, while others, again, are but literary exercises, or anticipations of conditions not yet fully realised.

(8) In particular, the New Testament letters and epistles, considered as sources for the history of the Christian religion in its early period, are of different respective values. The letters of Paul are not so much sources for the theology, or even for the religion, of the period, as simply for the personal religion of Paul as an individual; it is only by a literary misconception that they are looked upon as the documents of “Paulinism”. The result of their criticism from the standpoint of the history of religion can be nothing more than a sketch of the character of Paul the letter-writer, and not the system of Paul the epistolographer; what speaks to us in the letters is his faith, not his dogmatics; his morality, not his ethics; his hopes, not his eschatology—here and there, no doubt, in the faltering speech of theology. The early Christian epistles are the monuments of a religion which was gradually accommodating itself to external conditions, which had established itself in the world, which received its stimulus less in the closet than in the church, and which was on the way to express itself in liturgy and as doctrine.—

“The Hero who is the centre of all this did not himself . . . become an author; the only recorded occasion of his having written at all was when he wrote upon the ground with his finger, and the learning of eighteen centuries has not yet divined what he then wrote.”¹³⁸ If Jesus is the gospel, then it must hold good that the gospel is non-literary. Jesus had no wish to make a religion; whoever has such a wish will but make a Koran. It was only lack of understanding on the part of those who came after (die Epigonen) which could credit the Son of Man with the writing of epistles—and to a king to boot! The saints are the epistles of Christ.¹³⁹ Nor did the Apostle of Jesus Christ advocate the gospel by literature; in point of fact, the followers of Christ learned first to pray and then to write—like children. The beginnings of Christian literature are really the beginnings of the secularisation of Christianity: the gospel becomes a book-religion. The church, as a factor in history—which the gospel made no claim to be—required literature, and hence it made literature, and made books out of letters; hence also at length the New Testament came into existence. The New Testament is an offspring of the Church. The Church is not founded upon the New Testament; other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ. The gain which accrued to the world by the New Testament carried with it a danger which Christianity—to the detriment of the spirit of it—has not always been able to avoid, viz., the losing of itself as a literary religion in a religion of the letter.

02 - CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE HISTORY OF THE LANGUAGE OF THE GREEK BIBLE.

II.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE HISTORY OF THE LANGUAGE OF THE GREEK BIBLE.

νο·γωτ·μν·ματα μ·νκα··ν·ξω μ·ς·κτ·νμνηματων μ·ν
κα·ε·σ·ξω μ·ςε·στ·νγ·ντο··σρα·λ.

02.01 - CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE HISTORY OF THE LANGUAGE OF THE GREEK BIBLE.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE HISTORY OF THE LANGUAGE OF THE GREEK BIBLE.

Ever since the language of the Greek Bible became a subject of consideration, the most astonishing opinions have been held with regard to the sacred text.

There was a time when the Greek of the New Testament was looked upon as the genuinely classical; it was supposed that the Holy Spirit, using the Apostles merely as a pen, could not but clothe His thoughts in the most worthy garb. That time is past: the doctrine of verbal Inspiration, petrified almost into a dogma, crumbles more and more to pieces from day to day; and among the rubbish of the venerable ruins it is the human labours of the more pious past that are waiting, all intact, upon the overjoyed spectator. Whoever surrenders himself frankly to the impression which is made by the language of the early Christians, is fully assured that the historical connecting-points of New Testament Greek are not found in the period of the Epos and the Attic classical literature. Paul did not speak the language of the Homeric poems or of the tragedians and Demosthenes, any more than Luther that of the Nibelungen-Lied. But much still remains to be done before the influence of the idea of Inspiration upon the investigation of early Christian Greek is got rid of. Though, indeed, the former exaggerated estimate of its value no longer holds good, it yet reveals itself in the unobtrusive though widely-spread opinion that the phrase “the New Testament” represents, in the matter of language, a unity and a distinct entity; it is thought that the canonical writings should form a subject of linguistic investigation by themselves, and that it is possible within such a sphere to trace out the laws of a special “genius of language”. Thus, in theological commentaries, even with regard to expressions which have no special religious significance, we may find the observation that so and so are “New Testament” ■παξλεγμενα, 140 and in a philological discussion of the linguistic relations of the Atticists we are told, with reference to some peculiar construction, that the like does not occur “in the New Testament”—a remarkable to misconception.¹⁴¹ Or again the meaning of a word in Acts is to be determined: the word occurs also elsewhere in the New Testament, but with a meaning that does not suit the passage in question nearly so well as one that is vouched for say in Galen. Would not the attempt to enrich the “New Testament” lexicon from Galen stir up the most vigorous opposition in those who hold that the “New Testament” language is materially and formally of a uniform and self-contained character? They would object—with the assertion that in the “New Testament” that word was used in such and such a sense, and, therefore, also in the Acts of the Apostles. In hundreds of similar short observations found in the literature, the methodological presupposition that “the New Testament” is a philological department by itself, somewhat like Herodotus or Polybius, reveals itself in the same manner. The notion of the Canon is transferred to the language, and so there is fabricated a “sacred Greek” of Primitive Christianity.¹⁴²

It is only an extension of this presupposition when the “New Testament” Greek is placed in the larger connection of a “Biblical” Greek. “The New Testament” is written in the language of the

Septuagint. In this likewise much-favoured dictum lies the double theory that the Seventy used an idiom peculiar to themselves and that the writers of the New Testament appropriated it. Were the theory limited to the vocabulary, it would be to some extent justifiable. But it is extended also to the syntax, and such peculiarities as the prepositional usage of Paul are unhesitatingly explained by what is alleged to be similar usage in the LXX. The theory indicated is a great power in exegesis, and that it possesses a certain plausibility is not to be denied. It is edifying and, what is more, it is convenient. But it is absurd. It mechanises the marvellous variety of the linguistic elements of the Greek Bible and cannot be established either by the psychology of language or by history. It increases the difficulty of understanding the language of biblical texts in the same degree as the doctrine of verbal Inspiration proved obstructive to the historic and religious estimate of Holy Scripture. It takes the literary products which have been gathered into the Canon, or into the two divisions of the Canon, and which arose in the most various circumstances, times and places, as forming one homogeneous magnitude, and pays no heed to the footprints which bear their silent testimony to the solemn march of the centuries. The author will illustrate the capabilities of this method by an analogy. If any one were to combine the Canon of Muratori, a fragment or two of the Itala, the chief works of Tertullian, the Confessions of Augustine, the Latin Inscriptions of the Roman Christians in the Catacombs and an old Latin translation of Josephus, into one great volume, and assert that here one had monuments of "the" Latin of the early Church, he would make the same error as the wanderers who follow the phantom of "the" biblical Greek. It cannot be disputed that there would be a certain linguistic unity in such a volume, but this unity would depend, not upon the fact that these writings were, each and all, "ecclesiastical," but upon the valueless truism that they were, each and all, written in late-Latin. Similarly we cannot attribute all the appearances of linguistic unity in the Greek Bible to the accidental circumstance that the texts to which they belong stand side by side between the same two boards of the Canon. The unity rests solely on the historical circumstance that all these texts are late-Greek. The linguistic unity of the Greek Bible appears only against the background of classical, not of contemporary "profane," Greek.

It is important, therefore, in the investigation of the Greek Bible, to free oneself first of all from such a methodological notion as the sacred exclusiveness of its texts. And in breaking through the principle, now become a dogma, of its linguistic seclusion and isolation, we must aspire towards a knowledge of its separate and heterogeneous elements, and investigate these upon their own historical bases.

We have to begin with the Greek Old Testament. The Seventy translated a Semitic text into their own language. This language was the Egypto-Alexandrian dialect. Our method of investigation is deduced from these two facts.

If we ignore the fact that the work in question is a translation, we thereby relinquish an important factor for the understanding of its linguistic character. The translation is in method very different from what we nowadays call such. We see the difference at once when we compare the Alexandrian theologians' way of working with, say, the method which Weizsacker applied in his translation of the Epistles of Paul. Was it mere clumsiness, or was it reverence, which caused them to write as they often did? Who shall say? One thing is certain; in proportion as the idea of making the sacred book accessible in another language was at that time unheard-of, so helpless must the translators have felt had they been required to give some account of the correct method

of turning Semitic into Greek. They worked in happy and ingenuous ignorance of the laws of Hermeneutics,¹⁴³ and what they accomplished in spite of all is amazing. Their chief difficulty lay, not in the lexical, but in the syntactical, conditions of the subject-matter. They frequently stumbled at the syntax of the Hebrew text; over the Hebrew, with its grave and stately step, they have, so to speak, thrown their light native garb, without being able to conceal the alien's peculiar gait beneath its folds. So arose a written Semitic-Greek¹⁴⁴ which no one ever spoke, far less used for literary purposes, either before or after.¹⁴⁵ The supposition, that they had an easy task because the problem of the syntax was largely solved for them through a "Judaean-Greek" already long in existence,¹⁴⁶ is hardly tenable. We have a whole series of other Jewish texts from Alexandria,¹⁴⁷ but do their idioms bear comparison even in the slightest with the peculiarities of the LXX, which arose quite incidentally?¹⁴⁸ So long as no one can point to the existence of actual products of an original Judaean-Greek, we must be permitted to go on advocating the hypothesis, probable enough in itself, that it was never an actual living language at all. Thus the fact that the Alexandrian Old Testament is a translation is of fundamental importance for an all-round criticism of its syntax. Its "Hebraisms" permit of no conclusions being drawn from them in respect to the language actually spoken by the Hellenistic Jews of the period: they are no more than evidences of the complete disparity between Semitic and Greek syntax. It is another question, whether they may not have exercised an influence upon the speech of the readers of the next period: it is, of course, possible that the continually repeated reading of the written Judaean-Greek may have operated upon and transformed the "feeling for language" of the later Jews and of the early Christians. In respect of certain lexical phenomena, this supposition may of course be made good without further trouble; the parts of the O.T. Apocrypha which were in Greek from the beginning, Philo, Josephus, Paul, the early Christian Epistle-writers, move all of them more or less in the range of the ethical and religious terms furnished by the LXX. It is also quite conceivable that some of the familiar formula and formulaic turns of expression found in the Psalms or the Law were borrowed from the one or the other, or again, that the occasional literary impressiveness is an intentional imitation of the austere and unfamiliar solemnity of that mode of speech which was deemed to be biblical. But any fundamental influence of the LXX upon the syntactic, that is to say, the logical, sense of a native of Asia Minor, or of the West, is improbable, and it is in the highest degree precarious to connect certain grammatical phenomena in, say, Paul's Epistles straightway with casual similarities in the translation of the O.T. A more exact investigation of Alexandrian Greek will, as has been already signified, yield the result that far more of the alleged Hebraisms of the LXX than one usually supposes are really phenomena of Egyptian, or of popular, Greek.¹⁴⁹ This brings us to the second point: the real language, spoken and written, of the Seventy Interpreters was the Egyptian Greek of the period of the Ptolemies. If, as translators, they had often, in the matter of syntax, to conceal or disguise this fact, the more spontaneously, in regard to their lexical work, could they do justice to the profuse variety of the Bible by drawing from the rich store of terms furnished by their highly-cultured environment. Their work is thus one of the most important documents of Egyptian Greek.¹⁵⁰ Conversely, its specifically Egyptian character can be rendered intelligible only by means of a comparison with all that we possess of the literary memorials of Hellenic Egypt from the time of the Ptolemies till about the time of Origen.¹⁵¹ Since F. W. Sturz¹⁵² began his studies in this subject there has passed nearly a century, which has disclosed an infinite number of new sources. Why, if the Inscriptions in Egyptian Greek, when systematically turned to account, could put new life into Septuagint research even then, the

Papyrus discoveries have now put us in the position of being able to check the Egyptian dialect by document—so to speak—through hundreds of years. A large part of the Papyri, for us certainly the most valuable, comes from the Ptolemaic period itself; these venerable sheets are in the original of exactly the same age as the work of the Jewish translators¹⁵³ which has come down to us in late copies. When we contemplate these sheets, we are seized with a peculiar sense of their most delightful nearness to us—one might almost say, of historical reality raised from the dead. In this very way wrote the Seventy—the renowned, the unapproachable—on the same material, in the same characters, and in the same language! Over their work the history of twenty crowded centuries has passed: originating in the self-consciousness of Judaism at a time of such activity as has never been repeated, it was made to help Christianity to become a universal religion; it engaged the acuteness and the solicitude of early Christian Theology, and was to be found in libraries in which Homer and Cicero might have been sought for in vain; then, apparently, it was forgotten, but it continued still to control the many-tongued Christianity by means of its daughter-versions: mutilated, and no longer possessed of its original true form, it has come to us out of the past, and now proffers us so many enigmas and problems as to deter the approach not only of overweening ignorance but often of the diffidence of the ablest as well. Meanwhile the Papyrus documents of the same age remained in their tombs and beneath the rubbish ever being heaped upon them; but Our inquiring age has raised them up, and the information concerning the past which they give in return, is also helpful towards the understanding of the Greek Old Testament. They preserve for us glimpses into the highly-developed civilization of the Ptolemaic period: we come to know the stilted speech of the court, the technical terms of its industries, its agriculture and its jurisprudence; we see into the interior of the convent of Serapis, and into the family affairs which shrink from the gaze of history. We hear the talk of the people and the officials—unaffected because they had no thought of making literature. Petitions and rescripts, letters, accounts and receipts—of such things do the old documents actually consist; the historian of national deeds will disappointedly put them aside; to the investigator of the literature only do they present some fragments of authors of greater importance. But in spite of the apparent triviality of their contents at first sight, the Papyri are of the highest importance for the understanding of the language of the LXX,¹⁵⁴ simply because they are direct sources, because they show the same conditions of life which are recorded in the Bible and which, so to speak, have been translated into Egyptian Greek. Naturally, the obscure texts of the Papyri will often, in turn, receive illumination from the LXX; hence editors of intelligence have already begun to employ the LXX in this way, and the author is of opinion that good results may yet be obtained thereby. In some of the following entries he hopes, conversely, to have demonstrated the value of the Egyptian Papyri and Inscriptions for Septuagint research. It is really the pre-Christian sources which have been used;¹⁵⁵ but those of the early imperial period also will yet yield rich results. One fact observation appears to put beyond question, viz., the preference of the translators for the technical expressions of their surroundings. They, too, understood how to spoil the Egyptians. They were very ready to represent the technical (frequently also the general) terms of the Hebrew original by the technical terms in use in the Ptolemaic period.¹⁵⁶ In this way they sometimes not only Egyptianised the Bible, but, to speak from their own standpoint, modernised it. Many peculiarities from which it might even be inferred that a text different from our own lay before them, are explained, as the author thinks, by this striving to make themselves intelligible to the Egyptians. Such a striving is not of course justifiable from the modern translator's point of view; the ancient

scholars, who did not know the concept “historic,” worked altogether naïvely, and if, on that account, we cannot but pardon their obliteration of many historical and geographical particulars in their Bible, we may, as counterbalancing this, admire the skill which they brought to bear upon their wrongly-conceived task.¹⁵⁷ From such considerations arises the demand that no future lexicon to the LXX¹⁵⁸ shall content itself with the bringing forward of mere equations; in certain cases the Greek word chosen does not represent the Hebrew original at all, and it would be a serious mistake to suppose that the LXX everywhere used each particular word in the sense of its corresponding Hebrew. Very frequently the LXX did not translate the original at all, but made a substitution for it, and the actual meaning of the word substituted is, of course, to be ascertained only from Egyptian Greek. A lexicon to the LXX will thus be able to assert a claim to utility only if it informs us of what can be learned, with regard to each word, from Egyptian sources. In some places the original was no longer intelligible to the translators; we need only remember the instances in which they merely transcribed the Hebrew words—even when these were not proper names. But, in general, they knew Hebrew well, or had been well instructed in it. If then, by comparison of their translation with the original, there should be found a difference in meaning between any Hebrew word and its corresponding Greek, it should not be forthwith concluded that they did not understand it: it is exactly such cases that not seldom reveal to us the thoughtful diligence of these learned men.

What holds good of the investigation of the LXX in the narrower sense must also be taken into consideration in dealing with the other translations of Semitic originals into Greek. Peculiarities of syntax and of style should not in the first instance be referred to an alleged Judæo-Greek of the translators, but rather to the character of the original. We must, in our linguistic criticism, apply this principle not only to many of the Old Testament Apocryphal writings, but also to the Synoptic Gospels, in so far, at least, as these contain elements which originally were thought and spoken in Aramaic.¹⁵⁹ So far as regards these Apocryphal books, the non-existence of the original renders the problem more difficult, but the investigator who approaches it by way of the LXX will be able to reconstruct the original of many passages with considerable certainty, and to provide himself, at least in some degree, with the accessories most required. The case is less favourable in regard to the Synoptic sayings of Jesus, as also those of His friends and His opponents, which belong to the very earliest instalment of the pre-Hellenistic Gospel-tradition. We know no particulars about the translation into Greek of those portions which were originally spoken and spread abroad in the Palestinian vernacular; we only know, as can be perceived from the threefold text itself, that “they interpreted as best they could”.¹⁶⁰ The author is unable to judge how far retranslation into Aramaic would enable us to understand the Semitisms which are more or less clearly perceived in the three texts, and suspects that the solution of the problem, precisely in the important small details of it, is rendered difficult by the present state of the text, in the same way as the confusion of the traditional text of many portions of the LXX hinders the knowledge of its Greek. But the work must be done: the veil, which for the Greek scholar rests over the Gospel sayings, can be, if not fully drawn aside, yet at least gently lifted, by the consecrated hand of the specialist.¹⁶¹ Till that is done we must guard against the illusion¹⁶² that an Antiochian or Ephesian Christian (even if, like Paul, he were a product of Judaism) ever really spoke as he may have translated the Logia-collection, blessed—and cramped—as he was by the timid consciousness of being permitted to convey the sacred words of the Son of God to the Greeks. Perhaps the same peculiarities which, so far as the LXX were concerned, arose naturally and unintentionally, may, in

the translators of the Lord's words, rest upon a conscious or unconscious liturgical feeling: their reading of the Bible had made them acquainted with the sound, solemn as of the days of old, of the language of prophet and psalmist; they made the Saviour speak as Jahweh spoke to the fathers, especially when the original invited to such a procedure. Doubtless they themselves spoke differently¹⁶³ and Paul also spoke differently,¹⁶⁴ but then the Saviour also was different from those that were His.

Among the biblical writings a clear distinction can be traced between those that are translations, or those portions that can be referred to a translation, and the other genus, viz., those in Greek from the first. The authors of these belonged to Alexandria, to Palestine, or to Asia Minor. Who will assert that those of them who were Jews (leaving out of account those who belonged to Palestine) each and all spoke Aramaic—to say nothing of Hebrew—as their native tongue? We may assume that a Semitic dialect was known among the Jews of Alexandria and Asia Minor, but this cannot be exalted into the principle of a full historical criticism of their language. It seems to the writer that their national connection with Judaism is made, too hastily, and with more imagination than judgment, to support the inference of a (so to speak) innate Semitic “feeling for language”. But the majority of the Hellenistic Jews of the Dispersion probably spoke Greek as their native tongue: those who spoke the sacred language of the fathers had only learned it later.¹⁶⁵ It is more probable that their Hebrew would be Graecised than that their Greek would be Hebraised. For why was the Greek Old Testament devised at all? Why, after the Alexandrian translation was looked upon as suspicious, were new Greek translations prepared? Why do we find Jewish Inscriptions in the Greek language,¹⁶⁶ even where the Jews lived quite by themselves, viz., in the Roman catacombs? The fact is, the Hellenistic Jews spoke Greek, prayed in Greek, sang psalms in Greek, wrote in Greek, and produced Greek literature; further, their best minds thought in Greek.¹⁶⁷ While we may then continue, in critically examining the Greek of a Palestinian writer, to give due weight to the influence of his Semitic “feeling for language,”—an influence, unfortunately, very difficult to test—the same procedure is not justified with regard to the others. How should the Semitic “spirit of language” have exercised influence over them? And how, first of all indeed, over those early Christian authors who may originally have been pagans? This “spirit” must be kept within its own sphere; the investigator of the Greek of Paul and of the New Testament epistle-writers must first of all exorcise it, if he would see his subject face to face. We must start from the philological environment in which, as a fact of history, we find these authors to be, and not from an improbable and, at best, indefinable, linguistic Traducianism. The materials from which we can draw the knowledge of that philological environment have been preserved in sufficient quantity. In regard to the vocabulary, the Alexandrian Bible stands in the first rank: it formed part of the environment of the people, irrespective of whether they wrote in Alexandria, Asia Minor or Europe, since it was the international book of edification for Hellenistic Judaism and for primitive Christianity. We must, of course, keep always before us the question whether the terms of the LXX, in so far as they were employed by those who came after, had not already undergone some change of meaning in their minds. Little as the lexicon of the LXX can be built up by merely giving the Greek words with their corresponding Hebrew originals, just as little can Jewish or early Christian expressions be looked upon as the equivalents of the same expressions as previously used by the LXX. Even in express quotations one must constantly reckon with the possibility that a new content has been poured into the old forms. The history of religious terms—and not of religious ones only—shows that they have always the tendency to become richer or poorer; in any

case, to be constantly altering.¹⁶⁸ Take the term Spirit (Geist). Paul, Augustine, Luther, Servetus, the modern popular Rationalism: all of these apprehend it differently, and even the exegete who is well schooled in history, when he comes to describe the biblical thoughts about Spirit, finds it difficult to free himself from the philosophical ideas of his century. How differently must the Colossians, for example, have conceived of Angels, as compared with the travelling artisan who has grown up under the powerful influences of ecclesiastical artistic tradition, and who prays to his guardian angel! What changes has the idea of God undergone in the history of Christianity—from the grossest anthropomorphism to the most refined spiritualisation! One might write the history of religion as the history of religious terms, or, more correctly, one must apprehend the history of religious terms as being a chapter in the history of religion. In comparison with the powerful religious development recorded in the Hebrew Old Testament, the work of the Seventy presents quite a different phase: it does not close the religious history of Israel, but it stands at the beginning of that of Judaism, and the saying that the New Testament has its source in the Old is correct only if by the Old Testament one means the book as it was read and understood in the time of Jesus. The Greek Old Testament itself was no longer understood in the imperial period as it was in the Ptolemaic period, and, again, a pagan Christian in Rome naturally read it otherwise than a man like Paul. What the author means may be illustrated by reference to the Pauline idea of Faith. Whether Paul discovered it or not does not in the meantime concern us. At all events he imagined that it was contained in his Bible, and, considered outwardly, he was right. In reality, however, his idea of faith is altogether new: no one would think of identifying the πνεῦμα of the LXX with the πνεῦμα of Paul. Now the same alteration can be clearly perceived in other conceptions also; it must be considered as possible in all, at least in principle; and this possibility demands precise examination. Observe, for example, the terms Spirit, Flesh, Life, Death, Law, Works, Angel, Hell, Judgment, Sacrifice, Righteousness, Love. The lexicon of the Bible must also discuss the same problem in respect of expressions which are more colourless in a religious and ethical sense. The men of the New Testament resembled the Alexandrian translators in bringing with them, from their “profane” surroundings, the most varied extra-biblical elements of thought and speech.

When, then, we undertake to expound the early Christian writings, it is not sufficient to appeal to the LXX, or to the terms which the LXX may use in a sense peculiar to themselves: we must seek to become acquainted with the actual surroundings of the New Testament authors. In what other way would one undertake an exhaustive examination of these possible peculiar meanings? Should we confine ourselves to the LXX, or even to artificially petrified ideas of the LXX,—what were that but a concession to the myth of a “biblical” Greek? The early Christian writings, in fact, must be taken out of the narrow and not easily-illuminated cells of the Canon, and placed in the sunshine and under the blue sky of their native land and of their own time. There they will find companions in speech, perhaps also companions in thought. There they take their place in the vast phenomenon of the κοινόν. But even this fact, in several aspects of it, must not be conceived of mechanically. One must neither imagine the κοινόν to be a uniform whole, nor look upon the early Christian authors, all and sundry, as co-ordinate with a definite particular phenomenon like Polybius. In spite of all the consanguinity between those early Christian Greeks and the literary representatives of universal Greek, yet the former are not without their distinguishing characteristics. Certain elements in them of the popular dialect reveal the fact of their derivation from those healthy circles of society to which the Gospel appealed: the victorious future of those

obscure brotherhoods impressively announces itself in new technical terms, and the Apostles of the second and third generation employ the turns of expression, understood or not understood, used by Paul, that “great sculptor of language”.¹⁶⁹

It is thus likewise insufficient to appeal to the vocabulary and the grammar of the contemporary “profane” literature. This literature will doubtless afford the most instructive discoveries, but, when we compare it with the direct sources which are open to us, it is, so far as regards the language of the early Christian authors, only of secondary importance. These direct sources are the Inscriptions¹⁷⁰ of the imperial period. Just as we must set our printed Septuagint side by side with the Ptolemaic Papyri, so must we read the New Testament in the light of the opened folios of the Inscriptions. The classical authors reach us only in the traditional texts of an untrustworthy later period; their late codices cannot give us certain testimony with regard to any so-called matters of form, any more than the most venerable uncials of the New Testament can let us know how, say, the Letter to the Romans may have looked in its original form. If we are ever in this matter to reach certainty at all, then it is the Inscriptions and the Papyri which will give us the nearest approximation to the truth. Of course even they do not present us with unity in matters of form; but it would be something gained if the variety which they manifest throughout were at least to overthrow the orthodox confidence in the trustworthiness of the printed text of the New Testament, and place it among the “externals”. Here, too, must we do battle with a certain ingenuous acceptance of the idea of Inspiration. Just as formerly there were logically-minded individuals who held that the vowel-points in the Hebrew text were inspired, so even to-day there are those here and there who force the New Testament into the alleged rules of a uniform orthography. But by what authority—unless by the dictate of the Holy Spirit—will anyone support the notion that Paul, for instance, must have written the Greek form of the name David in exactly the same way as Mark or John the Divine? But the help which the Inscriptions afford in the correction of our printed texts, is not so important as the service they render towards the understanding of the language itself. It may be that their contents are often scanty; it may be that hundreds of stones, tiresomely repeating the same monotonous formula, have only the value of a single authority, yet, in their totality, these epigraphic remains furnish us with plenty of material—only, one should not expect too much of them, or too little. The author is not now thinking of the general historical contributions which they afford for the delineation of the period—such as we must make for Egypt, Syria, Asia Minor, Europe, if we would understand the biblical writings (though for that purpose nothing can be substituted for them); but rather of their value for the history of the language of the Greek Bible, and particularly of the New Testament. Those witnesses in stone come before us with exactly the same variety as to time and place as we have to take into account when dealing with these writings: the period of most of them, and the original locality of nearly all, can be determined with certainty. They afford us wholly trustworthy glimpses into certain sections of the sphere of ideas and of the store of words which belonged to certain definite regions, at a time when Christian (churches were taking their rise, and Christian books being written. Further, that the religious conceptions of the time may receive similar elucidation is a fact that we owe to the numerous sacred Inscriptions. In these, it may be observed that there existed, here and there, a terminology which was fixed, and which to some extent consisted of liturgical formulae. When, then, particular examples of this terminology are found not only in the early Christian authors, but in the LXX as well, the question must be asked: Do the Christian writers employ such and such an expression because they are familiar with the Greek Bible, or because they are unaffectedly speaking the

language of their neighbourhood? If we are dealing, e.g., with the Inscriptions of Asia Minor and the Christians of Asia Minor, the natural answer will be: Such expressions were known to any such Christian from his environment, before ever he read the LXX, and, when he met them again in that book, he had no feeling of having his store of words enlarged, but believed himself to be walking, so to speak, on known ground: since, happily for him, there was no Schleusner at his disposal, when he found those expressions in the LXX—where, in their connection, they were perhaps more pregnant in meaning, perhaps less so,—he read them with the eyes of an inhabitant of Asia Minor, and possibly emasculated them. For him they were moulds into which he poured, according to his own natural endowment, now good, now less valuable, metal. The mere use of LXX-words on the part of an inhabitant of Asia Minor is no guarantee that he is using the corresponding LXX-conceptions. Take as examples words like γυναικα, ερκατος, γυναικος, γαθος, εσβει α, θρησκεα, ρχιερεις, προφητης, κριος, θεος, γγελος, κτιστης, σωτηρα, διαθηκη, ργον, αβ. With regard to all these words, and many others, common to both the LXX and the Inscriptions of Asia Minor of the imperial period, it will be necessary to investigate how far the Christians of Asia Minor introduced definite local shades of meaning into their reading of the Septuagint, and, further, how far they unconsciously took these shades of meaning into account either in their own use of them or when they heard them uttered by the Apostles. The same holds good of such expressions as embody the specifically favourite conceptions of primitive Christianity, e.g., the titles of Christ, υψισθεος, κριος μν and σωτηρ. The author has, with regard to the first of these, set forth in the following pages in more detail the reasons why we should not ignore the extra-biblical technical use of the expression,—a use which, in particular, is authenticated by the Inscriptions. A similar investigation with regard to the others could be easily carried out. Even if it could be established that “the” New Testament always employs these expressions in their original, pregnant, distinctively Christian sense, yet who will guarantee that hundreds of those who heard the apostolic preaching, or of the readers of the Epistles, did not understand the expressions in the faded formulaic sense, in regard to which they reflected as little or as much as when they read a votive Inscription in honour of the υψισθεος Augustus, or of another emperor who was described as κριος μν, or of Apollo σωτηρ? By the time of the New Testament there had set in a process of mutual assimilation¹⁷¹ between the religious conceptions already current in Asia Minor on the one hand, and “biblical” and “Christian” elements on the other. Biblical expressions became secularised; heathen expressions gained ecclesiastical colouring, and the Inscriptions, as being the most impartial witnesses to the linguistic usage previous to New Testament times, are the sources which most readily permit us a tentative investigation of the process.

Other elements, too, of the language of certain portions of the New Testament cannot seldom be elucidated by parallels from the Inscriptions; likewise much of the so-called syntax. M. Frankel¹⁷² has indicated what an “extraordinary agreement in vocabulary and style” obtains between the Pergamian Inscriptions of pre-Roman times and Polybius; it is proved, he thinks, that the latter, “almost entirely wanting in a distinctive style of his own,” has “assumed the richly but pedantically developed speech of the public offices of his time”. The Inscriptions of Asia Minor have, as the author thinks, a similar significance for the history of the language of the New Testament. It may be readily granted to the outsider that many of the observations which it is possible to take in this connection have, of, course, “only” a philological value; he who undertakes them knows that he is obeying not only the voice of science but also the behests of reverence towards the Book of

Humanity.¹⁷³ The author has, here and there throughout the following pages, endeavoured to carry out in practice the ideas of method thus indicated. He would request that to these should be added the observations that lie scattered throughout the other parts of this book. If he makes a further request for indulgence, he would not omit to emphasise that he is not thereby accommodating himself to the well-worn literary habit the real purpose of which is only the captatiobenevolentiae. The peculiar nature of the subject-matter, which first attracted the author, is certainly calculated to engender the feeling of modesty, unless, indeed, the investigator has been possessed of that quality from the outset.

■γγαρε■ω.

Herodotus and Xenophon speak of the Persian **■γγαροι**. The word is of Persian origin and denotes the royal couriers. From **■γγαρος** is formed the verb **■γγαρε■ω**, which is used, Mark 15:21 = Matthew 27:32 and Matthew 5:41 (a saying of, the Lord), in the sense of to compel one to something. E. Hatch¹⁷⁴ finds the earliest application of the verb in a letter of Demetrius I. Soter to the high-priest Jonathan and the Jewish people: **κελε■ωδ■μηδ■γγαρε■εσθαιτ■ουδα■ων ■ποζ■για**, Joseph. Antt. xiii. 2 3. The letter was ostensibly written shortly before the death of the king, and, if this were so, we should have to date the passage shortly before the year 150 B.C. But against this assumption is to be placed the consideration that 1Ma 10:25-45, which was the source for the statement of Josephus, and which also quotes the said letter verbally, knows nothing of the passage in question. Indeed it rather appears that Josephus altered the passage, in which the remission of taxes upon the animals is spoken of (ver. 33 **κα■ π■ντες■φι■τωσαντο■ζφ■ρουςκα■τ■νκτην■να■τ■ν**), so as to make it mean that they should not be forced into public work. Even if, following Grimm,¹⁷⁵ we consider it possible that the passage in Maccabees has the same purport as the paraphrase of Josephus, yet the word—and it is only the word which comes into consideration here—must be assigned to Josephus, and, therefore, can be made to establish nothing in regard to the second century B.C., but only in regard to the first A.D. But we find the verb in use at a time much earlier than Hatch admitted. The Comedian Menander († 290 B.C.) uses it in Sicyon. iv. (Meineke, p. 952). It is twice employed in Pap. Flind. Petr. xx.176 (252 B.C.), both times in reference to a boat used for postal service: **το■ ■π■ρχοντοςζ■μβου■γγαρευθ■ντος ■π■σου** and **■γγαρε■σαστ■ν■ντικλ■ουςζ■μβον**. This application of the word is established for the Egyptian dialect¹⁷⁷ of Greek by the Inscription from the Temple of the Great Oasis (49 A.D.),¹⁷⁸ in which there is other linguistic material bearing on the Greek Bible, and to which Hatch has already called attention **μηδ■νλαμβ■νεινμηδ■γγαρε■εινε■μ■τινες■μ■διπλ■ματα ■χωσι**. In view of these facts the usage of the verb in the Synoptists¹⁷⁹ and Josephus falls into a more distinct historical connection: the word, originally applied only to a Persian institution, had gained a more general sense as early as the third century B.C.¹⁸⁰ This sense, of course, was itself a technical one at first, as can be seen from the Papyrus and the Inscription as well as from Josephus, but the word must have become so familiar that the Evangelists could use it quite generally for to compel.

■δελφ■ς. The employment of the name brother to designate the members of Christian communities is illustrated by the similar use, made known to us by the Papyri, of **■δελφος**, in the technical language of the Serapeum at Memphis. See the detailed treatment of it in A. Peyron,¹⁸¹ Leemans,¹⁸² Brunet de Presle,¹⁸³ and Kenyon.¹⁸⁴—**■δελφ■ς** also occurs in the usage of religious associations of the imperial period as applied to the members, cf. Schurer, in the

■ξ■ωμα. The LXX translate the words ■■■■■■■■■■ (Esther 5:3-8, Esther 7:22 f.), ■■■■■■■■■■ (LXX Psalms 119:170 [MT Psalms 119:170]) and the Aramaic ■■■■■■ (Daniel 6:7), which all mean request, desire, by ■ξ■ωμα. The word occurs in [3]1Es 8:4 in the same sense. It is “very infrequent in this signification; the lexica cite it, in prose, only from Plutarch, Conviv. disput. 1 9 (p. 632 C)”²¹⁰. The Inscriptions confirm the accuracy of its usage in the LXX: fragment of a royal decree to the inhabitants of Hierocome (date?) from Tralles;²¹¹ a decree of the Abderites (before 146 B.C.) from Teos;²¹² Inscription of Pergamus No. 13 (soon after 263 B. C.).²¹³ “In all these examples the word signifies a request preferred before a higher tribunal, thus acquiring the sense of ‘petition’ or ‘memorial’”²¹⁴.

■π■. Of the construction 2Ma 14:30 ■π■το■βελετ■στου in the most honourable way, in which one might suspect an un-Greek turn of expression, many examples can be found in the Inscriptions, as also in Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Plutarch.²¹⁵ ■ρεταλογ■α.²¹⁶

O. F. Fritzsche²¹⁷ still writes Sir 36:19 (14 or 16 in other editions) as follows: πλ■σον Σι■ν ■ραι τλ■γι■σου κ■π■τ■ς δ■ξης σου τ■ν λα■ν σου. M. W. L. de Wette implies the same text by his rendering: Fill Zion with the praise of Thy promises, and Thy people with Thy glory; he takes²¹⁸ ■ραι in the sense of laudibus extollers, celebrare, and thus the verbal translation would run: Fill Zion, in order to extol Thy declarations, and Thy people with Thy glory. But against this Fritzsche²¹⁹ makes the objection that ■ραι must stand here in the sense of ■■■■■■, and this, again, should be taken as receive, obtain, although, indeed, such a meaning cannot be vouched for by any quite analogous example. But leaving aside the fact that it is not good procedure to illustrate an obscure translation by referring to a meaning of the possible original which cannot be authenticated, the confusion of the parallelismus membrorum which, with their reading, disfigures the verse, must be urged against de Wette and Fritzsche.²²⁰ What then is the authority for this reading? The beginning of the verse has been handed down in the three principal Codices in the following forms:—

■A πλησονσιωναρεταλογιασου,

B πλησονσιωναρεταλογιασσου, Bb πλησιονσιωναραιταλογιασου. The last reading, that of the second reviser of B, has thus become the standard, except that the πλ■σον of the others has been retained instead of the πλησ■ον which it gives. H. B. Swete²²¹ considers it probable that also the αρε of ■A. is to be taken as equivalent to αραι ; in such case the current text would be supported by ■A as well. But in reality the matter stands quite otherwise; it is B which gives the original text: πλ■σον Σι■ν ■ρεταλογ■ας σου,²²² ■A is deduced from this by the hemigraphy of the σσ in αρεταλογιασσου, and Bb is a correction by the misunderstood ■A. The unwillingness to recognise this true state of the case (Fritzsche says of B’s reading: sed hoc quidem hic nullo modo locum habere potest) and indeed, to go further back, the alteration²²³ which was made by the reviser of B, who misunderstood the text, are due to a misconception of what ■ρεταλογ■α meant. If we consult, e.g., Pape,²²⁴ under ■ρεταλογ■α, we find that its meaning is given as buffoonery (Possenreisserei). Now it is clear that God cannot be invited to fill Zion with “aretalogy” in this sense; then comes the too precipitate deduction that the text must read differently, instead of the question whether the lexicon may not perhaps be in need of a correction. Even Symmachus, LXX Psalms 29:6 [MT Psalms 30:6], could have answered the question: in that passage he renders the word ■■■■■■ (shouting for joy) of the original by ■ρεταλογ■α,²²⁵ while he always translates it

elsewhere by εϕημ^α. The equation of Symmachus, ρεταλογ^α = εϕημ^α, which can be inferred from this, and the parallelism of the passage in Sirach, ρεταλογ^α || δξ^α mutually explain and support each other, and force us to the assumption that both translators used ρεταλογ^α *sensu bono*, i.e., of the glorifying of God. The assumption is so obvious as to require no further support; for, to argue from the analogies, it is indisputable that the word, the etymology of which is certainly clear enough, at first simply meant, as a matter of course, the speaking of the ρετα^α, and only then received the bad secondary signification. As to the meaning of ρετ^α which is the basis of this usage, cf. the next article.

ρετ^α.226 The observations of Hatch²²⁷ upon this word have added nothing new to the article ρετ^α in Cremer, and have ignored what is there (as it seems to the author) established beyond doubt, viz., that the LXX, in rendering ρεταλογ^α, magnificence, splendour (Habakkuk 3:3 and Zechariah 6:13) and ρεταλογ^α, glory, praise, by ρετ^α, are availing themselves of an already-existent linguistic usage.²²⁸ The meaning of ρεταλογ^α is readily deduced from this usage: the word signifies the same as is elsewhere expressed by means of the verbal constructions, LXX Isaiah 42:12 τ^α ρετ^α ζ^α το^α [θεο^α] ναγγ^α λλειν, LXX Isaiah 43:21 τ^α ρετ^α ζ^α μου [θεο^α] διηγε^α σθαι, 1 Peter 2:9 τ^α ρετ^α ζ^α [θεο^α] ξαγγ^α λλειν. It seems to the author the most probable interpretation that the ρετα^α of the last passage stands, as in the LXX, for laudes, seeing that the phrase looks like an allusion to LXX Isaiah 42:12, more clearly still to Isaiah 43:20 f.. One must nevertheless reckon with the possibility that the word is used here in a different sense, to which reference has recently been made by Sal. Reinach,²²⁹ and which no doubt many a reader of the above-cited passages from the LXX, not knowing the original, found in these phrases. Reinach, arguing from an Inscription from Asia Minor belonging to the imperial period, advocates the thesis²³⁰ that ρετ^α, even in pre-Christian usage, could mean miracle, effet surnaturel. He thinks that this is confirmed by a hitherto unobserved signification of the word ρεταλογ^α, which, in several places, should not be interpreted in the usual bad sense of one who babbles about virtues, buffoon, etc., but rather as a technical designation of the interprete de miracles, exegete who occupied an official position in the personnel of certain sanctuaries.²³¹ The author is unable to speak more particularly about the latter point, although it does perhaps cast a clearer light upon our ρεταλογ^α. He believes however that he can point to other passages in which the ρετ^α of God signifies, not the righteousness, nor yet the praise of God, but the manifestation of His power. Guided by the context, we must translate Joseph. Antt. xvii. 5.6, α^α θις νεπαρ^α νειτ^α ρετ^α το^α θε^α ου: he sinned, as if intoxicated, against God's manifestation of His power.²³² Still clearer is a passage from a hymn to Hermes, Pap. Lond. xlvi. 418 ff.²³³—

φρα τε μαντοσ^α νας τα^ας σα^ας ρετα^ασι λ^αβοιμι. The original has μαντοσυνας; the emendation μαντοσ^α νας (better than the alternative μαντοσ^α νης also given by Kenyon) seems to be established.²³⁴ It can only mean: that I may obtain the art of clairvoyance by the manifestations of Thy power, and this meaning allows the text to remain otherwise unaltered (after A. Dieterich). This sense of ρετα^α seems to have been unknown to other two editors; but they, too, have indicated, by their conjectures, that the word cannot signify virtues. Wessely²³⁵ emends thus:—

φρατεμαντοσ^α νηστ^ας ζ^ας μ^αρος ντιλ^α βοιμι, and Herwerden²³⁶ writes :—

φρατεμαντοσ^α νηντα^ας σα^ας ρετα^ασι (? χαρ^α τεσσι) λ^αβοιμι.

carefully-collected water of the canals becoming dried up shortly after the opening of the sluices (ἐξηρησθησαν φσηεις δτων), than it would be by speaking of dried-up brooks.²⁵³

2. The LXX translate [redacted] Leviticus 25:15, used, elliptically for Jubel-year,²⁵⁴ by the substantive σημασ sign, signal, a rendering altogether verbal, and one which does, not fail to mark the peculiarity of the original. But they translate Jubel-year in Leviticus 25:10-13 (apart from the fact that they do not supply the ellipsis that occurs here and there in the Hebrew passages) by νιαυτς or τος φσεωςσημασας, signal-year of emancipation.²⁵⁵ The technical expression signal-year was made intelligible to non-Hebrew readers by the addition of φσεως, which comes from Leviticus 25:10: διαβοησετε φεσιν πτςγς, where φεσις = [redacted]. From this, again, it is explained how Jubel-year in the parts of Leviticus 25:1-55 which follow the verse quoted, and in Leviticus 27:1-34, is rendered by τος or νιαυτς τς φσεως, which is not a translation,²⁵⁶ but an “explicative paraphrase”.²⁵⁷ Similarly in these passages the elliptical Jubel (standing in connection with what goes before) is imitated in a manner not liable to be mistaken by an elliptical φεσις.

Now this usage of the LXX is not to be explained as a mere mechanical imitation: it found a point of local connection in the legal conditions of the Ptolemaic period. Pap. Par. 63258 (165 B.C.) mentions, among various kinds of landed property, ττν φσεικα τνερν γν.²⁵⁹ Lumbroso²⁶⁰ explains the lands thus said to be ν φσει as those which were exempted from the payment of taxes, and points to several passages on the Rosetta Stone 261 (196 B.C.), in which the king is extolled as having expressly remitted certain taxes (εςτ λος φκεν).²⁶² With this seems to be connected also Pap. Flind. Petr. ii. 1 (260-259 B.C.) : 263 ταν φσεσιςδοθ; cf. previously τ κφρια. The LXX might have translated [redacted] Leviticus 25:10 (the rendering of which was determinative for the whole of their subsequent usage) by a different word, but their imitation of the technical Jubel was facilitated just by their choice of φσεσις, a technical word and one which was current in their locality.

βαστζω. In Matthew 8:17 there is quoted, as the word of “the prophet Isaiah,” aims ατςτςσθενεαμν λαβενκατςνσους βστασεν. “The passage Isaiah 53:4 is cited according to the original, but not in the historical sense thereof, . . . nor according to the special typical reference which any one looking back from the Saviour’s healing of diseases to that prophetic saying, might have perceived to be the intention of the latter (Meyer); but with a free interpretation of the language. The Evangelist, that is to say, clearly takes λαμβνεν in the sense of take away, as the [redacted] of the original may also signify—though not in this passage. On the other hand, it is doubtful whether he also understood βαστζειν ([redacted]) in the sense of bear hence (John 20:15), an impossible meaning for the Hebrew . . . , or whether he is not thinking rather of the trouble and pains which the Saviour’s acts of healing, continued till far on in the evening, cost Him.”²⁶⁴ H. Holtzmann,²⁶⁵ like Weiss, similarly identifies λαμβνεν with [redacted], and βαστζειν with [redacted]. But, if the author’s judgment is correct, the case is just the opposite: Matthew has not only discarded the translation given by the LXX, but has also, in his rendering, transposed the two clauses of the Hebrew sentence;²⁶⁶ he does not translate He bore our diseases and took upon Himself our pains, but He took upon Himself our pains, and bore our diseases.²⁶⁷ In that case it will not be [redacted] but [redacted], which is represented by βαστζειν.²⁶⁸ The LXX also translate [redacted], in 2 Kings 18:14 and Job 21:3, Cod. A, by βαστζειν; similarly Aquila in the four extant passages where he uses βαστζειν: Isaiah

40:11269Isaiah 53:11270Isaiah 66:12271 and Jeremiah 10:5272 Of these last passages, Isa. 53 deserves special attention, as it approximates in meaning to the quotation in Matthew: κατὰ μαρτυράσαντων βαστασει. If we should not assume, with E. Bohl,²⁷³ that the quotation is taken from an already-existent version, then it must be said that Matthew, or his authority, in their independent rendering of the [REDACTED] of the original by βασταζειν, were acting in the same way as do the LXX and the Jewish translator of the second century A.D. in other passages. It does not of course necessarily follow from the fact that the LXX, Matthew, and Aquila all use βασταζειν as the analogue of [REDACTED], that the βασταζειν of Matthew 8:17 must have the same meaning as the [REDACTED] of the Hebrew original. One must rather, in regard to this passage, as indeed in regard to all translations whatever, consider the question whether the translator does not give a new shade of meaning to his text by the expression he chooses. It will be more correct procedure to ascertain the meaning of βασταζειν in this verse of Matthew from the context in which the quotation occurs, than from the original meaning of [REDACTED]—however evident the correspondence βασταζειν = [REDACTED] superficially regarded, may seem. And all the better, if the meaning bear away, required here by the context for βασταζειν,²⁷⁴ is not absolutely foreign to [REDACTED]—in the sense, at least, which it has in other passages. The same favourable circumstance does not occur in connection with λαβειν, for the signification take away, which the context demands, does not give the sense of [REDACTED]. In the religious language of early Christianity the terms bear and take away, differing from each other more or less distinctly, and often having sin as their object, play a great part; the Synonymic²⁷⁵ of this usage must raise for itself the problem of investigating words like αρω, ξαρω, βασταζω, λαμβνω, ναλαμβνω, φρω, ναφρω, ποφρω in their various shades of meaning.

βεβαωσις.

“The seller was required, in general, i.e., unless the opposite was stipulated, to deliver to the buyer the thing sold ναμφισβητητον, without dispute, and had to accept of the responsibility if claims should be raised to the thing by others. . . . If he [the buyer], however, had obtained from the seller the promise of guarantee” . . . he could, if claims to the thing were subsequently raised by others, “go back upon the seller (this was called νηγεινεζηρητην) and summon him to confirm—as against the person now raising the claim—that he himself had bought from him the thing now claimed, i.e., he could summon him βεβαισαι. If the seller refused to do this, then the buyer could bring against him an action βεβαιωσις.”²⁷⁶ In the language of the Attic Process, βεβαωσις confirmation had thus received the technical meaning of a definite obligation of the seller, which among the Romans was termed auctoritas or eviction :²⁷⁷ the seller did not only make over the thing to the buyer, but assumed the guarantee to defend the validity of the sale against any possible claims of a third party. Among the historians of the ancient Civil Process there exist differences of opinion²⁷⁸ regarding the details of the δκηβεβαιωσις that might possibly be raised by the buyer, but these are immaterial for the determination of the idea corresponding to the word βεβαωσις. This technical expression found admission into Egypt in the Ptolemaic period. The Papyrus documents speak not only of the βεβαιωσις,²⁷⁹ the sale-surety, the auctor secundus of Roman law, but also of the βεβαωσις itself: Pap. Taur. i.280 (2nd cent. B.C.), Pap. Par. 62281 (2nd cent. B.C.)—twice in the latter passage, once in the combination as εζηνβεβαιωσιν ποθηκαι.²⁸² How thoroughly the expression had become

naturalised in Egypt is shown by the fact that we still find the $\beta\epsilon\beta\alpha\omega\sigma\iota\varsigma$ in Papyrus documents belonging to a time which is separated from the Lagides by seven hundred years. It is, indeed, possible that in these, as well as already in the Ptolemaic documents, $\beta\epsilon\beta\alpha\omega\sigma\iota\varsigma$ has no longer exactly the same specific meaning as it has in the more accurate terminology of the highly-polished juristic Greek of Attica:²⁸³ but the word is certainly used there also in the sense of guarantee, safe-guarding of a bargain: Pap. Par. 21 bis²⁸⁴ (592 A.D.), Pap. Jomard²⁸⁵ (592 A.D.), Pap. Par. 21286 (616 A.D.). In these the formula $\kappa\alpha\tau\pi\sigma\alpha\nu\beta\epsilon\beta\alpha\omega\sigma\iota\nu$ occurs several times, and even the formula $\epsilon\zeta\beta\epsilon\beta\alpha\omega\sigma\iota\nu$ comes before us again in Pap. Par. 20288 (600 A.D.), having thus²⁸⁹ maintained itself through more than seven hundred years. Reference has already been made by Lumbroso²⁸⁹ to the striking similarity of a passage in the LXX with this idiom of Egyptian Civil law. $\beta\epsilon\beta\alpha\omega\sigma\iota\varsigma$ is found only once in the Alexandrian translation, Leviticus 25:23, but there in the characteristic formula $\epsilon\zeta\beta\epsilon\beta\alpha\omega\sigma\iota\nu$: $\kappa\alpha\gamma\omega\pi\rho\alpha\theta\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\epsilon\zeta\beta\epsilon\beta\alpha\omega\sigma\iota\nu, \mu\gamma\rho\sigma\tau\iota\nu\gamma$. The translation is not a literal one, but one of great fineness and accuracy. The Israelites are but strangers and sojourners in the land; the ground, the soil, belongs to Jahweh—therefore it may not be sold absolutely : such is the bearing of the original לְעַלְמָדָם (properly unto annihilation, i.e., completely, for ever). Looked at superficially, the $\epsilon\zeta\beta\epsilon\beta\alpha\omega\sigma\iota\nu$ of the LXX is the exact opposite of the unto annihilation of the original;²⁹⁰ considered properly, it testifies to an excellent understanding of the text.²⁹¹ A sale $\epsilon\zeta\beta\epsilon\beta\alpha\omega\sigma\iota\nu$ is a definitive, legally guaranteed sale: mere sojourners could not, of course, sell the land which they held only in tenure,—least of all $\epsilon\zeta\beta\epsilon\beta\alpha\omega\sigma\iota\nu$. The reading $\epsilon\zeta\beta\epsilon\beta\alpha\omega\sigma\iota\nu$ ²⁹² of Codices xi., 19, 29, and others, also of the Aldine, is a clumsy mistake of later copyists (occasioned in part by LXX Leviticus 21:4), who only spoiled the delicately-chosen expression of the LXX by schoolboy literalness; on the other hand, the in confirmationem of the Vetus Latina²⁹³ is quite correct, while the renderings of Aquila,²⁹⁴ $\epsilon\zeta\pi\alpha\gamma\kappa\tau\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$, and Symmachus,²⁹⁵ $\epsilon\zeta\lambda\tau\rho\omega\tau\omicron\nu$, though they miss the point proper, yet render the thought fairly well. The LXX have shown the same skill in the only other passage where this Hebrew word occurs, viz., Leviticus 25:30: $\kappa\upsilon\rho\omega\theta\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota\omega\kappa\alpha\omega\sigma\alpha\nu\pi\lambda\epsilon\iota\tau\chi\omicron\sigma\tau\epsilon\chi\omicron\varsigma\beta\epsilon\beta\alpha\omega\sigma\iota\kappa\tau\eta\sigma\alpha\mu\iota\nu\alpha\tau\iota\nu$. That they did not here make choice of the formula $\epsilon\zeta\beta\epsilon\beta\alpha\omega\sigma\iota\nu$, in spite of the similarity of the original, reveals a true understanding of the matter, for, as the phrase was primarily used only of the giving of a guarantee in concluding a bargain, it would not have answered in this passage. The Alexandrian Christian to whom we owe the $\lambda\gamma\omicron\sigma\tau\zeta\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\kappa\lambda\sigma\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ in the New Testament, writes, in Hebrews 6:16, $\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\iota\gamma\rho\kappa\alpha\tau\omicron\mu\epsilon\zeta\omicron\nu\omicron\varsigma\mu\iota\nu\omicron\sigma\iota\nu\kappa\alpha\pi\sigma\eta\varsigma\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma\iota\lambda\omicron\gamma\alpha\sigma\pi\rho\alpha\varsigma\epsilon\zeta\beta\epsilon\beta\alpha\omega\sigma\iota\nu\omicron\rho\kappa\omicron\varsigma$. The context of the passage is permeated by juristic expressions—as is the Epistle to the Hebrews as a whole. That this Egyptian legal formula, persistent through hundreds of years, occurs here also, deserves our notice. We do not need to give it the same sharply-defined sense which it had in Attic jurisprudence (guarantee in regard to a sale):²⁹⁶ it must be interpreted more generally; at all events it is still a technical expression for a legal guarantee.²⁹⁷ The use of $\beta\epsilon\beta\alpha\omega\sigma\iota\varsigma$ elsewhere in biblical literature likewise appears to the author to be influenced by the technical meaning of the word. In Wis 6:19, in the magnificent hymn²⁹⁸ upon wisdom, occurs the gnomic saying $\pi\rho\omicron\sigma\omicron\chi\delta\iota\nu\mu\omega\nu\beta\epsilon\beta\alpha\omega\sigma\iota\varsigma\phi\theta\alpha\rho\sigma\alpha\varsigma$; here $\nu\mu\omega\nu$ suggests very plainly the juristic conception of the word: he who keeps the laws of wisdom has the legal guarantee of incorruption; he need have no fear that his $\phi\theta\alpha\rho\sigma\alpha$ will be disputed by another.

βεβαίως has been spoken of more definitely still by the man upon whose juristic terminology the jurist Johannes Ortwin Westenberg was able to write an important treatise²⁹⁹ a hundred and seventy years ago. Paul, in Php 1:7, says καθύστετινδκαιονμοτοτοφρονεν
 πρπντων μνδι τ χεινμεντκαρδ μς
 ντετοδεσμοζμουκα ντπολογκαβεβαισειτοεαγγελου: he is indeed in bonds, but he is standing on his defence, and this defence before the court will be at the same time an evictio or convictio of the Gospel. To the forensic expressions ντοδεσμος, and ντπολογ, which, of course,³⁰⁰ are not to be understood as metaphorical, νβεβαισειτοεαγγελου corresponds very well, and forms at the same time the final step of a very effective climax. That the Apostle was not ignorant of the older Attic signification of βεβαίως is rendered probable by a striking correspondence between the mode of expression he uses in other passages and the terms applied to the legal ideas which are demonstrably connoted by βεβαίως. Observe how Paul brackets together the conceptions ρραβν and βεβαιον. Harpocration, the lexicographer of the Attic Orators, who lived in the Imperial period, writes in his lexicon, subβεβαίως:³⁰¹ νοτεκα ρραβνοζμονοζδοθντοζετα μφισβητσαντοςτοπεπρακτος λγγανντντςβεβαισεωςδκηντνρραβναδοζτλαβντι. Similarly in the ancient Λξειςητορικα, one of the Lexica Segueriana, edited by Imm. Bekker,³⁰² subβεβαισεως:

δκηςνομστιν, νδικζοντοονησμενοικαττνποδομων, τετερος μφισβητο
 τοπραθντος, ξιοντεςβεβαιονατοζτπραθνννοτεδκα ρραβνοζμνουδοθ
 ντος. πτοτο ονλγγαννντντςβεβαισεωςδκηνοδντεςτν
 ρραβνατοζλαβοσιν, ναβεβαιωθ προ ρραβνδθη. Now, although doubts do exist ³⁰³ about the possibility of basing a δκηβεβαισεως upon the seller's acceptance of the earnest-money, still thus much is clear, viz., that, in technical usage, ρραβν and βεβαιον stand in an essential relation to each other.³⁰⁴ It is exactly in this way that Paul speaks—his indestructible faith representing the relation of God to believers under the image of a legally indisputable relation, 2 Corinthians 1:21 f. :
 δβεβαινμςσνμνεςΧριστνκαχρσαςμςθες, κασφραγισμενος
 μςκαδοζτνρραβνατοπνεματοςνταςκαρδαμν. Apt as is the metaphor itself, intelligible as it would be in this verse and in 2 Corinthians 5:5, particularly to the Christians of that great commercial centre, it is in form equally apt. The Apostle, of course, could have chosen another verb³⁰⁵ equally well, without rendering the image unintelligible, but the technical word makes the image still more effective. A patristic remark upon the passage in question³⁰⁶ shows us, further, how a Greek reader could fully appreciate the specific nature of the metaphor:
 γρρραβνεωθεβεβαιοντπνσνταγμα.

Hence we shall not err in construing βεβαιω³⁰⁷ and ββαιος,³⁰⁸ even where they occur elsewhere in the writings of Paul and his circle, from this standpoint, and especially as these words sometimes occur among other juristic expressions. By our taking confirm and sure in the sense of legally guaranteed security, the statements in which they occur gain in decisiveness and force. Symmachus ³⁰⁹ uses βεβαίως once: LXX Psalms 89:25 [MT Psalms 89:25] for ██████████ (LXX λθεια).

γνημα.³¹⁰

Very common in the LXX for the produce of the land; so also in the Synoptists: its first occurrence not in Polybius;³¹¹ it is already found in connection with Egypt in Pap. Flind. Petr. i. xvi. 2312 (230 B.C.): τ[■]γεν[■]ματ[■]ατ[■]ν[■] παρχ[■]ντωνμοι παραδε[■]σων, and in several other passages of the same age.³¹³ γογγ[■]ζω.

Very familiar in the LXX, also in Paul,³¹⁴ Synopt., John; authenticated in the subsequent extra-biblical literature only by Marcus Aurelius and Epictetus;⁴ but already used in the sense of murmur in Pap. Flind. Petr. ii. ix. 3315 (241-239 B.C.);

κα[■]τ[■]πλ[■]ρωμα (men) γογγ[■]ζειφ[■]μενοι[■]δικε[■]σθαι.

γραμματε[■]ς. In the O.T. the person designated scribe (■■■■■ and ■■■■■) is generally the official. The LXX translate verbally—γραμματε[■]ς—even in those passages where scribe seems to be used in the military sense, i.e., of officers. One might conjecture that in this they were slavishly subjecting themselves to the original, the employment of γραμματε[■]ς in the military sense being foreign to ordinary Greek usage. But their rendering is altogether correct from their own point of view: in Egyptian Greek γραμματε[■]ς is used as the designation of an officer. In Pap. Par. 63316 (165 B.c.) we find the γραμματε[■]ςτ[■]νμαχ[■]μων, and in Pap. Lond. xxiii.³¹⁷ (158-157 B.c.) the γραμματε[■]ςτ[■]νδυν[■]μεων. This technical meaning³¹⁸ of the word was familiar to the Alexandrian translators. So, e.g., 2 Chronicles 26:11, where the γραμματε[■]ς stands with the δι[■]δοχος;³¹⁹cf. also LXX Jer. 44[■]15 [MT Jeremiah 37:15]³²⁰—if Jonathan the scribe, in this passage, is an officer. Similarly Judges 5:14³²¹ The following passages, again, are of great interest as showing indubitably that the translators employed the technical term as they had learned its use in their locality. The Hebrew of 2 Kings 25:19 is almost verbally repeated in Jeremiah 52:25, as is 2 Kings 24:18, 2 Kings 25:30 as a whole in Jeremiah 52:1-34. The Book of Kings speaks here of the scribe, the captain of the host.³²² But in our text of Jeremiah we read (the article is wanting before ■■■■■) the scribe of the captain of the host. The LXX translate the first passage by τ[■]νγραμματ[■]α³²³το[■]ρχοντοςτ[■]ςδυν[■]μεως, as if they had had our text of Jeremiah before them; Jeremiah 52:25, on the other hand, they render by τ[■]νγραμματ[■]ατ[■]νδυν[■]μεων, which agrees in sense with the traditional text of 2 Kings 25:19. Now, without having the least desire to decide the question as to the meaning of ■■■■■ in the Hebrew O.T., or as to the original text of the above two passages, the author yet thinks it plain that the LXX believed that they had before them, in Jeremiah 52:25,³²⁴ the γραμματε[■]ςτ[■]νδυν[■]μεων now known to us from the London Papyrus, not some sort of scribe of the commander-in-chief (Generalcommando).³²⁵ The choice of the plural δυν[■]μεων, which was not forced upon them by the singular of the original, is to be explained only by the fact that they were adopting a long-established and fixed connection.

Isaiah 36:22 is a most instructive case. Our Hebrew text has simply a ■■■■■, there, without any addition; the LXX however, transfer him to the army with the rank of the γραμματε[■]ςτ[■]ςδυν[■]μεως: they understood scribe to denote a military rank.³²⁶ The military meaning of γραμματε[■]ς has been preserved in 1Ma 5:42; ³²⁷ probably also in Symmachus Judges 5:14,³²⁸ LXX Jer. 44[■]15 [MT Jeremiah 37:15]³²⁹ γρ[■]φω.

“In the sphere of Divine Revelation the documents belonging to it assume this³³⁰ regulative position, and the γ[■]γραπται always implies an appeal to the incontestable regulative authority of the dictum quoted.”³³¹ “The New Testament usage of ■γραφ[■] . . . implies the same idea as is stamped upon the usage of the γ[■]γραπται, viz., a reference to the regulative character of the

particular document as a whole, which character gives it a unique position, in virtue of which ἡ γραφή is always spoken of as an authority.”³³² In this explanation of terms Cremer has, without doubt, accurately defined the bases not only of “New Testament” usage but of the general idea that regulative authority belongs to scripture. Should the question be asked, whence it comes that the conception of Holy Scripture has been bound up with the idea of its absolute authority, the answer can only be a reference to the juristic idea of scripture, which was found ready to hand and was applied to the sacred documents. A religion of documents—considered even historically—is a religion of law. It is a particularly instructive, though commonly overlooked, fact in connection with this juristic conception of the biblical documents that the LXX translate אֱלֹהִים by νόμος in the great majority of passages, although the two ideas are not by any means identical; and that they have thus made a law out of a teaching.³³³ It is indeed probable that in this they had been already influenced by the mechanical conception of Scripture of early Rabbinism, but, in regard to form, they certainly came under the sway of the Greek juristic language. Cremer has given a series of examples from older Greek of this use of γράφειν in legislative work,³³⁴ and uses these to explain the frequently-occurring “biblical” ἡ γραπταί. This formula of quotation is, however, not “biblical” only, but is found also in juristic Papyrus documents of the Ptolemaic period and in Inscriptions: Pap. Rind. Petr. xxx. a;³³⁵ further—and this is most instructive for the frequent καθὼς γράπται of the biblical authors³³⁶—in the formula καθὼς τὴν γραπταί: Pap. Par. 13337 (probably 157 B.C.); Pap. Lugd. 0338(89 B.C.); Inscription of Mylasa in Caria, Waddington, iii. 2, No. 416 = CIG. ii., No. 2693 e (beginning of the imperial period);³³⁹ Inscription from the neighbourhood of Mylasa, Waddington, iii. 2, No. 483 (imperial period?): in spite of mutilation the formula is still legible in four passages here;—and in the formula καθὼς γράπται, Pap. Par. 7 340 (2nd or 1st cent. B.C.), cf. κατ(τ)ῆς περ . . . γράπ[τοι] in line 50 f. of the architectural Inscription of Tegea (ca. 3rd cent. B.C.)³⁴¹—in all of which reference is made to a definite obligatory clause of the document quoted.³⁴² Further examples in III. iii. 5 below. That the juristic conception of sacred writings was familiar to the Alexandrian translators is directly shown by Ep. Arist. (ed. M. Schmidt), p. 681ff. : when the translation of the Bible into Greek was finished, then, καθὼς ἄλλοις ἄλλοις στίχοις διασκευσείν προστιθεῖς μεταφωροντισσόνολοντὶν γεγραμμένων ποιομένων φάρεσιν,³⁴³ he was threatened with a curse. According to this the Greek Bible was placed under the legal point of view which forbade the altering of a document; this principle is not universal in Greek law,³⁴⁴ but the Apostle Paul gives evidence for it, when, in Galatians 3:15, arguing e concessis, he says that a διαθήκη κενωμένη can neither be made void³⁴⁵ nor have anything added to it. Speaking from the same point of view, the advocate Tertullian—to give another very clear example of the further development of the juristic conception of biblical authority—describes, adv. Mark 4:2 and elsewhere, the individual portions of the New Testament as instruments, i.e., as legally valid documents.³⁴⁶

διδοχος and διαδεχόμενος.

διδοχος occurs in the LXX only in 1 Chronicles 18:17, as the equivalent of אֲחֵרִי, 2 Chronicles 26:11 as the translation of אֲחֵרִי, and 2 Chronicles 28:7 as the translation of אֲחֵרִי. In none of these three passages is διδοχος, in its ordinary sense of successor, an accurate rendering of the original. It has therefore been asserted by Schleusner³⁴⁷ that διδοχος corresponds to the Hebrew words, and thus means something like proximus a rege; he refers to Philo, de Josepho, M. pp. 58 and 64. Similarly Grimm,³⁴⁸ in reference to 2Ma 4:29, has, on

account of the context, rejected the meaning successor for that passage and 2Ma 14:26; cf. also 2Ma 4:31 ἀδεχόμενος. This supposition is confirmed by Pap. Taur. (1. 15 and 6) 349 (2nd cent. B.C.), in which ὁ περὶ ἀλλοῦ διδοχοῖ and ὁ διδοχοῖ are higher officials at the court of the Ptolemies; 350 διδοχος is thus an Egyptian court-title. 351 The Alexandrian translators of the Book of Chronicles and the Alexandrian Philo used the word in this technical sense, and the second Book of Maccabees (compiled from Jason of Cyrene) also manifests a knowledge of the usage.

Allied to the technical meaning of διδοχος is that of the participle διδοχος, 352 Chronicles 31:12 and Esther 10:3, as the translation of the [] of the original: so 2Ma 4:31.

δίκαιος. The LXX render [] or the genitival [] by δίκαιος in almost every case, and their translation is accurate even for those passages in which the conception normal (which lies at the basis of the Hebrew words) has been preserved most purely, i.e., where correct measures are described as just. 354 That they did not translate mechanically in these cases appears from Proverbs 11:1, where they likewise render the weight there described as [] full, by σταθμῶν δίκαιων. 355 There can be established also for Greek a usage similar to the Semitic, 356 but it will be better in this matter to refer to Egyptian usage than to Xenophon and others, 357 who apply the attribute δίκαιος to ππος, βοs, etc., when these animals correspond to what is expected of them. Thus in the decree of the inhabitants of Busiris, 358 drawn up in honour of the emperor Nero, the rise of the Nile is called a δικάσιν βασις; but more significant—because the reference is to a measure—is the observation of Clemens Alexandrinus, Strom. vi. 4 (p. 758, Potter), that, in Egyptian ceremonies, the πχυσ τζδικαιοσνης was carried around—i.e., a correct cubit. 359 That is the same idiom as the LXX apply in the ζυγδκαικακασταθμδακαικαχοσδκαιος, Leviticus 19:36, in the μτρον ληθινκαδκαιον, Deuteronomy 25:15, and in the χονιξδικαα, Ezekiel 45:10.

διρυξ. The LXX translate floodsaiah 27:12, streamsaiah 33:21, and river LXX Jer. 38 9 [MT Jeremiah 31:9], by διρυξ canal. They have thus Egyptianised the original. Such a course was perhaps quite natural in the first passage, where the reference is to the “flood of Egypt”: noticing that stream and river were metaphorically used in the other two passages, they made the metaphors more intelligible to the Alexandrians by giving them a local colouring—just as was shown above in the case of φεις.

εις.

“The prepositional construction came easily to the N.T. writers probably because of the more forcible and more expressive diction of their native tongue, and we therefore find εις in places where the Dat. commodi or incommodi would have sufficed for the Greeks, e.g., Acts 24:17 : λημοσνασποισωνεστ θνοσμου . . .” 360 In answer to this it must, to begin with, be remarked that “the” New Testament writers were not the first to find the usage a natural one, for it is already found in the Greek Old Testament. The author is not now examining the use of εις in that book, but he can point to the following passages, in which εις represents the “dative of advantage”: LXX Bel 361, σαεσατν [Bel] δαπανται, Acts 24:22, τν δαπνηντνεσατν [Bel], with which is to be compared Acts 24:2, νηλσκετοατ 362 [Bel]; Ep. Jeremiah 9:1-26 (ργριον) εις αυτοσκαταναλοσι; Sir 37:7, συμβουλεωνεσατν (= Sir 37:8, αυτβουλεσεται). In all these passages the original is wanting, but it seems certain to the author that what we find here is not one of the LXX’s many 363

Hebraisms in the use of prepositions, but that this employment of *εἰς* is an Alexandrian idiom. In Pap. Flind. Petr. xxv. a-i364 (ca. 226 B.C.) and elsewhere, we have a number of receipts, from the standing formulm of which it appears that *εἰς* was used to specify the various purposes of the items of an account. Thus the receipt α365 runs: **■μολογε■Κεφ■λων■ν■οχος ■χαινπαρ■Χ■ρμου. . . . ε■ς α■τ■νκα■■νι■χους ζ■ . . . ■ρωνκαθαρ■νβ■χο■νικας κα■ε■ς■πποκ■μουσιγ■■ρτωνα■τοπ■ρων . . . κς■** i.e., Kephalon the charioteer certifies that he has received from Charinos for himself and 7 other charioteers, 2 choenices of pure bread, and for 13 grooms, 26 measures of bran bread. Further, *εἰς* stands before non-personal words in the same way: **κα■ε■ς■ππον■νοχλο■μενον. ε■ςχρ■σιν■λα■ουκ■γ■ και . . . ε■ςλ■χγους κ■κεωσκ■β■**, i.e., and for a, sick horse 3 cotylas of oil for rubbing in, and for the lantern 2 cotylas of Kiki-oil. Still more clear is the passage from the contract Pap. Par.5 366 (114 B.C.) **κα■τ■νε■ς■T■γηνο■κον■κοδομημ■νον**. Further examples in III. iii. 1, below. The same usage of *εἰς*, the examples of which may be increased from the Papyri, is found specially clearly in Paul: 1 Corinthians 16:1**τ■ςλογε■ατ■ςε■ςτο■ς■γ■ους**, similarly 2 Corinthians 8:4, 2 Corinthians 9:1, 2 Corinthians 9:13, Romans 15:26; cf. Acts 24:17; Mark 8:19 f. should probably be explained in the same way.

■κτ■ς ε■μ■. The commonly cited examples, from Lucian, etc., of this jumbled phrase,³⁶⁷ long since recognised as late-Greek, in the Cilician Paul (1 Corinthians 14:5, 1 Corinthians 15:2, cf. 1 Timothy 5:19) are not so instructive for its use as is the passage of an Inscription of Mopsuestia in Cilicia, Waddington, iii. 2, No. 1499 (the author cannot fix the date ; certainly the imperial period): **■κτ■ςε■μ■ [■]■νM■γναμ■νηθε[λ■]σ■**.

■ν. The ignoring of the difference between translations of Semitic originals and works which were in Greek from the first—a difference of fundamental importance for the grammar (and the lexicon) of the “biblical” writers—has nowhere such disastrous consequences as in connection with the preposition. The author considers that he has previously shown, by a not unimportant example, what a difference there is between a peculiarity of syntax in the originally-Greek Epistles of Paul and the apparently similar phenomenon in Greek translations. A similar fact may be observed with regard to the question of **■ν** with the *dativus instrumenti*. Winer-Lunemann³⁶⁸ still maintains that **■ν** is used “of the instrument and means (chiefly in the Apocalypse)—not only (as in the better Greek prose-writers. . . .) where in (or on) would be proper enough . . . , but also, respectively of this, where in Greek the dative alone, as *casus instrumentalis*, would be used—as an after-effect of the Hebrew **■■**”. Similarly A. Buttmann.³⁶⁹ In their enumeration of the examples—in so far as these can come into consideration at all—both writers, in neglecting this difference, commit the error of uncritically placing passages from the Gospels and the Apocalypse, in regard to which one may speak of a Semitic influence, i.e., of a possible Semitic original, alongside of, say, Pauline passages, without, however, giving any indication of how they imagine the “after-effect” of the **■■** to have influenced Paul. Thus Winer-Lunemann quotes Romans 15:6**■ν■ν■στ■ματιδοξ■ζητε**, and Buttmann,³⁷⁰ 1 Corinthians 4:21**■ν■βδ■ ■λωπρ■ς ■μ■ς**, as Pauline examples of **■ν** with the instrumental dative. The author believes that both passages are capable of another explanation, and that, as they are the only ones that can be cited with even an appearance of reason, this use of **■ν** by Paul cannot be made out. For, to begin with, the passage in Romans is one of those “where in would be proper enough,” i.e., where the reference to its primary sense of location is fully adequate to explain it, and it is thus quite superfluous to

make for such instances a new compartment in the dust-covered repository; the Romans are to glorify God in one mouth—because, of course, words are formed in the mouth, just as, according to popular psychology, thoughts dwell in the heart. In 1 Corinthians 4:21, again, the case seems to be more favourable for the view of Buttmann, for the LXX frequently use the very construction **ἐν τῷ βδ**; what more easy than to maintain that “the” biblical Greek uses this construction instrumentally throughout? But here also we perceive very clearly the difference between the diction of the translators as cramped by their original, and, the un-constrained language of Paul. In all the passages of the LXX Genesis 32:10, Exodus 17:5, Exodus 21:20, LXX 1Ki. 17:43 [MT 1 Samuel 17:43], LXX 2 Kings 23:21 [MT 2 Samuel 7:14, 2 Samuel 23:21], 1 Chronicles 11:23, Psalms 2:9 LXX Psa. 88:33 [MT Psalms 89:33], Isaiah 10:24, Micah 5:1, Micah 7:14; cf. Ezekiel 39:9, also Hosea 4:12, where **ἐν βδοις** is conformed to the previous **ἐν** [= **ἐν**] **συμβολοις**) the **ἐν**, of the phrase **ἐν τῷ βδ** is a mechanical imitation of a **ἐν** in the original: it cannot therefore be maintained in any way that that construction is peculiar to the indigenous Alexandrian Greek. With Paul, on the contrary, **ἐν βδ** is anticipatively conformed to the following locative **ἐν γὰρ πνευματικῆ πρᾶτητος**; it is but a loose formation of the moment, and cannot be deduced from any law of syntax. It is, of course, not impossible that this anticipative conformation came the more easily to the Apostle, who knew his Greek Bible, because one or other of those passages of the LXX may have hovered³⁷¹ before his mind, but it is certainly preposterous to speak of the “after-effect” of a **ἐν**. Where in Paul’s psychology of language may this powerful particle have had its dwelling-place?

ἐνταφιαστῆς. The LXX correctly translate **ἰατρὸς** physician by **ἰατρῆς**; only in Genesis 50:2 f. by **ἐνταφιαστῆς**. The original speaks in that passage of the Egyptian physicians who embalmed the body of Jacob. The translation is not affected by the verb **ἐνταφίζειν** simply, but is explained by the endeavour to introduce a term better suited to Egyptian conditions: it was, of course, an embalming in Egypt. But the professional designation of the person³⁷² entrusted with this work was **ἐνταφιαστῆς**, Pap. Par. 7 373 (99 B.C.). Those sections of the Old Testament the scene of which was laid in Egypt, or which had regard to Egyptian conditions, naturally gave the translators most occasion to use Egyptianised expressions.

ἐντυχῆνω, **ἐντευξίς**, **ἐντυχῆα**. In the New Testament writings **ἐντευξίς** is used only in 1 Timothy 2:1 and 1 Timothy 4:5, having in both passages the sense of petitionary prayer. This usage is commonly explained³⁷⁴ by the employment of the word in the sense of petition which is found in extra-biblical literature from the time of Diodorus and Josephus. The Papyri³⁷⁵ show that in Egypt it had been long familiar in technical language: “**ἐντευξίς** est ipsa petitio seu voce significata, seu in scripto libello expressa, quam supplex subditus offert; . . . vocem Alexandrini potissimum usurpant ad designandas petitiones vel Regi, vel iis, qui regis nomine rempublicam moderantur, exhibitas”.³⁷⁶ This explanation has been fully confirmed by the newly-discovered Papyri of the Ptolemaic period.³⁷⁷ The technical meaning also occurs in Ep. Arist. (ed. M. Schmidt), p. 583; A. Peyron, who has previously drawn attention to this passage, finds it also in 2Ma 4:8—probably without justification.

ἐντυχῆα is found in the same sense in Pap. Lond. xlv.3 378(161 B.C.) and 3Ma. 6:40—in both passages in the idiomatic phrase **ἐντυχῆα νποιεῖσθα**. The verb **ἐντυχῆνω**^{379a} has the corresponding technical meaning; the correlative term for the king’s giving an answer is **χρηματίζειν**.^{379b} Both the verb and the substantive are frequently combined with **κατὰ** and

■π■ρ, according to whether the memorial expresses itself against or for some one; cf. the Pauline ■περεντυγγ■νω, Rom. 8:26.

■ργοδι■κτης. This word, common in the LXX, but hitherto not authenticated elsewhere, is vouched for by Pap. Flind. Petr. ii. iv. i.380 (255-254 B.C.) as a technical term for overseer of work, foreman. Philo, who uses it later, de Vit. Mos. i. 7 (M., p. 86), can hardly have found it in the LXX first of all, but rather in the current vocabulary of his time. It is in use centuries later in Alexandria: Origen³⁸¹ jestingly calls his friend Ambrosius his ■ργοδι■κτης. Even he would not originally get the expression from the LXX.³⁸² ε■λλατος.

Occurring only in LXX Psalms 98:8 [MT Psalms 99:8] (representing ■■■■■■) and [3]1Es 8:53383 = very favourable: already exemplified in Pap. Flind. Petr. xiii. 19384 (ca. 255 B.C.); observe that it is the same phrase τυχε■ντινοσε■λλ■του which is found here and in the passage in Esd. See la furtherexample, iii. 6, subβι■ζομαι, below.

ε■χαριστ■ω. In regard to the passive,³⁸⁵² Corinthians 1:11, Pap. Flind. Petr. ii. ii. 4 386 (260-259 B.C.) is instructive; it is difficult, however, to settle what the ε■χαριστηθε■ς in this passage refers to, owing to mutilation of the leaf.

τ■θεμ■λιον. In deciding the question whether θεμ■λιον is to be construed as masculine or neuter in passages where the gender of the word is not clearly determined, attention is usually called to the fact that the neuter form is first found in Pausanius (2nd cent. A.D.). But it occurs previously in Pap. Flind. Petr. ii. xiv. 3 387 (Ptolemaic period). Cf. also τ■θεμ■λιον of an unknown translator of Leviticus 4:18388 From this, the possibility, at least, of taking it as neuter, in the nondecisive passages³⁸⁹Sir 1:15, Romans 15:20, Ephesians 2:20, Luke 6:48 f., Luke 14:29 , 1 Timothy 6:19, Hebrews 6:1, may be inferred.

■διος. The LXX not seldom (Genesis 47:18, Deuteronomy 15:2, Job 2:11, Job 7:10, Job 7:13, Proverbs 6:2, Proverbs 13:8, Proverbs 16:23, Proverbs 27:8, Daniel 1:10) translate the possessive pronoun (as a suffix) by ■διος, though the connection does not require the giving of such an emphasis to the particular possessive relation. Such passages as Job 24:12, Proverbs 9:12, Proverbs 22:7, Proverbs 27:15, might be considered stranger still, where the translator adds ■διος, though the Hebrew text does not indicate a possessive relation at all, nor the context require the emphasising of any. This special prominence is, however, only apparent, and the translation (or addition) is correct. We have here probably the earliest examples of the late-Greek use of ■διος for the genitives ■αυτο■, and ■αυτ■ν employed as possessives, a usage which can be pointed to in Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Philo, Josephus and Plutarch,³⁹⁰ and in the Attic Inscriptions³⁹¹ subsequent to 69 B.C. This usage is also confirmed by the Apocryphal books of the O.T., specially by those in Greek from the first, and it influences the New Testament writers,³⁹² and especially Paul, much more strongly than is implied by Winer-Luemann.³⁹³ Exegetes have, in many places, laid a stress upon the ■διος which, in the text, does not belong to it at all. In consideration of the very widely-extended use of the exhausted ■διος in the post-classical age, it will, in point of fact, be the most proper course in exegesis always to assume it primarily as most probable, and to take ■διος in the old sense only when the context absolutely requires it. A specially instructive example is 1 Corinthians 7:2, δι■δ■τ■ςπορνε■αζ■καστοστ■ν ■αυτο■γυνα■κα■χ■τωκα■κ■στητ■ν■διον■νδρα■χ■τω : ■διος is here used only for the sake of variety and is exactly equivalent to the ■αυτο■.

■λαστ■ριος and ■λαστ■ριον. Of all the errors to be found in exegetical and lexical literature, that of imagining that ■λαστ■ριον in the LXX is identical in meaning with ■■■■■■■■■■, cover (of the ark of the covenant), and that therefore the word with them means propitiatory cover (Luther Gnadenstuhl), is one of the most popular, most pregnant with results, and most baneful. Its source lies in the fact that the LXX's frequent external verbal equation, viz., ■λαστ■ριον = kapp■reth, has been inconsiderately taken as an equation of ideas. But the investigation cannot proceed upon the assumption of this identification of ideas. We must rather, as in all cases where the Greek expression is not congruent with the Hebrew original, begin here by establishing the difference, and then proceed with an attempt to explain it. In the present case our position is happily such that we can give the explanation with some certainty, and that the wider philologico-historical conditions can be ascertained quite as clearly. To begin with, it is altogether inaccurate to assert that the LXX translate kapp■reth by ■λαστ■ριον. They first encountered the word in Exodus 25:16 [17]: and thou shalt make a kapp■reth of pure gold. The Greek translator rendered thus: κα■ποι■σεις■λαστ■ριον■π■θεμα³⁹⁴ χρυσ■ου καθαρο■. His rendering of kapp■reth is therefore not ■λαστ■ριον, but ■λαστ■ριον■π■θεμα; he understood kapp■reth quite well, and translates it properly by cover,³⁹⁵ but he has elucidated the word, used technically in this place, by a theological adjunct which is not incorrect in substance.³⁹⁶ π■θεμα is doubtless a translation of kapp■reth the word; ■λαστ■ριον■π■θεμα is a rendering of kapp■reth the religious concept. How then are we to understand this theological gloss upon the Hebrew word? ■λαστ■ριον is not a substantive,³⁹⁷ but, as in 4Ma. 17:22 (if το■λαστηρ■ουθαν■του is to be read here with the Alexandrinus), an adjective, and signifies of use for propitiation. The same theological gloss upon the ceremonial kapp■reth is observed when, in the Greek translation of the Pentateuch 398 —first in the passages immediately following upon Exodus 25:16 [17] and also later—it is rendered, brevilouquently,³⁹⁹ by the simple ■λαστ■ριον instead of ■λαστ■ριονεπ■θεμα. The word is now a substantive and signifies something like propitiatory article. It does not mean cover, nor even propitiatory cover, but for the concept cover it substitutes another, which only expresses the ceremonial purpose of the article. The kapp■reth was for the translators a σ■μβολοντ■ς■λεωτο■θεο■δυν■μεως, as Philo, de vit. Mos. iii. 8 (M., p. 150), speaking from the same theological stand-point, explains it, and therefore they named this symbol ■λαστ■ριον. Any other sacred article having some connection with propitiation might in the very same way be brought under the general conception ■λαστ■ριον, and have the latter substituted for it, i.e., if what was required was not a translation but a theological paraphrase. And thus it is of the greatest possible significance that the LXX actually do make a generalising gloss⁴⁰⁰ upon another quite different religious conception by ■λαστ■ριον, viz., ■■■■■■■■■■, the ledge of the altar, Ezekiel 43:14, Ezekiel 43:17, Ezekiel 43:20; it also, according to Ezekiel 43:20, had to be sprinkled with the blood of the sin-offering, and was therefore a kind of propitiatory article—hence the theologising rendering of the Greek translators. ■λαστ■ριον here also means neither ledge nor ledge of propitiation, but propitiatory article. The proof of the fact that the LXX did not identify the concept ■λαστ■ριον with kapp■reth and 'azarah can be supplemented by the following observed facts. The two words paraphrased by ■λαστ■ριον have other renderings as well. In Exodus 26:34 the original runs, and thou shalt put the kapp■reth upon the ark of the testimony in the most holy place; LXX κα■κατακαλ■ψειςτ■καταπετ■σματιτ■νκιβωτ■ν το■μαρτυρ■ου■ντ■γ■τ■νγ■ων. According to Cremer, the LXX have not translated the Hebrew word here at all—let alone by καταπ■τασμα. But it is without doubt a more correct

conjecture that they read not **καταπύλας** but **καταπέτασμα** curtain, and thus did translate the Hebrew word.⁴⁰¹ This conjecture is, however, in no way absolutely necessary; the author thinks it not at all impossible that the LXX read **καταπέτασμα**, and translated it by **καταπέτασμα**, just as they did, at its first occurrence, by **πύλας**. More significant is 1 Chronicles 28:11, where house of the **καταπέτασμα** is rendered by **οικος το ξιλασμο**: this also is a theological gloss, not a verbal translation of the original.⁴⁰² It may be regarded as specially significant that the ceremonial word should thus be glossed in two different ways. Similarly, 'azrah in Ezekiel 45:19 is paraphrased⁴⁰³ by **εργον**, and, in 2 Chronicles 4:9 and 2 Chronicles 6:13, translated by **αλ**.

It thus seems clear to the author that it is not correct to take the LXX's equation of words as being an equation of ideas. **λαστριον**, for the translators, signified propitiatory article, even where they used it for **καταπέτασμα**. Philo still had a clear conception of the state of the matter. It is not correct to assert⁴⁰⁴ that, following the example of the LXX, he describes **καταπέτασμα** as **λαστριον**: he describes it correctly as **πυλας**, and remarks further that it is called **λαστριον** in the Bible: De Vit. Mos. iii. 8 (M. p. 150) **δικιωτης . . . ,** **πυλας** **σανεπματ** **λεγμανον** **εραββλιος** **λαστριον**, and, further on in the same work, **δικιωτης** **πυλας** **προσαγορευμενον** **λαστριον** De Profug. 19 (M. p. 561) . . . **πυλας** **δικιωτης**, **καλε** **δα** **λαστριον**. Philo manifestly perceived that the **λαστριον** of the Greek Bible was an altogether peculiar designation, and therefore expressly distinguishes it as such: he puts the word, so to speak, in quotation-marks. Thus also, in De Cherub. 8 (M. p. 143), **κα** **γ** **ρ** **ν** **τι** **π** **ρ** **σ** **ω** **φ** **α** **σ** **ι** **ν** **ε** **ν** **αι** **ν** **ε** **ο** **ν** **τ** **α** **π** **ρ** **ς** **τ** **λ** **α** **σ** **τ** **ρ** **ι** **ο** **ν** **τ** **ρ** **ο** **ι** **ς** is clearly an allusion to LXX Exodus 25:20 [21], and, instead of saying that Philo here describes the **καταπέτασμα** as **λαστριον**,⁴⁰⁵ we should rather say that he, following the LXX, asserts that the cherubim over-shadow the **λαστριον**.⁴⁰⁶ How little one is entitled to speak of a "Sprachgebrauch" ⁴⁰⁷ (usage, or, habit of speech), viz., **λαστριον** = **καταπέτασμα**, is shown by the fact that Symmachus in Genesis 6:16 [15] twice renders the Ark of Noah by **λαστριον** and that Josephus, Ant. xvi. 71, speaks of a monument of white stone as a **λαστριον** : **περ** **φο** **β** **ο** **ς** **δ** **α** **τ** **ς** **ξ** **ει** **κα** **το** **δ** **ο** **υ** **ς** **λ** **α** **σ** **τ** **ρ** **ι** **ο** **ν** **μ** **ν** **μ** **α** **λ** **ε** **υ** **κ** **ς** **π** **τ** **ρ** **α** **ς** **π** **τ** **σ** **τ** **ο** **μ** **κ** **α** **τ** **ε** **σ** **κ** **υ** **σ** **α** **τ** **ο**, which must certainly be translated: he set up a monument of white stone as a **λαστριον**.⁴⁰⁸

What, then, is the meaning of **λαστριον** in the important "Christological" statement Romans 3:25 ? Paul says there of Jesus Christ, **ν** **π** **ο** **ρ** **θ** **ε** **τ** **ο** **θ** **ε** **ς** **λ** **α** **σ** **τ** **ρ** **ι** **ο** **ν** **δ** **ι** **π** **σ** **τ** **ε** **ω** **ς** **ν** **τ** **α** **τ** **ο** **α** **μ** **α** **τ** **ι** **ς** **ν** **δ** **ει** **ξ** **ι** **ν** **τ** **ς** **δ** **ι** **κ** **α** **ι** **ο** **ς** **ν** **η** **ς** **α** **τ** **ο**. It has been said that the Roman readers could hardly have known the expression from any other source than the Greek Bible.⁴⁰⁹ But, even if this assumption were correct, it still requires to be proved that they could have learned from the Greek Bible that **λαστριον** means the **καταπέτασμα**; besides, the primary question must be: what did the term signify to Paul himself? The author believes that even the context requires us to reject the opinion that the Apostle is describing the crucified Christ as "a" ⁴¹⁰**καταπέτασμα**. Had the Cross been so named, then the metaphor might possibly be understood; as used of a person, it is infelicitous and unintelligible; further, Christ, the end of the law, Christ, of whom Paul has just said that He is the revealer of the **δικαιοσνηθεοχωρ** **ς** **ν** **μ** **ο** **υ**, would hardly be named by the same Paul, in the same breath, as the cover of the ark of testimony: the metaphor were as unlike Paul as possible. But the whole assumption of the explanation in question is without support: no

“Sprachgebrauch,” according to which one had to understand ἑλᾶσθριον as the kappreth, ever existed either in the LXX or later. Hence this explanation of the passage in Romans has long encountered opposition. Again, it is a popular interpretation to take ἑλᾶσθριον as equivalent to propitiatory sacrifice, after the analogy of σωθριον, χαρισθριον, καθρσιον, etc., in connection with which θεμα is to be supplied. However difficult it would be to find examples of the word being used in this sense,⁴¹¹ there is no objection to it linguistically. But it is opposed by the context; it can hardly be said of a sacrifice that God πορθετο it. The more general explanation therefore, which of late has been advocated again, specially by B. Weiss,⁴¹² viz., means of propitiation, is to be preferred: linguistically it is the most obvious; it is also presupposed in the “usage” of the LXX, and admirably suits the connection—particularly in the more special sense of propitiatory gift which is to be referred to just below. Hitherto the word in this sense had been noted only in Dion Chrysostom (1-2 cent. A.D.), Or. xi. p. 355 (Reinke), καταλεψειν γρατο εν θεμα κλλιστον καμγιστον θεην καπιργψειν ἑλᾶσθριον χαιοτλιδι—and in later authors. The word here means a votive gift, which was brought to the deities in order to induce them to be favourable⁴¹³—a propitiatory gift. Even one such example would be sufficient to confirm the view of the passage in Romans advocated above. Its evidential value is not decreased, but rather increased, by the fact that it is taken from a “late” author. It would surely be a mechanical notion of statistical facts to demand that only such concepts in “profane” literature as can be authenticated before, e.g., the time of Paul, should be available for the explanation of the Pauline Epistles. For this would be to uphold the fantastic idea that the first occurrence of a word in the slender remains of the ancient literature must be identical with the earliest use of it in the history of the Greek language, and to overlook the fact that the annoying caprice of statistics may, in most cases, rather tend to delude the pedants who entertain such an idea. In the case before us, however, a means has been found of removing the objection to the “lateness” of the quotation: ἑλᾶσθριον in the assigned meaning is found also before the time of Paul—occurring as it does in a place at which the Apostle certainly touched in his travels (Acts 21:1): the Inscription of Cos No. 81414 reads thus:—

δμος πρτςτοκρτορος

Κασαρος

θεουο414b Σεβαστοσωτηρας

θεος ἑλᾶσθριον. This Inscription is found on a statue or on the base of a statue,⁴¹⁵—at all events on a votive-gift which the “people” of Cos erected to the gods as a ἑλᾶσθριον for the welfare of the “son of God,” Augustus. That is exactly the same use of the word as we find later in Dion Chrysostom, and the similarity of the respective formulae is evident. The word is used in the same way in the Inscription of Cos No. 347,⁴¹⁶ which the author cannot date exactly, but which certainly falls within the imperial period: it occurs upon the fragment of a pillar:—

[δμος λεντων] Σε]βα-

σ[τ]δι[σ]τ[ρα]τ[ο]ν ἑλᾶσθριον δαμαρχεν- τος Γαου Νωρ- βανο Μοσχω- νο[σφι]λοκασα- ρος

Thus much, then, can be derived from these three passages, as also from Josephus, viz., that, early in the imperial period, it was a not uncommon custom to dedicate propitiatory gifts to the Gods, which were called **■λαστ■ρια**. The author considers it quite impossible that Paul should not have known the word in this sense: if he had not already become familiar with it by living in Cilicia, he had certainly read it here and there in his wanderings through the empire, when he stood before the monuments of paganism and pensively contemplated what the piety of a dying civilisation had to offer to its known or unknown Gods. Similarly, the Christians of the capital, whether one sees in them, as the misleading distinction goes, Jewish Christians or Heathen Christians, would know what a **■λαστ■ριον** was in their time. To suppose that, in consequence of their “magnificent knowledge of the Old Testament,” 417 they would immediately think of the **■λαστ■ριον**, is to overlook two facts. First, that the out-of-the-way⁴¹⁸ passages referring to the **■λαστ■ριον** may very well have remained unknown even to a Christian who was conversant with the LXX: how many Bible readers of to-day, nay, how many theologians of to-day—who, at least, should be Bible readers,—if their readings have been unforced, and not desecrated by sideglances towards “Ritschlianism” or towards possible examination questions, are acquainted with the **■λαστ■ριον**? The second fact overlooked is, that such Christians of the imperial period as were conversant with those passages, naturally understood the **■λαστ■ριον** in the sense familiar to them, not in the alleged sense of propitiatory cover—just as a Bible reader of to-day, unspoiled by theology, finding the word Gnadenstuhl (mercy-seat) in Luther, would certainly never think of a cover. That the verb **προ■θετο** admirably suits the **■λαστ■ριον** taken as propitiatory gift, in the sense given to it in the Greek usage of the imperial period, requires no proof. God has publicly set forth the crucified Christ in His blood in view of the Cosmos—to the Jews a stumbling block, to the Gentiles foolishness, to Faith a **■λαστ■ριον**. The crucified Christ is the votive-gift of the Divine Love for the salvation of men. Elsewhere it is human hands which dedicate to the Deity a dead image of stone in order to gain His favour; here the God of grace Himself erects the consoling image,—for the skill and power of men are not sufficient. In the thought that God Himself has erected the **■λαστ■ριον**, lies the same wonderful **μωρ■α** of apostolic piety which has so inimitably diffused the unction of artless genius over other religious ideas of Paul. God’s favour must be obtained—He Himself fulfils the preliminary conditions; Men can do nothing at all, they cannot so much as believe—God does all in Christ: that is the religion of Paul, and our passage in Romans is but another expression of this same mystery of salvation. A. Ritschl,⁴¹⁹ one of the most energetic upholders of the theory that the **■λαστ■ριον** of the passage in Romans signifies the **■λαστ■ριον**, has, in his investigation of this question, laid down the following canon of method “. . . for **■λαστ■ριον** the meaning propitiatory sacrifice is authenticated in heathen usage, as being a gift by which the anger of the gods is appeased, and they themselves induced to be gracious. . . . But . . . the heathen meaning of the disputed word should be tried as a means of explaining the statement in question only when the biblical meaning has proved to be wholly inapplicable to the passage.” It would hardly be possible to find the sacred conception of a “biblical” Greek more plainly upheld by an opponent of the theory of inspiration than is the case in these sentences. What has been already said will show the error, as the author thinks it, of the actual assertions they contain concerning the meaning of **■λαστ■ριον** in “biblical” 420 and in “heathen” usage; his own reflections about method are contained in the introduction to these investigations. But the case under consideration, on account of its importance, may be tested, once more by an analogy which has already been indicated above. In the hymn O Konig, dessen Majestdt, by Valentin Ernst

seems to be lost, and to be supplanted by a different one: for καρπον of course means “to make or offer as fruit”. 425 The idea of the Seventy, that that which was leavened, or honey, might be named a fruit-offering, is certainly more striking than the fact that the offering made by fire is here upplanted by the offering of fruit. But the vagary cannot have been peculiar to these venerable ancients, for we meet with the same, strange notion also in passages which are not reckoned as their work in the narrower sense. According to [3] 1Es 4:52 King Darius permits to the returning Jews, among other things, καπτιθυσιαστριονλοκαυτακαρποσθαικαθ' μραν, and, in the Song of the Three Children 14, Azariaslaments καοκστινντκαιρτοτρχωνκαπροφτης καγομενοςοδλοκατωσιςοδθυσιαοδπροσφοροδθυμαοδτποστοκαρπσαιναντονσουκαερεν λeos. If then a whole burnt-offering could be spoken of as a fruit-offering, wherefore should the same not be done as regards things leavened and honey? But the LXX can be vindicated in a more honourable way. Even their own usage of καρπω elsewhere might give the hint: it is elsewhere found 426 only in Deuteronomy 26:14, οκ κκρωσαπ'ατνεζκθαρτον, which is meant to represent I have put away nothing thereof (i.e., of the tithes), beingunclean. In this the LXX take ██████████, to mean for an unclean use, as did also De Wette, while καρπω for ██████████ is apparently intended to signify put away, a meaning of the word which is found nowhere else,427 implying, as it does, almost the opposite of the primary meaning to bring forth fruit. It is not the LXX, however, who have taken καρπω and put away as equivalent, but rather the unscientific procedure which looks upon verbal equations between translation and original without further ceremony as equations of ideas. The true intention of the Greek ranslators is shown by a comparison of Leviticus 2:11 and Deuteronomy 26:14. In the first passage, one may doubt as to whether καρπω is meant to represent ██████████ or ██████████, but whichever of the two be decided upon does not matter: in either case it represents some idea like to offer a sacrifice made with fire. In the other passage, καρπω certainly stands for ██████████, and if, indeed, the Greek word cannot mean put away, yet the Hebrew one can mean to burn. It is quite plain that the LXX thought that they found this familiar meaning in this passage also: the two passages, in fact, support one another, and ward off any suspicion of “the LXX’s” having used καρπω in the sense of put away and bring forth fruit at the same time. However strange the result may appear, the issue of our critical comparison is this: the LXX used καρπω for to burn both in a ceremonial and in a non-ceremonial sense. This strange usage, however, has received a brilliant confirmation. P. Stengel 428 has shown, from four Inscriptions and from the old lexicographers,429 that καρπω must have been quite commonly used for to burn in the ceremonial sense.430 Stengel explains as follows how this meaning arose: καρπον, properly signifies to cut into pieces; the holocausts of the Greeks were cut into pieces, and thus, in ceremonial language, καρπω must have come to mean absumere, consumere, λοκαυτεν. The ceremonial sense of καρπω grows more distinct when we notice the compound form λοκαρπω,431Sir 45:14, 4Ma. 18:11, Sibyll. Orac. 3565, as also by the identity in meaning of the substantives λακρωμα = λοκατωμα, and λοκρωσις = λοκατωσις, all of which can be fully established in the LXX and the Apocrypha as meaning, in most cases, burnt-offering, just like κρωμα = κρωσις. These substantives are all to be derived, not from καρπωfruit, but from the ceremonial καρπω, to burn.432 κατ.

1. In 3Ma. 5:34 and Romans 12:5 is found καθ'εζ433for εζκαστος, and in Mark 14:19 and John 8:9434 the formula εζ καθ'εζ for unusquisque. In these constructions, unknown in

classical Greek, we must, it is said, either treat *eh* as an indeclinable numeral, or treat the preposition as an adverb.⁴³⁵ Only in the Byzantine writers have such constructions been authenticated. But *εκαθ'εκαστος*⁴³⁶ already stands in LXX Leviticus 25:10 (*καπελεσεταιεκαστοσεστνκτσινατο*), according to Cod. A. This represents *εκαθ'εκαστος*, and cannot, therefore, be explained as a mechanical imitation of the original. What we have here (assuming that A has preserved the original reading) will rather be the first example of a special usage of *καθ'*, and thus, since it is *εκαστος* which is now in question, the first, at least, of Buttmann's proposed explanations would fall to the ground. It is, of course, quite possible that the *εκαθ'εκαστος* should be assigned only to the late writer of Cod. A. But the hypothesis of its being the original derives, as the author thinks, further support from the following facts. The LXX translate the absolute *εκαστος* by *εκαστος* in innumerable passages. But in not a single passage except the present (according to the ordinary text), is it rendered by *εκαστος*. This combination, already found in Thucydides,⁴³⁷ frequent also in the "fourth" Book of Maccabees,⁴³⁸ in Paul and in Luke, is used nowhere else in the LXX, a fact which, in consideration of the great frequency of *εκαστος* = *εκαστος* is certainly worthy of note. It is in harmony with this that, so far as the author has seen, no example occurs in the contemporary Papyri.⁴³⁹ The phrase seems to be absent from the Alexandrian dialect in the Ptolemaic period.⁴⁴⁰ Hence it is a priori probable that any other reading which is given by a trustworthy source should have the preference. Although indeed our *εκαθ'εκαστος* seems strange and unique, yet this fact speaks not against, but in favour of, its being the original. It can hardly be imagined that the copyist would have formed the harsh *εκαθ'εκαστος* out of the every-day *εκαστος*. But it is quite plain, on the other hand, that the latter reading could arise from the former—nay, even had to be made from it by a fairly "educated" copyist.⁴⁴¹ Our reading is further confirmed not only by the analogies cited, but also by Revelation 21:21, *νεκαστοςενπυλωνενξενζυμαργαρτου*: here also we have evidently an adverbial use of a preposition,⁴⁴² which should hardly be explained as one of the Hebraisms of Revelation, since in Revelation 4:8 the distributive *να* is made, quite correctly, to govern the accusative, and since, further, it would be difficult to say what the original really was which, as it is thought, is thus imitated in Hebraising fashion.

2. "Even more diffuse and more or less Hebraising periphrases of simple prepositions are effected by means of the substantives *πρωπον, γερον, στωμα, φθαλμος*."⁴⁴³ The author considers that this general assertion fails to stand the test. One of the phrases used by Buttmann as an example, viz., *κατπρωποντινος* = *καθ'* is already found in Pap. Flind. Petr. i. xxi.,⁴⁴⁴ the will of a Libyan, of the year 237 B.C., in which the text of line 8 can hardly be restored otherwise than *τμ[νκα]τπρωποντοερο*.

λειτουργω, λειτουργα, λειτουργικς.

"The LXX took over the word [*λειτουργω*] in order to designate the duties of the Priests and Levites in the sanctuary, for which its usage in profane Greek yielded no direct support, as it is only in late and in very isolated cases [according to p. 562, in Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Plutarch] that even one word of this family, *λειτουργς*, occurs as applied to priests."⁴⁴⁵ The Papyri show, however, that *λειτουργω* and *λειτουργα* were commonly used in Egypt in the ceremonial sense. In particular, the services in the Serapeum⁴⁴⁶ were so designated. As examples of the verb there should be noted here: Pap. Par. 23447 (165 B.C.), 27448 (same date),

Pap. Lugd. B449 (164 B.C.), E450 (same date), Pap. Lond. xxxiii.451 (161 B.c.), xli.452 (161 B.C.), Pap. Par. 29453 (161-160 B.C.); of the substantive, Pap. Lugd. B454 (164 B.C.), Pap. Lond. xxii.455 (164-163 B.C.), xli.456 (161 B.C.), Pap. Dresd. ii.457 (162 B.C.), Pap. Par. 33458 (ca. 160 B.C.). But also of other ceremonial services elsewhere there were used λειτουργία, Pap. Par. 5459 (113 B.c.) twice; λειτουργία in the Papp. Lugd. G460, H461 and J,462 written 99 B.C.463

λειτουργία is found not “only in biblical and ecclesiastical Greek,”⁴⁶⁴ but occurs in a non-religious sense six times in a taxation-roll of the Ptolemaic Period, Pap. Flind. Petr. xxxix. e.465 Its use is confined, so far as “biblical” literature is concerned, to the following Alexandrian compositions: LXX Exodus 31:10, Exodus 39:1466 Numbers 4:12, Numbers 4:26, Numbers 7:5 , 2 Chronicles 24:14; Hebrews 1:14.

λψ. In the three passages, 2 Chronicles 32:30, 2 Chronicles 33:14, and Daniel 8:5, the LXX render the direction West by λψ. Elsewhere they use λψ, quite accurately for South. But even in the passages cited they have not been guilty of any negligence, but have availed themselves of a special Egyptian usage, which might have been noticed long ago in one of the earliest-known Papyrus documents. In a Papyrus of date 104 B.C., which was elucidated by Boeckh,⁴⁶⁷ there occurs the phrase λιβυσοκταφίτος. As the South (ντος) has been expressly mentioned just before, this can mean only in the West the house of Tephis. To this Boeckh⁴⁶⁸ observes: “λψ means South-West in Hellas, Africus, because Libya lies South-West from the Hellenes—whence its name: Libya lies directly West from the Egyptians; hence λψ is for them the West itself, as we learn here”. The word had been already used in the will of a Libyan, Pap. Flind. Petr. xxi.469 (237 B.C.), where similarly the connection yields the meaning West.

λογεα. In 1 Corinthians 16:1 Paul calls the collection for “the saints” (according to the ordinary text) λογα, and in 1 Corinthians 16:2 says that the λογα must begin at once. The word is supposed to occur for the first time here,⁴⁷⁰ and to occur elsewhere only in the Fathers. Grimm⁴⁷¹ derives it from λγω. Both views are wrong.

λογεα can be demonstrated to have been used in Egypt from the 2nd cent. B.C. at the latest: it is found in Papyrus documents belonging to the Χοαχται or Χολχται (the orthography and etymology of the word are uncertain), a society which had to perform a part of the ceremonies required in the embalming of bodies: they are named in one place δελφοοτςλειτουργαςνταςνεκραιςπαρεχμενοι.⁴⁷² They had the right, as members of the guild, to institute collections, and they could sell this right. Such a collection is called λογεα: Pap. Lond. iii.473 (ca. 140 B.C.), Pap. Par. 5474 (114 B.C.) twice; Pap. Lugd. M475 (114 B.C.). We find the word, further, in the taxation-roll Pap. Kind. Petr. xxxix. c.476 of the Ptolemaic period,⁴⁷⁷ in which it is used six times—probably in the sense of tax. The derivation of the word from λγω is impossible; λογεα belongs to the class⁴⁷⁸ of substantives in -εα formed from verbs in -εω. Now the verb λογεωto collect, which has not been noticed in literary compositions, is found in the following Papyri and Inscriptions: Pap. Lond. xxiv.479 (163 B. C.), iii.480 (ca. 140 B.c.), a Papyrus of date 134 B.C.,⁴⁸¹ Pap. Taur. 8482(end of 2nd cent. B.C.), an Egyptian Inscription, CIG. iii., No. 495637 (49 A.D.); cf. also the Papyrus-fragment which proves the presence of Jews in the Fayyûm.⁴⁸³ The Papyri yield also the pair παραλογεω, Pap. Flind. Petr. xxxviii. b484 (242 B.C.) and παραλογεα, Pap. Par. 61485 (145 B.C.). In regard to the orthography of the word, it is to be observed that the spelling λογεα corresponds to the laws of

word-formation. Its consistent employment in the relatively well-written pre-Christian Papyri urges us to assume that it would also be used by Paul: the Vaticanus still has it, in 1 Corinthians 16:2486 at least. In speaking of the collection for 487 the poor in Jerusalem, Paul has other synonyms besides *λογεῖα*, among them *λειτουργεῖα*, 2 Corinthians 9:12. This more general term is similarly associated with *λογεῖα* in Pap. Lond. iii. 9.488 In 1 Corinthians 16:1 Donnaeus and H. Grotius proposed to alter “*λογεῖα*” to *εὐλογεῖα*,⁴⁸⁹ as the collection is named in 2 Corinthians 9:5. This is of course unnecessary: but it does not seem to the author to be quite impossible that, conversely, the first *εὐλογεῖαν* in the latter passage should be altered to *λογεῖαν*. If *λογεῖαν* were the original, the sentence would be much more forcible; the temptation to substitute the known word for the strange one could come as easily to a copyist as to the scholars of a later period.

μειζότερος. With this double comparative in 3 John 1:4490 cf. the double superlative *μεγιστάτος*, Pap. Lond. cxxx.491 (1st or 2nd cent. A.D.).

μικρῆς. In Mark 15:40 there is mentioned a *κωβος μικρῆς*. It is a question whether the attribute refers to his age or his stature,⁴⁹² and the deciding between these alternatives is not without importance for the identification of this James and of Mary his mother. In reference to this the author would call attention to the following passages. In Pap. Lugd. N493 (103 B.C.) a *Νεχοτῆς μικρῆς* is named twice. Upon this Leemans⁴⁹⁴ observes: “*quominus vocem μικρῆς de corporis altitudine intelligamus prohibent tum ipse verborum ordo quo ante patris nomen et hic et infra in Trapezitae subscriptione vs. 4 ponitur; tum quae sequitur vox ἡμῶς, qua staturae certe non parvae plisse Nechyten docemur. Itaque ad aetatem referendum videtur, et additum fortasse ut distingueretur ab altero Nechyte, frater majore;*” it is, in point of fact, shown by Pap. Taur. i. that this Nechytes had a brother of the same name. In a similar manner a *Μνηρημῆγας* is named in Pap. Flind. Petr. ii. xxv. i495 (Ptolemaic period). Mahaffy,⁴⁹⁶ it is true, prefers to interpret the attribute here as applying to the stature. The LXX also are acquainted with (not to speak of the idiom *πῶς μικροῦς μεγῆλου*) a usage of *μικρῆς* to signify age, e.g., 2 Chronicles 22:1.

νομῆς.

L. van Ess's edition of the LXX (1887)⁴⁹⁷ still reads Isaiah 19:2 thus: *κατὰ πνεύμα ἔσονται ἄγγελοι π' Ἀγυπτῶν καὶ πολεμῶσι ἐν θρωποσὶν δελφῶνα τοῦ κατὰ θρωποσὶν πλησῶνα τοῦ πλῆθους πῶς πλινκῶν ἡμῶς πῶν ἡμῶν*. In the original the concluding words of the verse are kingdom against kingdom. The Concordance of Tromm therefore says *νομῆς* lex stands for *regnum*, and the editor of Van Ess's LXX appears to be of the same opinion. The correct view has long been known;⁴⁹⁸ the phrase should be accented thus: *νομῆς πῶν ἡμῶν*.⁴⁹⁹

νομῆς is a terminus technicus for a political department of the country, and was used as such in Egypt especially, as was already known from Herodotus and Strabo. The Papyri throw fresh light upon this division into departments, though indeed the great majority of these Papyri come from the “Archives” of the Nomos of Arsinoe. This small matter is noted here because the translation of Isaiah 19:1-25, the “*ῥασις Ἀγυπτου*,” has, as a whole, been furnished by the LXX, for reasons easily perceived, with very many instances of specifically Egyptian—in comparison with the original, we might indeed say modern-Egyptian-local-colouring. This may also be observed in other passages of the O.T. which refer to Egyptian conditions.

νομα. In connection with the characteristic “biblical” construction εστ νομτινος,500 and, indeed, with the general usage of νομα, in the LXX, etc., the expression ντευξιζεσ ττο βασιλωσ νομα, which occurs several times in the Papyri, deserves very great attention: Pap. Flind. Petr. ii. ii. 1501 (260-259 B.C.), Pap. Flind. Petr. ii. xx. ee502 (241 B.C.);cf., possibly, Pap. Flind. Petr. xlvii.503 (191 B.C.)! Mahaffy504 speaks of the phrase as a hitherto unknown “formula”. Its repeated occurrence in indictments certainly suggests the conjecture that it must have had a technical meaning. This is, doubtless, true of ντευξις.505 An ντευξιζεσ ττο βασιλωσ νομα would be a direct petition—a memorial to the King’s Majesty;506 the name of the King is the essence of what he is as ruler. We see how nearly this idea of the νομα approaches to that of the Old Testament , and how convenient it was for the Egyptian translators to be able to render quite literally the expressive word of the sacred text. The special colouring which νομα often has in early Christian writings was doubtless strongly influenced by the LXX, but the latter did not borrow that colouring first from the Hebrew; it was rather a portion of what they took from the adulatory official vocabulary of their environment. But current usage in Asia Minor also provided a connecting link for the solemn formula of the early Christians, viz. εστ νομα with genitive of God, of Christ, etc., after it. In the Inscription of Mylasa in Caria, addington, iii. 2, No. 416 CIG ii. No. 2693 e, belonging to the beginning of the imperial period,507 we find γενομ νησδ τς νστ νπρογεγραμμ νωντο σκτηματ ναιζεσ ττο θεο νομα.508 This means: “after the sale of the afore-mentioned objects had been concluded with theκτηματ ναιεσ ττο θεο [Zeus] νομα”. In reference to the κτηματ νης, which is to be found in Inscriptions only, Waddington509 observes that the word means the purchaser of an article, but the person in question, in this connection, is only the nominal purchaser, who represents the real purchaser, i.e., the Deity; the κτηματ νησεσ ττο θεο νομα is the fideicommissaire du domaine sacre. The passage appears to the author to be the more important in that it presupposes exactly the same conception of the word νομα as we find in the solemn forms of expression used in religion. Just as, in the Inscription, to buy into the name of God means to buy so that the article bought belongs to God, so also the idea underlying, e.g., the expressions to baptise into the name of the Lord, or to believe into the name of the Son of God, is that baptism or faith constitutes the belonging to God or to the Son of God. The author would therefore take exception to the statement that the non-occurrence of the expression ποιε ντι ν νματτινος in profane Greek is due to the absence of this usage of the Name.510 What we have to deal with here is most likely but a matter of chance; since the use of νομα has been established for the impressive language of the court and of worship, it is quite possible that the phrase ντ νματι το βασιλωσ or το θεο may also come to light some day in Egypt or Asia Minor. The present example throws much light upon the development of the meaning of the religious terms of primitive Christianity. It shows us that, when we find, e.g., a Christian of Asia Minor employing peculiar expressions, which occur also in his Bible, we must be very strictly on our guard against summarily asserting a “dependence” upon the Greek Old Testament, or, in fact, the presence of any Semitic influence whatever.—Further in Ill. iii. 1 below [], and Theol. Literaturzeitung, xxv. (1900), p. 735.

ψνιον. The first occurrence of τ ψνια is not in Polybius;511 it is previously found in Pap. Flind. Petr. xiii. 7512 and 17513 (258-253 B.C.); τ ψνια is found in Pap. Flind. Petr. ii. xxxiii. a514 (Ptolemaic period). In all three places, not pay of soldiers, but quite generally wages; similarly Pap. Lond. xlv.515 (160-159 B.C.), xv.516 (131-130 B.Cc.), Pap. Par. 62517 (Ptolemaic

period). The word is to be found in Inscriptions onwards from 278 B.C. 518 Further remarks below, III. iii. 6.

παρδεισος. This word resembles γαρεω in its having been divested of its original technical meaning, and in its having become current in a more general sense. It stands for garden in general already in Pap. Flind. Petr. xlvi. b519 (200 B.C.), cf. xxii., 520 xxx. c, 521 xxxix. i522 (all of the Ptolemaic period); 523 similarly in the Inscription of Pergamus, Waddington, iii. 2, No. 1720 b (undated). It is frequent in the LXX, always for garden (in three of the passages, viz., Nehemiah 2:8, Ecclesiastes 2:15, Song of Solomon 4:13, as representing 524); So in Sir., Sus., Josephus, etc., frequently. Of course, παρδεισος in LXX Genesis 2:8 ff. is also garden, not Paradise. "the first witness to this new technical meaning 525 is, doubtless, Paul, 2 Corinthians 12:4, then Luke 23:43 and Revelation 2:7; 4 Esd. 7:53, 8:52.

παρεπιδημος. In LXX Genesis 23:4 and LXX Psalms 38:13 [MT Psalms 39:13], this is the translation of 526 used, most probably in consequence thereof in 1 Peter 1:1, 1 Peter 2:11, Hebrews 11:13; authenticated only 526 in Polybius and Athenaeus. But it had been already used in the will of a certain Aphrodisios of Heraklea, Pap. Flind. Petr. i. xix. 527 (225 B.C.), who calls himself, with other designations, a παρεπιδημος. Mahaffy 528 remarks upon this: "in the description of the testator we find another new class, παρεπιδημος, a sojourner, so that even such persons had a right to bequeath their property". Of still greater interest is the passage of a will of date 238-237 B.C. 529 which gives the name of a Jewish παρεπιδημος in the Fayyûm: 530 πολλων παρεπιδημων 531 [καλεται]. The verb παρεπιδημω, e.g., Pap. Flind. Petr. xiii. 19532 (258-253 B. C.).

παστοφριον. The LXX use this word in almost all the relatively numerous passages where it occurs, the Apocrypha and Josephus 533 in every case, for the chambers of the Temple. Sturz 534 had assigned it to the Egyptian dialect. His conjecture is confirmed by the Papyri. In the numerous documents relating to the Serapeum 535 at Memphis, παστοφριον is used, in a technical sense, of the Serapeum itself, or of cells in the Serapeum: 536 Pap. Par. 11537 (157 B.C.), 40538 (156 B.C.); similarly in the contemporary documents Pap. Par. 41539 and 37540—in the last passage used of the 537 σαρτιον which is described as being contained 538 ντμεγαλαρπιε 541 The LXX have thus very happily rendered the general term 539, wherever it denotes a chamber of the Temple, by a technical name with which they were familiar. παστοφριον is also retained by several Codices in 1 Chronicles 9:33, and 2 Es 8:29 [Hebr. Ezra 8:29]. 542 περιδξιον. In LXX Numbers 31:50, Exodus 35:22 and Isaiah 3:20 (in the two latter passages without any corresponding original) for bracelet. To be found in Pap. Flind. Petr. i. xii. 543 (238-237 B.C.). The enumeration given there of articles of finery resembles Exodus 35:22, and particularly Isaiah 3:20; in the latter passage the 544 ντια 544 (mentioned also in the former) come immediately after the περιδξια—so in the Papyrus. As the original has no corresponding word in either of the LXX passages, we may perhaps attribute the addition to the fact that the two ornaments were usually named together.

περστασις. In 2Ma 4:16, Symmachus LXX Psalms 33:5 [MT Psalms 34:5] 545 (here the LXX has θλψις, or παροικια), in the evil sense, for distress; it is not found first of all in Polybius, but already in Pap. Lond. xlii. 546 (172 B.C.); cf. the Inscription of Pergamus No. 245 A547 (before 133 B.C.) and the Inscription of Sestos (ca. 120 B.C.), line 25. 548 περιτμνω. The LXX use

περιτμῶ always in the technical sense of the ceremonial act of circumcision; this technical meaning also underlies the passages in which circumcision is metaphorically spoken of, e.g., Deuteronomy 10:16 and Jeremiah 4:4. The word is never employed by the LXX in any other sense. The usual Hebrew word כָּטַע occurs frequently, it is true, in a non-technical signification, but in such cases the translators always choose another word: LXX Psalms 57:8[MT Psalms 58:8] σθενῶ for to be cut off,⁵⁴⁹ LXX Psalms 17:10-12 [MT Psalms 118:10-12], μνομαί, for the cutting in pieces (?) of enemies, LXX Psalms 89:6 [MT Psalms 90:6] ποπτῶ (of grass) for to be cut down.⁵⁵⁰ Even in a passage, Deuteronomy 30:6, where כָּטַע, circumcise, is used metaphorically, they reject περιτμῶ and translate by περικαθαρίζω.⁵⁵¹ The textual history of Ezekiel 16:4 affords a specially good illustration of their severely restrained use of language. To the original (according to our Hebrew text) thy navel-string was not cut, corresponds, in the LXX (according to the current text), οκ δησαζτομαστοζσου, “quite an absurd translation, which, however, just because of its absolute meaninglessness, is, without doubt, ancient tradition”.⁵⁵² But the “translation” is not so absurd after all, if we read δησαν⁵⁵³ with the Alexandrinus and the Marchalianus,⁵⁵⁴ a reading which is supported by the remark of Origen:⁵⁵⁵ the LXX had translated non alligaverunt ubera tua, “sensus magis eloquii exponentes quam verbum de verbo exprinentes”. That is to say, among the services mentioned here as requiring to be rendered to the helpless new-born girl, the Greek translators set down something different from the procedure described by the Hebrew author; what they did set down corresponds in some degree with the νσπαργνοισσπαργανθναι, which comes later.⁵⁵⁶ But perhaps they had a different text before them. In any case the translation given by some Codices,⁵⁵⁷ viz., οκτμθημφਾਲζσου, is a late correction of the LXX text by our present Hebrew text; other Codices read οκ δησαντοζμαστοζσου, and add the emendation οκτμθημφਾਲζσου; others do the same, but substitute περιετμθη, a form utterly at variance with LXX usage (and one against which Jerome’s non ligaverunt mamillas teas et umbilicus tuus non est praecisus⁵⁵⁸ still guards), for the τμθη. It is this late emendation which has occasioned the idea⁵⁵⁹ that the LXX in one case also used τνμφάλν as the object of περιτμνειν. This is not correct. One may truly speak here, for once, about a “usage” of the LXX: περιτμῶ, with them, has always a ceremonial meaning.⁵⁶⁰ In comparison with the verbs כָּטַע, כָּטַע and כָּטַע, which are rendered by περιτμῶ, the Greek word undoubtedly introduces an additional nuance to the meaning; not one of the three words contains what the περιτμ implies. The choice of this particular compound is explained by the fact that it was familiar to the LXX, being in common use as a technical term for an Egyptian custom similar to the Old Testament circumcision. “The Egyptians certainly practised circumcision in the 16th century B.C., probably much earlier.”⁵⁶¹ Now even if it cannot be made out with certainty that the Israelites copied the practice from the Egyptians, yet it is in the highest degree probable that the Greek Jews are indebted to the Egyptians⁵⁶² for the word. Herodotus already verifies its use in ii. 36 and 104: he reports that the Egyptians περιτμνονταιταδνα. But the expression is also authenticated by direct Egyptian testimony: Pap. Lond. xxiv.⁵⁶³ (163 B.C.), ζ θοςσττοΑγπτοισσπεριτμνεσθαι and Pap. Berol. 7820⁵⁶⁴ (14th January, 171 A.D., Fayyûm) still speaks several times of the περιτμηθναι of a boy καττθος. If περιτμῶ is thus one of the words which were taken over by the LXX, yet the supposition⁵⁶⁵ that their frequent περιτμητοςuncircumcised = כָּטַע was first coined by the Jews of Alexandria may have some degree of probability. In the last-cited Berlin Papyrus, at least, the as yet uncircumcised boy is twice described as σημος.⁵⁶⁶ The

document appears to be employing fixed expressions. ἄσημος was perhaps the technical term for uncircumcised among the Greek Egyptians;⁵⁶⁷ the more definite and, at the same time, harsher ἄπερτιμητος corresponded to the contempt with which the Greek Jews thought of the uncircumcised.

πηγυς.

We need have no doubt at all about the contracted genitive πηγυν,⁵⁶⁸ LXX 1 Kings 7:38-39 (Cod. A) [MT 1 Samuel 7:2; 1 Samuel 7:6], Esther 5:14, Esther 7:9, Ezekiel 40:7, Ezekiel 41:22; John 21:8, Revelation 21:17. It is already found in Pap. Flind. Petr. ii. xli.569 (Ptolemaic period) twice; Josephus agrees with the LXX in using πηγυων and πηγυν promiscuously.⁵⁷⁰ ποτισμυς. In Aquila Proverbs 3:8 [MT Pro. 3:8]⁵⁷¹ watering, irrigation; to be found in Pap. Flind. Petr. ii. ix. 4572 (240 B.C.) .

πρωκτωρ. In LXX Isaiah 3:12 for ████████ despot. In the Papyri frequently as the designation of an official; the πρωκτωρ⁵⁷³ seems to have been the public accountant:⁵⁷⁴ Pap. Flind. Petr. ii. xiii. 17575 (258-253 B.C.), and several other undated Papyri of the Ptolemaic period given in Mahaffy, ii.576 In Luke 12:58 also the word has most probably a technical meaning; it does not however denote a finance-official, but a lower officer of the court. Symmachus Psalms 108:11 [MT Psalms 109:11]⁵⁷⁷ uses it for ████████ creditor.

πρεσβυτερος. The LXX translate ████████ old man by both πρεσβυτης and πρεσβυτερος. The most natural rendering was πρεσβυτης, and the employment of the comparative πρεσβυτερος must have had some special reason. We usually find πρεσβυτερος in places where the translators appear to have taken the ████████ of the original as implying an official position. That they in such cases speak of the elders and not of the old men is explained by the fact that they found πρεσβυτερος already used technically in Egypt for the holder of a communal office. Thus, in Pap. Lugd. A 35 f.578 (Ptolemaic period), mention is made of πρεσβυτεροστρυκμυς—without doubt an official designation,—although, indeed, owing to the mutilation of another passage in the same Papyrus (lines 17-23), no further particulars as to the nature of this office can be ascertained from it.⁵⁷⁹ The author thinks that οπρεσβυτεροι in Pap. Flind. Petr. ii. iv. 613 580 (255-254 B.C.) is also an official designation; cf. also Pap. Flind. Petr. ii. xxxix. a, 3 and 14.⁵⁸¹ Similarly, in the decree of the priests at Diospolis in honour of Callimachus,⁵⁸² (ca. 40 B.C.), the πρεσβυτεροι are still mentioned along with the ερεζτομεγιστουθεομονρασωνθηρ. We have a periphrasis of the title πρεσβυτερος in Pap. Taur. 860f. 583 (end of the 2nd cent B.C.), in which the attribute τπρεσβεον χωνπαρτοζλλους τοζντκμκατοικοντας is applied to a certain Erius. We still find οπρεσβυτεροι in the 2nd century A.D. as Egyptian village-magistrates, of whom a certain council of three men, οτρεις, appears to have occupied a special position.⁵⁸⁴ Here also then the Alexandrian translators have appropriated a technical expression which was current in the land. Hence we must not summarily attribute the “New Testament,” i.e., the early Christian, passages, in which πρεσβυτεροι occurs as an official designation, to the “Septuagint idiom,” since this is in reality an Alexandrian one. In those cases, indeed, where the expression is used to designate Jewish municipal authorities⁵⁸⁵ and the Sanhedrin,⁵⁸⁶ it is allowable to suppose that it had been adopted by the Greek Jews from the Greek Bible,⁵⁸⁷ and that the Christians who had to translate the term the old men found it convenient to render it by the familiar expression οπρεσβυτεροι. But that is no reason for deeming this technical term a peculiarity of

the Jewish idiom. Just as the Jewish usage is traceable to Egypt, so is it possible that also the Christian communities of Asia Minor, which named their superintendents *πρεσβυτεροι*, may have borrowed the word from their surroundings, and may not have received it through the medium of Judaism at all.⁵⁸⁸ The Inscriptions of Asia Minor prove beyond doubt that *πρεσβυτεροι* was the technical term, in the most diverse localities, for the members of a corporation: 589 in Chios, CIG. ii. Nos. 2220 and 2221 (1st cent. B.C.590), —in both passages the council of the *πρεσβυτεροι* is also named *τῶν πρεσβυτερων*; in Cos, CIG. ii. No. 2508 = Paton and Hicks, No. 119 (imperial period⁵⁹¹); in Philadelphia in Lydia, CIG. ii. No. 3417 (imperial period), in which the *συνδριον τῶν πρεσβυτερων*,⁵⁹² mentioned here, is previously named *γερουσια*. “It can be demonstrated that in some islands and in many towns of Asia Minor there was, besides the Boule, also a Gerousia, which possessed the privileges of corporation, and, as it appears, usually consisted of Boueutes who were delegated to it. Its members were called *γεροντες*, *γερουσιαστα*, *πρεσβυτεροι*, *γεραιο*. They had a president (*αρχων*, *προστιτης*, *προηγουμενος*), a secretary, a special treasury, a special place of assembly (*γεροντικον*, *γερουσια*), and a palaestra.”⁵⁹³—See also III. iii. 4, below [].

πρωθεισις. The LXX translate the technical expression bread of the countenance (also called row-bread [Schichtbrot] and continualbread), which Luther rendered Schaubrot (show-bread), in 1 Samuel 21:6 and Nehemiah 10:33 by *ο αρτοι προσπου*, and in Exodus 25:30 by *ο αρτοι των πριων*, but their usual rendering is *ο αρτοις προθεσεως*. The usual explanation of this *πρωθεισις* is setting forth, i.e., of the bread before God. The author leaves it undecided whether this explanation is correct; but, in any case, it is to be asked how the LXX came to use this free translation, while they rendered the original verbally in the other three passages. The author thinks it not unlikely that they were influenced by the reminiscence of a ceremonial custom of their time: “Au culte se rattachaient des institutions philanthropiques telle que la suivante: Le medecin Diodes cite par Athenle (3, 110), nous apprend qu’il y avait une *πρωθεισις* sicde pains periodique a Alexandrie, dans le temple de Saturne (*λεξανδρεισις Κρονου φιεροντες προτιθασιν σπειν βουλομιν ντων Κρονουερ*) Cette *πρωθεισις των πρωτων* se retrouve dans un papyrus du Louvre (60 bis).”⁵⁹⁴ The expression *πρωθεισις αρτων* is also found in LXX 2 Chronicles 13:11; cf. 2Ma 10:3.

πυρρικης.

Hitherto known only from LXX Genesis 25:25 [MT Genesis 25:25], LXX 1 Kings 16:12,17:42 [MT 1 Samuel 16:12, 1 Samuel 17:42], for ruddy. To be found in Pap. Flind. Petr. i. xvi. 1 595 (237 B.C.), xxi.596 (237 B.C.), possibly also in xiv.597 (237 B.C.).

σιτομητριον. In Luke 12:42 for *portio frumenti*; referred to in this passage only: to be verified by Pap. Flind. Petr. xxxiii. a598 (Ptolemaic period). Cf. *σιτομετρων* in Genesis 47:12 (said of Joseph in Egypt).

σκευοφυλαξ.

Earliest occurrence in the Recension of Lucianus,⁵⁹⁹ 1 Samuel 17:22, as the literal translation of *keeper of the baggage*.⁶⁰⁰ The supposition that the word was not first applied as a mere momentary creation of the recensionist, but came to him on good authority, is supported by its occurrence in Pap. Flind. Petr. xiii. 10601 (258-253 B.C.): *σκευοφυλακα* there is to

be read σκευοφύλακα, in accordance with σκευοφυλάκιον in Pap. Flind. Petr. ii v. a602 (before 250 B.C.).

σπυρς, σφυρς. With the σφυρς (vernacular aspiration 603) handed down on good authority in Mark 8:8, Mark 8:20, Matthew 15:37, Matthew 16:10, Acts 9:25, cf. σφυφδα in Pap. Flind. Petr. xviii. 2 a604 (246 B.C.), though we should observe the reading σπυριδου in Pap. Flind. Petr. Z d605 (Ptolemaic period). Further remarks in III. i. 2, below [].

στεις.

Among other words, the translation of which by στεις is more or less intelligible, stronghold Nahum 3:11, and footstool 1 Chronicles 28:2, are rendered in the same way by the LXX, and Symmachus 606 uses στεις in Isaiah 6:13 for root-stock (truncus) or young tree, cutting; 607 certainly a very remarkable use of the word, and one hardly explained by the extraordinary note which Schleusner 608 makes to the passage in Nahum: “στεις est firmitas, consistentia, modus et via subsistendi ac resistendi”. What is common to the above three words translated by στεις is the idea of secure elevation above the ground, of upright position, and this fact seems to warrant the conjecture that the translators were acquainted with a quite general usage of στεις for any upright object. 609 This conjecture is confirmed by Pap. Flind. Petr. ii. xiv. 3610 (Ptolemaic period ?), i.e., if the στεις which is found in this certainly very difficult passage be rightly interpreted as erections, buildings. 611 This use of the word seems to the author to be more certain in an Inscription from Mylasa in Caria, CIG. ii. No. 2694 a (imperial period), in which Boeckh interprets the word στεις (so restored by him) as stabula.

συγγενς. In the Old Testament Apocryphal books there is found not infrequently the expression kinsman of a king. Like friend, 612 etc., it is a court-title, which was transferred from the Persian usage to the language of Alexander the Great's court, and thence became very common among the Diadochi. Compare, in regard to Egypt, the exhaustive references in Lumbroso; 613 in regard to Pergamus, the Inscription No. 248, line 28f. (135-134 B.C.). 614 συνω.

Used in Luke 22:63 of the officers who held Jesus in charge; in the same sense Pap. Flind. Petr. ii. xx. 615 (252 B.C.).

σµα. In Revelation 18:13 σµατα stands for slaves. σµα was used for person in very early times, and already in classical Greek the slaves were called σµαταοκετικ or δολα. 616 σµα alone—without any such addition—is not found used for slave earlier than in LXX Genesis 34:29 [MT Genesis 36:6], 617 Tob 10:10, Daniel 14:32, 2Ma 8:11, Ep. Arist. (ed. M. Schmidt), p. 1629, in Polybius and later writers. The Greek translators of the O.T. found the usage in Egypt: the Papyri of the Ptolemaic period yield a large number of examples, cf. especially Pap. Flind. Petr. xxxix. 618 ποζγιον. The LXX translate mass in very many places by ποζγιον (cf. also Theodotion Judges 5:10 619 Judges 19:10 620 also the Alexandrinus and the recension of Lucianus read ποζυγιων in both passages), Symmachus Genesis 36:24 621). Similarly, ποζγιον stands for ass in Matthew 21:5 (cf. Zechariah 9:9) and 2 Peter 2:16. 622 This specialising of the original general term draught animal, beast of burden, is described by Grimm 623 as a usage peculiar to Holy Scripture, which is explained by the importance of the ass as the beast of burden κατ'ξογν in the East. A statistical examination of the word, however,

might teach us that what we have to deal with here is no “biblical” peculiarity, but, at most, a special usage of the LXX which may possibly have influenced other writings. But even the LXX do not occupy an isolated position in regard to it; the truth is rather that they avail themselves of an already-current Egyptian idiom. It seems to the author, at least, that the “biblical” usage of **ἐκ τοῦ** is already shown in the following passages: Pap. Flind. Petr. xxii.624 (Ptolemaic period), where **ἐκ τοῦ** and **ἐκ τοῦ** are mentioned after one another; Pap. Flind. Petr. xxv. d626 (2nd half of 3rd cent. B.C.), where the donkey-driver Horos gives a receipt for money due to him by a certain Charmos in respect of **ἐκ τοῦ**: **ἐκ τοῦ** **ἐκ τοῦ**; similarly in the same Papyrus i.627 Grimm’s remark may, of course, be turned to account in the explanation of this idiom.

ἐκ τοῦ (**ἐκ τοῦ**).

Those circumlocutions by which certain adjectival conceptions are represented by **ἐκ τοῦ** or **ἐκ τοῦ** followed by a genitive, and which are very frequent in the early Christian writings, are traced back by A. Buttman⁶²⁸ to an “influence of the oriental spirit of language”; they are explained by Winer-Lunemann⁶²⁹ as “Hebrew-like circumlocution,” which however is no mere idle circumlocution, but is due to the more vivid imagination of the oriental, who looked upon any very intimate relationship—whether of connection, origin or dependence—as a relation of sonship, even in the spiritual sphere. According to Grimm,⁶³⁰ these periphrases spring “ex ingenio linguae hebraeae,” and Cremer⁶³¹ describes them as “Hebrew-like turns of expression in which **ἐκ τοῦ** . . . is used analogously to the Hebr. **בן**”. In order to understand this “New Testament” idiom, it is also necessary to distinguish here between the cases in which this “periphrastic” **ἐκ τοῦ** or **ἐκ τοῦ**⁶³² occurs in translations of Semitic originals, and the instances found in texts which were in Greek from the first. This distinction gives us at once the statistical result that the circumlocution is more frequent in the former class than in the latter. One should not, therefore, uniformly trace the “New Testament” passages back to the influence of an un-Greek “spirit of language,” but, in the majority of cases, should rather speak merely of a translation from the Semitic. What occasioned the frequent **ἐκ τοῦ** or **ἐκ τοῦ** was no “spirit of language” which the translators may have brought to their task, but rather the hermeneutic method into which they were unconsciously drawn by the original. First as regards **ἐκ τοῦ**: such translations occur in the following passages,—Mark 2:19 = Matthew 9:15 = Luke 5:34, **ἐκ τοῦ** **ἐκ τοῦ**, a saying of Jesus.—Mark 3:17, **ἐκ τοῦ**, where the original, **βοανεργες** or **βοανηργες**, is also given, and the equation **βοανερ** or **βοανη** = **ἐκ τοῦ** is certainly evident. —Matthew 8:12 = Matthew 13:38, of **ἐκ τοῦ** **ἐκ τοῦ**, sayings of Jesus. —Matthew 13:38, **ἐκ τοῦ** **ἐκ τοῦ**, a saying of Jesus. —Matthew 23:15, **ἐκ τοῦ**, a saying of Jesus.—Matthew 21:5, **ἐκ τοῦ**, translation⁶³³ of the Hebrew **בן**, Zechariah 9:9. —Luke 10:6, **ἐκ τοῦ**, a saying of Jesus.—Luke 16:3 and Luke 2:34, **ἐκ τοῦ** **ἐκ τοῦ**, sayings of Jesus.—Luke 16:8, **ἐκ τοῦ** **ἐκ τοῦ**, a saying of Jesus.—Luke 20:36, **ἐκ τοῦ** **ἐκ τοῦ**, a saying of Jesus.—Acts 4:36, **ἐκ τοῦ** **ἐκ τοῦ**, where the ostensible original, **βαρναβας**,⁶³⁴ is also given.—The **ἐκ τοῦ**, Acts 13:10, should also be mentioned here, as the expression clearly forms a sarcastic antithesis to **βαρνησο**, son of Jesus (Acts 13:6). As regards **ἐκ τοῦ**, we have the same phenomenon in (Matthew 11:19 =) Luke 7:35, **ἐκ τοῦ** **ἐκ τοῦ** [**σοφ**], a saying of Jesus. Similarly quotations and manifest analogical formations should not be taken into consideration in a critical examination of the original idiom;

e.g., υοφωτς in 1 Thessalonians 5:5 (here also the analogical formation υομρς and John 12:36 (cf. τκναφωτς, Ephesians 5:8) should probably be taken as a quotation from Luke 16:8, or of the saying of Jesus preserved there, but in any case as an already familiar phrase; ουοτνπροφητν, Acts 3:25, is a quotation of a combination which had become familiar from LXX 1 Kings 20:35, 2 Kings 2:3, 2 Kings 2:5, 2 Kings 2:7 [MT 1 Samuel 20:35, 2 Samuel 2:3, 2 Samuel 2:5, 2 Samuel 2:7]—the following κα [υο] τςδιαθκης is an analogical formation; υςτςπωλεας, 2 Thessalonians 2:3 and John 17:12 is an echo of LXX Isaiah 57:4 τκναπωλειας; τ τνατοδιαβλου 1 John 3:10 is perhaps an analogical formation from ουοτοπονηρο, Matthew 13:38. There remain, then, the combination υοτςπειθεας (Colossians 3:6), Ephesians 2:2, Ephesians 5:6, and its antithesis τκναπακος, 1 Peter 1:14; ττκνατςπαγγελιας, Galatians 4:28, Romans 9:8, and its antitheses κατρς, 2 Peter 2:14, τκναργς, Ephesians 2:3. But it is not at all necessary, even for the explanation of these expressions, to go back to the Hebrew spirit or to the oriental genius of language. The system followed by the Alexandrian translators of the Old Testament may furnish us here with an instructive hint. In innumerable cases their task was to render into Greek an exceedingly large number of those characteristic Semitic turns of expression formed with . True, they rendered not a few of those cases by the corresponding constructions with υς; but very frequently, too, translating freely (as we might say), they found substitutes for them in Greek expressions of a different character. But such a procedure, in view of the comparative scrupulosity with which in general they follow the original, must surely surprise us, if we are to pre-suppose in them, as in the early Christian writers, a certain Semitic “genius of language” lying in reserve, as it were, and behind their “feeling” for the Greek tongue. Had they always imitated that characteristic by using υο, then it might have been maintained with some plausibility that they had seized the welcome opportunity of translating literally and, at the same time, of giving scope to the non-Hellenic tendencies of their nature in the matter of language; as they, however, did not do this, we may be permitted to say that they had no such tendency at all. We give the following cases, 635 from which this fact may be deduced with certainty: “Son” of Man, Isaiah 56:2, Proverbs 15:11 = νθρωπος; son of the uncle, Numbers 36:11 = νεψος; son of the she-asses, Zechariah 9:9 = πλοσυος; 636 “son” of the month, often, = μηνιαος; “son” of the dawn, Isaiah 14:12 = πρωνατλλων; “son” of strangers, often, = αλλογενς or αλλφυλος; “son” of the people, Genesis 23:11 = πολτης; “son” of the quiver, Lamentations 3:13 = ο637φαρτρας; “son” of strength, 2 Chronicles 28:6 = δυνατςσχ; “son” of misery, Proverbs 31:5 = σθενς; “son” of strokes, Deuteronomy 25:2 = ξιοζπληγν. And if, on the other hand, cases can be pointed out in which the LXX imitate 638 the characteristic , then the υς of the Greek text is not to be forthwith explained as caused by the translators’ oriental way of thinking, but rather as due to the original. At the very most we might speak of a “Hebraism of translation,” but not of a Hebraism simply. 639 But we are of opinion that it is not at all necessary, in this matter, to have recourse to a Hebraism in every case; we cannot, at least, perceive why such constructions 640 as LXX Judges 19:22 υοπαρρανμων, 1 Samuel 20:31 υςθαντου, 641 2 Samuel 13:28 υοδυνμεως, 2 Es 4:1, 2 Es 10:7, 2 Es 10:16 [MT Ezra 4:1, Ezra 10:7, Ezra 10:16 - not Ezra 6:19] υο ποικιας, Hosea 2:4 [not Eze.] τκναπορνεας, Isaiah 57:4 τκναπωλεας, should be looked upon as un-Greek. 642 It is true, of course, that a Corinthian baggage-carrier or an Alexandrian donkey-driver would not so speak—the expressions are meant to be in elevated style and to have an impressive sound; but for that very reason they might have been used by a

Greek poet. Plato uses the word **κγονος**643 in exactly the same way: *Phaedr.*, p. 275 D, **κγονατςζωγραφας** and *Rep.*, pp. 506 E and 507 A, **κγονοστογαθο** (genitive of **τγαθν**). In the impressive style of speech on inscriptions and coins we find **υς** in a number of formal titles of honour644 such as **υςτςγερουσας, υςτςπλεως, υςτοδμου, 645 υςφροδισιων**, etc. And thus, though the **υς** of the biblical passages above may have been occasioned, in the first instance, by the original, yet no one can call it un-Greek. —W. Schulze has also directed the author's attention to the **υςτςχις** in the *Tragedians*, and *filius fortunae* in Horace. Our judgment, then, in regard to the philological history of the above-cited expressions (Greek from the first) in Paul and the Epistles of Peter, may be formulated somewhat in this way. In no case whatever are they un-Greek; they might quite well have been coined by a Greek who wished to use impressive language. Since, however, similar turns of expression are found in the Greek Bible, and are in part cited by Paul and others, the theory of analogical formations will be found a sufficient explanation.

υςτοθεο.

It is very highly probable that the "New Testament" designation of Christ as the Son of God goes back to an "Old Testament" form of expression. But when the question is raised as to the manner in which the "Heathen-Christians" of Asia Minor, of Rome, or of Alexandria, understood this designation, it seems equally probable that such "Old Testament presuppositions" were not extant among them. We are therefore brought face to face with the problem whether they could in any way understand the Saviour's title of dignity in the light of the ideas of their locality. If this solemn form of expression was already current among them in any sense whatever, that would be the very sense in which they understood it when they heard it in the discourses of the missionary strangers: how much more so, then, seeing that among the "heathen" the expression Son of God was a technical term, and one which therefore stamped itself all the more firmly upon the mind. When the author came upon the expression for the first time in a non-Christian document (*Pap. Berol.* 7006646 (*Fayyûm*, 22nd August, 7 A.D.): **τους [κ]τουκατριακοστο [τς] Κασαροςκρατςσεωςθεουο**, where without doubt the Emperor Augustus is described as **θεους**), he had no idea how very frequently the title is used for Augustus in the Inscriptions. Since that time he has become convinced that the matter stands thus: **υςθεο** is a translation of the *divi filius* which is equally frequent in Latin Inscriptions. Since, then, it is established that the expression **υςθεο** was a familiar one in the Graeco-Roman world from the beginning of the first century,647 we can no longer ignore the fact; it is indirectly of great importance for the history of the early-Christian title of Christ. The fact does not of course explain its origin or its primary signification, but it yields a contribution to the question as to how it might be understood in the empire.648 It must be placed in due connection with what is said by Harnack649 about the term **θες** as used in the imperial period.

φλος.

Friend was the title of honour given at the court of the Ptolemies to the highest royal officials. "Greek writers, it is true, already used this name for the officials of the Persian king; from the Persian kings the practice was adopted by Alexander, and from him again by all the Diadochi; but we meet it particularly often as an Egyptian title."650 The LXX were, herefore, quite correct (from their standpoint) in translating **prince** by **φλος**, *Esther* 1:3, *Esther* 2:18, *Esther* 6:9,—a fact

not taken into consideration in the Concordance of Hatch and Redpath—and the same usage is exceedingly frequent in the Books of Maccabees.⁶⁵¹ We think it probable that the Alexandrian writer of the Book of Wisdom was following this idiom when he spoke of the pious as φίλοςθεός (Wis 7:27, cf. Wis 7:14); similarly the Alexandrian Philo, *Fragm. (M.) ii.*, p. 652, πρῶτος θεός φίλος, and *De Sobr. (M.) i.*, p. 401, where he quotes the saying in LXX Gen. 18:17 (in our text οὐκ ἔψω γὰρ πρῶτον παίδευσον) thus: μὴ πικρῶ γὰρ πρῶτον φίλου μου. In explaining this, reference is usually made to Plato *Legg. iv.*, p. 716, 8 μὴ σφρωνθε φίλος, μοιοσγῆρ; but, although it is not to be denied that this passage may perhaps have exercised an influence in regard to the choice of the expression, yet the Alexandrians would, in the first instance, understand it⁶⁵³ in the sense to which they had been predisposed by the above-mentioned familiar technical usage of φίλος: φίλοςθεός denotes high honour in the sight of God⁶⁵⁴—nothing more nor less. The question whether friend of God is to be interpreted as one who loved God or as one whom God loved, is not only insoluble⁶⁵⁵ but superfluous. Philo and the others would hardly be thinking of a “relation of the will . . . , such, however, that the benevolence and love of God towards men are to be emphasised as its main element”.⁶⁵⁶ In John 15:15 οὐκ ἐτιλήγω μὲς δοῦλος . . . μὲς δεῖρα καὶ φίλος, as can be seen by the contrast, φίλος has, of course, its simple sense of friend. In Corinth the Gospel was understood otherwise than in Jerusalem, in Egypt otherwise than in Ephesus. The history of our Religion, in its further course, manifestly shows distinct phases of Christianity: we see, in succession or side by side, a Jewish Christianity and an International—a Roman, a Greek, a German and a Modern. The historical conditions of this vigorous development are to be found to a large extent in the profusion of the individual forms which were available for the ideas of the Evangelists and the Apostles. The variation in the meaning of religious terms has not always been to the disadvantage of religion itself: the Kingdom of God is not in words.

03 - FURTHER CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE HISTORY OF THE LANGUAGE OF THE GREEK BIBLE

III.

FURTHER CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE HISTORY

OF THE LANGUAGE OF THE GREEK BIBLE BEING NEUE BIBELSTUDIEN, MARBURG, 1897.

■δ■γρ■ζ■στιν■κ■σμος

03.01 - FURTHER CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE HISTORY OF THE LANGUAGE OF THE GREEK BIBLE

FURTHER CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE HISTORY OF THE LANGUAGE OF THE GREEK BIBLE

In the third article⁶⁵⁷ of *Bibelstudien* we endeavoured to correct the widespread notion that the New Testament presents us with a uniform and isolated linguistic phenomenon. Most of the lexical articles in that section were intended to make good the thesis that a philological understanding of the history of New Testament (and also of Septuagint) texts could be attained to only when these were set in their proper historical connection, that is to say, when they were considered as products of later Greek. Friedrich Blass in his critique⁶⁵⁸ of *Bibelstudien* has expressed himself with regard to this inquiry in the following manner:— The third treatise again⁶⁵⁹ begins with general reflections, the purport of which is that it is erroneous to regard New Testament, or even biblical, Greek as something distinct and isolated, seeing that the Papyrus documents and the Inscriptions are essentially of the same character, and belong similarly to that “Book of Humanity” to which “reverence “ (Pietat) is due.⁶⁶⁰ This appears to us to be the language of naturalism rather than of theology but, this apart, it remains an incontestable fact that, in the sphere of Greek literature, the New Testament books form a special group—one to be primarily explained by itself; first, because they manifest a peculiar genius, and, secondly, because they alone, or almost alone, represent the popular—in contrast to the literary—speech of their time in a form not indeed wholly, but yet comparatively, unadulterated, and in fragments of large extent. All the Papyri in the world cannot alter this—even were there never so many more of them: they lack the peculiar genius, and with it the intrinsic value; further, they are to a considerable extent composed in the language of the office or in that of books. True, no one would maintain that the N.T. occupies an absolutely isolated position, or would be other than grateful⁶⁶¹ if some peculiar expression therein were to derive illumination and clearness from cognate instances in a Papyrus. But it would be well not to expect too much. The author must confess that he did not expect this opposition from the philological side.⁶⁶² The objections of such a renowned Graecist—renowned also in theological circles—certainly did not fail to make an impression upon him. They prompted him to investigate his thesis again, and more thoroughly, and to test its soundness by minute and detailed research. But the more opportunity he had of examining non-literary Greek texts of the imperial Roman period, the more clearly did he see himself compelled to stand out against the objections of the Halle Scholar. Blass has meanwhile published his *Grammar of New Testament Greek*.⁶⁶³ In the Introduction, as was to be expected, he expresses his view of the whole question. The astonishment with which the present writer read the following, p. 2, may be conceived:— . . . The spoken tongue in its various gradations (which, according to the rank and education of those who spoke it, were, of course, not absent from it) comes to us quite pure—in fact even purer than in the New Testament itself—in the private records, the number and importance of which are constantly being increased by the ever-growing discoveries in Egypt. Thus the New Testament language may be quite justly placed in this connection, and whoever would write a grammar of the popular language of that period on the basis of all these various witnesses and remains, would be, from

the grammarian's point of view, taking perhaps a more correct course than one who should limit himself to the language of the N.T.⁶⁶⁴ If the present writer judges rightly, Blass has, in these sentences, abandoned his opposition to the thesis above mentioned. For his own part, at least, he does not perceive what objection he could take to these words, or in what respect they differ from the statements the accuracy of which had previously been impugned by Blass. When in the Grammar we read further:— Nevertheless those practical considerations from which we started will more and more impose such a limitation, for that which some Egyptian or other may write in a letter or in a deed of sale is not of equal value with that which the New Testament authors have written:— it can hardly need any asseveration on the author's part that with such words in themselves he again finds no fault. For practical reasons, on account of the necessities of biblical study, the linguistic relations of the New Testament, and of the Greek Bible as a whole, may continue to be treated by themselves, but certainly not as the phenomena of a special idiom requiring to be judged according to its own laws.

Moreover, that view of the inherent value of the ideas of the New Testament which Blass again emphasises in the words quoted from his Grammar, does not enter into the present connection. It must remain a matter of indifference to the grammarian whether he finds $\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\alpha\kappa\omicron\varsigma$ used for $\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\alpha$ in the New Testament or in a bill of sale from the Fayyûm, and the lexicographer must register the $\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\alpha\kappa\omicron\varsigma$ found in the pagan Papyri and Inscriptions with the same care as when it occurs in the writings of the Apostle Paul. The following investigations have been, in part, arranged on a plan which is polemical. For although the author is now exempted, on account of Blass's present attitude, from any need of controversy with him as regards principles, still the historical method of biblical philology has very many opponents even yet. In this matter, one thinks first of all of the unconscious opponents, viz., those who in the particular questions of exegesis and also of textual criticism stand under the charm of the "New Testament" Greek without ever feeling any necessity to probe the whole matter to the bottom. Among these the author reckons Willibald Grimm (not without the highest esteem for his lasting services towards the reinvigoration of exegetical studies), the late reviser of Wilke's *Clavis Novi Testamenti Philologica*. A comparison of the second,⁶⁶⁵ and the little-changed third,⁶⁶⁶ edition of his work with the English revision of Joseph Henry Thayer⁶⁶⁷—the best, because the most reliable of all dictionaries to the N.T. known to us—reveals many errors, not only in its materials, but also in its method. His book reflects the condition of philological research in, say, the fifties and sixties. At least, the notion of the specifically peculiar character of New Testament Greek could be upheld with more plausibility than now; the New Testament texts were decidedly the most characteristic of all the products of non-literary and of later Greek which were then known. But materials have now been discovered in face of which the linguistic isolation of the New Testament—even that more modest variety of it which diffuses an atmosphere of venerable romanticism around so many of our commentaries—must lose its last shadow of justification. Among the conscious opponents, i.e., those who oppose in matters of principle, we reckon Hermann Cremer. His *Biblisches-theologisches Wörterbuch der neutestamentlichen Graciteit*⁶⁶⁸ has for its fundamental principle the idea of the formative power of Christianity in the sphere of language. This idea, as a canon of historical philology, becomes a fetter upon investigation. Further, it breaks down at once in the department of morphology. But the most conspicuous peculiarity of "New Testament" Greek—let us allow the phrase for once—is just the morphology. The canon breaks down very often in the syntax also. There are many very striking phenomena in this department which we cannot isolate, however

much we may wish. The few Hebraising expressions in those parts of the New Testament which were in Greek from the first⁶⁶⁹ are but an accidens which does not essentially alter the fundamental character of its language. The case in regard to these is similar to that of the Hebraisms in the German Bible, which, in spite of the many Semitic constructions underlying it, is yet a German book. There remains, then, only the lexical element in the narrower sense, with which Cremer's book is, indeed, almost exclusively occupied. In many (not in all, nor in all the more important) of its articles, there appears, more or less clearly, the tendency to establish new "biblical" or "New Testament" words, or new "biblical" or "New Testament" meanings of old Greek words. That there are "biblical" and "New Testament" words—or, more correctly, words formed for the first time by Greek Jews and Christians—and alterations of meaning, cannot be denied. Every movement of civilisation which makes its mark in history enriches language with new terms and fills the old speech with new meanings. Cremer's fundamental idea is, therefore, quite admissible if it be intended as nothing more than a means for investigating the history of religion. But it not infrequently becomes a philologico-historical principle: it is not the ideas of the early Christians which are presented to us, but their "Greek". The correct attitude of a lexicon, so far as concerns the history of language, is only attained when its primary and persistent endeavour is to answer the question: To what extent do the single words and conceptions have links of connection with contemporary usage? Cremer, on the other hand, prefers to ask: To what extent does Christian usage differ from heathen? In cases of doubt, as we think, the natural course is to betake oneself placidly to the hypothesis of ordinary usage; Cremer prefers in such cases to demonstrate something which is distinctively Christian or, at least, distinctively biblical. In spite of the partially polemical plan of the following investigations, polemics are not their chief aim. Their purpose is to offer,⁶⁷⁰ towards the understanding of the New Testament, positive materials⁶⁷¹ from the approximately contemporary products of later Greek, and to assist, in what degree they can, in the liberation of biblical study from the bonds of tradition, in the secularising of it—in the good sense of that term. They take up again, one might say, the work of the industrious collectors of "observations" in last century. The reasons why the new spheres of observation disclosed since that time are of special importance for the linguistic investigation of the Greek Bible in particular, have been already set forth and corroborated by examples.⁶⁷² In these pages the following works have been laid under contribution:— 1. Collections of Inscriptions: the Inscriptions of Pergamus⁶⁷³ and those of the Islands of the AEgean Sea, fast. 1.⁶⁷⁴ 2. Issues of Papyri: the Berlin Egyptian Documents, vol. i. and vol. ii., parts 1-9;⁶⁷⁵ also the Papyri of the Archduke Rainer, vol. i.⁶⁷⁶ In reading these the author had in view chiefly the lexical element, but he would expressly state that a reperusal having regard to the orthographical and morphological features would assuredly repay itself. He desiderates, in general, a very strict scrutiny of his own selections. It is only the most important lexical features that are given here. The author, not having in Herborn the necessary materials for the investigation of the LXX at his disposal, had, very reluctantly, to leave it almost entirely out of consideration. But he has reason for believing that the Berlin and Vienna Papyri in particular, in spite of their comparative lateness, will yet yield considerable contributions towards the lexicon of the LXX, and that the same holds good especially of the Inscriptions of Pergamus in connection with the Books of Maccabees. It may be said that the two groups of authorities have been arbitrarily associated together here. But that is not altogether the case. They represent linguistic remains from Asia Minor⁶⁷⁷ and Egypt, that is to say, from the regions which, above all others, come into consideration in connection with Greek

Christianity. And, doubtless, the greater part of the materials they yield will not be merely local, or confined only to the districts in question. The gains from the Papyri are of much wider extent than those from the Inscriptions. The reason is obvious. We might almost say that this difference is determined by the disparity of the respective materials on which the writing was made. Papyrus is accommodating and is available for private purposes; stone is unyielding, and stands open to every eye in the market-place, in the temple, or beside the tomb. The Inscriptions, particularly the more lengthy and the official ones, often approximate in style to the literary language, and are thus readily liable to affectation and mannerism; what the papyrus leaves contain is much less affected, proceeding, as it does, from the thousand requirements and circumstances of the daily life of unimportant people. If the legal documents among the Papyri show a certain fixed mode of speech, marked by the formalism of the office, yet the many letter-writers, male and female, express themselves all the more unconstrainedly. This holds good, in particular, in regard to all that is, relatively speaking, matter of form. But also in regard to the vocabulary, the Inscriptions afford materials which well repay the labour spent on them. What will yet be yielded by the comprehensive collections of Inscriptions, which have not yet been read by the author in their continuity, may be surmised from the incidental discoveries to which he has been guided by the citations given by Frankel. What might we not learn, e.g., from the one inscription of Xanthus the Lycian!678 Would that the numerous memorials of antiquity which our age has restored to us, and which have been already so successfully turned to account in other branches of science, were also explored, in ever-increasing degree, in the interest of the philologico-historical investigation of the Greek Bible! Here is a great opportunity for the ascertainment of facts!

04 - An Epigraphic Memorial of the Septuagint.

IV. AN EPIGRAPHIC MEMORIAL OF THE SEPTUAGINT.

... εϑραγεπηλαφσειανατνκαευροικεν.

04.01 - An Epigraphic Memorial of the Septuagint.

An Epigraphic Memorial of the Septuagint. The Alexandrian translation of the Old Testament passed from the sphere of Jewish learning after Hellenistic Judaism had ceased to exist. Later on, the very existence of a Greek translation was completely forgotten.⁹³² It is therefore all the more interesting to follow the traces which reveal any direct or indirect effects which the Septuagint had upon the common people—their thoughts and their illusions. The materials for a knowledge of the popular religious and ethical ideas of the Jews and Christians in the imperial period are more meagre than those which yield us the thoughts of the cultured and learned. But those materials, scanty though they be, have not as yet been fully worked. Scholars are usually more interested in the theologians of Tiberias, Alexandria, Antioch and Rome, than in such people as found their edification in the “Apocryphal” Legends, Gospels and Acts. But surely it is erroneous to suppose that we have a satisfactory knowledge of the history of religion when we have gained but a notion of the origin and development of dogma. The history of religion is the history of the religious feeling (Religiosität) not that of theology, and as truly as religion is older than theology,—as truly as religion has existed in every age outside of theology and in opposition to dogma, so imperious must grow the demand that we shall assign a place in the gallery of history to the monuments of popular piety. These are necessarily few. For while theology, and the religion of theologians, have always been capable of asserting themselves, the religion of the people at large has not been concerned to raise memorials of itself. Thus it is not to be wondered at that the copious literature of theology should, so far as appearance goes, stifle the insignificant remains of the people’s spontaneous expression of their religion,⁹³³—not to speak of the fact that much that was of value in the latter was intentionally destroyed. That which was extra-theological and extra-ecclesiastical was looked upon by the official theology as a priori questionable. Why, even at the present day, most of those productions of ancient popular religion come to us bearing the same stigma: we are accustomed to think of them as Apocryphal, Heretical, Gnostic, and as such to ignore them. But those ideas, further, which we commonly designate as Superstition⁹³⁴ seem to the author to deserve a place in the history of popular religion. The ordinary members of the community, townsman and peasant, soldier and slave, went on living a religious life of their own,⁹³⁵ unaffected by the theological tendencies around them. We may very well doubt, indeed, whether that which moved their hearts was religion in the same sense as Prophecy or the Gospel, but their faith had received from the illustrious past the religious temper, at least, of ingenuous and unquestioning childhood. Their faith was not the faith of Isaiah or of the Son of Man; still, their “superstition” was not wholly forsaken of God. A devout soul will not be provoked by their follies, for throughout all their “heathenish” myth-forming and the natural hedonism of their religion there throbbed a yearning anticipation of the Divine. The superstitions of the imperial period do not permit of being divided into the three classes: Heathen, Jewish, Christian. There is frequently no such clear distinction between the faith of the Heathen and the Jew and that of the Christian. Superstition is syncretic in character: this fact has been anew confirmed by the extensive recently-discovered remains of the Literature of Magic. And yet it is possible, with more or less precision, to assign certain fragments of these to one of the three departments named. The literary

memorial which is to be discussed below has been influenced in the most marked degree by the ideas of Greek Judaism, or, what is practically the same, of the Alexandrian Old Testament. After a few remarks about the circumstances of its discovery,⁹³⁶ the text itself is given. The tablet of lead upon which the Inscription is scratched comes from the large Necropolis of ancient Adrumetum, the capital of the region of Byzacium in the Roman province of Africa. The town lies on the coast to the south-east of Carthage. In connection with the French excavations which have been successfully carried on there for some time, the rolled-up tablet was incidentally found by a workman in the

June of 1890;⁹³⁷ he noticed it only when a prong of his mattock had pierced the roll. This damaged the tablet in three places.⁹³⁸ There were also other three holes in the lead—probably caused by a nail with which the roll had been perforated. The tablet is thus damaged in six places, but the few letters which are in each case destroyed permit, with one exception, of being easily supplied.

We read the text thus⁹³⁹ :—

■ρκ■ζωσε, δαιμ■νιονπνε■ματ■νθ■δεκε■μενον, τ■ν■- ματιτ■γ■Αωθ

Αβ[α■θτ■νθε■ντο■Αβραανκα■τ■νΙαωτ■ντο■

Ιακου, Ιαω

Αω[θΑβ]αωθε■ντο■Ισραμα■κουσοντο■ν■ματος

■ντ■μου

4 & 5 κα■ [φοβ]ερο■κα■μεγ■λουκα■πελθεπρ■ζτ■νΟ(■) ρ-

βαν■ν, ■ν ■τεκ(ε)νΟ■ρβαν■, κα■ξονα■τ■νπρ■ζτ■ν

6 Δομιτιαν■ν, ■ν ■τεκενΚ[αν]δ■δα, ■ρ■νταμαιν■μενον

■γρυπνο[■ν]-

τα■π■τ■φιλ■α■τ■ςκα■πιθυμ■κα■δε■μενονα■τ■ς

■πανελθε■ν

ε■ζτ■νο■κ■ανα■το■σ■μβιο[ν] γεν■σθαι. ■ρκ■ζωσεται■ν

μ■γανθε■ν

τ■να■νιονκα■παι■νιονκι■παντοκρ■τορατ■ν ■περ- ■νωτ■ν

10 ■περ■νωθε■ν. ■ρκ■ζωσεται■νκτ■σαντατ■νο■ραν■ν

κα■τ■νθ■-

λασσαν. ■ρκιζωσεται■νδιαχωρ■σαντατο■ζε■σεβε■ς.

■ρκ■ζωσε

τ■νδιαστ■σαντατ■ν■βδον■ντ■θαλ■σσ■γαγε■νκα■

ζεξαι

[τ]νΟρβανν,ν τεκενΟρβαν,πρζτν

Δομιτιανν,ν τεκεν

[Καν]δδα,ρνταβασανιζμενονργυπνονταπτ

πιθυμια-

15 τζκαρωτι,ναατνσμβιονπγεζτνοκαν

αυτο. ρκ-

ζωσετνποισαντατνμνοννμτεκεν. ρκζωσε

τνδιορσαν-

τατ [φς] πτοσκτους. ρκζωσετνσυντρβοντα

τζπτρας.

Ορκζω[ωσ]ετνπο(ρ)ρξαντατρη. ρκζωσετν

συνστρφοντατν

γν[πτ]νθεμελωνατς. ρκζωσετγιοννομα

ολλγεταιν

20 τ [. .] []νομσωατκαοδαμονεζξεγερθσιν

κθαμβοικαπερ-

φοβ[οιγεν]μενοι,γαγεγκαζεξαισμβιοντνΟρβανν,ν τεκεν,

Ορβαν,πρζτνΔομιτιανν,ν τεκενΚανδδα,ρντα

καδεμε-

νονατς,δηταχ. ρκζωσετνφωστρακαστρα

νορανποι-

σανταδιφωνςπροστ[μ]ατοςστεφανεινπσιν

νθρποις.

25 ρκζωσετνσυνσεσαν[τ]απσαντνοκουμνηνκαι

τρη

κτραχηλζοντακακβρ[ζ]οντατνποιοντα κτρομον

τν [γ]-

νπασ(ανκα) καινζονταπνταζτοζκατοικοντας. ρκζωσετνποι-

σαντασημε^ανο^οραν^κ[^α] ^πι^γςκα^θαλ^σσης, ^γαγε^νκα^ζε^ξαι
σ^μβιοντ^ορβαν^ν,^ν ^[τ]εκεν^ορβαν^πρ^ζτ^ν
Δομιτιαν^ν,^ν
30 ^τεκεν^κανδ^δα,^ρντα^τςκα^γρυπνο^ντα^πτ^π
^πιθυμ^α-
τ^ςδε^μενονα^τςκα^ρωτ^ντα^τν,^να^παν^λθ^θ
ε^ςτ^νο^καν
[^α]τοσ^μβιοσγενομ^νη. ^ρκ^ζωσετ^νθε^ντ^νμ^γαν
τ^να^π-
[^ν]ονκα^παντοκρ^τορα,^νφοβε^ται^ρηκα^νπαικαθ'
^λην [^τ]νο^π-
κο[^υ]μ^[ν]ην,δ^νλ^{ων}φ^ησιντ^ρπαγμακα^τ
^ρητρ^μει
35 κα[^γ] κα^θλασσα,^καστος^δλλεται^ν ^χει
φ^βοστο^κυρ^{ου}
α[^{ων}ου] ^θαν^τουπαντεφ^πτουμισοπον^ρου^πιστα- ^μνονουτ^π
[γεν^μεν]α^γαθ^κκα^κκα^κκα^τθ^λασσανκα^{πο}- ^{τα}μο^ςκα^τρ^η
κα[^τνγ]^ν,ΑωθΑβαωθ^νθε^ντο^Αβραανκα^π
τ^ν [I] αωτ^ντο^Ιακου,
Ια[^ΑωθΑβαωθ^{θε}ντο^Ισραμα^ξονζε^ξοντ^ν
Ο^ρβαν^ν,^ν
40 ^τεκεν^ορβαν(ν^π),^πρ^ζτ^νΔομιτιαν^ν,^ν ^τεκεν^καν- ^δδα,^ρντα
μ^{αι}[^ν]^μενο^νβασανι^ζμ^ενον^πτ^φιλ^κα^ρωτικα^π
^πιθυμ^π
τη^Δομιτιαν^ς,^ν ^τεκεν^κανδ^δα. ^ζε^ξονα^{το}ςγ^μ
κα^π
^ρωτισυμβιο^ντας^λτ^τςζω^ςα^τν^χρ^νπ^οη- ^σονα^π-
τ^νςδο^λονα^τρ^ντα ^ποτεταχθ^ναι,μηδεμ^{αν}
^λλη[^ν]

45 γυναικαμ τεπαρθνον πιθυμο ντα, μνηνδ τ νΔο- μιτια[ν],
ν τεκενΚανδδα, σμβ[ι]ον χειν λ τ τς [ζω]
α τ νχρ ν], δη δηταχ ταχ.

Line 2, Ιακου: M. corr. (σ)κου.

Line 3 and line 39, Ισραμα: M. corr. σραλ.

Line 4, line 5 had to be commenced after μεγλου.

Line 20, τ[. . .] : M τ (δτ).

Line 27, και before καινζοντα had fallen out by hemigraphy.

Line 33, ν: M. ο.

Line 35, καστος (in place of the καστον of the original) δλλετα. M. (ν) καστος (ε)δλλεται.

Line 44, λλη[ν]: M. μτε.

Keeping up the formal peculiarities of the text, we may, perhaps, translate it as follows:—

“I adjure thee, demonic spirit, who dost rest here, with the sacred names Aoth Aboath, by the God of Abraan and the Jao of Jaku, the Jao Aoth Aboath, the God of Israma: hearken to the glorious and fearful 4 & 5 and great name, and hasten to Urbanus, whom Urbana bore, and bring him to Domitiana, whom Candida bore, so that he, loving, frantic, sleepless with love of her and desire, may beg her to return to his house and become his wife. I adjure thee by the great God, the 10 eternal and more than eternal and almighty, who is exalted above the exalted Gods. I adjure thee by Him who created the heaven and the sea. I adjure thee by him who separates the devout ones. I adjure thee by him who divided his staff in the seasic, that thou bring Urbanus, whom Urbana bore, and unite him with Domitiana, whom Candida bore, so that he, loving, tormented, sleepless with desire of her and with love, may take her 15 home to his house as his wife. I adjure thee by him who caused the mule not to bear. I adjure thee by him who divided the light from the darkness. I adjure thee by him who crusheth the rocks. I adjure thee by him who parted the mountains. I adjure thee by him who holdeth the earth upon her foundations. I adjure 20 thee by the sacred Name which is not uttered; in the [— —] I will mention it and the demons will be startled, terrified and full of horror, that thou bring Urbanus, whom Urbana bore, and unite him as husband with Domitiana, whom Candida bore, and that he loving may beseech her; at once! quick! I adjure thee by him who set a lamp and stars in the heavens by the command of his voice so that they might lighten all 25 men. I adjure thee by him who shook the whole world, and causeth the mountains to fall and rise, who causeth the whole earth to quake, and all her inhabitants to return. I adjure thee by him who made signs in the heaven and upon the earth and upon the sea, that thou bring Urbanus, whom Urbana bore, and unite him as 30 husband with Domitiana, whom Candida bore, so that he, loving her, and sleepless with desire of her, beg her and beseech her to return to his house as his wife. I adjure thee by the great God, the eternal and almighty, whom the mountains fear and the valleys in 35 all the world, through whom the lion parts with the spoil, and the mountains tremble and the earth and the sea, (through whom) every one becomes wise who is

possessed with the fear of the Lord, the eternal, the immortal, the all-seeing, who hateth evil, who knoweth what good and what evil happeneth in the sea and the rivers and the mountains and the earth, Aoth Abaoth; by the God of Abraan and the Jao of Jaku, the Jao Aoth Abaoth, the God of Israma, bring and unite 40 Urbanus, whom Urbana bore, with Domitiana, whom Candida bore,—loving, frantic, tormented with love and affection and desire for Domitiana, whom Candida bore; unite them in marriage and as spouses in love for the whole time of their life. So make it that he, loving, 45 shall obey her like a slave, and desire no other wife or maiden, but have Domitiana alone, whom Candida bore, as his spouse for the whole time of their life, at once, at once! quick, quick!”

EXPLANATION. The tablet, as is shown not only by its place of origin (the Necropolis of Adrumetum belongs to the second and third centuries, A.D.; the part in which the tablet was found is fixed in the third), but also by the character of the lettering, is to be assigned to the third century,⁹⁴⁰ that is—to determine it by a date in the history of the Greek Bible—about the time of Origen. Maspero includes it among the Imprecation-tablets (Devotions-oder Defixionstafeln) not infrequently found in ancient tombs.⁹⁴¹ A leaden tablet, rolled up like a letter, was placed in the tomb with the dead, in order, as it were, to let it reach the residence of the deities of the underworld; to their vengeance was delivered the enemy whose destruction was desired.⁹⁴² This tablet, however, contains no execrations against an enemy, but is a love-spell⁹⁴³ dressed in the form of an energetic adjuration of a demon, by means of which a certain Domitiana desires to make sure of the possession of her Urbanus. The technical details of the spell have no direct significance for our subject; we are interested only in the formulae by which the demon is adjured. It is upon these, therefore, that the greatest stress will be laid in the following detailed explanation. We may at once take for granted that these formulae were not composed by Domitiana herself. She copied them, or had them copied, from one of the many current books of Magic, and in doing so had her own name and that of the person loved inserted at the respective places. To conclude from the biblical nature of the formulae she used, that she must have been a Jewess, or even a Christian,⁹⁴⁴ would be a precarious inference; it seems to the author more probable that she and Urbanus, to judge from their names perhaps slaves or emancipated⁹⁴⁵ persons, were “heathens”.⁹⁴⁶ Quite ingenuously the love-sick girl applied the spell, which her adviser asserted to be of use in love-troubles—just because it so stood, black on white, in the “Books”. On this assumption the historical value of the formulae is increased, for the formulae thus employed in the third century must have been extracted by the writer of the book in question at a certainly much earlier date⁹⁴⁷ from the Alexandrian Old Testament. In the Magic books now in Paris, Leiden and London, which were in the main composed before the third century, we find quite a multitude of similar adjurations compiled from biblical materials, and the task of subjecting these to a critical survey is well worth while.⁹⁴⁸ It would thus, for the reasons indicated, be a mistake, as the author thinks, to add this tablet to the proofs of the presence of Jews westwards of Cyrenaica, a collection of which has been made by Schurer⁹⁴⁹ so far as regards the imperial period. In detail, the following observations must be made:— Line 1 f. It is the δαιμόνιον πνεύμα of the tomb in which or upon which the spell was laid that is addressed. That the δαιμόνια stay beside the grave is an idea of post-biblical Judaism: these demons of the tomb help men in the practice of Magic.⁹⁵⁰ It is in the Papyri a frequently given direction, to make sure of the assistance of a spirit who resides in the grave of a murdered person or of one who has in any other way perished unfortunately.⁹⁵¹— ἄρκιζω τὸν ματιγ: cf. (3) 1Es 1:48, ἄρκισθε ἕστὸν ματικυρῶν

; for τνοματων, exceedingly frequent in “biblical” Greek, specially in Lev., Pss. and Ezek., particular references are unnecessary.— Α ω θ: a Divine name in Magic, not infrequent in the Papyri; in the Clavis Melitonis⁹⁵² it is “explained” as gloriosus. As in Pap. Lond. xlvi. 134,953 so also here it stands in connection with Αβωθ, likewise a Magical Divine name.— τνενοματων Αβραων : ρκζειντιν = to adjure by any one, as in Mark 5:7, Acts 19:13. The God of Abraham, etc., is the solemn biblical designation of God. We thought it well to leave the form Αβραων in the text, as it is significant for the nationality of the writer of the tablet: a Jew would hardly have written it so. Domitiana—or the obliging magician—did not know the word. The writer of Pap. Lugd. J 384, ix. 7 954 has made a similar corruption where he, in the midst of a long series of Magical Divine names, writes Αβραων, τνενοματων, τνενοματων Ισαακ, τνενοματων Ιακωβι ; so also Codex B (Birch) has Αβραων in Luke 3:34. The interchanging of μ and ν at the end of Semitic words is to be frequently seen elsewhere; see below, p. 310 f. [↓]— τνενοματων Ιακου : on Ιαω see below, p. 324; observe the article here. Ιακου was likewise left as it was; probably it is a corruption of Ισακου ;⁹⁵⁵ even Josephus Graecises the simple transcription, as with most proper names; Ισακ or Ισαακ he gives as σακος. Line 3 f. το Ισραμα : clearly a corruption of Ισραηλ, arising from a copyist’s error; the Λ might easily become Α. The use of the solemn designation the God of Abraham, of Isaac and of Jacob is exceedingly common in the Magical formulm.⁹⁵⁶ These names, according to Origen, had to be left untranslated in the adjurations if the power of the incantation was not to be lost:⁹⁵⁷— κουσοντο εν ματος ντιμου κα φοβερο κα μεγαλου : LXX Deuteronomy 28:58, φοβεσθαι εντιμοντ θαυμαστωντοτο (Cf. also LXX Psalms 71:14 [MT Psalms 72:14], ενμα εντιμον said of a human name); LXX Psa. 110⁹ [MT Psalms 111:9], φοβερ εν ενμαατο, similarly LXX Psalms 98:3 [MT Psalms 99:3]; τνοματων μγα of the name of God, LXX Psalms 98:3 [MT Psalms 99:3], Ezekiel 36:23, cf. LXX Psalms 75:2 [MT Psalms 76:2] and Isaiah 33:21; the combination μγασκα φοβερος is very frequently applied to God in the LXX: Deuteronomy 10:17, 1 Chronicles 16:25, Nehemiah 1:5, Nehemiah 4:14, LXX Psalms 46:3 [MT Psalms 47:3], LXX Psalms 88:8 [MT Psalms 89:8], LXX Psalms 95:4 [MT Psalms 96:4], Sir 43:29. Lines 4-8. The persons named, as has been said, were probably slaves or had been emancipated. An Ορβανος is found also in Romans 16:9; he was a Christian of Ephesus,⁹⁵⁸ and is distinguished by Paul with the title of honour συνεργος.—The consistent annexation of the name of the person’s mother is stereotyped in the Magic formulae, and manifests itself up to a late period.⁹⁵⁹ The directions found in the Magic Papyri exhibit this pattern in innumerable examples; the construction is such that the particular person’s name requires only to be inserted instead of the provisional δενα, ν τεκεν δενα. — γρυπνωπ : cf. LXX Proverbs 8:34, Job 21:32.— σμβιος: as to the usage of this word, especially in Egyptian Greek, attention should be paid to the collection of W. Brunet de Presle,⁹⁶⁰ which may be extended by many passages in the Berlin Papyrus documents now in course of publication. The word is common among the Christians later on. Line 8 f. τνενοματων ενναωνιον : LXX Isaiah 26:4, θες μγασανιος ; cf. Isaiah 40:28, Sus. 42.— παωνιον LXX Exodus 15:18, κριος βασιλεωντ νακα πανακα τι.— παντοκρορα, very frequent in LXX.— τνενοματων περνωτνενοματων περνωθενενοματων : cf. LXX Ezekiel 10:19, κα δεξαθεοσραλν πατνενοματων (the cherubim) περνω, similarly Ezekiel 11:22; and with the idea, φοβεροςστιν ππνταστοςθεος, LXX Psalms 95:4 [MT Psalms 96:4] ⁹⁶¹ Line 10 f. τνενοματωνσαντατωνοραννκατνενοματων θλασσαν ; an echo of Genesis 1:1, not in expression,⁹⁶² but in sense, like LXX Genesis 14:19, Genesis 14:22, [3] 1Es 6:13, Bel 5,

cf. Revelation 10:6, and with this LXX Psalms 145:6 [MT Psalms 146:6]. The collocation Heaven and sea instead of Heaven and earth is surprising in this connection, but it is not foreign to the O.T. An exhaustive collection of the many variants—echoes of Genesis 11:1-32.—for Creator of the heavens and the earth in Judaeo-Hellenistic and early Christian literature which have become formulaic, would be an important contribution to the history of the text of the “Apostolic” Symbol.

Line 11. τὸν διαχωρῶσαν τατοῦ σεβεῖς can only mean, he who separates the devout ones, i.e., from the godless; διαχωρῶζω = to separate from is common in the LXX. The passage is an allusion to Sir 36:1-26 [33] ff. πλῆθει πιστοῦ μησκρίοιος διεχρίσεν ἀτοῦς (men): so we have the contrast πῖναντιεσεβοῦς μαρτωλῶς (in Sir 36:14). Line 12. τὸν διαστῶσαν τατὸν βδονντθαλσσ, literally, he who divides his staff in the sea. This is, of course, meaningless; the first writer of the incantation, without doubt, wrote inversely: τὸν διαστῶσαν τατὸν θλασσανντβδ or τβδ, who divided the sea with his staff, an allusion in sense to LXX Exodus 14:15 f.: ἐπεδκρίοιος πρὸς Μωσῶν . . . κασπαροντβσουκα κτεινοντνχερ σου πτνθλασσαν καξονατν, with the difference that in the Bible it is Moses who lifts the staff—though of course at God’s command. In regard to form its similarity with Theodotion LXX Psalms 73:13 [MT Psalms 74:13] 963σ (God) διστησας ντδυνμεισουτνθλασσαν, with which should be compared LXX Exodus 15:8: καδιπνεματοστοθυμοσου διστητδωρ. . . πγητκματατςθαλσσης. The miracle at the Red Sea, so frequently celebrated in the Psalms and elsewhere, is also alluded to in other Magical formulae.⁹⁶⁴ See under ν, above [↑], Art. ii., upon the possible ντβδ. Line 16. τνποισαν τατν μονονμτεκεν a peculiar designation of God. It does not occur, as such, in the Old Testament, but the underlying idea of God’s providentia specialissima for the animals is very similarly expressed in the sublime address of Jahweh to the doubting Job (Job 38:1-41 ff.); cf., in particular, Job 39:1-3: Knowest thou the time when the wild goats of the rock bring forth? Or canst thou mark when the hinds do calve? Canst thou number the months that they fulfil, or knowest thou the time when they bring forth? They bow themselves, they bring forth their young, they cast out their sorrows. It is God who directs all this. Just as He gives young to the wild goats and the hinds, so, the present passage would say, He has made the mule to be barren. The barrenness of the mule is often mentioned in the Mishna;⁹⁶⁵ it was manifestly a fact of great interest in the Jewish Philosophy of Nature, as also in Greek and Latin authors:⁹⁶⁶ Plin. Nat. Hist. viii. 173: observatum ex duobus diversis generibus nata tertii generis fieri et neutri parentium esse similia, eaque ipsa quae sunt ita nata non gignere in omni animalium genere, idcirco mulas non parere. When Zopyrus was besieging Babylon he received, according to Herod. iii. 153, the oracle πενπερμονοιτκωσιν, ττεττεχοςλσεσθαι. The partus of a mule was reckoned a prodigium Cic. de Div. ii. 22 49, 28 61, Liv. xxxvii. 3 3, JUV. xiii. 64, Sueton. Galba, 4, and this explains the Roman proverb” cum mula peperit, i.e., never. Then the fact played a great part in incantations. Gargilius Martialis (third cent. A.D.) in de cura bourn § 19 (ed. Schuch)⁹⁶⁷ hands down the following healing charm: nec lapis lanam fert, nec lumbricus oculos habet, nec mula parit utriculum; similarly Marcellus (fifth cent. A.D.), De Medicam. viii. 191 (ed. Helmreich):⁹⁶⁸ nec mula parit nec lapis lanam fert nec huic morbo caput crescat aut si creverit tabescat, and a Codex Vossianus ed. Piechotta Anecd. lat. clxx.:⁹⁶⁹ “quod mula non parit” et exspues, “nec cantharus aquam bibit” et exspues, “nec palumba dentes habet” et exspues, “sic mihi dentes non doleant” et exspues. Finally, reference must be made to a passage in the Leiden copy of the Codex Corbeiensis of Vegetius,⁹⁷⁰ which gives the formula: focus alget, aqua sitit, cibaria esurit, mula

parit, tasca masca venas omnes. But what comes nearest to our passage is a sentence preserved in a poem of the Codex Vindobonensis, 93:971 herbula Proserpinacia, Horci regis filia, quomodo clausisti mulae partum, sic claudas et undam sanguinis huius, and in a still more instructive form in the Codex Bonnensis, 218 (66 a):972 herbula Proserpinacia, Horci regis filia, adiuro te per tuas virtutes, ut quomodo clausisti partum mulae, claudas undas sanguinis huius. Strange as at first sight the affirmation thus made of God may appear in connection with the others, we now see that in an incantation it is least of all strange. The Jewish compiler of our text borrowed it from pagan sources, probably unconsciously but perhaps intentionally using a biblical phrase—and, indeed, the intention did not directly oppose the biblical range of thought. Line 16 f. τνδιορσαντατφςπτοσκτους : cf. LXX Genesis 1:4, καδιεχρισενθεςνμσοντοφωτςκανμσοντοσκτους—similarly Genesis 1:18. The compiler quotes freely: διορζειν, frequent elsewhere in the LXX, also with π, does not stand in any of the Greek translations of this passage. It is significant that he has avoided the repeated “between,” a Hebraism taken over by the LXX. Line 17. τνσυντρβοντατςπτρας : an echo in form of LXX 3Ki. 19:11 [MT 1 Kings 19:11], πνεμαμγα . . . συντρβον πτραςνπιονκυρου : cf. LXX Nahum 1:6, κααπτραιδιεθρβησανπ’ατο. Line 18. τνπορρξαντατρη : cf. LXX Psalms 77:15 [MT Psalms 78:15] διρρηξεπτραννρμ, similarly LXX Psa. 104:41 [MT Psalms 105:41]; parallels to the thought are easily found. Line 18 f. τνσυνστρφοντατνγνπτνθεμελωνατς : συστρφω, current in the LXX, though not in this connection; θεμλιατςγς is likewise frequent. With regard to the sense, cf. LXX Proverbs 8:29 σχυρ ποει τ θεμλια τς γς, and the common phrase θεμελωσετνγν. Line 19 ff. ρκζωσετγιοννομαοληγεται : It is possible to doubt this punctuation. Maspero writes οληγεταιντδτ, but if the reading δτ is correct, then, with his punctuation, the thought would be in direct opposition to the Jewish view, for the Temple was just the one place in which the name of God could be pronounced; Philo, De Vit. Mos. iii. 11 (M., p. 152), says νματος μνοιστοςτακαγλτανσοφκεκαθαρμνοισθμισκοειν καληγειννγοις,λλδοδεντπαρπανοδαμο. The Mischna, Tamid, vii. 2,973 has “In the Temple the name of God is pronounced as it is written; in the land [elsewhere] another title is substituted”. We consider it absolutely impossible that any one having any kind of sympathy with Judaism whatever could assert that the holy name was not pronounced in the Temple. If the word read by Maspero as δτ can be made out at all—which to us, judging at least from the fac-simile, appears impossible—then, if it is to be read after οληγεται, it must be a general term of place such as κσμ or λα; if, again, it is to be connected with the following νομσωατ, then ντδτ were meaningless, or at least very singular. Of which Temple could the Jewish compiler be thinking? Can it be that he wrote before the destruction of the Temple?974 We would therefore propose to consider οληγεται as a clause by itself: it expresses the well-known Jewish idea that the name of God is an νομαρρητον,—see LXX Leviticus 24:16 νομζωνδτνομακυρουθαντθανατοσθω; Josephus, Antt. ii. 12 4: καθεςατσημανειτναυτοπροσηγοραν οπρτερωνεςνθρπτουςπαρελθοσαν,περςομοιθεμιτν επεν.975—ντ [. . .] νομσωατκαοδαμονες ξεγερθσιν κθαμβοικαπερφοβοιγενμενοι. How the lacuna after ντ is to be filled up the present writer does not know, and he will make no conjectures; thus much only is probable, viz., that what stood there was a designation of place or

time. The magician utters the severest possible threat against the demon; he will, in order to win him over, pronounce the unutterable Name of God, the very sound of which fills the demons with shuddering and dread. That demons and spirits are controlled by the mention of sacred names has remained to the present day one of the most important ideas in magic.⁹⁷⁶ We have no direct example of this in the LXX, but we can point to James 2:19 as being valid for biblical times, κατ' ἄδαιμνία πιστεύουσιν καθ' ἑσθ' ἑσθουσιν, which presupposes the same fearful impression upon the demons of the thought of God. With this is to be compared Pap. Lond. xlvi. 80 f.⁹⁷⁷ (fourth cent. A.D.), where the Demon is adjured κατ' ἐνφρικτῶν νομῶν, just as Josephus, Bell. Jud. v. 10 3, speaks of the φρικτῶν νομοθεοῦ. The overwhelming effect of the Divine name upon the Demons was a very familiar idea in post-biblical Judaism.⁹⁷⁸ not altogether un-Greek. — στεφάνειν πῶσιν ἐν θροῶσι :

LXX Genesis 1:17 καθετο ἄτομα θεῶν ἐν τῆσδε ματι τοῦ ὀρανοῦ στεφάνειν πῶσιν ἐν τῆσδε.

Line 25 f. τῶσιν σῶσαντα πῶσιν ἐν τῆσδε ματι τοῦ ὀρανοῦ στεφάνειν πῶσιν ἐν τῆσδε : LXX Psalms 59:4 [MT Psalms 60:4], συνείσασθαι ἐν γῆν. For πῶσαν τῶσιν ἐν τῆσδε ματι τοῦ ὀρανοῦ στεφάνειν πῶσιν ἐν τῆσδε, cf. LXX Isaiah 13:5.— κατ' ἄδαιμνία κτραχὴ λῆζοντα κατ' ἄδαιμνία κτραχὴ λῆζοντα:⁹⁸⁴ a repetition of the thought; in line 18, but verbally independent. Line 26 f. τῶσιν πῶσαντα κτρομοντῶσιν ἐν τῆσδε ματι τοῦ ὀρανοῦ στεφάνειν πῶσιν ἐν τῆσδε : cf. LXX Psa. 103:32 [MT Psalms 104:32] ἐπιβλῶσιν πῶσιν ἐν τῆσδε ματι τοῦ ὀρανοῦ στεφάνειν πῶσιν ἐν τῆσδε ; κτρομος does not seem to have been retained anywhere else, the LXX using ἐντρομος in the same sense, LXX Psalms 17:8 [MT Psalms 18:8] and LXX Psa. 76:19 [MT Psalms 77:19].

Line 27. (κα) καινίζοντα πῶσιν ἐν τῆσδε ματι τοῦ ὀρανοῦ στεφάνειν πῶσιν ἐν τῆσδε : the author follows Maspero in adding the κα. We may reject the idea that καινίζοντα has an ethical reference in the sense of the πνευματικῶν of Ezekiel 11:19, cf. Psalms 50:12 [MT Psalms 51:12], or of the καρδία καινῶν of Ezekiel 36:26; we must rather take it as expressing the idea of the preservation of the race by the ceaseless upspringing of new generations. The compiler may have had a confused recollection of phrases like ἐπιβλέψεν ἐπὶ πῶσαντα πῶσιν ἐν τῆσδε ματι τοῦ ὀρανοῦ στεφάνειν πῶσιν ἐν τῆσδε, LXX Psa. 32:14 [MT Psalms 33:14], and κριός θεός . . . καινίσθη ἐν τῆσδε ματι τοῦ ὀρανοῦ στεφάνειν πῶσιν ἐν τῆσδε, Zephaniah 3:17; cf. LXX Psalms 102:5 [MT Psalms 103:5], νακαινίσθη ἐν τῆσδε ματι τοῦ ὀρανοῦ στεφάνειν πῶσιν ἐν τῆσδε. In Wis 7:27, τῶσιν ἐν τῆσδε ματι τοῦ ὀρανοῦ στεφάνειν πῶσιν ἐν τῆσδε, is predicated of the divine σοφία.

Line 27 f. τῶσιν πῶσαντα σημεῖα κατ' ἄδαιμνία κτραχὴ λῆζοντα πῶσιν ἐν τῆσδε ματι τοῦ ὀρανοῦ στεφάνειν πῶσιν ἐν τῆσδε : see Daniel 6:27 κατ' ἄδαιμνία σημεῖα κατ' ἄδαιμνία κτραχὴ λῆζοντα πῶσιν ἐν τῆσδε ματι τοῦ ὀρανοῦ στεφάνειν πῶσιν ἐν τῆσδε, cf. LXX Joel 2:30. Line 31. ῥωτῶντα : here, as often in Paul, Synopt., Acts, John, in the sense of beg, beseech; not “an application of the word which was manifestly first made through the influence of the Hebrew □□□□,”⁹⁸⁵ (which in that case must surely have appeared first of all in the LXX), but popular Greek.⁹⁸⁶ Line 33. ἐνφοβῆται ῥηκῶν πῶσιν ἐν τῆσδε ματι τοῦ ὀρανοῦ στεφάνειν πῶσιν ἐν τῆσδε : instead of the unmistakable ἐν Maspero writes ο. A specialising of the idea that the earth also has a “fear of God”: cf. LXX Psalms 32:8 [MT Psalms 33:8], φοβηθῶσιν ἐν τῆσδε ματι τοῦ ὀρανοῦ στεφάνειν πῶσιν ἐν τῆσδε, and LXX Psalms 66:8 [MT Psalms 67:7], φοβηθῶσιν ἐν τῆσδε ματι τοῦ ὀρανοῦ στεφάνειν πῶσιν ἐν τῆσδε. For the combination of ῥη and πῶσιν cf. LXX Isaiah 40:12, Ezekiel 6:3, Ezekiel 36:6. Line 34. δι' ἐν ἄλλων φησιν τῶσιν ἐν τῆσδε ματι τοῦ ὀρανοῦ στεφάνειν πῶσιν ἐν τῆσδε : the fact stated in this connection vividly recalls τῶσιν πῶσαντα τῶσιν ἐν τῆσδε ματι τοῦ ὀρανοῦ στεφάνειν πῶσιν ἐν τῆσδε in line 16. It is surprising that it should be said that God causes the lion to abandon his prey,⁹⁸⁷ whereas the biblical idea is just that God supplies the lion's food, Job 38:39. One might suppose an allusion to Daniel 6:27, ἐστὶς ξέλατος βασιλεὺς κχείρῶσιν ἐν τῆσδε ματι τοῦ ὀρανοῦ στεφάνειν πῶσιν ἐν τῆσδε, and similar passages, the more so as a little before, in line 27 f., there was a strong resemblance to the first half of the same verse; but this

may be considered as negated by **πραγμα**. We shall not err in considering the statement to be an expression of God's omnipotence, of His complete dominion over nature: God is even able to make possible that which is against nature, viz., that the lion shall relinquish his prey. We may be reminded by this of the prophetic pictures of the Messianic future in Isaiah 11:6, **καμοσχριονκαταροςκαλωνμαβοσκηθσονταικαπαιδονμικρονξειατος**, and Isaiah 65:25 = Isaiah 11:7, **καλωνςβοςφγεταιχυρα**, in which it is likewise affirmed that the lion may change his nature, if God so wills it. The clause has been freely compiled from biblical materials.— **κατρητρμει**: LXX Jeremiah 4:24 **εδοντρηκαντρμουντα**. Line 35. **καστοςδλλεταιν χειφβοςτο Κυρου**: perhaps this is the most difficult passage in the Inscription. **δλλομαι**, (**εδλλομαι**) or **νδλλομαι** means to seem, appear, become visible, show oneself, also to resemble. The word does not occur in the LXX, but **νδαλμα**, the noun, is found in LXX Jer. 27:39 [MT Jeremiah 50:39], probably in the sense of ghost, in Wis 17:3 for image, which meanings are easily obtained from the verb. The first appearance of the verb in biblico-ecclesiastical literature, so far as the author knows, is in Clement of Rome, 1Co. 23:2, **διμδιψυχημενμηδνδαλλσθωψυχημνπιτας περιβαλλοσαιςκανδξιος δωρεαζατο** (God), where either it has the meaning to seem imagine oneself, somewhat like **φυσιοσθαι**, or it is, as Bryennios, following others, has recently again proposed, a synonym of the verbs **λιγην**, to be confused, and **νδοιζειν**, to waver.⁹⁸⁹ Now **καστονδλλεται**, as the passage runs in the original, does not give sense: Maspero conjectures **νκαστοζεδλλεται** and translates a qui chacun devient semblable, which appears to us to be grammatically impossible. In regard to the reading which we propose, which may recommend itself by the insignificance of the textual change, we would refer to the explanation of the verb which is given by Hesychius: **νδλλεταιμοιοται, φανεται, δοκε, στοχζεται, σοται, σοφζεται**,⁹⁹⁰ with which is to be compared the note of Suidas **εδαλμαςσυνετς**. Taking then **δλλεται = σοφζεται**,⁹⁹¹ we get the familiar biblical thought that the Fear of God gives men Wisdom, as in LXX Psa. 110:10 [MT Psalms 111:10] = Proverbs 1:7, Proverbs 9:10 **ρχσοφαςφβος κυρου**, Proverbs 22:4 **γενεσοφαςφβοςκυρου**; cf. LXX Psalms 18:8, Psalms 18:10 [MT Psalms 19:8, Psalms 19:10] **μαρτυρακυρουπισσοφζουσανπια . . . φβος κυρουγνςδιαμνωνεζανανανος**. The only possible objection to this explanation is that the clause has no connection with the previous one; and certainly a **κα**, or the repetition of the **διν**, were desirable—only it would be equally required with any other reading. The writer of the tablet seems not to have understood the statement.—With regard to **ν χειφβοςτοκυρου** (cf. LXX Job 31:23 **φβοςγκυρουσυνσχημε**), reference should be made to the equivalent (in profane Greek likewise common) use of **χειν**, LXX Job 21:6, Isaiah 13:8, Mark 16:8. Examples of **φβοςτοκυρου** would be superfluous. Line 36. **θαντου** : Sir 51:9 [13] Cod. A has **καπ θαντουσεωςδεθην**, which probably means and to the Immortal One did I pray for deliverance; cf. 1 Timothy 6:16, **μνοςχωνθανασαν**. The thought is a Greek one; this attribute of God, in the present connection (cf. line 35), recalls the sublime Hellenistic-Jewish thought that the knowledge of God, the possession of the divine **σοφα** and **δικαιοσνη**, impart immortality: Wis 15:3 **εδναισουτκρτοςζαθανασας**, Wis 8:17 **στινθανασανσυγγενεσοφας**, cf. Wis 8:13 **ξωδι'ατνθανασαν**, Wis 1:15 **δικαιοσνηγρθανασανστν**.⁹⁹² — παντεφπτου:⁹⁹³ Esther 5:1 **νπντωνππτηνθεν**; 3Ma. 2:21 **πντωνππτηςθες**; 2Ma 7:35 (cf. 2Ma 3:39) **τοπαντοκρτοροςππτουθεο**; cf. LXX Job 34:24 **γκρριος πντας** (Cod. A, **τπντα**)

■φορ■, similarly 2Ma 12:22 and 2Ma 15:2.—μισοπον■ρου: the idea is common in the O.T.;⁹⁹⁴ in regard to the word cf. μισοπονηρ■ω, 2Ma 4:49 and 2Ma 8:4; μισοπονηρ■α, 2Ma 3:1. Line 36 ff. ■πισταμ■νου κτλ. : a well-known biblical idea, here developed independently with the assistance of biblical expressions. Line 43. συμβιο■ντας: Sir 13:5 has the word. Line 45. ■πιθυμο■ντα with the Accusative as not infrequently in LXX; cf., e.g., Exodus 20:17, ο■κ■πιθυμ■σεις τ■νγυνα■κατο■πλησ■ονσου. Looking again at the Inscription, we find, in the first place, confirmation of the supposition that the writer of the tablet, whether male or female, and the original author of the text cannot have been the same individual. No One apparently so familiar with even the deeper thoughts of the Greek Bible could fall into such childish errors in the most everyday matters, such as the names of the patriarchs and other things. It is in all probability most correct to suppose that the tablet (with the exception of such parts as referred to the particular case) was copied from a book of Magic, and that even there the original text was already corrupt. If the tablet was itself written in the third century, and if between it and the compiler of the original text there was already a considerable period, in which corrupt copies were produced and circulated, then the second century A.D. will probably form a terminus ad quem for the date of its composition; nevertheless there is nothing to prevent our assigning to the original text a still earlier date. As the locality of the original composition we may assume Egypt, perhaps Alexandria, not only from the general character of the text, but also by reason of the Egyptian origin of texts which are cognate with it. The author was a Greek Jew:⁹⁹⁵ this follows incontrovertibly, as it seems to us, from the formal character of the text. If we had in the incantation a succession of verbal citations from the Septuagint, the hypothesis of a Jewish author were certainly the most natural, but we should then have to reckon also with the presumption that some “heathen,” convinced of the magic power of the alien God, may have taken the sayings from the mysterious pages of the holy and not always intelligible Book of this same God, very much in the same way as passages at large from Homer⁹⁹⁶ were written down for magical purposes, and as to this day amulets are made from biblical sayings.⁹⁹⁷ Really verbal quotations, however, such as could be copied mechanically, are almost entirely absent from our text, in spite of its extreme dependence in substance and form upon the Greek Old Testament. We have here an instructive example of the reproduction of biblical passages from memory which played such a great part in quotations and allusions in the early Christian writings. The compiler of our text certainly did not consult his Greek Bible as he set down one biblical attribute of God after another; the words flowed from his pen without any consideration on his part of what might be their particular origin, or any thought of checking the letters in a scrupulous bibliolatry. Only a man who lived and moved in the Bible, and, indeed, in the Greek Bible, could write as he wrote. And if here and there something got mixed with his writing which has no authority in the Septuagint, then even that speaks not against, but in favour of, our view. For the theological conception of the Canon has never been a favourite with popular religion,—we might almost say, indeed, with religion in general. In every age the religious instinct has shown an indifference in respect to the Canon,—unconscious, unexpressed, but none the less effective—which has violated it both by narrowing it and extending it. How many words of the canonical Bible have never yet been able to effect what Holy Scripture should! How much that is extra-canonical has filled whole generations with solace and gladness and religious enthusiasm! Just as the Christians of New Testament times not infrequently quoted as scripture words for which one should have vainly sought in the Canon (assuming that even then an exact demarcation had been made, or was known), so also does this text from Adrumetum, with all its obligations to

the Bible, manifest an ingenuous independence with regard to the Canon. In respect of form, the following facts also merit attention. The text is almost wholly free from those grammatical peculiarities of the Septuagint which are usually spoken of as Hebraisms — a term easily misunderstood. This is a proof of the fact, for which there is other evidence as well,⁹⁹⁸ that the syntactic “influence” of the Alexandrian translation was less powerful by far than the lexical. The spirit of the Greek language was, in the imperial period, sufficiently accommodating where the enlarging of its stock of terms was concerned; the good old words were becoming worn out, and gropings were being made towards new ones and towards the stores of the popular language—as if internal deterioration could be again made good by means of external enlargement. But notwithstanding all this it had a sense of reserve quite sufficient to ward off the claims of a logic which was repugnant to its nature. The alleged “Jewish-Greek,” of which the Alexandrian translation of the Old Testament is supposed to be the most prominent memorial, never existed as a living dialect at all. Surely no one would seriously affirm that the clumsy barbarisms of the Aramaean who tried to make himself understood in the Greek tongue were prescribed by the rules of a “Jewish-Greek” grammar. It may be, indeed, that certain peculiarities, particularly with regard to the order of words, are frequently repeated, but one has no right to search after the rules of syntax of a “Semitic Greek” on the basis of these peculiarities, any more than one should have in trying to put together a syntax of “English High-German” from the similar idioms of a German-speaking Englishman. We need not be led astray by the observed fact that Greek translations of Semitic originals manifest a more or less definite persistence of Semitisms; for this persistence is not the product of a dialect which arose and developed in the Ghettos of Alexandria and Rome, but the disguised conformity to rule of the Semitic original, which was often plastered over rather than translated. How comes it that the syntax of the Jew Philo and the Benjamite Paul stands so distinctly apart from that of such Greek translations? Just because, though they had grown up in the Law, and meditated upon it day and night, they were yet Alexandrian and Tarsian respectively, and as such fitted their words naturally together, just as people spoke in Egypt and Asia Minor, and not in the manner of the clumsy pedantry⁹⁹⁹ of the study, submitting line after line to the power of an alien spirit. The translators of the Old Testament were Hellenists as well as were Philo and Paul, but they clothed themselves in a strait-jacket—in the idea perhaps that such holy labour demanded the putting on of a priestly garment. Their work gained a success such as has fallen to the lot of but few books: it became one of the “great powers” of history. But although Greek Judaism and Christianity entered into, and lived in, the sphere of its ideas, yet their faith and their language remained so uninjured that no one thought of the disguised Hebrew as being sacred, least of all as worthy of imitation,¹⁰⁰⁰—though, of course, there was but little reflection on the matter.

Then the Tablet from Adrumetum manifests a peculiarity, well known in the literature of Hellenistic Judaism, which, we think, ought also to be considered as one of form. This is the heaping up of attributes of God, which appears to have been a favourite custom, especially in prayers.¹⁰⁰¹ It is a characteristic of certain heathen prayers; it was believed that the gods were honoured, and that the bestowal of their favours was influenced,¹⁰⁰² by the enumeration of their attributes. We think it probable that this notion also influenced the form of Judo-Greek prayers.¹⁰⁰³ At all events we hear in them the expression of the same naïve tendency which Grimm unjustifiably reproaches as “a misunderstanding of and lack of the true spirit of prayer”. Good words were given to God—something must be given: His divine self-importance, as it were, was appealed to. It is

children that flatter thus. With regard to this characteristic in prayer, unmistakably present also in our text, compare the prayer of the Three Men, then 3Macc. 2:2 ff. and 6:2 ff., but specially the following passages:—

2Ma 1:24 f. κριε κριε θες πντων κτστης φοβερς κας σχυρς κας δκαιος κας λεμων, μνος βασιλες κας χρηστς μνος χορηγς μνος δκαιος κας παντοκρωτωρ κας ανιος, διασζων τς στραλ κ παντς κακο, ποισας τος πατρρας κλεκτος κας γισας ατος.

Man 1:1-15 (in O. F. Fritzsche, Libri apocr. V. T. graece, p. 92) 1-4: κριε παντοκρωτωρ θες τν πατρων μν το βραμ κας σακ κας ακβ κας το σπρματος ατν το δικαου, ποσας τν ορανν κας τν γν σν παντ τ κσμ ατν, πεδσας τν θλασσαν τ λγ το προστγματς σου, κλεσας τν βυσσον κας σφραγισμενος ατν τ φοβερς κας νδξς νματς σου, ν πντα φρσσει κας τρμει π προσπου δυνμες σου. The agreement, especially of the latter passage, with the tablet of Adrumetum is so striking that we should have to suppose that our compiler used the Prayer of Manasses, unless the case was that both were working with the same materials in the same framework of a customary form. That this form came in course of time to be of great influence liturgically, and that it can still be perceived in the monotony of many a service-book prayer, can only be indicated here. It is doubtless a partial cause of the fact that the word Litanei, in our customary speech, has gained an unpleasant secondary signification. [Litanei = litany + jeremiad.] The peculiarity just treated of was described as a formal one. For even if its origin points, psychologically, to a temper of mind not entirely alien to religion, yet the employment of it, where the religious motive has given place to the liturgical, the unconstrained feeling of the true worshipper to the literary interest of the prayer-book writer, is in general purely ritualistic, that is, formal. But the attributes of God which are found in the text from Adrumetum are of deep interest even in substance, when considered in reference to the choice which the compiler has made. It is true that they are here used as the vehicle of an incantation, but how different is their simplicity and intelligibility from the meaningless chaos of most other incantamenta! The context in which they stand must not cause us to ignore their religious value. If we put aside the adjuration of the demon for the trivial ends of a sickly affection, we are enabled to gain a notion of how the unknown author thought about God. The suspicion that he was an impostor and that he intentionally employed the biblical expressions as hocus-pocus is perhaps not to be flatly denied; but there is nothing to justify it, and to assert, without further consideration, that the literary representatives of magic were swindlers, would be to misapprehend the tremendous force with which the popular mind in all ages has been ruled by the "superstitious" notion that the possession of supernatural powers may be secured through religion. Our compiler, just because of the relative simplicity of his formulae, has the right to be taken in earnest. What strikes us most of all in these are the thoughts which establish the omnipotence of God. The God, through Whom he adjures the demon, is for him the creator, the preserver and the governor of nature in its widest sense: He has, of course, the power to crush the miserable spirit of the tomb. But besides this conception of God, which impresses the senses more strongly than the conscience, and upon which the poetry of biblical and post-biblical Judaism long continued to nourish itself, 1004 this unknown man has also extracted the best of what was best in the Jewish faith, viz., the ethical idea of the God of prophecy, Who separates the pious from the transgressors because He hates evil, and the "fear" of Whom is the beginning of wisdom. Thus the tablet of

Adrumetum is a memorial of the Alexandrian Old Testament. Not only does it reveal what a potent formal influence the Greek Bible, and especially the praise-book thereof, exercised upon the classes who lived outside of the official protection of the Synagogue and the Church, and who thus elude the gaze of history, but it lets us also surmise that the eternal thoughts of the Old Testament had not wholly lost their germinative power even where, long after and in an obscure place, they had seemingly fallen among thorns.

05 - NOTES ON SOME BIBLICAL PERSONS AND NAMES

V.

NOTES ON SOME BIBLICAL PERSONS AND NAMES

τ■ν■λιονα■το■νατ■λλει■π■πονηρο■ζκα■γαθο■ζκα■βρ■χει

■π■δικα■ουζκα■δ■κους.

05.01 - HELIODORUS.

1. HELIODORUS. The Second Book of Maccabees has a wonderful story to tell of how King Seleucus IV. Philopator made an unsuccessful attempt to plunder the temple-treasury in Jerusalem. A certain Simon, who had occasion to revenge himself upon Onias the high-priest, had gone hurriedly to Apollonius, the Syrian governor of Coelesyria and Phoenicia, and had contrived to impress him with the most marvellous ideas of the temple property in Jerusalem. The king, having been informed of the sacred store, thought it well to send his minister Heliodorus to Jerusalem, with orders to bring back the gold with him. Heliodorus was the very man for such a mission. Having reached Jerusalem, neither the expostulations of the high priest nor the lamentations of the people were able to dissuade him. In the extremity of their distress recourse was had to prayer. And just as the heartless official and his minions were actually preparing to pillage the treasury, "there appeared unto them a horse with a terrible rider upon him, and adorned with a very fair covering, and he ran fiercely, and smote at Heliodorus with his fore-feet; and it seemed that he that sat upon the horse had complete harness of gold. Moreover, two other young men appeared before him, notable in strength, excellent in beauty, and comely in apparel; who stood by him on either side, and scourged him continually, and gave him many sore stripes. And Heliodorus fell suddenly to the ground and was compassed with great darkness; but they that were with him took him up, and put him into a litter and carried him forth." A sacrifice offered by the high-priest saved the half-dead man, and then the two young men, apparelled as before, appeared to him again, and told him that he owed his life to Onias. Then Heliodorus, being asked by the king after his return, who might be the proper person to send on the same errand to Jerusalem, replied: "If thou hast any enemy or adversary to thy government, send him thither, and thou shalt receive him well scourged, if he escape with his life: for in that place without doubt there is an especial power of God". The historical foundations of this tale in 2Ma 3:1-40, which is certainly better known to-day through Raphael's picture than through its original narrator, are not so obvious as its pious aim. Grimm¹⁰⁰⁵ is inclined to allow it a kernel of history; up to 2Ma 3:23 the story does not contain a single feature which might not have been literally true. Owing to the financial difficulties occasioned by the conclusion of peace with Rome, temple-robbings seem to have become, to some extent, the order of the day with the Seleucidae. Grimm therefore accepts the historicity of the attempt to plunder the temple, but leaves undecided the actual nature of the event, thus ornamented by tradition, by which the project of Heliodorus was baffled. The author is not in a position to decide this question, though, indeed, the answer given by Grimm seems to him to be in the main correct.¹⁰⁰⁶ But in any case the observation of Schurer,¹⁰⁰⁷ viz., that the book as a whole (or its source, Jason of Cyrene) is not seldom very well-informed in the matter of details, is confirmed in the present passage. The book undoubtedly says what is correct of the hero of the story, Heliodorus,¹⁰⁰⁸ in describing him as first minister of the Syrian king. It is indeed true that this assertion is not vouched for in ancient literature; for Appian, Syr., p. 45 (Mendelssohn, i., p. 416) makes mention of only one Heliodorus as $\tau\iota\nu\sigma\tau\epsilon\rho\tau\alpha\lambda\upsilon$ of Seleucus. But even if this note makes it more than "probable"¹⁰⁰⁹ that it refers to the same man as is alluded to in the Second Book of Maccabees, yet, if there were no further proof of the identity, it would be

necessary to reckon seriously with the possibility that the author of that book, in accordance with his general purpose, transformed some mere court-official into the first minister of the king of Syria, in order to make still more impressive the miracle of his punishment and his repentance. But this very detail, suspicious in itself, can be corroborated by two Inscriptions from Delos, made known by Th. Homolle, which may be given here:— I.1010

τ[ε]ν[σ]ν[τροφον]1011το[β]ασιλε[ω]ς[ε]λε[κου]

Φιλοπ[το]ροσκα[π]τ[ν]πρα[γμ]των

τεταγμ[νο]νο[ν]λα[ο]κιε[?]

τ[ν]Φοιν[κ]γδοχε[ς]κα[να]κληροι[?]

υνο[α]ςνεκενκα[φ]ιλοστρο[ργ]ας]

[τ]σε[ς]τ[ν]βασιλ[α]κα[ε]εργ[ε]σ[α]ς τ[σε]ε[ς]α[το]ς

π[λλων]ι The Inscription stands upon the base of a statue no longer extant: its purport is that some Phoenician ship-masters dedicated the statue of Heliodorus, out of gratitude for his kindness, and on account of his being well-affected towards the king, to the Delian Apollo.

II.1012

Σελε[κου]τεταγμ[νο]νδ[κ]α[π]τ[ν]πραγμ[των]

κα[τ]ν[συγγ]νειανα[το]

ρτεμ[δ]ωορς ρακλε[δ]ουτ[ν]

ρετ[ς]νεκενκα[δικα]ιοσ[νης] . . . [ς] [χων]

διατελε[ε]ςτετ[ν]βασιλ[α]κ[α]

φιλ[α]ςδ[κα]ε[ε]ργεσ[α]ςτ[σε]ε[ς]αυτ[ν]ν[θηκεν]

π[λλων]ι[ρτ]μιδιλητο]. This Inscription also is found on the base of a statue; its contents quite resemble those of No. 1; in line 3 συγγ[νειαν], with some supplementary participle, will signify the same title which is already known to us as συγγεν[ς].1013 Homolle's conjecture that this Heliodorus is identical with the one mentioned in 2 Maccabees, and by Appian, seems to us to be fully established;1014 note how accurately 2Ma 3:7 also introduces him as λι[δ]ωρον τ[ν]π[τ]ν[πραγμ]των. This title, which is current elsewhere in the Books of Maccabees (c_3 32->1Ma 3:32, _10 11->2Ma 10:11, 2Ma 13:2, 2Ma 13:23_13 23->, 3Ma. 7:1) is proved by other writings to have belonged to Syria, 1015 as also to Pergamus. 1016 In Polybius and Josephus it is applied to the viceroy, the representative of the absent king, similarly in c_3 32->1Ma 3:32, _10 23->2Ma 13:23; in 3Ma. 7:1 it has the further meaning of chancellor of the kingdom, first minister, 1017 similarly 2Ma 10:11, 2Ma 13:2, 3Ma. 7:1. The first Inscription, moreover, confirms the reading πραγμ[των] which is given by most MSS. in 2Ma 3:7. Codices 19, 44, 71, etc., which substitute χρημ[των] for πραγμ[των] in this passage,1017 have obviously been so influenced by the contents of the narrative as to turn the chancellor into a chancellor of the exchequer; for such must have been the sense of the title given by them, viz., τ[ν]π[τ]ν[χρημ]των. As for Syncellus (8th cent. A.D.), Chronogr., p. 529 7 (Bonn edition), who likewise describes Heliodorus as

■π■τ■νχρημ■των, he is probably dependent on these codices.¹⁰¹⁸ Evidence from the Inscriptions has extended our knowledge thus far: Heliodorus came originally from Antioch,¹⁰¹⁹ and was the son of a certain Aischylos. In the lofty position of first minister of King Seleucus IV. Philopator, to whose familiar circle (σ■ντροφοι) he had certainly belonged previously, he earned good repute in connection with the shipping trade, and was in consequence the recipient of frequent honours. The marble statue of Heliodorus was prepared for Phoenician merchants by the ancient sculptors, and the pious gift was dedicated to the Delian Apollo; some narrator of late pre-Christian times, full of faith in the written word, made him the central figure of a richly-coloured picture, and the fate of the temple-robber became a theme for edification, not unmixed with pious horror; fifteen hundred years afterwards Raphael's Stanza d'Eliodoro transformed this naive exultation in the penalty paid by the godless man into the lofty though unhistorical idea that the Church of the Vatican is ever triumphant.

05.02 - BARNABAS

2. BARNABAS.¹⁰²⁰ The writer of the Acts of the Apostles reports, Acts 4:36, that there was given to the Cyprian ■ωσ■φ the surname Βαρναβας ■π■τ■ν■ποστ■λων, ■■στινμεθερμηνευ■μενονυ■■ζπαρακλ■σεως. Now even if it be true that “the Apostles” so named him, yet it is improbable that they were the first to coin the name, which rather appears to be an ancient one. The derivation given by the writer of the early history of Christianity is clear only as regards its first part: βαρ is of course the Aramaic ■■■■■, son, so frequently found in Semitic names. In regard to ναβας, however, the second element in the name, it is not evident which Semitic word has been translated παρ■κλησις in the Apostolic text. The usual conjecture is ■■■■■■■■■■. But this signifies a prophecy, and is accordingly rendered quite accurately in LXX 2Es 6:14 [MT Ezra 6:14], Nehemiah 6:12, 2 Chronicles 15:8 by προφητε■α, and in 2 Chronicles 9:29 by λ■γοι. A. Klostermann¹⁰²¹ therefore proposes the Aramaic ■■■■■■■■■■, pacification, consolation; but we doubt whether this will explain the transcription ναβας. It would seem better, even were the etymology given in Acts more intelligible than it is, to leave it out of account as a basis of explanation,¹⁰²² since we are at once assailed by the suspicion that we have here, as in many other passages, a folk-etymology ex post facto. We must rather try to understand the name from itself; and, as we believe, two possible explanations of the -ναβας, which is alone in question, lie open to us. In the Greek Bible, Nun, the father of Joshua, is called Ναυη. Whatever be the explanation of this form, whether or not it is actually to be understood, as has been supposed, as a corruption¹⁰²³ of NAYN into NAYH, does not signify. The only important matter is that, for Ναυη, there also occur the variants Ναβη or Ναβι. Whether this Ναυη—Ναβη—Ναβι was already in use as a personal name (= prophet) in the time of the LXX cannot be ascertained; certainly, however, it had later on become known as such to the Jews through the Greek Bible. We might, then, possibly find this name in the -ναβας: Βαρναβας would be a Βαρναβη or Βαρναβι with a Greek termination—son of a prophet. But the author thinks it a more promising theory to connect Βαρναβας with the recently-discovered Semitic name βαρνεβο■ς. An Inscription¹⁰²⁴ found in Islahie, the ancient Nicopolis, in Northern Syria, which is assigned, probably on account of the written character, to the 3rd or 4th century A.D., runs as follows:—

Βαρνεβο■ντ■νκα■, ¹⁰²⁵ ■πολλιν■ριονΣαμμαν■α■τθα■ρετονδημιουργ■νκα■γυμνασ■αρχονφ■λ[οι]. The editors explain the name quite correctly as son of Nebo.¹⁰²⁶ Their conjecture can be further confirmed, particularly by Symmachus, who in Isaiah 46:1 renders ■■■■■■, Nebo, by Νεβο■ς, while the LXX, Aquila and Theodotion transcribe it by Ναβ■.¹⁰²⁷ Βαρνεβο■ς is one of the many personal names which have Nebo as a constituent part, and), as a theophoric name, will be relatively old. The hypothesis of the affinity, or of the original identity, of Βαρναβας and Βαρνεβο■ς is further borne out by the well-known fact that in the transcription of other names compounded with Nebo the E-sound of the word is sometimes replaced by a,¹⁰²⁸e.g., Nebuchadnezzar = (LXX) Ναβουχοδονοσορ = (Berosus and Josephus) Ναβουχοδον■σορος = (Strabo) Ναβοκοδρ■σορος ; and Nebuzaradan 2 Kings 25:8 = (LXX 4Ki. 25■8) Ναβουζαρδαν. It is

therefore highly probable that the form Βαρναβο¹⁰²⁹ might occur instead of Βαρνεβο¹⁰³⁰. The former appears to us to be the original form of the name Βαρναβ¹⁰³¹. The termination -ο¹⁰³² must, in that case, have developed into -¹⁰³³, but this is no extraordinary phenomenon in view of the arbitrariness with which Semitic names were Graecised; perhaps the Jews intentionally substituted the very common Greek name-ending -α¹⁰³⁴ for -ου¹⁰³⁵ in order to remove from the name its suspiciously pagan appearance: the mutilation of Gentile theophoric names was looked upon by the Jews as an actual religious duty, on the authority of Deuteronomy 7:26 and Deuteronomy 12:3. We indeed see this duty discharged in another personal name formed with Nebo: the name Abed Nego¹⁰³⁶ in the Book of Daniel is most probably an intentional defacement of Abed Nebo, servant of Nebo. Thus did the later Graeco-Jewish Βαρναβ¹⁰³⁷ arise from the ancient Semitic βαρνεβο¹⁰³⁸ or Βαρναβο¹⁰³⁹. It then became the part of popular etymology to give a religious interpretation to the name thus defaced from motives of piety. The very difficulty of establishing which Semitic word was believed to correspond to -ναβα¹⁰⁴⁰ bears out the hypothesis enunciated above.

05.03 - MANAËN.

3. MANAËN. In 1Ma 1:6, according to the common reading, mention is made of παῖδες σῦντροφοὶ πνεύματος of Alexander the Great, and, in 2Ma 9:29, of a certain Philippos as σῦντροφος of King Antiochus IV. Epiphanes; similarly, in Acts 13:1, the esteemed Antiochian Christian Manaen¹⁰³² is distinguished by the attribute ῥηδουτοῦ τετραρχοῦ σῦντροφος. In the first passage, however, we have good authority Alexandrinus, Sinaiticus, etc., for σῦντροφοί, a word not found elsewhere, “but which, precisely on that account, may have been displaced by σῦντρ.”;¹⁰³³ the addition of πνεύματος seems to us to give additional support to the assumption that σῦντροφοί was the original form.¹⁰³⁴ Accordingly O. F. Fritzsche, in his edition, has also decided for σῦντροφοί. The meaning of the word is unquestionably one reared along with another in the proper sense.¹⁰³⁵ The case is different with the σῦντροφος of the other two passages. The commentaries give, in connection with Acts 13:1, the alternative meanings foster-brother and companion in education;¹⁰³⁶ but the former explanation is forthwith rendered void by the frequent occurrence (to be established presently) of the expression in connection with a king’s name, if we but think what strange inferences would follow from it! We should have to assume, for instance, that in the most diverse localities, and at times most widely apart, the newly-born crown-princes had very frequently to be entrusted to the care of healthy citizens, and, further, that the son of the plebeian nurse was still alive when his conlactaneus ascended the throne of his father. The interpretation companion in education is better: one might in this connection compare the play-mates of the Dauphin, who were, as a matter of course, taken from the best families, and of whom, later on, one or another continued, so far as consistent with the reverence that “cloth hedge a king,” to be the intimate friend of the prince, now come to man’s estate. But this hypothesis is likewise too special; σῦντροφος τοῦ βασιλῆως is a court title, which is of course to be explained by the fundamental meaning of the word, but in the usage of which this fundamental meaning had disappeared, having given place to the general meaning of intimate friend. The case is on all fours with that of the title of king’s relative.¹⁰³⁷ σῦντροφος τοῦ βασιλῆως is established as regards Pergamus by Polybius, xxxii. 25 10; further by the Pergamenian Inscriptions, Nos. 179 3, 224 2, 248 6 and 28,¹⁰³⁸ all of pre-Roman times (before 133 B.C.). “It appears to have been in general use throughout the Hellenistic kingdoms.”¹⁰³⁹ In regard to Macedonia, Frankel cites Polyb. v. 9 4; for Pontus, he refers to the Inscription, Bulletin de correspondance hellenique, vii. (1883), p. 355; for Egypt, to the observations of Lumbroso.¹⁰⁴⁰ But the Inscription of Delos (first half of 2nd cent. B.C.) given above,¹⁰⁴¹ in which the title is established for Syria also, is the most instructive of all in connection with the passage in Acts; Heliodorus, probably an Antiochian likewise, is there invested with the honorary title σῦντροφος τοῦ βασιλῆως Σελεῦκου Φιλοπτορος. And in the same way it was allowable to speak of Manaen as the intimate friend of Herod Antipas; nothing further is implied by the technical term, and any inference drawn from it regarding the antecedents of the man, or regarding any tender relationship between his mother and the infant Herod, would be very precarious. In the context of the narrative the attribute, when understood in this sense, is of course still more honourable for Manaen and the church at Antioch than would be the case according to the traditional interpretation.

05.04 - SAULUS PAULUS

4. SAULUS PAULUS. In Acts 13:9 the words Σαυλος καὶ Παυλος, are quite abruptly introduced to designate the Apostle who has always hitherto been spoken of as Σαυλος, and from this place onwards in the book the name Παυλος is always used. The passage has given rise to the most extraordinary conjectures; it has even been asserted that the narrator meant the καὶ Παυλος to indicate that the change of name had some sort of connection with the conversion of the Proconsul Sergius Paulus described immediately before. It must not be forgotten, in investigating the point, that it is not said that the Apostle made the change; it is the narrator who does so: by means of the καὶ he makes the transition from the previously-used Σαυλος to the Παυλος to which he henceforth keeps. We have never yet seen the fact recorded in connection with this passage¹⁰⁴² that the elliptically-used καὶ with double names is an exceedingly common usage in N.T. times. W. Schmid,¹⁰⁴³ in his studies on Atticism (of great importance for the history of the language of the Greek Bible), has recently shown from the Papyri and Inscriptions how widespread this usage was in all quarters; he names an Inscription of Antiochus Epiphanes as his first authority. "As qui et is similarly used in Latin in the case of familiar designations . . . , we might suspect a Latinism, had the Antiochus Inscription not made it more likely that the Latin usage is really a Graecism."¹⁰⁴⁴ W. Schmid seems to think that certain passages from Aelianus and Achilles Tatius are the earliest instances of this construction in the literature. But even in the literature the usage, most likely derived from the popular speech, can be shown to go much farther back. We find the reading λκιμος καὶ κκιμος, in 1Ma 7:5, 1Ma 7:12, 1Ma 7:20 ff., 1Ma 9:54 ff., 2Ma 14:3, at least in Codd. 64, 93, 19 (also 62 in the last passage). But even should this reading not be the original, yet we need not be at a loss for literary authorities; a relatively large number are supplied by Josephus.¹⁰⁴⁵ The Jewish historian, in giving double names, employs not only the fuller forms of expression, such as Σμων καὶ δκαιος πικληθες (Antt. xii. 2 4), λκιμος καὶ κκιμος κληθες (Antt. xii. 9 7), ωννηντνκα Γαδδνλεγμανον (Antt. xiii. 1 2), Διδοτος καὶ Τρφων πικληθες (Antt. xiii. 51), Σελνη καὶ Κλεοπτρακαλουμνη (Antt. xiii. 16 4), ντοχος καὶ Δινυσος πικληθες (Bell. Jud. 47), but he often simply connects the two names by καὶ : ανναοντνκα λξανδρον (Antt. xiii. 12 1),¹⁰⁴⁶ σηπος καὶ Καφας (Antt. xviii. 2 2)¹⁰⁴⁷ Κλεδημος καὶ Μλχος (Antt. i. 15), ρκη καὶ κδεπους (Antt. v. 1 22), οδας καὶ Μακκαβαος (Antt. xii. 6 4), Πακρτ καὶ πρεσβυτρ (Antt. xx. 3 3). When Acts 13:9 is placed in this philological context, we see that it cannot mean "Saul who was henceforth also called Paul"; an ancient reader could only have taken it to mean "Saul who was also called Paul".¹⁰⁴⁸ Had the writer of Acts intended to say that Paul had adopted the Graecised Roman name in honour of the Proconsul, or even that he now adopted it for the first time, he would have selected a different expression. The καὶ admits of no other supposition than that he was called Saulos Paulos before he came to Cyprus; he had, like many natives of Asia Minor, many Jews and Egyptians of his age, a double name. We know not when he received the non-Semitic name in addition to the Semitic one. It will hardly be demanded that we should specify the particular circumstance which formed the occasion of his receiving the surname Paulos. The regulations of Roman Law about the bearing of names cannot

in this question be taken into consideration. If in Asia Minor or on the Nile any obscure individual felt that, in adopting a non-barbaric surname, he was simply adapting himself to the times, it is unlikely that the authorities would trouble themselves about the matter. The choice of such Graeco-Roman second names was usually determined by the innocent freedom of popular taste. But we can sometimes see that such names as were more or less similar in sound to the native name must have been specially preferred.¹⁰⁴⁹ In regard to Jewish names this is the case with, e.g., **■**■**■**κιμ—**■**■**■**λκιμος (Joseph. Antt. xii. 9 7), **■**■**■**ησο**■**■**■**ς**■**■**■**λεγ**■**■**■**μενος**■**■**■**ο**■**■**■**στος (Colossians 4:11), **■**■**■**ωσ**■**■**■**φ. . . **■**■**■**ς**■**■**■**πεκλ**■**■**■**θη**■**■**■**ο**■**■**■**στος (Act. 1:23);¹⁰⁵⁰ of Egyptian names, we have noticed **■**■**■**Σαταβο**■**■**■**ς**■**■**■**κα**■**■**■**Σ**■**■**■**τυρος (Pap. Berol. 7080, Col. 2, Fayyum, 2nd cent. A.D.).¹⁰⁵¹ Thus, too, in the case of the Tarsian **■**■**■**Σαο**■**■**■**λ,¹⁰⁵² when he received a non-Semitic second name (we do not know the exact time, but it must have been before Acts 13:9) the choice of **■**■**■**Πα**■**■**■**λος may have been determined by nothing more than the fact that **■**■**■**Πα**■**■**■**λος had a sound somewhat similar to the name made venerable by association with his fellow-tribesman of old.¹⁰⁵³ So far as we know, there has hitherto been no evidence to show that the name **■**■**■**Πα**■**■**■**λος was adopted by any other Jew; it is therefore of interest that the recently-published Papyrus fragments relating to the Jewish war of Trajan¹⁰⁵⁴ several times mention an Alexandrian Jew called **■**■**■**Πα**■**■**■**λος,¹⁰⁵⁵ who seems to have been the leader of a deputation which negotiated with the emperor. The question why the narrator calls the Apostle **■**■**■**Σα**■**■**■**λος previous to Acts 13:9, and **■**■**■**Πα**■**■**■**λος afterwards, has nothing to do with the science of names, or with the history of Paul; it is altogether a question of literary history. The most satisfactory solution so far (unless we are willing to go back to a difference in the sources) is the supposition¹⁰⁵⁶ that the historian uses the one or the other name according to the field of his hero's labours; from Acts 13:1 the Jewish disciple **■**■**■**Σα**■**■**■**λος is an apostle to the whole world: it is high time, then, that he should be presented to the Greeks under a name about which there was nothing barbaric, and which, even before this, was really his own.

■■**■**Σα**■**■**■**λος**■**■**■**κα**■**■**■**Πα**■**■**■**λος only as such perhaps did many of his brethren of the same race understand him; from his own confessions we know that he was rather a **■**■**■**Πα**■**■**■**λος**■**■**■**κα**■**■**■**Σα**■**■**■**λος—a man who laboured for the future and for humanity, though as a son of Benjamin and a contemporary of the Caesars. Christians in later times would often have fain called him Saul only; but on this account it is the name Paul alone which in history is graven above the narrow gate at which Augustine and Luther entered in.¹⁰⁵⁷

06 - GREEK TRANSCRIPTIONS OF THE TETRAGRAMMATON.

VI.

GREEK TRANSCRIPTIONS OF THE TETRAGRAMMATON.

καϕοβηθσοντατ θνητνομσουκριε. IN a notice of Professor W. Dindorf's edition of Clement, Professor P. de Lagarde¹⁰⁵⁸ reproaches the editor, in reference to the passage Strom. v. 6 34 (Dindorf, p. 27 25), with having "no idea whatever of the deep significance of his author's words, or of the great attention which he must pay to them in this very passage". Dindorf reads there the form αο as τετραγραμμοννοματμυστικν. But in various manuscripts and in the Turin Catena to the Pentateuch¹⁰⁵⁹ we find the variants οα or ο. ¹⁰⁶⁰Lagarde holds that the latter reading "might have been unhesitatingly set in the text; in theological books nowadays nothing is a matter of course". The reading αου certainly appears to be the original; the ε was subsequently left out because, naturally enough, the name designated as the Tetragrammaton must have no more than four letters. ¹⁰⁶¹The form αου is one of the most important Greek transcriptions of the Tetragrammaton usually referred to in seeking to ascertain the original pronunciation. F. Dietrich in a letter of February, 1866, ¹⁰⁶²to Franz Delitzsch, makes the following collection of these transcriptions:—

■■■■■■■■

■■■■■

■■■■

Cent. 2. Irenaeus —

—

Ιαοθ (?)¹⁰⁶⁴

—

" 2-3. Clement

(Ιαουε)¹⁰⁶³

Ιαου

—

" 3. Origen —

—

Ιαω (ΙαωΙα)

Ια-IAH

” 4. Jerome

—

Jaho

—

” — Epiphanius

Iαβε

—

Iα

” 5. Theodoret

(Sam.)

Iαβε

Iαω

A■α (cod. Aug.

Iα)

” 7. Isidore

—

—

Ja. Ja.

It is an important fact that nearly all the transcriptions which have thus come down from the Christian Fathers are likewise substantiated by “heathen” sources. In the recently-discovered Egyptian Magic Papyri there is a whole series of passages which—even if in part they are not to be conceived of as transcriptions of the Tetragrammaton—merit our attention in this connection. As early as 1876 W. W. Graf Baudissin,¹⁰⁶⁵ in his investigation of the form ■■■ω, had referred to passages relating to it in the Magic Papyri in Leiden¹⁰⁶⁶ and Berlin.¹⁰⁶⁷ Since that time the edition of the Leiden Papyri by C. Leemans,¹⁰⁶⁸ and that of the Paris and London Papyri by C. Wessely,¹⁰⁶⁹ the new edition of the Leiden Papyri by A. Dieterich,¹⁰⁷⁰ the latest publications of the British Museum,¹⁰⁷¹ and other works, have rendered still more possible the knowledge of this strange literature, and an investigation of these would be worth the trouble, both for the historian of Christianity¹⁰⁷² and for the Semitic philologist.¹⁰⁷³ The Papyri in their extant form were written about the end of the third and beginning of the fourth century A.D.; their composition may be dated some hundred years before—in the time of Tertullian.¹⁰⁷⁴ But there would be no risk of error in supposing that many elements in this literature belong to a still earlier period. It is even probable, in view of the obstinate persistence of the forms of popular belief and superstition, that, e.g., the books of the Jewish exorcists at Ephesus, which, according to Acts 19:19, were committed to the flames in consequence of the appearance of the Apostle Paul, had essentially the same contents

as the Magic Papyri from Egypt which we now possess.¹⁰⁷⁵ In the formulae of incantation and adjuration found in this literature an important part is played by the Divine names. Every possible and impossible designation of deities, Greek, Egyptian and Semitic, is found in profuse variety, just as, in general, this whole class of literature is characterised by a peculiar syncretism of Greek, Egyptian and Semitic ideas. But what interests us at present are the forms which can in any way be considered to be transcriptions of the Tetragrammaton. For the forms which are handed down by the Fathers, in part still questioned, are all verified by the Papyri, with the sole possible exception of Clement's *laove*.

Ιαω. To the examples given by Baudissin there is to be added such a large number from the Papyri since deciphered, that a detailed enumeration is unnecessary.¹⁰⁷⁶ The palindromic form ιαωαι¹⁰⁷⁷ is also frequently found, and, still more frequently, forms that seem to the author to be combinations of it, such as αρβαθιαω.¹⁰⁷⁸ The divine name Ιαω became so familiar that it even underwent declension: εμθεζθενπαντωνιαων σαβαωθαδωναια[βραξ]ας (Pap. Lugd. J 384, iii. 1).¹⁰⁷⁹

Ια.

Likewise not infrequent. Without claiming exhaustiveness we cite the following:—

πτζνγκηςτεταγμνοζιακουβιαιαωσαβαωθ αδωναι [α]βρασαξ (Pap. Lond. cxxi. 648, 640),¹⁰⁸⁰ with which compare the gem-inscription ιαιιαωαδωναισαβαωθ,¹⁰⁸¹ the combinations ιαηλ (Pap. Lond. xlvi. 56 6 Pap. Paris. Bibl. nat. 961 and 30331082), and ιαωλ (Pap. Paris. Louvre 2391 151),¹⁰⁸³ as also a whole mass of other combinations.

Ιαωια.¹⁰⁸⁴

(read) πτομετπουαωα (Pap. Paris. Bibl. nat. 3257).¹⁰⁸⁵ Ιαη occurs more frequently; in particular, in the significant passage:—

ρκζωσεκαττοθεοτνβραιωνησουιαβαιαηαβραωθαααθωθελεελωαηωε ουιιβαεχαβαρμαςαβαραουαβελεβελλωνααβραμαροιαβρακιων (Pap. Paris. Bibl. nat. 3019;¹⁰⁸⁶ again, in the same Papyrus, 1222 ff.¹⁰⁸⁷ κριε ιαωαιηιωηιωηιωηιαωαιαιουωαηωηαιεωηωαηιαωααα αηηιωαεσυιαηει. One might surmise that the form ιαη in the latter passage should be assigned to the other meaningless permutations of the vowels.¹⁰⁸⁸ But against this is to be set the fact that the form is authenticated as a Divine name by Origen, that in this passage it stands at the end of the series (the ει of the Papyrus should likely be accented ε), and thus seems to correspond to the well-known form ιαω at the beginning. Nevertheless, too great stress should not be laid upon the occurrence, in similar vowel-series, of purely vocalic transcriptions of the Tetragrammaton.

Further, in the same Papyrus, 1564¹⁰⁸⁹ and 1986¹⁰⁹⁰; also in Pap. Lond. xlvi. 23.¹⁰⁹¹ This form is also found in W. Frohner's¹⁰⁹² issue of the bronze tablet in the Museum at Avignon: the last two lines should not be read κασσυνργειβρασξιληα, as Frohner reads them, but κασσυνργειαβρασαξιαη¹⁰⁹³ιαω. The reverse combination ιαωιαη is found in a leaden tablet from Carthage, CIL. viii. Suppl. i., No. 12509. We may, finally, at least refer to the passage τιδισλλαβοζεαη (Pap. Paris. Bibl. nat. 944).¹⁰⁹⁴ According to Dieterich,¹⁰⁹⁵ αη is "simply a mystical Divine name," and "it is possible that it should be read αω". We consider this alteration

quite unnecessary. Either αη is an indistinct reminiscence of our ιαη, or else we must definitely conclude that the ι of ιαη coining after et has fallen out by hemigraphy.1096 Α■α.

Theodoret's form Α■α, for which the Augsburg Codex and the ed. print. of Picus read Ια,1097 is found not only in the above-cited passage, Pap. Par. Bibl. nat. 3019 ff., but also in Pap. Lugd. J 395, xvii. 31,1098 as—a fact of special interest—the correction of the αιρα which originally stood in the MS.

Jaoth. The Latin codices of Ireneus yield the form Jaoth.1099 Ireneus distinguishes one pronunciation with a long, and another with a short, o (ii. 35 3, Massuet: Jawth, extensa cum aspiratione novissima syllaba, mensuram praefinitam manifestat; cum autem per o graecam corripitur ut puta Jaoth, eum qui dat fugam malorum significat). F. Dietrich has erroneously questioned this form.1100 The following should be added to the citations given by Baudissin:— Pap. Lond. xlvi. 142 (ιαωτ),1101 " " xlvi. 479 (ιαωθ),1102 Pap. Par. Bibl. nat. 3263 (ιαωθ),1103 Pap. Lugd. J 395, xxi. 14 (αβρατιαωθ),1104 Pap. Lond. xlvi. 56 (αβραθιαωθ),1105 Pap. Berol. 2 125 (αμβριθιαωθ).1106 With reference to the agglutination of a T-sound to ιαω, cf. the literature cited by Baudissin.1107 The Papyri yield a large number of examples of similar forms in -ωθ. Similar forms with Greek terminations (e.g., Φαρα■θης), in Josephus and others.1108 Ιαουε.

Regarding Clement's form Ιαουε, the author calls attention to the following passages:—

θε■ςθε■ν,■κ■ριοςτ■νπνευμ■των1109■πλ■νητοσα■ν
ιαουηι,ε■σ■κουσ■νμουτ■ςφων■ς■πικαλο■μα■σετ■νδυν■στηντ■νθε■ν, ■ψιβρεμ■ταZe■,
Ze■τ■ραννε,αδαιναϊςικ■ριειαουηε■γ■ε■μ■πικαλο■μεν■ςσεσυριστ■θε■ν
μ■γανζααλαηριφουκα■σ■μ■παρακο■ς■ςτ■ςφων■ς■βρα■στ■
αβλαναθαναλβααβρασιλωα■γ■γ■ρε■μισιλθαχουοχλαιλαμ βαασαλωθιαωιεωνεβουθσαβιοθα
ρβωθαρβαθιαωιαωθσαβωθπατουρηζαγουρηβαρουχαδωναιελωαιαβρααμβαρβαρωνουσιφ
■ψηλ■φρονε . . . (Pap. Lond. xlvi. 466-482).1110

■κουσ■τωμοιςιςπ■σαγλ■σσακα■π■σαφων■,■τι■γ■ ε■μιπερταω [μηχχαχ]
μνηχακμηφιαωουεηωηωηωιουση ηιαηα [corrupt] ιηουοει1111. . . (Pap. Lugd. J 384, vi.
12-14).1112

σ■ε■γαθοδα■μων■γενν■ν■γαθ■κα■τροφ■ντ■ν
ο■κουμ■νην,σο■δ■τ■νναουκομαστ■ριον,■ν■καθ■δρυτα■ σουτ■πταγρ■μματον■νομαπ
ρ■ςτ■ν■ρμον■αντ■νζ'φθ■γαφαφιαβρααρμαραφααβρααχπερταωμηχακμηχιαωουεη
ιαουεειουαηωηουιαω. . . (Pap. Lugd. J 395, xvii. 25-32).1113

■τιπροσε■λημμαιτ■νδ■ναμιντο■βρα■μ■σ■κκα■το■
■ακ■βκα■το■μεγ■λουθεο■δα■μονοζιαωαβλαναθαναλβα
σιαβραθιλαωλαμψητηριτω.θε■,πο■ησον,κ■ριε,περταωμηχ
χακμηχιαωουηειαωουηειουαηωηουιαω (Pap. Lugd., J 395, xviii., 21-26).1114

It might appear at first sight very natural to assume that these forms are related to Clement's Ιαουε. In consideration of the great freedom with which the Hebrew vowels were transcribed in Greek, it need not seem strange that the E-sound at the end of words is rendered by ηι, ηε and εη in the Papyri; in point of fact the strengthening or lengthening of the ε by the addition of η would give a more distinct rendering of the ■,- than the bare ε of Clement. The coming of ω before ου is

the only strange feature. Still, even this peculiarity might be explained by the preference for law, the most popular transcription, which it was desired should have a place also here. For these reasons Kenyon maintains that the form $\text{I}\alpha\omega\sigma\eta\epsilon$ is actually the Divine name, and, indeed, that it is an expansion of the form $\text{I}\alpha\omega$.¹¹¹⁵ Notwithstanding, we must not trust entirely to plausibility. We must first of all investigate whether the said forms do not belong to the manifold permutations of the seven vowels,¹¹¹⁶ which are all but universally considered to be capricious and meaningless, mocking every possible attempt at explanation, and which can therefore, now less than ever, yield a basis for etymological conjectures. An instructive collection of these permutations and combinations of the seven vowels for magical purposes is found in Wessely's treatise, *Ephesia Grammata*.¹¹¹⁷ That writer elsewhere¹¹¹⁸ passes judgment upon them as follows: "other [names] again appear to have no special meaning, for, just as magical formulae are formed from the seven vowels $\alpha\epsilon\eta\iota\omicron\upsilon\omega$ and their permutations and combinations . . . , so in all probability there were magic formulae formed from the consonants also, now Hebraising, now Egyptianising, now Graecising, and without any definite meaning". We are unable to decide whether this assertion concerning the consonantal formulae is correct. But certainly when the chaos of the vocalic formations is surveyed, the possibility of accounting for the great majority of the cases may be doubted.¹¹¹⁹ If, then, it were established that the forms cited above should also be assigned to this class, they could, of course, no longer be mentioned in the present discussion. We should otherwise repeat the mistake of old J. M. Gesner,¹¹²⁰ who believed that he had discovered the Divine name Jehovah in the vowel series $\text{IEH}\Omega\text{OYA}$. But in the present instance the matter is somewhat different, and the conjecture of Kenyon cannot be summarily rejected. To begin with, the form twooune or mammy , in the first passage quoted, does not stand among other vowel-series; on the contrary, it is enclosed on both sides by a number of indubitable Divine names. Further, the same form with insignificant modifications is found in various passages of various Papyri; from this we may conclude that it is at least no merely hap-hazard, accidental form. Finally, its similarity with Clement's $\text{I}\alpha\omicron\upsilon\epsilon$ is to be noted. At the same time, wider conclusions should not be drawn from these forms—none, in particular, as to the true pronunciation of the Tetragrammaton: for the fact that in three of the quoted passages the form in question is followed by vocalic combinations in part meaningless, constitutes an objection that is at all events possible. The value of the vocalic transcriptions of the Tetragrammaton for the determination of its true pronunciation appears to us, by reason of the diffuse and capricious usage of the vowels which we find throughout the Magic Literature, to be at most very small. The very great uncertainty of the traditional texts must also be urged as an objection to its being so employed. Nowhere could copyists' errors¹¹²¹ be more easily made, nowhere are errors in reading by editors more possible, than in these texts. Let any one but attempt to copy half a page of such magic formulae for himself: the eye will be continually losing its way because there is no fixed point amidst the confusion of meaningless vowels by which it can right itself.

$\text{I}\alpha\beta\epsilon$.

It is thus all the more valuable a fact that the important consonantal transcription of the Tetragram, $\text{I}\alpha\beta\epsilon$, given by Epiphanius and Theodoret, is attested likewise by the Magic Literature, both directly and indirectly. The author has found it four times in the collocation $\alpha\beta\epsilon\zeta\epsilon\beta\upsilon\theta$:—

■ $\xi\omicron\rho\kappa$ ■ $\zeta\omega$ ■ μ ■ $\varsigma\tau$ ■ $\gamma\iota\omicron\nu$ ■ $\nu\omicron\mu$ [α

case to merit our attention:—

ιαβοε, Pap. Lond. xlvi. 63; 1136 ιαβα 1137 is frequently found: ρκζωσεκαττοθεοτν
βραωνησοιαβαιαη. . . . αβαρμαςαβαραου.αβελβελ . . . (Pap. Par. Bibl. nat. 3019
ff.), 1138 πικαλομασετν μγαννοβραν βαθαβαθιατμωναλει ιαβα
θαβαωθ 1139 σαβαωθ αδωναιθεζμγαζορσενοφρη (Pap. Par. Bibl. nat. 1621
ff.), 1140 μςξορκζωκαττοαωκατοσαβαωθ κααδωναι. . βαλιαβα (Pap. Par. Bibl.
nat. 1484 ff.), 1141 ιαβαεδδιαω (a gem-inscription) 1142; ιαβαωθ 1143: ιαωθιαβαωθ (Pap. Par. Bibl.
nat. 3263), 1144 διτμγα νδοξοννομααβρααμμεινααεουβαωθβαιθωβεσια ιαβαωθ (Pap.
Lond. cxxi. 314 f.); 1145

ιαβας : σειαβας σειαπως (Pap. Lond. xlvi. 104). 1146 A. Dieterich 1147 thinks it superfluous
“to seek a βης or similar name” in this; it is but “mystical play-work set down at random”. But
the supposition that ιαβας and ιαπως are not mere capricious forms, but rather corrupt
Graecisings of Ιαβε, is supported by the context of the whole passage, which belongs to those that
are most strongly permeated by Jewish conceptions.

There may also be mentioned another series of forms, chiefly verbal combinations, in which this
transcription appears, in part at least, to be contained. We mention only the examples: ιαβω
(Geoponica, ed. Niclas, ii., 42 5); 1149 ιαβουνη (Pap. Lond. xlvi. 340); 1149 the names of angels
βαθιαβηλ and αβραθιαβρι (Pap. Lond. cxxi. 906 f.); 1150 further, ιαβουχ and ιαβωχ (Pap. Par.
Bibl. nat. 2204). 1151 Even putting aside the last-quoted series of forms, we consider it to have
nevertheless been made plain that Ιαβε must have enjoyed an extraordinary popularity in the
Magic Literature. Now this may appear strange if we remember the observation given by the
Fathers that it was the Samaritan pronunciation of the Tetragram: how did it get to Egypt and the
land of the Cumaean Sybil? The question, however, does not appear to the writer to be
unanswerable. We must not of course so conceive of the dissemination of the form as if it had
been consciously employed, in such various localities, as the true name of the Mighty God of the
Jews; the writer of the Cumaean tablet simply copied it along with other enigmatic and, of course,
unintelligible magic formula from one of the numerous books of Magic, all of which, very
probably—to judge from those still extant—point to Egypt as their native region. But Egypt was just
the country which, because of the ethnological conditions, was most ready to transfer Jewish
conceptions into its Magic. One may therefore not unjustifiably suppose that here especially the
Tetragrammaton was used by the magicians as a particularly efficacious Name in its correct
pronunciation, which was, of course, still known to the Jews, though they shrank from using it, up
to and into the Christian era. Thus we have been using the Ιαβε not necessarily for the purpose of
indicating the specifically Samaritan pronunciation as such, but rather as an evidence for the
correct pronunciation. But we consider it quite possible to account for the occurrence of Ιαβε in
Egyptian Papyri by “Samaritan” influence. Besides the Jews proper 1152 there were also
Samaritans in Egypt. “Ptolemy I. Lagi in his conquest of Palestine had taken with him many
prisoners-of-war not only from Judaea and Jerusalem but also ‘from Samaria and those who dwelt
in Mount Gerizim,’ and settled them in Egypt [Joseph. Antt. xii. 1]. In the time of Ptolemy VI.
Philometor, the Jews and Samaritans are reported to have taken their dispute concerning the true
centre of worship (Jerusalem or Gerizim) to the judgment-seat of the king [Joseph. Antt. xiii.
34].” 1153 Some Papyri of the Ptolemaic period confirm the relatively early residence of
Samaritans in Egypt. As early as the time of the second Ptolemy we find (Pap. Flind Petr. ii. iv.

11)1154 mention of a place Samaria in the Fayyûm, and two inhabitants of this Samaria, θεοφιλος and Πυθαγορας,1155 are named in Pap. Flind. Petr. xxviii.1156 Even more important, in this connection, than such general information, is a passage in the supposed letter of Hadrian to Servianus, in which it is said that the Samaritans in Egypt, together with the Jews and Christians dwelling in that country, are all Astrologers, Aruspices and Quacksalvers.1157 This is of course an exaggeration; but still the remark, even if the letter is spurious, is direct evidence of the fact that magic and its allied arts were common among the Egyptian Samaritans. We may also refer here to Acts viii.: Simon the magian was altogether successful among the Samaritans: "to him they all gave heed, from the least to the greatest, saying, This man is that power of God which is called Great".1158 As the Divine name played a great part in the adjurations, we may conclude that the Samaritan magicians used it too—naturally in the form familiar to them. From them it was transferred, along with other Palestinian matter, to the Magic Literature, and thus it is explained why we should find it in a remote region, scratched by some one unknown, full of superstitious dread, upon the lead of the minatory magical tablet.

07 - SPICILEGIUM

VII.

SPICILEGIUM ■νομ■τι■π■ληται

07.01 - THE CHRONOLOGICAL STATEMENT IN THE PROLOGUE TO JESUS SIRACH

1. THE CHRONOLOGICAL STATEMENT IN THE PROLOGUE TO JESUS SIRACH.

■νγ■ρτ■γδ■κα■τριακοστ■ ■τει■π■το■ ■υεργ■του
 βασιλ■ωςπαραγενηθε■ζε■ζΑ■γυπτονκα■συγχρον■σαζε■ρονο■ μικρ■ςπαιδε■ας■φ■μοιον: of
 this chronological statement of the grandson of the son of Sirach, which is of the highest
 importance not only as regards the date of the book itself, but also, on account of the other
 contents of the prologue, for the history of the Old Testament canon, various interpretations are
 given.¹¹⁵⁹ If it be “a matter of course” that the writer of the Prologue wishes to indicate, not the
 year of his own life, but the thirty-eighth year of King Euergetes,¹¹⁶⁰ no doubt can exist as to the
 year in which the writer came to Egypt; of the two Ptolemies who bore the surname of Euergetes,
 the reign of the second only, Ptolemy VII. Physcon, extended to thirty-eight years, and hence the
 date given in the Prologue would signify the year 132 B.C. But when we find a writer like L. Hug
 preferring the other interpretation,¹¹⁶¹ we cannot but feel that there must be a difficulty
 somewhere. The chief support of those who interpret the date as the year of the prologue-writer’s
 age, and, at the same time, the chief difficulty of the other interpretation, lie in the ■π■ which
 stands between the number and the name of the king. «La preposition ■π■paratit ici tout a fait
 superflue, puisque toujours le mot ■τουcest suivi d’un genitif direct. On ne dit
 jamais ■τουςπρ■του, δευτ■ρου . . . ■π■τιν■ς, en parlant d’un roi, mais bien ■τους . . .
 τιν■ςουτ■ςβασιλε■αςτιν■ς. Cette locution serait donc sans exemple:» the difficulty in question
 may be formulated in these words of Letronne,¹¹⁶² written in reference to a passage in the
 Inscription of Rosetta to be noticed presently. The difficulty, nevertheless, can be removed. But
 certainly not by simply referring, as does O. F. Fritzsche,¹¹⁶³ to the passages LXX Haggai 1:1,
 Haggai 2:1, Zechariah 1:7, Zechariah 7:1, 1Ma 13:42, 1Ma 14:27, to which may be added LXX
 Zechariah 1:1, for, all these passages being translations of Semitic originals, the ■π■, might be a
 mere imitation of ■■, and would thus yield nothing decisive for the idiom of the Prologue to Sirach,
 which was in Greek from the first. The following passages seem to the present writer to be of
 much greater force. In an Inscription from the Acropolis,¹¹⁶⁴ as old as the 3rd cent. B.C., we find
 in line 24f. the words ■ερε■ςγεν■μενος■ντ■π■Λυσι■δου■ρχοντος■νιαυτ■. Still more
 significant for the passage in Sirach are the following parallels of Egyptian origin. The Inscription of
 the Rosetta Stone (27th March, 196 B.C.), line 16,¹¹⁶⁵ runs thus: προσ■ταξεν [Ptolemy V.
 Epiphanes] δ■κα■περ■τ■ν■ερ■ων, ■πωςμηθ■νπλε■ονδιδ■σινε■ςτ■τελεστικ■ν
 ο■τ■σσοντο■ωςτο■πρ■του ■τους■π■το■πατρ■ςα■το■ [Ptolemy IV. Philopator]. Though
 Letronne, in view of the alleged want of precedent for this usage of ■π■¹¹⁶⁶ tries a different
 interpretation, he is yet forced to acknowledge that, if we translate the concluding words by until
 the first year [of the reign] of his father, the whole sentence is made to fit most appropriately into
 the context;¹¹⁶⁷ the priests, who are hardly inclined to speak of the merits of Epiphanes for
 nothing, would be again but manifesting their ability to do obeisance to him, and, at the same time,
 to extol the memory of his father. Had Letronne known the example from the Prologue to Sirach,

perhaps he would have decided for this way of taking π, which so admirably suits the context. The two passages mutually support one another. But the usage of π is further confirmed by other passages of Egyptian origin. In Pap. Par. 151168 (120 B.C.) two ἀγπτιαισυγγραφα are mentioned, which are dated as follows: μιζμνγεγονυας [τοIH' τουσπαχ]νπτοΦιλομτορος, the one of Pachon (Egyptian month) of the 18th year (of the reign) of Philometor; τραςδγεγονυαστοΛΕ'μεσορππτοατοβασιλωσ, the other of Mesore [Egyptian month] (of the year) 35 (of the reign) of the same king. Finally, Pap. Par. 51169 begins thus: βασιλευντωνΚλεοπτρασκαΠτολεμαουθενΦιλομητρωνΣωτρων τουσΔ'φ'ερωσ βασιλεωσΠτολεμαουθεοΦιλμτοροςΣωτροσλεξνδρου καθενΣωτρων, κτλ. If the interpretation advocated by Brunet against Brugsch, 1170 viz., under King Ptolemy . . . , the priest of Alexander [the Great] and of the gods be correct, then this passage also must be taken into consideration. The pleonastic π of the Prologue to Sirach is thus supported by several authorities of about the same date and place. Hence also, in the light of this result, the passages from the Greek Bible, cited above, acquire a new significance. The pleonastic girl found in these is not to be explained by that excessive scrupulosity of the translators which manifests itself elsewhere; in point of fact, their desire to translate literally was assisted by a peculiar idiom of their locality, and hence we have a translation which is at once literal and accurate.

07.02 - THE SUPPOSED EDICT OF PTOLEMY IV. PHILO-PATOR AGAINST THE EGYPTIAN JEWS.

2. THE SUPPOSED EDICT OF PTOLEMY IV. PHILO-PATOR AGAINST THE EGYPTIAN JEWS.

In c_3 11-">3Ma. 3:11 ff. is quoted a decree of Ptolemy IV. Philopator against the Egyptian Jews, according to which a reward is promised to every one who informs against a Jew. In our editions the Greek text of verse 28 runs thus:

μην■εινδ■τ■νβουλ■μενον■φ'■τ■νο■σ■αντο■μ■π■πτοντος ■π■τ■ν
ε■θυνανλ■ψεταιικα■κτο■βασιλικο■ργυρ■ουδραχμ■ς
δισχιλ■αζκα■τ■ς■λευθερ■αζτε■ξεταικα■στεφανωθ■σεται. Grimm1171 explains the

ungrammatical (construction-slos) accusative at the beginning of the verse as an anacoluthon,—as if the writer had in his mind some such construction as ε■στ■ν■λευθερ■αν■φαιρησ■μεθα. In that case we translate as follows: him, however, who is willing to inform against a Jew—he shall receive, in addition to the property of him upon whom the punishment falls, two thousand silver drachmae from the royal treasury, shall obtain his freedom, and shall be crowned with a garland. A most extraordinary proclamation,—extraordinary even for the third Book of Maccabees, which is by no means wanting in extraordinary things. “It cannot but seem strange that slaves only are invited to become informers, and that this fact is announced quite indirectly, and, what is more, only at the end of the statement.”¹¹⁷² But even this invitation, which, in the circumstances related in the book, is by no means impossible, does not appear so strange to the present writer as the proffered reward, which, in consideration of the great ease with which an information might be lodged against any individual Jew among so many,¹¹⁷³ is hardly less than horrifying: not so much, indeed, the monetary reward, as the declaration that the slave who acted as informer was to receive not only his freedom, but also the honour which was the special prerogative of distinguished men, viz., the being crowned with a garland. The passage thus awakes suspicion of its being corrupt, and, as a matter of fact, the Alexandrinus, as well as other manuscripts, omits τε■ξεταικα■, and reads thus: κα■το■ς■λευθερ■αζτεφανωθ■σεται. But nothing is really gained thereby, for this reading, as such, gives no sense—though, indeed, its very unintelligibility makes it probable that it represents the older, though already corrupt, form of the text, by which the received reading can be explained as being an attempt to make the statement more plausible.

Hence Grimm gives it the preference, and “cannot hesitate for a moment” to accept the emendation of Grotius, viz., κα■το■ς■λευθερ■οιςτεφανωθ■σεται, i.e., and he shall be crowned at the feast of the Eleutheria. The alteration is certainly not extensive, and the conjecture has at all events the advantage of explaining away the invitation to the slaves, which seems so offensive to its proposer. Nevertheless, O. F. Fritzsche¹¹⁷⁴ hesitates to accept it, and, as we think, not without good reason. We know nothing of any feast of the Eleutheria as a custom in Egypt under the Ptolemies, and it is extremely precarious to take refuge in a conjecture which, by introducing an entirely new historical consideration, would give the text such a very special meaning. The author believes that the following facts from Egyptian sources contribute something towards the elucidation of the verse. In the first place, for the supposed “construction-less” accusative

μην■εινδ■τ■νβουλ■μενον, reference might have been made to the similar, apparently absolute, infinitive at the end of the edict of Ptolemy II. Philadelphus which is given in the Epistle of Aristeeus (ed. M. Schmidt), p. 17 f., viz., τ■νδ■βουλ■μενονπροσαγγ■λλεινπερ■τ■ν■πειθησ■ντων ■π■το■φαν■ντος■ν■χουτ■νκυρ■αν■ζειν (p. 18 7f.); as a matter of fact, ■ζειν depends upon the technical διειλ■φμεν of the previous sentence. Similarly we might construe the μην■εινδ■τ■νβουλ■μενον with the διειλ■φμεν of verse 26. We cannot but perceive that there is on the whole a certain similarity between the official formulae of the two edicts, and it seems very natural to suppose that, even if both are spurious, yet in form they fully represent the official style of the Ptolemaic period. In fact, a comparison of this Maccabean passage with Pap. Par. 101175 (145 B.C.)—a warrant for the apprehension of two runaway slaves—raises the supposition to a certainty. The warrant first gives an exact description of each fugitive, and then sets forth a reward for their recapture, or for information concerning their whereabouts. When we place the two passages in parallel columns as below, we see at once the remarkable similarity between the formula employed in each ; be it noted that the Maccabean passage has been correctly punctuated.

3Macc. 3:28

Pap. Par. 10.

μην■εινδ■τ■νβου-

λ■μενον,■φ'■τ■νο■σ■αν

το■μ■π■πτοντος ■π■τ■νε■-

θυνανλ■ψεταιικα■κτο■

βασιλικο■ργυρ■ουδραχμ■ς

δισχιλ■ας [Codd. 19, 64, 93, Syr.: τρισχιλ■ας].

το■τον■ς■ν■ναγ■γ■

λ■ψεταιιχαλκο■τ■λαντα

δ■οτρισχιλ■ας (δραχμ■ς)μην■εινδ■τ■νβου-

λ■μενοντο■ςπαρ■το■στρα- τηγο■.

In reference to the absolute μην■εινδ■τ■νβουλ■μενον of the Papyrus, the French editor¹¹⁷⁶ remarks that the infinitive does duty for the imperative, as in similar formula generally. It would perhaps be more accurate, especially as the imperative infinitive is itself to be explained as a breviloquence, to make the infinitive depend upon a verb of command which the edict tacitly presupposes.¹¹⁷⁷ We must, in any case, reject the hypothesis of an anacoluthon in the Maccabean passage; it would destroy the impression given by the peculiarly official style of the edict. The words μην■ειν δ■τ■νβουλ■μενον are a complete sentence in themselves: he shall inform, who so desires. Hence the comparison instituted above is not without interest for the criticism of the third Book of Maccabees; while, conversely, it may be maintained that the Ptolemaic edicts in Jewish-Alexandrian literature, even if they were each and all spurious, and

were without value as sources for the facts, are yet of great historical importance, in so far, that is, 1178 as they faithfully represent the forms of official intercourse. What, then, shall we say of the “extraordinary” proclamation at the end of v. 28? There is no necessity whatever that we should connect the passage itself (according to the ordinary reading) with slaves; the present writer is surprised that Grimm did not perceive the much more obvious explanation, viz., that the invitation is really directed to the Jews. The edict threatened their freedom and their lives, as may not only be inferred from the circumstances of the case, but as is also confirmed by the expression of their feelings once the danger had been happily averted: they felt that they were σινεζ, λεθεροι, περχαρεζ. 1179 Hence when those who appeared as king’s evidence against their proscribed brethren were thereby promised the freedom which was otherwise in danger, the bargain was an exceedingly tempting one. It is, finally, quite unnecessary to speak of a crowning of the informer. Assuming that the reading of the Alexandrinus, κατζλευθεραζεστανωθσεται, is the older—though itself a corrupt—form of the text, the author would propose to make a trivial alteration, and read κατζλευθερστανωθσεται. 1180 The verb στεφανω has not infrequently the general meaning reward, 1181 and this is what it means here.

07.03 - THE “LARGE LETTERS” AND THE “MARKS OF JESUS” IN GAL. 6.

3. THE “LARGE LETTERS” AND THE “MARKS OF JESUS” IN GAL. 6.

Paul began his preaching of the gospel to the Galatians in most promising circumstances; they received the invalid traveller as a messenger of God, yea, as if it had been the Saviour himself who sank down upon their threshold under the burden of the cross. Whereas others might have turned from Paul with loathing, they came to him, aye, and would have given away their eyes if by so doing they could have helped him. And then with childlike piety they gazed upon the majestic Form which the stranger pictured to them. Ever afterwards they were his children; and like a father's, indeed, are the thoughts which, across land and sea, bind him to the far-off churches of Galatia. True, he knows that they had forsaken their native idols with the zeal of the newly-awakened, but he also knows that they had not followed up this advance by full realisation of the sacred fellowship in which the majesty of the living Christ ever anew assumes human form. The confession regarding his own life in Christ, which Paul, on the very eve of his martyrdom, made to his dearest friends, had been confirmed in his own mind by the painful yet joyful experience of his long apostolic labours among the churches; Not as though I had already attained! So then, as he left these infant churches in Asia Minor, his heart, full of love and gratitude, would yet have some foreboding of the dangers which their isolation might bring about; we cannot imagine that he was one to think, with the blind affection of a father, that the newly-awakened had no further need of tutors and governors. Nay, but rather that, as he prayed to the Father on their behalf, his remembrance of them would be all the more fervent. With their good-natured Gallic flightiness of disposition, these young Christians, left to themselves, succumbed to the wiles of their tempters. Paul was compelled to recognise that here too, the wicked enemy, who was always sowing tares among his wheat, did not labour in vain. In their simple-hearted ignorance the Galatians had allowed themselves to be bewitched by the word of the Law, and, in course of time, their idea of the man whom they had once honoured as their father in Christ became somewhat distorted in the light which streamed from national and theological animosity. How shall we figure to ourselves the feelings of the Apostle as the news of this reached his ears? If we would understand not only the words, but, so to speak, also the spirit, of the Letter to the Galatians, we must, above all, endeavour to bring home to our minds the movements of this marvellous human soul. The keen biting polemic of the missive gives us to know exactly how Paul judged of the legal particularism of his opponents; it was the salutary indignation of the reformer that guided his pen here. But we dare not assume that he meted out the same measure to the tempted as to their tempters. The bitter incisiveness with which he speaks of these churches does not proceed from the self-willed sullenness of the misinterpreted benefactor who is pleased to pose as a martyr: it is rather the lament of the father who, in the unfilial conduct of his son, sees but the evil which the wrong-doer brings upon himself. The harsh and formal speech of the first page or two of the letter is that of the *παιδάγωγος* *Χριστός*. But he speaks thus only incidentally; once he has risen above the warfare of embittering words to the praise of the faith in Christ which may again be

theirs, the warm feelings of the old intimacy will no longer be subdued, and the man who a moment before had feared that his labour among these foolish ones had been in vain, changes his tone and speaks as if he were addressing the Philippians or his friend Philemon. As in his other letters, so in this does Paul add to the words he had dictated to his amanuensis a postscript in his own handwriting. More attention ought to be paid to the concluding words of the letters generally; they are of the highest importance if we are ever to understand the Apostle. The conclusion of the Letter to the Galatians is certainly a very remarkable one. Once again, in short and clear antitheses, the Law and Christ are set over against each other; and, moreover, the fact that it is only his opponents whom he now treats severely, fully consorts with the mood of reconciliation with the church, to which, in course of writing, he had been brought. The letter does not close with complaints against the Galatians; and in view of the occasion of the letter, this must be taken as signifying very much the same as what can be observed in the conclusion of other letters called forth by opposition, viz., the express indication of the cordiality that subsisted between the writer and the readers. Paul has again attained to perfect peace—so far, at least, as concerns his Galatian brethren; and we are of opinion that in this placid frame of mind lies the explanation of the much-discussed words at the beginning of the autograph conclusion: See with how large letters I write unto you with mine own hand. The true mode of interpreting these words is to take them as a piece of amiable irony, from which the readers might clearly realise that it was no rigorous pedagogue that was addressing them. The amanuensis, whose swift pen was scarcely able to record the eloquent flow of Paul's dictation upon the coarse papyrus leaves, had a minute commonplace handwriting. Between his fluent hand and that of Paul there was a pronounced difference¹¹⁸²—not only in the Letter to the Galatians. Surely it is hardly quite accurate to say that Paul used large letters in the present isolated instance for the purpose of marking the importance of the words to follow. The large letters naturally suggest that the explanation rather lies in the formal and external matter of caligraphy, and the fact that Paul calls special attention to them can only be explained, as we think, on the theory indicated above. Large letters are calculated to make an impression on children; and it is as his own dear foolish children that he treats the Galatians, playfully trusting that surely the large letters will touch their hearts. When Paul condescended to speak in such a way, the Galatians knew that the last shadows of castigatory sternness had died from his countenance. The real sternness of the letter was by no means obliterated thereby; but the feeling of coolness that might have remained behind was now happily wiped away by Paul's thrice-welcome good-natured irony, and the readers were now all the more ready to receive the final message that still lay on his heart. The closing words present no difficulty in themselves. It is only the last sentence but one¹¹⁸³—one of the strangest utterances of Paul—which is somewhat enigmatical.

To λοιπο¹¹⁸⁴ κ¹¹⁸⁴τους ζυμοιμηδε¹¹⁸⁴ς παρεχ¹¹⁸⁴τω¹¹⁸⁴ γ¹¹⁸⁴ γ¹¹⁸⁴ ρτ¹¹⁸⁴ στ¹¹⁸⁴ γματα το¹¹⁸⁴ ησο¹¹⁸⁴ ντ¹¹⁸⁴ σ¹¹⁸⁴ ματ¹¹⁸⁴ μου βαστ¹¹⁸⁴ ζω, henceforth let no man trouble me, for I bear in my body (R.V. branded on my body) the marks of Jesus. Two questions arise here: first, what does Paul mean by the marks of Jesus? and, secondly, to what extent does he base the warning, that no one shall trouble him, upon his bearing of these marks? “στ¹¹⁸⁴ γματα . . . are signs, usually letters of the alphabet (Leviticus 19:28), which were made upon the body (especially on the forehead and the hands) by branding or puncturing,—on slaves as a symbol of their masters, on soldiers as a symbol of their leaders, on criminals as a symbol of their crime, and also, among some oriental peoples, as a symbol of the deity they served (3Ma. 2:29, . . .).”¹¹⁸⁵ Hence an ancient reader would know perfectly well what these stigmata were, but the very variety of their possible

application renders less evident the special reference in the case before us. In any case, it seems to us quite evident that Paul is speaking metaphorically; is alluding, in fact, to the scars of the wounds he had received in his apostolic labours,¹¹⁸⁶ and not to actual, artificially-produced $\sigma\tau\gamma\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$. Sieffert¹¹⁸⁷ decides in favour of the hypothesis that Paul's intention was to describe himself as the slave of Christ; but in that case, how can the $\gamma\mu\rho$ possibly be explained? We feel, in fact, that the $\gamma\mu\rho$ is of itself sufficient to invalidate the hypothesis. Had Paul said the exact contrary; had he said, for instance, Henceforth go on troubling me as you will,¹¹⁸⁸—then the $\gamma\mu\rho$ would have admirably fitted the context; that is, Paul might have gone on to say, with proud resignation, I am accustomed to that, for I am naught but a despised slave of Jesus Christ. No one will seriously contend that Paul wished to compare himself with a branded criminal; and the reference to the tattooing of soldiers would seem equally far-fetched. The $\gamma\mu\rho$ sneaks against the latter explanation quite as forcibly as against the hypothesis of slave-marks; for the miles christianus does not quench the fiery darts of the Evil One by striking a treaty, but by going forth to active warfare, armed with the shield of faith. The explanation of Wetstein¹¹⁸⁹ still seems to us to be the best; according to this, Paul means sacred signs, in virtue of which he is declared to be one consecrated to Christ, one therefore whom no Christian dare molest. But Wetstein, too, fails adequately to show the causal relation between the two clauses, and as little does he justify the unquestionably strange periphrasis here used to express metaphorically the idea of belonging to Christ.¹¹⁹⁰ Provisionally accepting, however, this theory of the $\sigma\tau\gamma\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$, we might represent the causal relation somewhat as follows: Anyone who bears the marks of Jesus is His disciple, and, as such, is under His protection; hence anyone who offends against Paul lays himself open to the punishment of a stronger Power. We should thus be led to look upon the $\sigma\tau\gamma\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$ as sacred protective-marks, and to interpret our passage in connection with certain lines of thought to which B. Stade has recently called attention.¹¹⁹¹ Already in the Old Testament, according to him, we find not a few indications of such protective-marks. He explains the mark of Cain as such, but, even apart from this, reference may be made to Isaiah 44:5¹¹⁹² and Ezekiel 9:1-11; ¹¹⁹³ in the latter passage we read that, before the angels bring ruin upon Jerusalem and destroy its inhabitants, one of them sets a mark upon the forehead of all those who mourn for the abominations practised in the city; these are spared by the destroying angels.¹¹⁹⁴ In Leviticus 19:27 f., ¹¹⁹⁵ Leviticus 21:5 f. Deuteronomy 14:1 f., there is likewise implied an acquaintance with sacred signs by which the bearer indicates that he belongs to a certain deity: were the Israelites to permit of the sign of another god among them, they would thereby rupture their special relation to Jahweh as being His people. Circumcision, too, may be looked upon as a mark of Jahweh.¹¹⁹⁶ The following passages, belonging to a later time, may be mentioned:¹¹⁹⁷ Psa. Sol. 15:8 $\tau\iota\tau\sigma\eta\mu\epsilon\omicron\nu\tau\omicron\theta\epsilon\omicron\pi\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\epsilon\zeta\sigma\omega\tau\eta\rho\alpha\nu$, cf. v. 10, where it is said of the $\rho\omicron\iota\omicron\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma\iota\nu\omicron\mu\alpha\nu$ that they have $\tau\sigma\eta\mu\epsilon\omicron\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma\pi\omega\lambda\epsilon\alpha\varsigma\pi\omicron\tau\omicron\mu\epsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\alpha\tau\omicron\nu$; according to 3Ma. 2:29 the Alexandrian Jews were compelled by Ptolemy IV. Philopator to have branded upon them an ivy leaf, the sign of Dionysos, the king himself being similarly marked;¹¹⁹⁸ Philo, de Monarchia (M.), p. 220 f., reproaches the Jewish apostates for allowing themselves to be branded with the signs of idols made with hands ($\nu\iota\omicron\iota\delta\tau\omicron\sigma\alpha\tau\kappa\chi\rho\eta\nu\tau\alpha\iota\mu\alpha\nu\alpha\varsigma\pi\epsilon\rho\beta\omicron\lambda$, $\sigma\tau'$. . . $\epsilon\nu\tau\alpha\iota\pi\rho\varsigma\delta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\epsilon\alpha\nu\tau\omicron\nu\chi\epsilon\iota\rho\kappa\mu\tau\omega\nu\gamma\rho\mu\mu\alpha\sigma\iota\nu\alpha\tau\omicron\nu\mu\omicron\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$. . . $\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma\sigma\mu\alpha\sigma\iota\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\sigma\tau\zeta\omicron\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma\alpha\tau\omicron\nu\sigma\iota\delta\rho\mu\pi\epsilon\pi\upsilon\rho\omega\mu\epsilon\nu\pi\rho\varsigma\nu\epsilon\zeta\lambda\epsilon\iota\pi\tau\omicron\nu\delta\gamma\mu\rho\chi\rho\mu\tau\alpha\tau\alpha\mu\alpha\upsilon\rho\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\iota$); and similarly the worshippers of the beast in Revelation bear the name or the number of the beast as a $\chi\rho\rho\alpha\gamma\mu\alpha$ on the forehead or on the right hand,¹¹⁹⁹ while

the faithful are marked with the name of the Lamb and of the living God.¹²⁰⁰ Finally—a fact which is specially instructive in regard to the significance of protective-marks in Greek Judaism—the Thephillin, prayer-fillets, were regarded as protective-marks, and were designated φυλακτ[■]ρια, the technical term for amulets. These various data are sufficient, in our opinion, to justify us in supposing that the Apostle might quite easily characterise his scars metaphorically as protective-marks.¹²⁰¹ In confirmation of this supposition we feel that we must draw attention to a certain Papyrus passage, which seems to grow in significance the longer we contemplate it, and which, moreover, may even merit the attention of those who cannot at once accept the conclusions here drawn from it, as we think, with some degree of justification. It is found in the bilingual (Demotic and Greek) Papyrus J. 383 (Papyrus Anastasy 65) of the Leiden Museum. C. J. C. Reuvens¹²⁰² was the first to call attention to it, assigning it to the first half of the 3rd cent. A.D.¹²⁰³ Then it was published in fac-simile¹²⁰⁴ and discussed¹²⁰⁵ by C. Leemans, the director of the museum, who has lately again¹²⁰⁶ indicated his agreement with Reuvens' date. H. Brugsch¹²⁰⁷ has expressly emphasised the great importance of the Papyrus for the study of the Demotic, and has made most exhaustive use of it in his Demotic Grammar.¹²⁰⁸ He follows Reu-vens and Leemans in describing it as Gnostic—a term that may either mean much or little. The passage in question has been recently discussed more or less elaborately by E. Revillout,¹²⁰⁹ G. Maspero¹²¹⁰ and C. Wessely.¹²¹¹ It is found in the Demotic text of this "Gnostic" Papyrus,¹²¹² which belongs to that literature of magic which has been handed down to us in extensive fragments, and recently brought to light. To judge from the fac-similes, its decipherment is quite easy—so far, at least, as it affects us here. First of all, the text, as we read it, is given, the various readings of Reuvens (Rs), Leemans (L), Brugsch (B), Maspero (M), Revillout (Rt) and Wessely (W) being also indicated. It is introduced by a sentence in the Demotic which Revillout translates as follows: "Pour parvenir a e'tre aime de quelqu'un qui lutte contre toi et ne veut pas to parler (dire):" In the original the spell occupies three and a half lines. A rent runs down the Papyrus column, nearly in the middle; the number of the missing letters is indicated in the transcript by dots, the ends of the original lines by |.

ΜΗΜΕΔΙΩΚΕΟΔΕΑΝΟΧ

ΠΑΠΠΕΤ. . ΜΕΤΟΥΒΑΝΕΣ

ΒΑΣΤΑΖΩΤΗΝΤΑΦΗΝ

ΤΟΥΟΣΙΡΕΩΣΚΑΙΥΠΙΑΓΩ

5 ΚΑΤΑ . . ΗΣΑΙΑΥΤΗΝΕΣ

ΑΒΙΔΟΣ|ΚΑΤΑΣΤΗΣΑΙΕΙΣ

ΤΑΣΤΑΣΚΑΙΚΑΤΑΘΕΣΘΑΙ

ΕΙΣ. . . ΧΑΣΕΑΝΜΟΙΟΔ

ΚΟΠΟΥΣ|ΣΠΑΡΑΣΧΗΠΡΟΣ

ΡΕΥΩΑΥΤΗΝΑΥΤΩ|

2 παπιπε . . . : Rs. παπιπε . . . , L. παπιπετ., B. παπιπετ(ου), M. Papipetu, Rt. Παπιπιτου, W. παπιπετου| 4 οσιρεως: W. οσιροις [!] 5 κατα . . . ησαι: Rs. πατα(στη)σαι, L. κατα. . . ησαι, B. M. Rt. καταστησαι, W. κατα(στη)σαιες: Rs. B. M. Rt. εις, L. ε. ς | 7 ταστας: Rs. ταστας, B. τασταφας, W. ταστασις | 8 ... χας: Rs. (μ)αχας, L. αχας, M. αλχας, W. . . αχας | Δ: B. M. Rt. interpret as δεινα, W. δ(ε) ι(να)| 9 ρεψω: B. M. Rt. τρεψω, W. φερω | The editors differ from one another principally in their reproduction (or restoration) of the non-Greek words in the text. As these are irrelevant to our present purpose, we shall not further pursue the subject, feeling constrained to follow Maspero in reading thus:—

Μ■μεδ■ωκε■δε■ανοχ

παπιπετ[ου] μετουβανες■

βαστ■ζωτ■νταφ■ν

το■ ■σ■ρεωςκα■ ■π■γω

5 κατα[στ]■σαια■τ■νε(■) ς

■βιδος,καταστ■σαιε■ς

τασταςκα■καταθ■σθαι

ε■ς [αλ]χας■ ■νμοι■δε■να

κ■πουςπαρ■σχ■,προσ- 10 (τ)ρ■ψωα■τ■να■τ■. In the Papyrus a Demotic rendering of the incantation follows the Greek text,—not literal, indeed, but showing, few variations. This Demotic version is thus rendered by Revillout:1213 “Ne me persecute pas, une telle!—Je suis Papipetou Metoubanes, je porte le sepulcre d’ Osiris, je vais le transporter a Abydos; je le ferai reposer dans les Alkah. Si une telle me resiste aujourd’hui, je le renverserai.—Dire sept fois.” We perceive at once that we have here a formula of adjuration. The following notes will help towards an understanding of the Greek text. Line 1. The commentators take ανοχ to be the Coptic anok (cf. ■■■■■■■■) I am. In the Greek books of magic we very frequently find similar instances of the ■γ■ε■μι followed by the divine name, by which the adjurer identifies himself with the particular deity in order to invest his spell with special efficacy, and to strike the demon with terror. L. 2. We have not as yet discovered any satisfactory etymological explanation of the words παπιπετουμετουβανες ; Reuven and Leemans give nothing more than conjectures. It is sufficient for our purpose to remember that such foreign words play a very great part in adjurations. Even if they had originally any meaning at all, it is yet unlikely that those who used the formula ever knew it; the more mysterious the words of their spell sounded, the more efficacious did they deem it. L. 3. The editors translate τ■νταφ■ντο■■σ■ρεως as the coffin, or the mummy, of Osiris. ταφ■ in this sense is of frequent occurrence in the Papyri and elsewhere.1214 By this ταφ■το■■σ■ρεως we must understand a model of the coffin or of the mummy of Osiris used as an amulet. The efficacy of this amulet is explained by the Osiris myth.1215 The Osiris of Graeco-Roman times was the god of the dead. His corpse, dismembered by Typhon, was again put together with the greatest difficulty by Isis; and it was ever afterwards the most cherished task of Isis, Nephthys, Horus, Anubis and Hermes, deities friendly to Osiris, to guard his tomb, and to prevent the wicked Typhon from repeating his mutilation of the divine body. The magicians took advantage of this conflict among the gods in order to make sure of the assistance of those who were friendly to

Osiris. They strove to get possession of the sacred coffin; they carried it about with them—at least in effigie, as an amulet—and they threatened to demolish it if their desires were not fulfilled. Thus, according to Jamblichus,¹²¹⁶ the threats to destroy the heavens, to reveal the mysteries of Isis, to divulge the ineffable secret hidden in the depths, to stay the sacred sun-berge, to gratify Typhon by scattering the limbs of Osiris belong to the βιαστικα■πτειλα■, of the Egyptian magicians. The adjuration under notice is an efficacious minatory formula of this kind. It is directed to a demon, who is believed to be the cause of the difficulties which, it is hoped, will be eluded by its means;¹²¹⁷ the possession of the ταφ■το■σ■ρεως cannot but impress him, being a guarantee for the support of the most powerful deities, seeing that it was to their own best interests to be favourable to the possessor of the imperilled mummy. A quite similar menace, made by some “obscure gentleman,” is found in a recently-published tabula devotionis¹²¹⁸ from Adrumetum: if not, I shall go down to the holy places of Osiris, and break his corpse in pieces, and throw it into the river to be borne away.¹²¹⁹ L. 6. ■βιδος is the Egyptian Abydos. The town is of great importance in the history of Osiris. It was looked upon as the burial-place of the god, and its mysteries are spoken of by several ancient writers.¹²²⁰ The assertion of the bearer of the amulet, viz., that he is about to convey the mummy of Osiris to Abydos, seems to us to signify that he wishes, by means of an act which exercises a secret influence upon the friends of Osiris, to be all the more assured of their favour, and all the more dangerous to the demon. L. 7 and 8. ταστας and αλλαγς are the Greek transcriptions of two Egyptian words which are rendered by Maspero¹²²¹ as les retraites and les demeures eternelles respectively. They help us to obtain a clearer understanding of the preceding lines: the user of the spell, in thus reverently entombing the body which Typhon had abused, lays the most powerful deities under the highest obligation to himself. L. 8. ■δε■να is represented in the original by the abbreviation Δ, which is frequently used in the Papyri in the same way; when the formula prescribed in the book of magic was actually used against some troublesome person, this person’s name was substituted for the ■δε■να, just as the name of the demon who was the cause of the κ■ποι took the place of the ■δε in line 1. (U. von Wilamowitz-Moellen-dorff informs the author by letter that he reads ■δε(■να) also in line 1 (not ■δε), for which there is much to be said). L. 9. προσ(τ)ρ■ψω: the Papyrus distinctly shows προσρ■ψω, i.e., the future of προσρ■πω, to incline towards, intransitive: here it would be transitive, for which usage there is no authority.¹²²² Hence προστρ■ψω¹²²³ would seem the preferable reading. But the question is of no importance for the sense of the concluding sentence; in either case, the adjurer threatens to use his efficacious amulet against the troubler. The spell may accordingly be translated as follows:—

Persecute me not, thou there am PAPIPETOU METUBANES; I carry the corpse of Osiris and I go to convey it to Abydos, to convey it to its resting-place, and to place it in the everlasting chambers. Should any one trouble me, I shall use it against him.

Now, differ as we may as to the meaning of the individual details of this spell, and, in particular, as to the allusions to Egyptian mythology, it is, after all, only the essential meaning which concerns us here, and this meaning the author holds to be established: the βαστ■ζειν of a particular amulet associated with a god acts as a charm against the κ■πουςπαρ■χειν on the part of an adversary. Starting from this point, let us now seek to understand the enigmatical words of the Apostle. One can hardly resist the impression that the obscure metaphor all at once becomes more intelligible: Let no man venture κ■πουςπαρ■χειν for me, for in the βαστ■ζειν of the marks of Jesus I possess a

talisman against all such things. In this way the sense of the γρ, in particular, becomes perfectly clear. The words are not directed against the Judaisers, but to the Galatians, and, moreover, it seems probable that we must explain the threat by the same temper of mind¹²²⁴ to which we attributed the sportive phrase about the large letters. Just as the Apostle, with kindly menace, could ask the Corinthians, Shall I come unto you with the rod?¹²²⁵ so here, too, he smilingly holds up his finger and says to his naughty but well-beloved children: Do be sensible, do not imagine that you can hurt me—I am protected by a charm. We must confess that we do not feel that Paul, by this mixture of earnest and amiable jest, lays himself open to the charge of trifling. Only by a total misapprehension of the actual letter-like character of his writings as they have come down to us, could we expect that he should in the same severe manner of the doctor gentium, who, caught up into the third heaven, proclaims to mankind and to the ages what eye hath never seen. Paul is no bloodless and shadowy figure of a saint, but a man, a man of the olden time. One in whose letters utterance is found for the raptured glow of faith and for a sensitive and circumspect love, for bitter feelings of scorn and relentless irony—why should the winning kindness of the jest be deemed alien to him? He wishes to bring back the Galatians to the true way, but perhaps feels that he, in treating as τλαιοι those who are but νπιοι, has overshot the mark. So he withdraws, though as regards the manner rather than the matter of his charges; and who that has ever loved the Apostle could find fault? Paul has taken care, in this passage, that his words shall have no hackneyed ring; he does not use general terms about the purposelessness of the attacks made on him, but intimates that what preserves him are the protective-marks of Jesus. Jesus guards him; Jesus restrains the troublers; Jesus will say to them: τατκπουσπαρχετε; καλνργονργσατονμο. We cannot, of course, go so far as to maintain that Paul makes conscious allusion to the incantation of the Papyrus; but it is not improbable that it, or one similar to it, was known to him, even were it not the case that he composed the Letter to the Galatians in the city of magicians and sorcerers. The Papyrus dates from the time of Tertullian; the incantation itself may be much older.¹²²⁶ The same Papyrus furnishes us with another incantation,¹²²⁷ manifestly pervaded by Jewish ideas,—another proof of the supposition that the Apostle may have been acquainted with such forms of expression. Moreover, we learn even from Christian sources that Paul on more than one occasion came into contact with magicians,¹²²⁸ while he himself warns the Galatians against φαρμακεα,¹²²⁹ and reproaches them for having suffered themselves to be bewitched:¹²³⁰ all these things but serve as evidence for the fact that the sphere, from which, haply, some light has been thrown upon the obscure phrase about the marks of Jesus, was in no wise outwith the circle of ideas in which the writer moved.¹²³¹ Be it at least conceded that our contention should not be met by aesthetic or religious objections. We would not maintain, of course, that the figure used by Paul can be fitted into the formulas of dogmatic Christology; but in its context it forms a perfectly definite and forcible metaphor. And as for the possible religious objection, that Paul was not the man to apply terms originating in the darkest “heathenism” to facts distinctively Christian, it is a fair counter-plea to ask whether it is an unchristian mode of speech, at the present day, to use the verb charm (feien) in a similar connection, or to extol the Cross as one’s Talisman. In the same manner does Paul speak of the wounds which he had received in his apostolic work—and which in 2 Corinthians 4:10 he escribes as the νκρωσις τοησο—as the marks of Jesus, which protected him as by a charm.

07.04 - A NOTE TO THE LITERARY HISTORY OF SECOND PETER.

4. A NOTE TO THE LITERARY HISTORY OF SECOND PETER.

Graven upon the stones of a locality where we should not expect it, we find a piece of evidence which, in any treatment of the Second Epistle of Peter, deserves the highest consideration. The beginning of this early Christian booklet has many points in common with a decree of the inhabitants of Stratonicea in Caria in honour of Zeus Panhemerios and of Hekate, which, dating from the early imperial period, has been preserved in an Inscription. This Inscription has already, in our investigation of the word **πρετ**, been laid under contribution,¹²³² and it will once again engage our attention.¹²³³ We begin here by giving the two texts in parallel columns, duly marking the cognate elements in each; be it observed that it is not only the unquestion-able similarities in expression and meaning which are thus emphasised, but also certain—for the present let us call them mechanical—assonances between the two texts, the calling of attention to which will be justified as we proceed. in order to understand the Inscription, which, omitting the introductory formula, we give in the original orthography, let it be borne in mind that the infinitive **σεσθαι** depends upon an antecedent **επιπντος**.

Decree of Stratonicea.[En.Tr.]

2 Peter 1:3ff.

. . . τινπλιννωθενττν
 προεσττωνατςμεγτων
 θεν [προνοΔιςΠ]ανημε-
 [ροουκακ]τηςκπολλν
 καμεγλωνκασυνεχνκιν-
 δνωνσεσθαι,νκατ
 ερσσυλακακταικα
 ερσνκλητοςδγματισε-
 [βαστοΚασαροςπ] τςτν
 κυρωνωμωνωνουρ-
 χςποισαντοπροφανεςν-
 αργεαςκαλςδ χιπσαν
 σπουδνσφρεσθαιςτν
 πρς [ατοςεσβ]ειανκα

μηδ' ἄνακα ἰρὴν παρὰ λιπὸν τοῦ
ἐσβεβένκα λιτανεῖνα -
τοῦς καθ' ἑδρυταῖδ' ἄγ' ἄλματα
ἴντ' ἑβαστ' βουλευτηρῶν
τ' ἴν προειρημ' ἴν ὠ[νθεῖν] πι-
φάν] ἐστ' ἄσπαρ' ἄχοντα τῶς
θεῖας δυν' μεως' ρετ' ἄς, δι' ἄς
κατ' ἴσ' ἴν πανπλ' ἄθος θ' εἶτε
καπ' ἴθυμι κα' ε' ἄχεται κα'
ἐχ' ἀριστε' [ε' το' σ] ἄδετο ἄς
ὁ τῶς π' ἴφανε στ' τοῖς θεοῖς
κ' κτ' ἄς δι' ἴμν' ἄδ' ἄς προσ' ἄδου
τοῦς [ε' ἄθισται] ἄδ' ἄξετ' βουλ'
κτλ.

ἄς τ' π' ἴν τα' ἴμ' ἴν τ' ἄς
θεῖας δυν' μεως' ἄ το' τ' πρ' ἄς
ζῶ ἴν κα' ε' σ' βειαν δ' ἐδωρη-
μ' ἴν ἄς δι' τ' ἄς π' ἴν γ' ἄσεως το'
καλ' ἄσαντος ἴμ' ἄς ἄδ' ἄδ' ἄξ' κα'
ἄρετ' δι' ἴν τ' τ' ἴμ' ἴμ' ἴν κα'
μ' ἄγιστα ἄπαγγ' ἄλματα δ' ἐδ'-
ρηται, ἴνα δι' το' τῶν γ' ἴν ἄθη
θεῖας κοινῶν ἄφ' ἄσεως ἄπο-
φυγ' ἴν τε στ' ἄς ἴν τ' κ' σ' ἴμ' ἴν
ἄπιθυμ' ἄφθορ' ἄς, κα' ἄα τ'
το' το' δ' ἄσπουδ' ἴν π' ἄσαν παρ-
εἰσεν ἄγκαντες ἄπιχορηγ' ἄσατε
ἴν τ' π' ἄστει ἴμ' ἴν τ' ἴν ἄρετ' ἴν
ἴν δ' τ' ἄρετ' τ' ἴν γ' ἄσιν ἴν

δ■τ■γν■σειτ■ν■γκρ■τειαν
 ■νδ■τ■γκρατε■τ■ν■πο-
 μον■ν■νδ■τ■πομον■τ■ν
 ε■σ■βειαν■νδ■τ■ε■σε-
 βε■τ■νφιλαδελφ■αν■νδ■
 τ■φιλαδελφ■τ■ν■γ■πην.
 . . . (2 Peter 1:11): ο■τωζγ■ρ
 πλουσ■ως■πιχορηγηθ■σεται
 ■μ■ν■ε■σοδοξε■ζτ■να■νιον
 βασιλε■αντο■κυρ■ου■μ■νκα■
 σωτ■ρος■ησο■Χριστο■.

Let us allow these parallels to speak for themselves, wholly ignoring the feelings of unpleasantness or, it may be, of wonder which they may wake in the breasts of some. The most important feature is manifestly this: that both texts contain the expression ■θε■αδ■ναμις,1234 and in the same case to boot. Now this is no trite expression; its occurrence in the Inscription could not be ignored, even if there were no further point of similarity with the Epistle. But the fact that this solemn periphrasis of the term God is in both passages connected with the word ■ρετ■, and further, that it occurs in an altogether peculiar and unfamiliar sense, lends a peculiar intrinsic importance to the external similarity. Suppose for a moment that the τ■ζθε■αζδυν■μεως■ρετ■ς of the decree occurred somewhere in the LXX; there would not, in that case, be the shadow of a doubt that the Epistle had quoted it—dismembered, it might be—or at all events had alluded to it. Nor can this analogy be set aside by the objection that the use, by the author of the Epistle, of an out-of-the-way Inscription, in a manner corresponding to that of biblical quotation, is inconceivable—for we have as yet said nothing as to our idea of the relation between the two texts; the objection, in any case, would be a pure petitio principlei But further: it is an especially significant, though apparently trivial, circumstance, that in both texts a relative sentence beginning with δι■, follows the ■ρετ■ς (or ■ρετ■); if on other grounds it seems probable that the Inscription and the Epistle are so related that either presupposes a knowledge of the other, then we should have here the recurrence of a phenomenon often observed in parallel or internally-dependent texts, viz., that consciously or unconsciously the dependent text has been so framed, by means of a slight alteration,1235 as to obliterate the traces of its origin. We are of opinion that the parallels already indicated are sufficiently evident. Should further instances be made out, these will naturally gain a much stronger evidential value from their connection with what has been already pointed out. There is nothing remarkable in the mere fact that the Inscription contains this or that word which occurs in the Epistle. But what is significant, is that the same definite number of what are, in part, very characteristic expressions, is found in each of the two texts; and it is this which renders improbable the hypothesis of mere accident. Little value as we would place upon individual cases of similarity, yet in their totality these strike us as very forcible. Hence the

connection also brings out the full importance of the parallels βασιλεῖα τοῦ κυρίου and τῶν κυρίων ἀσπίδος, an importance which appears still more decided, when we compare these parallels with, e.g., those (by no means so striking) given by H. von Soden¹²³⁶ in connection with the Epistle ad loc., viz., Hebrews 12:28 βασιλεῖα σάλευτος, and 2 Timothy 4:18 βασιλεῖα πορευτός. In both of these passages the only real parallel is the word βασιλεῖα; but it was surely unnecessary to seek references for that.¹²³⁷ The outstanding feature of the phrase in the Epistle is the term ἀσπίς, applied to kingdom;¹²³⁸ hence, even if the Inscription joins this term with what is only a synonym of βασιλεῖα, the force of our parallel is in no way lessened. Observe, moreover, κυρίων || κυρίου. Then, again, the likeness of πᾶσαν σουδὲν ἐσφραθεῖν in the Inscription to σουδὲν πᾶσαν παρῆεν γκάντες in the Epistle, cannot fail to strike the eye. Even at some risk of repetition, we cannot help remarking that this expression would not of itself prove anything, for it is common in later Greek. It is only by a false method of procedure that M. Krenkel¹²³⁹ reckons it among the assonances which are thought to prove an alleged indebtedness to Josephus on the part of the author of the Second Epistle of Peter. But in the present case the phrase, connected as it is with the other parallels, has a force at least equivalent to that ascribed to the shorter σουδὲν πᾶσαν¹²⁴⁰ in connection with our Epistle's numerous unquestionable plagiarisms from the Epistle of Jude.¹²⁴¹ The same will hold good, with more or less force, of the ἐσβεία. The statistics of the word in the biblical writings—if we may, for once, isolate the concept “biblical Greek”—are very remarkable. Relatively seldom,¹²⁴² on the whole, as it occurs there, it is yet quite frequently found in the Pastoral Epistles and the Second Epistle of Peter; while the Acts of the Apostles also uses ἐσβεία, ἐσβεβέν, and ἐσβεβέν.¹²⁴³ Now these words occur frequently in the Inscriptions of Asia Minor: they appear to have been familiar terms in the religious language of the imperial period. The more external resemblances between the two texts have also been indicated; for, if the hypothesis of relationship be valid, they cannot but prove to be of interest. In connection with this very Epistle of Peter it has been demonstrated that the writer of it not seldom depends upon his assiduously-used model, the Epistle of Jude, in quite an external way. “Some peculiar expression, the purpose of which is made plain only by the context in Jude, is retained, or an expression is fabricated from reminiscences of the purely local connection in that book. In 2 Peter 2:13, the leading word συνευωχόμενοι is taken from Jude 1:12, and yet its concrete relationship to the love-feasts has been allowed to fall out, so that it is only the sound of the words which influences the choice of the essentially different expressions (πᾶταις¹²⁴⁴ instead of γᾶταις, σπᾶλοι instead of σπιλάδες).”¹²⁴⁵ Now, precisely as in regard to the formal assonances in the very instructive example just given, viz.: —

Jude 1:12

2 Peter 2:13

οὐκ ἐσίνοντα ἄσπίδα-

παίς μὲν σπιλάδες, συνευωχόμενοι φθῶς

σπᾶλοι¹²⁴⁶ καμμοί ντρο-

φῶτες ἄσπίδα πᾶταις-

τῶν συνευωχόμενοι μὲν

so might we perhaps judge of the instance **■γ■λματα ■παγγ■λματα** in the Decree and the Epistle respectively—although the author would advance the point with all due reserve. Shall we count it more probable that the *επιθυμια* of the one text has exercised an outward influence on the syntactically and lexically different *επιθυμια* of the other? Once more, the use of the superlative **μ■γιστος** in both passages cannot be ignored,—though, at first sight, such a statement may seem strange; but its cogency will be more readily perceived when it is remembered that the superlative of **μ■γας** occurs nowhere else in “the” New Testament.¹²⁴⁷ Is it possible to hold that the similarities in the two texts are merely accidental? We have again and again pondered this question, but have always come to the conclusion that it must be answered in the negative. Doubtless, the deciding of such questions always implies a certain inner susceptibility, and is thus subjective. But here, as we judge, there are objective grounds to proceed upon. We would endeavour, therefore, to define more precisely the very general impression made by the two texts, by saying that they must be inter-related in some way. Now the Decree of Stratonicea is undoubtedly older than the Second Epistle of Peter. From its contents, we might infer its date to be previous to 22 A.D.; from its form, somewhat later. But even if the Inscription were of later date than the Epistle, it would be an improbable hypothesis that the former was in its contents dependent upon the latter. The dependence must rather be, if the relationship is granted, on the side of the Epistle. Hence the general statement made above may be specialised thus far: the beginning of the Second Epistle of Peter must be in some way dependent upon forms of expression occurring in the Decree of Stratonicea. We speak of the forms of expression of the Decree. For it is not urgently necessary to assert a dependence upon the Decree itself. Of course, it is certainly possible that the writer of the Epistle may have read the Inscription. Assuredly Paul is not the only Christian of the century of the New Testament who read “heathen” inscriptions, and reflected thereon. The inscriptions, official and private, found in the streets and market-places, in temples and upon tombs, would be the only reading of the great majority of people who could read. Of what we call classical literature, the greater number would hardly ever read anything at all. The heads of the Christian brotherhoods who were versed in literature were influenced, in respect of their range both of words and thoughts, by their sacred books, but manifestly also by the forms of expression common in their locality. The present writer would count the expressions before us, found in the Inscription of Stratonicea, as belonging to the solemn forms of the official liturgical language of Asia Minor. From the nature of the case it seems certain that they were not used for the first time in this Decree in honour of Zeus Panhemerios and Hekate. Conceivable though it be that the author of the Second Epistle of Peter had adopted them directly from the Carian Inscription,¹²⁴⁸ yet we would confine ourselves to the more cautious conjecture that the author of the Epistle, like the author of the Decree before him, simply availed himself of the familiar forms and formulm of religious emotion.¹²⁴⁹ The mosaic-like character of the writer’s work, specially evident in his relation to the Epistle of Jude, is illustrated once more by the facts just adduced. Should our conjecture hold good—particularly, of course, if a direct dependence upon the Decree of Stratonicea could be made probable—we should have a new factor for the solution of the problem as to the origin of the Epistle. Certainly the hypothesis of an Egyptian origin, which has gained great favour in recent years, is not confirmed by the local colouring, which belongs to Asia Minor; we would, however, refrain meanwhile from categorically asserting that it originated in Asia Minor,¹²⁵⁰ as we have not yet mastered the lexical relations of the Epistle. It would at least be necessary to inquire how far its peculiar vocabulary has points of contact with that of literary

sources (of the imperial period) from Egypt,¹²⁵¹ or Asia Minor,¹²⁵² including those of the Papyri and the Inscriptions.

07.05 - WHITE ROBES AND PALMS.

5. WHITE ROBES AND PALMS.

“After these things I saw, and behold, a great multitude, which no man could number, out of every nation, and of all tribes and peoples and tongues, standing before the throne and before the Lamb, arrayed in white robes, and palms in their hands; and they cry with a great voice, saying, Salvation unto our God which sitteth on the throne, and unto the Lamb.” So does the early Christian seer depict those who have been made perfect, who have come out of the great tribulation, and now serve God day and night in His temple. Few Bible passages have taken such hold of the everyday Christian consciousness, few have been inscribed so hopefully on the impassive tombstone, as these chaste verses from the mysterious final pages of the Holy Book. So deeply have they entered into the sphere of religious ideas, that, generally speaking, we are not struck by the thought, how eloquent of ancient days is the colouring of the artist who created the picture. The inner beauty of the thought keeps in abeyance any impression which its form might suggest; the captivated spirit even of the modern man readily and unconstrainedly accepts the unaccustomed scenery, which yet has its proper place only under the eternal blue of the eastern sky, or in the serene halls of an ancient temple. The pious Christian of the times of decadence did not depict things to come in the forms of the pitiful present; he saw them rather in the crystal mirror of the authoritative past. The exegetes of Revelation 7:9 ff. have striven, in widely divergent ways, to explain the peculiar colouring of this celestial scenery. How does it come about that the adornment of the blessed choir of the saints before the throne of God should be portrayed exactly as it is? The explanation of the individual elements provides no difficulty.¹²⁵³ The white robes, of course, according to the bold symbolism of the text itself, are connected with the cleansing power of the blood of the Lamb (Revelation 7:14); and, even without this special reference, they have already a distinct and well-known sense (see Revelation 6:11). Again, the expression palms in their hands is familiar to the reader of the Bible as a sign of festive joy. Attempts have been made to supply a more definite background for this latter feature, now from Jewish, now from Hellenic, ideas. On the one hand, the palms have been looked upon as suggesting a comparison of the heavenly glory with the Feast of Tabernacles; on the other, they have been taken as an allusion to the palm-twigs bestowed upon the victor in the Greek games. We would not deny that such explanations, so far as concerns the details of a picture which is not after all so difficult to grasp, are quite adequate. But they do not elucidate the scene in its entirety. How did the writer come to bring together precisely these two features? And how comes it that both are assigned to the choir of the blessed, which, in alternate song with the angels, raises a hallelujah to the Most High? If we knew of no historical circumstance which might suggest an answer to these questions, we might naturally enough infer that the writer of the Apocalypse had himself composed his picture from diverse elements. But we are of opinion that there are good grounds for the supposition that the portrayer of the $\pi\alpha\nu\gamma\upsilon\rho\iota\varsigma\ \pi\omicron\upsilon\rho\ \nu\omicron\iota\varsigma$ had availed himself of the scenery of a religious ceremony with which he was familiar. In the Inscription of Stratonicea in Caria (already mentioned several times), belonging to the beginning of the imperial period,¹²⁵⁴ the inhabitants of the city, out of gratitude to

Zeus Panhimerios and Hekate, resolve that, in honour of these deities, thirty boys of noble parentage, under the leadership of the παιδων■μος and the παιδοφ■λακες, shall daily sing a prescribed hymnus in the bouleuterion—clothed in white and crowned with a twig, likewise holding a twig in their hands. This custom would hardly be inaugurated by the piety of the people of Stratonicea; such choirs of sacred singers, similarly accoutred, were, without doubt, also to be seen elsewhere in the Greek districts of Asia Minor. Here, then, in all probability, we have the model by which the writer of the Apocalypse was consciously or unconsciously guided; and those belonging to Asia Minor who read his book—a book full of the local colour of that region—would grasp his imagery with special facility. What they beheld in heaven was something that had, by association with their native soil, become familiar and dear to them—a choir of pious singers in festive attire; and if they had an ear to hear what the Spirit said to the churches, they could also, of course, surmise that in this instance what came from holy lips was a new song. THE END.

08 - Footnotes

Footnotes

1 Cf. the programme (of the superintendent) Dr. Carl Wilhelm Robert: . . . announces that the Literary Association . . . shall be duly opened . . . on the 27th inst. . . . [Marburg] Miller's Erben and Weldige, 1772, p. 13. That the superintendent had still an eye for the requirements of practical life is shown by his remarks elsewhere. For example, on page 7 f., he good-naturedly asserts that he has carried out "in the most conscientious manner" the order that "the bursars shall be supplied with sufficient well-prepared food and wholesome and unadulterated beer". The programme affords a fine glimpse into the academic life of the Marburg of a past time.

2 Additional note, 1899: Professor Dr. Johannes Weiss of Marburg has announced a course upon the Greek Psalter for the Summer Session, 1899; the author lectured on the Language of the Greek Bible in Heidelberg in the Winter Session of 1897-98.

3 It appears sufficiently naïve that Tatian (Or. ad Graec., p. 1 15 f Schwartz) and Clement of Alexandria (Strom. i. 16, p. 364, Potter) should say, following the historian Hellanikos, that the Persian queen Atossa (6th-5th cent. B.C.) was the discoverer of letter-writing. For it is in this sense that we should understand the expression that occurs in both, viz., πιστολζσυντσσειν, and not as collecting letters together and publishing them, which R. Bentley (Dr. Rich. Bentley's Dissertation on the Epistles of Phalaris, London, 1699, p. 535 f., German edition by W. Ribbeck, Leipzig, 1857, p. 532) considers to be also possible; cf. M. Kremmer, De catalogis heurematum, Leipzig, 1890, p. 15.

4 [Pseudo-] Diogenes, ep. 3 (Epistolographi Graeci, rec. R. Hercher, Parisiis, 1873, p. 235).—Demetr., de elocut., 223 f. (Hercher, p. 13).—[Pseudo-] Proclus, de forma epistolari (Hercher, p. 6).

5 Cf. Th. Birt, Das antike Buchwesen in seinem Verhältniss zur Litteratur, Berlin, 1882, top of p. 2.—It is most singular that Pliny (Hist. Nat., xiii. 13), and, after him, Bentley (p. 538 f.; German edition by Ribbeck, p. 532 f.), deny that the letters on wax-tablets mentioned by Homer are letters.

6 Demetr., de elocut., 231 (Hercher, p. 14).

7 Cic., Fam. 15,214, aliter enim scribimus quod eos solos quibus mittimus, aliter quod multos lecturos putamus. Cic., Phil. 2, 7, quam multa iota solent esse in epistulis quae prolata si sint inepta videantur! quam multa seria neque tamen ullo modo divulganda!—Johann Kepler wrote a letter to Reimarus Ursus, of which the latter then made a great parade in a manner painful to Kepler and Tycho Brahe. Having got a warning by this, Kepler determined that for the future: "scribam caute, retinebo exemplaria". (Joannis Kepleri astronomi opera omnia, ed. Ch. Frisch, i. [Frankfurt and Erlangen, 1858], p. 234; of. C. Anschutz, Ungedruckte wissenschaftliche Correspondent zwischen Johann Kepler and Herwart von Hohenburg, 1599, Prague, 1886, p. 91 f.—The Palatinate physician-in-ordinary Helisaus Roslinus († 1616) says about one of his letters

which had been printed without his knowledge: "I wrote it the day immediately following that on which I first beheld with astonishment the new star—on the evening of Tuesday, the 2/12 October; I communicated the same at once in haste to a good friend in Strassburg. . . . This letter (6 paginarum) was subsequently printed without my knowledge or desire, which in itself did not concern me—only had I known beforehand, I should have arranged it somewhat better and expressed myself more distinctly than I did while engaged in the writing of it" (Joannis Kepleri opp. omn. i., p. 666). Moltke to his wife, 3rd July, 1864: "I have in the above given you a portrayal of the seizure of Alsen, which embodies no official report, but simply the observations of an eyewitness, which always add freshness to description. If you think it would be of interest to others as well, I have no objection to copies being taken of it in which certain personal matters will be left out, and myself not mentioned: Auer will put the matter right for you " (Gesammelte Schriften, tend Denkwürdigkeiten des General-Feldmarschalls Grafen Helmuth von Moltke, vi. [Berlin, 1892], p. 408 f.). One notices, however, in this "letter," that it was written under the impression that copies of it might be made. Compare also the similar sentiment (in the matter of diary-notes, which are essentially akin to letters) of K. von Hase, of the year 1877: "It may be that my knowledge that these soliloquies will soon fall into other hands detracts from their naturalness. Still they will be the hands of kind and cherished persons, and so may the thought of it be but a quickly passing shadow!" (Annalen meines Lebens, Leipzig, 1891, p. 271).

8 Demetr., de elocut., 227 (Hereher, p. 13). Greg. Naz., ad Nicobulum (Hercher, p. 16).

9 Birt, Buchwesen, p. 2: " Similarly the point of separation between a private writing and a literary work was the moment when [in antiquity] an author delivered his manuscript to his own slaves or to those of a contractor in order that copies of it might be produced".

10 A. Stahr, Aristotelia, i., Halle, 1830, p. 192 f.

11 Wellhausen, Israelitische and Judische Geschichte, p. 58: "Already in early times writing was practised, but in documents and contracts only ; also letters when the contents of the message were not for the light of day or when, for other reasons, they required to be kept secret". Hebrew literature blossomed forth only later.

12 In the following pages the literary letter [Litteraturbrief] will continue to be so named: the author considers that the borrowed word appropriately expresses the technical sense.

13 F. Susemihl, Geschichte der griechischen Litteratur in der Alexandrinerzeit, ii., Leipzig, 1892, p. 579: "It may well be that the first impulse to this branch of authorship was given by the early collecting together, in the individual schools of philosophy, such as the Epicurean, of the genuine correspondence of their founders and oldest members".

14 Cf. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Aristoteles and Athen, ii., Berlin, 1893, p. 392: "He [Isocrates] did not understand that the letter, as a confidential and spontaneous utterance, is well written only when it is written for reading, not hearing, when it is distinguished from the set oration *κατεδός*". This judgment applies also to real, genuine letters by Isocrates.

15 Von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Antigonos von Karystos (Philologischz Untersuchungen, iv.), Berlin, 1881, p. 151, says, "Such letters as are actually written with a view to publication are essentially different in character from private correspondence".

16 Briefe, dots Studium der Theologie betreffend, Third Part, Frankfurt and Leipzig, 1790, Preface to the first edition, pp. i.-iii.

17 The origin of spurious collections of letters among the Greeks is traced back to “the exercises in style of the Athenian schools of rhetoric in the earlier and earliest Hellenistic period,” Susemihl, ii., pp. 448, 579. If some callow rhetorician succeeded in performing an exercise of this kind specially well, he might feel tempted to publish it. But it is not impossible that actual forgeries were committed for purposes of gain by trading with the great libraries, cf. Susemihl, ii., pp. 449 f. ; Bentley, p. 9 f., in Ribbeck’s German edition, p. 81 ff. ; A. M. Zumpt, *De Alexandri Olympiadisqueepistularum fontibus et reliquiis*, Berlin, 1894, p. 1.—As late as 1551, Joachim Camerarius ventured on the harmless jest of fabricating, “ad institutionem puerilem,” a correspondence in Greek between Paul and the Presbytery of Ephesus (Th. Zahn, *Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanons*, ii., 2, Erlangen and Leipzig, 1892, p. 365).

18 Cf. the confession made by U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Aristoteles und Athen*, i., Berlin, 1893, Preface, p. vi. : “The task of authorship demands an end attained—in irreconcilable antithesis to the investigations of science. The Phaedrus has taught us that the book in general is a pitiful thing as compared with living investigation, and it is to be hoped that we are wiser in our classrooms than in our books. But Plato, too, wrote books; he spoke forth freely each time what he knew as well as he knew it, assured that he would contradict himself, and hopeful that he would correct himself, next time he wrote.”

19 The term pseudonymous of itself certainly implies blame, but it has become so much worn in the using, that it is also applied in quite an innocent sense.

20 Cf. on this point specially Julicher, *Einleitung in das N.T.*, p. 32 ff.

21 The discussion which occupies the remainder of this paragraph is one which may, indeed, be translated, but can hardly be transferred, into English. It turns partly on the ambiguity of the German word *echt*, and partly on a distinction corresponding to that which English critics have tried to establish between the words “genuine” and “authentic”—a long-vexed question which now practice rather than theory is beginning to settle. *Echt* means authentic, as applied, for instance, to a book written by the author whose name it bears; it also means genuine both as applied to a true record of experience, whether facts or feelings, and as implying the truth (that is the naturalness, spontaneity or reality) of the experience itself. The translator felt that, in justice to the author, he must render *echt* throughout the passage in question by a single word, and has therefore chosen *genuine*, as representing, more adequately than any other, the somewhat wide connotation of the German adjective.—Tr.

22 The history of the literature of “letters” among the Italian Humanists is, from the point of view of method, specially instructive. Stahr, *Aristotelia*, ii., p. 187 f., has already drawn attention to it. The best information on the subject is to be found in G. Voigt’s *Die Wiederbelebung des classischen Alterthums oder das erste Jahrhundert des Humanismus*, ii.3, Berlin, 1893, pp. 417-436.

23 Von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Antigonos von Karystos*, p. 151: “I cannot imagine that fictitious correspondence, as a species of literature, was anterior in time to genuine”.

24 J. Karabacek, *Mittheilungen*, aus der Sammlung der Papyrus Erzherzog Rainer, i., Vienna, 1887, p. 51; cf. J. Krall, *Guide-book of the Exhibition [of the Pap. Erz. Rainer]*, Vienna, 1894, p. 32.—The author doubts whether the term literature should really be applied to the letters in cuneiform character which were published by Fried. Delitzsch (*Beitrage zur Assyriologie*, 1893 and 1894) under the title of “Babylonisch-Assyrische Brief litteratur”.

25 Meyer, *xiv.5* (1888), p. 187.

26 Cf. for instance the letter of K. Ninck to his congregation at Frucht, of the 1st September, 1870—from Corny ; partly printed in F. Cuntz’s *KarlWilh. Theodor Ninck, Ein Lebensbild*. 2nd edn., Herborn, 1891, p. 94 ff.

27 This difference does not, of course, hold in modern English; we can hardly imagine a letter-writer employing the singular forms thou, thee, But the distinction does not necessarily hold in German either.—Tr.

28E. Reuss, *Die Geschichte der h. Schriften* N.T.6 § 74, p. 70, uses the expression true letters, addressed to definite and particular readers. Von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Aristoteles und Athen*, p. 393; p. 394: real letters ; *ibid.*, p. 392, letters, **■πιστολα■** in the full sense of the word. The same author in *Ein Weihgeschenk des Eratosthenes*, in *Nachrichten der Kgl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Gottingen*, 1894, p. 5: true private letter.—Birt also uses—besides the designations private writing (*Buchwesen*, pp. 2, 20, 61, 277, 443) and incidental letter (pp. 61, 325)—the expression true correspondence (*wirkliche Correspondenzen*, p. 326). Similarly A. Westermann, *De epistolarum scriptoribus graecis* 8 progr., i., Leipzig, 1851, p. 13, calls them “*veras epistolas, h. e. tales, quae ab auctoribus ad ipsos, quibus inscribuntur, homines revera datae sunt*”.

29 Von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Ein Weihgeschenk des Eratosthenes*. p. 3.

30 Among philologists one hears often enough the complaint about the neglect of the study of ancient “letters”. The classical preparatory labour of Bentley has waited long in vain for the successor of which both it and its subject were worthy. It is only recently that there appears to have sprung up a more general interest in the matter.

31The *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, edited . . . by Bernard P. Grenfell and Arthur S. Hunt, Part I., London, 1898; Part II., London, 1899. For those who feel themselves more specially interested in the subject, a comparison with the original Greek texts will, of course, be necessary.

32 The German edition of this work contains a Greek transcription, with annotations, of ten Papyrus letters (distinct from those given here) from Egypt, of dates varying from 255 B.C. to the 2nd-3rd centuries A.D.

33The *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, No. 291, ii., p. 291. Chaireas was strategus of the Oxyrhynchite nome. Tyrannos was **διοικητ■ς**.

34The *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, No. 292, ii., p. 292.

35The *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, No. 293, ii., p. 293.

36The *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, No. 295, ii., p. 296.

37The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, No. 297, ii., p. 298.

38The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, No. 300, ii., p. 301.

39 Theon is probably the husband of Thaeisus.

40The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, No. 115, i., p. 181.

41πντεσομο. Grenfell and Hunt: all my friends.

42The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, No. 113, i., p. 178 f.

43 Von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Antigonos von Karystos, p. 151.

44 Stahr, Aristotelia, p. 195.

45 Von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Antigonos von Karystos, p. 151; Susemihl, ii., 580.

46 Hercher, pp. 172-174.

47 Susemihl, ii., 580 f.

48 Hercher, pp. 319-336.

49 Von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Aristoteles und Athen, ii., pp. 391-399. It is unfortunate that some of the most recent critics of Paul's Letters had not those few pages before them. They might then have seen, perhaps, both what a letter is, and what method is.

50 P. 391 f.

51 P. 392.

52 P. 397.

53 P. 399.

54 P. 395.

55 Pp. 393-397.

56 Susemihl, i., p. 96 f.; H. Usener, Epicurea, Leipzig, 1887, p. liv.

57 From Usener's edition, p. 154.

58 Of course, official letters, too, are primarily "true letters," not literature, even when they are addressed to a number of persons.—(This note and the two following do not belong to the quotation from Teuffel-Schwabe.) 59 Hence in themselves they are manifestly not literature.

60 The insertion of letters in historical works was a very common literary custom among the Greeks and Romans. It is to be classed along with the insertion of public papers and longer or shorter speeches in a historical report. If it holds good that such speeches are, speaking generally, to be regarded as the compositions of the historian, yet, in regard to letters and public papers, the hypothesis of their authenticity should not be always summarily rejected. In regard to this question, important as it also is for the criticism of the biblical writings, see especially H. Schnorr von Carolsfeld, *Über die Reden und Briefe bei Sallust*, Leipzig, 1888, p. 1 ff., and the literature given in

Scharer, i., p. 66, note 14 [Eng. Trans. i., i., p. 90]; also Teuffel-Schwabe, 1., p. 84, pos. 3, and Westermann, i. (1851), p. 4.

61 W. S. Teuffel's *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*, revised by L. Schwabe i., Leipzig, 1890, p. 83.

62 Teuffel-Schwabe, p. 356 ff.

63 This point is also a very valuable one for the critic of the biblical "letters" in the matter of method. For an estimation of the historical importance of Cicero's letters, the author refers, further, to J. Bernays, *Edward Gibbon's Geschichtswerk in the Gesammelte Abhh. von J. B.*, edited by H. Usener, ii., Berlin, 1885, p. 243, and E. Ruete, *Die Correspondenz Ciceros in den Jahren 44 and 43*, Marburg, 1883, p. 1.

64 The present writer would question this.

65 Teuffel-Schwabe, i., p. 356 f.

66 Teuffel-Schwabe, i., p. 357.

67 Teuffel-Schwabe, p. 357, quotes in connection with this Cic. ad Attic., 16, 55 (44 B.C.) *mearum epistularum nulla est συναγωγή*, sed habet Tiro instar LXX, et quidem sent a te quaedam sumendae; eas ego oportet perspiciam, corrigam; tum denique edentur,—and to Tiro, Fam., 16, 171 (46 B.c.) *tuas quoque epistulas vis referri in volumina*.

68 Teuffel-Schwabe, p. 357.

69 Teuffel-Schwabe, p. 357.

70 Teuffel-Schwabe, p. 357.

71 Teuffel-Schwabe, p. 358.

72 Teuffel-Schwabe, p. 83.

73 Teuffel-Schwabe, i., p. 362.

74 Teuffel-Schwabe, i., p. 364. This is another point highly important in regard to method,—for the criticism of the Pauline Letters in particular.

75 ii., p. 600.

76 Von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Aristoteles und Athen*, ii., p. 393.

77 Westermann, i. (1851), p. 13. See Susemihl, ii., p. 601, for many other examples in Greek literature.

78 Demetr. de elocut., 22S (Hercher, p. 13), and 231 (H., p. 14).

79 A saying of the Rhetor Aristides (2nd cent. B.C.) shows how well an ancient epistolographer was able to estimate the literary character of his compositions. In his works we find an *πλεξινδρπιτφιος* dedicated *τβουλκατδμΚοτυαων*, of which he himself says (i., p. 148, Dindorf), *περγεκαβρχτςπιστολζεποντιβολεσθεκαλεντβιβλον*.

Hence Westermann, iii. (1852), p. 4, applies to this and to another “ letter “ of Aristides the name declamations epistolarum sub specie latentes.

80 Teuffel-Schwabe, i., pp. 84, 197 f.

81 Teuffel-Schwabe ii., p. 700.

82 Teuffel-Schwabe, ii., pp. 849, 851 ff.

83 Teuffel-Schwabe, ii., p. 852.

84 Teuffel-Schwabe, ii., p. 849.

85 Teuffel-Schwabe, ii., p. 852.

86 Teuffel-Schwabe, ii., p. 852.

87 Teuffel-Schwabe, ii., p. 852.

88 Teuffel-Schwabe, i., p. 39 f.

89 Teuffel-Schwabe, p. 84.

90 Teuffel-Schwabe, p. 85.

91 Susemihl, ii., p. 601.

92 A. Dieterich, Abraxas, p. 161 f. Particular references will be found there and specially in Fleck. Jbb. Suppl. xvi. (1888), p. 757. ■

93 Cf. pp. 15 [↑] and 20 [↑] above.

94 J. F. Marcks, Symbola critica ad Epistolographos Graecos, Bonn, 1883.

95 Cf. on this Westermann, (1851), p. 9 f. For Greek theorists in letter-writing, see Hercher, pp. 1-16; for the Latin, the Rhetores Latini, minores, em., C. Halm, fasc. ii., Leipzig, 1863, pp. 447 f. and 589.

96 [Pseudo-]Procl. De Forma Epistolari (Hercher, p. 6 f.). This quotation, it is true, refers not to the various logical divisions of the concept “letter,” but to the 41 [!] various sub-classes of true letters. The process of distinguishing these various classes ([Pseudo-]Demetr. [Hercher, p. 1 ff.] similarly enumerates 21 categories) is, in its details, sometimes very extraordinary.

97 Cf. p. 63 ff. [↑]

98 The author has already briefly expressed these ideas about the history of biblical religion in the essay Zur Methode der Biblischen, Theologie des Neuen Testaments, Zeitschrift fur Theologie und Kirche, iii. (1893), pp. 126-139.

99 E. P. Gould, in an article entitled “The Literary Character of St. Paul's Letters” in The Old and New Testament Student, vol. xi. (1890), pp. 71 ff. and 134 ff., seems to apply the same question to some at least of the biblical “letters,” but in reality his essay has an altogether different purpose.

100 Über die Anfänge der patristischen Litteratur in the Historische Zeitschrift, 48, Neue Folge 12 (1882), p. 429 ff. The present writer cannot but emphasise how much profitable stimulation in regard to method he has received from this essay, even though he differs from the essayist on important points.

101 P. 429, and foot of p. 428.

102 P. 429. Overbeck would seem sometimes not to be quite clear with regard to the term form, which he frequently uses. The author understands the word in the above quotation in the same way as in the fundamental proposition on p. 423: "In the forms of literature is found its history". Here form can be understood only as Eidos. The forms of literature are, e.g., Epos, Tragedy, History, etc. Overbeck, in his contention that the form is essential for the contents of a literary work, is undoubtedly correct, if he is referring to the good old εἶδη of literature. No one, for example, will expect a comedy to incite φιλοσοφία. But the contention is not correct when it refers to such a subordinate literary Eidos as the epistle. The epistle may treat of all possible subjects—and some others as well. And therefore when all is said, it is literature, a literary form—even when only a bad form (Unform).

103 P. 429.

104 P. 429 at the top.

105 P. 431 f.

106 Overbeck here means the Gospels, Acts of the Apostles and Revelation.

107 P. 426 IL

108 P. 429.

109 Not solely, of course, those writings which we now recognise as canonical.

110 The influence of a Jewish literary form can be clearly seen at its best in the Apocalypse of John. But also the Acts of the Apostles (which, along with the Gospels, the present writer would, contra Overbeck, characterise as belonging already to Christian literature) has its historical prototype, in the matter of form, in the Hellenistic writing of annals designed for the edification of the people. What in the Acts of the Apostles recalls the literary method of "profane" historical literature (e.g., insertion of speeches, letters, and official papers), need not be accounted for by a competent knowledge of classical authors on the part of the writer of it; it may quite well be explained by the influence of its Jewish prototypes. When the Christians began to make literature, they adopted their literary forms, even those which have the appearance of being Graeco-Roman, from Greek Judaism, with the single exception of the Evangelium—a literary form which originated within Christianity itself.

111 It is, of course, possible, in these merely general observations, to avoid touching on the question of the integrity of this message.

112 The following is also instructive: It is reported at the end of the Greek Book of Esther that the "Priest and Levite" Dositheus and his son Ptolemaeus, had "brought hither" (i.e., to Egypt) the πῖστολ τῶν Φρουρῶν (concerning the Feast of Purim) from Esther and Mordecai (LXX Est.

9■29, cf. 20 [MT Est. 9:29, cf. 20]), which was translated (into Greek) by Lysimachus, the son of Ptolemaeus in Jerusalem. It would thus seem that a Greek letter concerning Purim, written by Esther and Mordecai, was known in Alexandria. It is not improbable that the alleged bearers of the “letter” were really the authors of it.

113 The Books of Maccabees, Epistle of Aristeeus, specially also Eupolemos (cf. thereon J. Freudenthal, *Hellenistische Studien*, part i. and ii., Breslau, 1875, p. 106 ff.), Josephus.

114 C. Bruston (*Trois lettres des Juifs de Palestine*, ZAW. x. [1890], pp. 110-117) has recently tried to show that 2Ma 1:1-36, 2Ma 2:1-18 contains not two but three letters (2Ma 1:1-36, 2Ma 2:1-18).

115 Unless this be of Christian times, as appears probable to the present writer. In any case it is an instructive analogy for the literary criticism of the Epistle of James and the First Epistle of Peter.

116 Cf. J. Bernays, *Lucian and die Kyniker*, Berlin, 1879, p. 96 ff.

117 J. Bernays, *Die heraklitischen Briefe*, Berlin, 1869, particularly p. 61 ff.

118 At some future time the author may perhaps pursue the subject further. He hopes then to treat also of so-called formal matters (form of the address, of the beginning and the end, style of letter, etc.), for which he has already gathered some materials.

119 But seldom has this been more distinctly maintained than quite recently by A. Gercke, who designates the letters of Paul, in plain language, as “treatises in the form of letters” (GGA., 1894, p. 577). But this great and widely-prevalent misconception of the matter stretches back in its beginnings to the early years of the Christian Church. Strictly speaking, it began with the first movements towards the canonisation of the letters. Canonisation was possible only when the non-literary (and altogether uncanonical) character of the messages had been forgotten; when Paul, from being an Apostle, had become a literary power and an authority of the past. Those by whom the letters were treated as elements of the developing New Testament considered the Apostle to be an epistolographer. Further, the pseudo-Pauline “letters,” including the correspondence between Paul and Seneca, are evidences of the fact that the writers of them no longer understood the true nature of the genuine letters; the bringing together of the Apostle and the epistolographer Seneca is in itself a particularly significant fact. We may also mention here the connecting—whether genuine or not—of Paul with the Attic orators (in the Rhetorician Longinus: cf. J. L. Hug, *Einleitung in die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, ii. 3, Stuttgart and Tübingen, 1826, p. 334 ff.; Heinrici, *Das zweite Sendschreiben des Ap. P. an die Korinther*, p. 578). The same position is held very decidedly by A. Scultetus († 1624), according to whom the Apostle imitates the “letters” of Heraclitus (cf. Bernays, *Die heraklitischen Briefe*, p. 151). How well the misunderstanding still flourishes, how tightly it shackles both the criticism of the Letters and the representation of Paulinism, the author will not further discuss at present; he would refer to his conclusions regarding method at the end of this essay. In his opinion, one of the most pertinent things that have been of late written on the true character of Paul’s letters is § 70 of Reuss’s *Introduction* (*Die Geschichte der heiligen Schrr. N.T.* p. 70). Mention may also be made—reference to living writers being omitted—of A. Ritschl’s *Die christl. Lehre von der Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung*, ii.3, P. 22. Supporters of the correct view were, of course, not wanting even in earlier times. Compare the anonymous opinion in the *Codex Barberinus*, iii., 36

(saec. xi.):πιστολα Παλουκαλονται,πειδτατας Παλοςδπιστλλεικαδι' ατνοζμνδηρακεκαδδαξεν
πομιμνσκεικαπιδιορθοται,οζδμρακεσπουδζεικατηγεγκαδιδσκειν in E. Klostermann's *Analecta zur Septuaginta, Hexapla und Patristik*, Leipzig, 1895, p. 95.

120Cf. pp. 4 [↑] and 18 f. [↑]

121 The relative lengthiness of the letter must also be deemed an irrelevant consideration—one not likely, as the author thinks, to be advanced. The difference between a letter and an epistle cannot be decided by the tape-line. Most letters are shorter than the Letter to the Philippians, shorter still than the “great” Pauline letters. But there are also quite diminutive epistles: a large number of examples are to be found in the collection of Hercher.

122 At the present day it would be difficult enough, in many cases, to determine forthwith the character of such letters. For instance, the so-called Pastoral Letters of bishops and general superintendents might almost always be taken as epistles, not, indeed, because they are official, but because they are designed for a public larger than the address might lead one to suppose. Further, at the present day they are usually printed from the outset. An example from the Middle-Ages, the “letter” of Gregory VII. to Hermann of Metz, dated the 15th March, 1081, has been investigated in regard to its literary character by C. Mirbt, *Die Publizistik im Zeitalter Gregors VII.*, Leipzig, 1894, p. 23. Cf., on p. 4 of the same work, the observations on literary publicity. The defining lines are more easily drawn in regard to antiquity. A peculiar hybrid phenomenon is found in the still extant correspondence of Abelard and Heloise. It is quite impossible to say exactly where the letters end and the epistles begin. Heloise writes more in the style of the letter, Abelard more in that of the epistle. There had, of course, been a time when both wrote differently: the glow of feeling which, in the nun’s letters, between biblical and classical quotations, still breaks occasionally into a flame of passion, gives us an idea of how Heloise may once have written, when it was impossible for her to act against his wish, and when she felt herself altogether guilty and yet totally innocent. Neither, certainly, did Abelard, before the great sorrow of his life had deprived him of both his nature and his naturalness, write in the affected style of the convert weary of life, whose words like deadly swords pierced the soul of the woman who now lived upon memories. In his later “letters” he kept, though perhaps only unconsciously, a furtive eye upon the public into whose hands they might some day fall—and then he was no longer a letter-writer at all.

123 See p. 35. [↑] 124Cf. the observations upon this letter in the Spicilegium below. [↓]

125 This explains why, of the extant “letters” of celebrated men who have written both letters and epistles, it is the latter that have, in general, been preserved in larger numbers than the former. Compare, for instance, the extant “letters” of Origen.

126 It is a further proof of these “epistles” being letters that we know the bearers of some of them. The epistle as such needs no bearer, and should it name one it is only as a matter of form. It is a characteristic circumstance that the writer of the epistle at the end of the Apocalypse of Baruch sends his booklet to the receivers by an eagle. Paul uses men as his messengers: he would not have entrusted a letter to eagles—they fly too high.

127 Nor, strictly speaking, can we count the First Epistle of John as an epistle—on the ground, that is, that the address must have disappeared. It is a brochure, the literary eidos of which cannot

be determined just at once. But the special characterisation of it does not matter, if we only recognise the literary character of the booklet. That it could be placed among the “letters” (i.e., in this case, epistles) of the N.T., is partly explained by the fact that it is allied to them in character: literature associated with literature. Hence the present writer cannot think that Weiss (Meyer, xiv.5 [1888], p. 15) is justified in saying: “It is certainly a useless quarrel about words to refuse to call such a composition a letter in the sense of the New Testament letter-literature”. The question letter or epistle? is in effect the necessary pre-condition for the understanding of the historical facts of the case. The “sense” of the New Testament letter-literature, which Weiss seems to assume as something well known, but which forms our problem, cannot really be ascertained without first putting that question.—The author does not venture here to give a decision regarding the Second and Third Epistles of John; the question “letter or epistle?” is particularly difficult to answer in these cases.

128 This idea of a catholic writing is implied in the classification of the Aristotelian writings which is given by the philosopher David the Armenian (end of the fifth cent. A.D.) in his prolegomena to the categories of Aristotle (Ed. Ch. A. Brandis, Schol. in Arist., p. 24a, Westermann, iii. [1852], p. 9). In contrast to *μερικῆς* special, *καθολικῆς* is used as meaning general; both terms refer to the contents of the writings, not to the largeness of the public for which the author respectively designed them.

129 P. 431.

130 Hercher, p. 241 ff.

131 For the investigation of the Second Epistle of Peter see the observations which follow below in the Spicilegium.

132 That is to say, of course, publication within Christianity.

133 Especially those which were made on behalf of a definite circle of readers.

134 It is not likely that the collection was made all at one time. It may be assumed that the Letter to Philemon, for instance, was a relatively late addition. The collection was probably begun not very long after the death of Paul.

135 Upon this point the author would specially desire to recommend a perusal of the sketch of the earliest dissemination of the New Testament letters in B. Weiss’s *Lehrbuch der Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, Berlin, 1886, §§ 6, 7, p. 38 ff. Many of the apparently striking facts in the history of the “evidence” which are indicated there might find a simple enough explanation if they were regarded from our point of view.

136 See p. 81. [↑]

137 Cf. p. 29, note 3. One may adduce for comparison other non-literary sources as well, e.g., the “We” source of the Acts. It, too, became literature only subsequently—only after it had been wrought into the work of Luke.

138 Herder, *Briefe, das Studium der Theologie betreffend*, zweyter Theil, zweyte verbesserte Auflage, Frankfurt and Leipzig, 1790, p. 209.

1392 Corinthians 3:3.

140 The only meaning that can be given to such observations—if they are to have any meaning at all—is when it is presumed that “the genius of the language of the New Testament” is not fond of certain words and constructions. It is of course quite a different matter to speak of the **παξλεγμενα** of a single definite writer such as Paul.

141 W. Schmid, *Der Atticismus in seinen Hauptvertretern von Dionysius von Halikarnass bis auf den zweiten Philostratus*, iii., Stuttgart 1893, p. 338. The **κα** which is inserted between preposition and substantive is there dealt with. The present writer does not suppose that Schmid, whose book is of the greatest importance for the understanding of the biblical texts, would advocate the perverse notion above referred to, should he be called upon to give judgment upon it on principle: especially as the context of the passage quoted permits one to suppose that he there desires to contrast “the N. T.” as a monument of popular literature with the studied elegance [?] of *Ælian*. But the subsuming of the varied writings of the Canon under the philological concept “New Testament” is a mechanical procedure. Who will tell us that, say, even Paul did not consciously aspire to elegance of expression now and then? Why, the very **μετκα** which, it is alleged, does not belong to the N. T., seems to the author to occur in *Php* 4:3 (differently *Acts* 25:23 **σντεκα**): cf. **μασν1** *Thessalonians* 4:17 and 1 *Thessalonians* 5:10

142 It is of course true that the language of the early Christians contained a series of religious terms peculiar to itself, some of which it formed for the first time, while others were raised from among expressions already in use to the status of technical terms. But this phenomenon must not be limited to Christianity: it manifests itself in all new movements of civilization. The representatives of any peculiar opinions are constantly enriching the language with special conceptions. This enrichment, however, does not extend to the “syntax,” the laws of which rather originate and are modified on general grounds.

143 Some centuries later an important Semitic work was translated into Greek in a very different manner, viz., the original text of Josephus’s *Jewish War*. In the preface he states that he had written it first of all in his native language (i.e., Aramaic). In the work of translation he had recourse to collaborateurs for the sake of the Greek style (c. *Ap.* i. 9), cf. Schurer, i. (1890), p. 60 f. [Eng. Trans., i., p. 83]. Here then we have the case of a Semitic text being translated under Greek superintendence with the conscious intention of attaining Greek elegance. Thus the *Jewish War* should not, strictly speaking, be used as an authority for the style of Josephus the Semite. The case is different with the *Antiquities*—unless they likewise have been redacted in form. Moreover, it has been shown by Guil. Schmidt, *De Flavii Iosephi elocution observations criticae*, *Fleck. Jahrb.* Suppl. xx. (1894), p. 514 ff.—an essay in the highest degree instructive on the question of the “influences” of the Semitic feeling for language—that at most only one Hebraism is found in Josephus, and that a lexical one, viz., the use of **προστθεσθαι** = ■■■■

144 Cf. the remarks of Winer, adopted by Schmiedel, *Winer-Schmiedel*, § 4, 1 b (p. 25 f.) [Eng. Trans., p. 28 f.], upon the Greek which was really spoken by the Jewish common people and was independent of the Greek of translation. But see the author’s remark on p. 74, note 1.

145 See below, p. 295 ff. [↓]

146 In particular, J. Wellhausen formerly advocated this supposition; cf. his observations in F. Bleek's *Einleitung in das A. T.* 4, Berlin, 1878, p. 578, and, previously, in *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis untersucht*, Göttingen, 1871, p. 11. But the very example which he adduces in the latter passage supports our view. In LXX 1 Kings 4:2-3 f. [MT 1 Samuel 4:2-3 f.], the verb $\pi\tau\alpha\omega$ is twice found, the first time intransitively, the second time transitively, corresponding respectively to the Niphal and Qal of פָּטַח . Wellhausen rightly considers it to be incredible that the Seventy "were unwilling or unable" to express "the distinction of Qal and Hiphil, etc.," by the use of two different Greek words. When, however, he traces back the double $\pi\tau\alpha\omega$, with its distinction of meaning, to the already existent popular usage of the contemporaries of the LXX (i.e., from the context—the Alexandrian Jews), he overlooks the fact that the transitive sense of $\pi\tau\alpha\omega$ is also Greek. The LXX avoided a change of verb because they desired to represent the same Hebrew root by the same Greek word, and in this case a Greek could make no objection.—Regarding another peculiarity of the LXX, viz., the standing use "of the Greek aorist as an inchoative answering to the Hebrew perfect," it is admitted by Wellhausen himself that "for this, connecting links were afforded by classical Greek."—Wellhausen now no longer advocates the hypothesis of a "Judæo-Greek," as he has informed the author by letter.

147 To the literary sources here indicated there have lately been added certain fragments of reports which refer to the Jewish War of Trajan, and which were probably drawn up by an Alexandrian Jew: Pap. Par. 68 (Notices, xviii. 2, p. 383 ff.), and Pap. Lond. 1 (Kenyon, p. 229 f.); cf. Schurer, i., p. 53; further particulars and a new reading in U. Wilcken, *Ein Aktens-Nick zum jüdischen Kriege Trajans*, *Hermes*, xxvii. (1892), p. 464 ff. (see also *Hermes*, xxii. [1887], p. 487), and on this GGA. 1894, p. 749. Pap. Berol. 8111 (BU. xi., p. 333, No. 341), is also connected with it. I cannot, however willing, discover the slightest difference in respect of language between the readable part of the fragments, which unfortunately is not very large, and the non-Jewish Papyri of the same period. Independently of their historical value, the fragments afford some interesting phenomena, e.g., $\kappa\omega\sigma\tau\omega\delta\alpha$ (Matthew 27:65 f., Matthew 28:11 $\kappa\upsilon\sigma\tau\omega\delta\alpha$, Matthew 27:66 Cod. A $\kappa\omega\sigma\tau\upsilon\delta\alpha$; Cod. D has $\kappa\upsilon\sigma\tau\upsilon\delta\alpha$), $\chi\rho\epsilon\iota\delta\omicron\lambda\omicron\iota$ (Luke 17:10, cf. Matthew 25:30). The identification of the $\sigma\omicron\iota\upsilon\delta\alpha\omicron\iota$ with the successors of the $\sigma\iota\delta\alpha\omicron\iota$ of the Maccabean period, which Wilcken advances, hardly commends itself; the expression does not refer to a party within Alexandrian Judaism, but is rather a self-applied general title of honour.—Wilcken, further, has in view the publication of another Papyrus fragment (*Hermes*, xxvii., p. 474), which contains an account of the reception of a Jewish embassy by the Emperor Claudius at Rome. (This publication has now seen the light; for all further particulars see the beginning of the author's sketch, "Neuentdeckte Papyrus-Fragmente zur Geschichte des griechischen Judenthums," in *ThLZ*. xxiii. (1898), p. 602 ff.)

148 The relation which the language of the Prologue to Sirach bears to the translation of the book is of the utmost importance in this question. (Cf. the similar relation between the Prologue to Luke and the main constituent parts of the Gospel; see below, p. 76, note 2 [↓].) The Prologue is sufficiently long to permit of successful comparison: the impression cannot be avoided that it is an Alexandrian Greek who speaks here; in the book itself, a disguised Semite. The translator' himself had a correct apprehension of how such a rendering of a Semitic text into Greek differed from Greek—the language which he spoke, and used in writing the Prologue. He begs that allowance should be made for him, if his work in spite of all his diligence should produce the impression $\tau\iota\sigma\omega$

τὸν λῆξιν δυνάμει νομογράφου σοδυνάμει ἀπὸ τοῦ βρασιλεῖ μενακᾶ τανμετ
αχέστου ρανγλίσσαν. Whoever counts the Greek Sirach among the monuments of a
“Judaean-Greek,” thought of as a living language, must show why the translator uses Alexandrian
Greek when he is not writing as a translator.

149 References in regard to the truly Greek character of alleged Hebraisms in Josephus are given
by U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff and Guil. Schmidt in the already-quoted study of the latter, pp.
515 f. and 421.—See below, p. 290 f. [↓] 150 Cf. the remarks of Buresch, Rhein. Ins. für Philologie,
N. F., xlv. (1891), p. 208 ff.

151 In the rich Patristic literature of Egypt there lies much material for the investigation of Egyptian
Greek. One must not overestimate here the “influence” of the LXX, particularly of its vocabulary.
The Egyptian Fathers doubtless got much from the colloquial language of their time, and the
theory of borrowing from the LXX need not be constantly resorted to. The Papyri of the second
and third centuries may be used as a standard of comparison.

152 De dialecto Macedonica et Alexandrina liber, Leipzig, 1808.

153 We have Papyri of the very time of Ptolemy II. Philadelphus, who plays such an important part
in the traditions of the LXX.

154 A portion at least of the Papyri might be of importance for the LXX even with respect to
matters of form. The author refers to the official decisions, written by trained public functionaries,
and approximately contemporaneous with the LXX. While the orthography of the letters and other
private documents is in part, as amongst ourselves, very capricious, there appears to him to be a
certain uniformity in those official papers. One may assume that the LXX, as “educated” people,
took pains to learn the official orthography of their time. The Papyri have been already referred to
in LXX-investigations by H. W. J. Thiersch, De Pentateuchiversione Alexandrina libri tres,
Erlangen, 1841, p. 87 ff.; recently by B. Jacob, Das Buch Esther bei den LXX, ZAW. x. (1890), p.
241 ff. The Papyri are likewise of great value for the criticism of the Epistle of Aristeas; hints of this
are given in the writings of Giac. Lumbroso.

155 U. Wilcken is preparing a collection of Ptolemaic texts (DLZ. xiv. [1893], p. 265). Until this
appears we are limited to texts which are scattered throughout the various editions, and of which
some can hardly be utilised.

156 It is specially instructive to notice that terms belonging to the language of the court were
employed to express religious conceptions, just as conversely the word Grace, for instance, is
prostituted by servility or irony amongst ourselves. Legal phraseology also came to be of great
importance in religious usage.

157 Quite similar modernisings and Germanisings of technical terms are found also in Luther’s
translation. Luther, too, while translating apparently literally, often gives dogmatic shadings to
important terms in theology and ethics; the author has found it specially instructive to note his
translation of Paul’s υἱοθεοῦ by Kinder Gottes (children of God), of υἱοθεοῦ by Sohn Gottes
(Son of God). Luther’s dogmatic sense strove against an identical rendering of υἱοθεοῦ in both cases:
he was unwilling to call Christians sons of God, or Jesus Christ the child of God, and in
consequence made a distinction in the word υἱοθεοῦ. We may also remember the translation of

ἐννοεῖται in 2 Corinthians 10:5 by Vernunft (reason), whereby biblical authority was found for the doctrine fides praecedit intellectum.

158 The clamant need of a Lexicon to the LXX is not to be dismissed by pointing to the miserable condition of the Text. The knowledge of the lexical conditions is itself a preliminary condition of textual criticism.

159 The author cannot assent to the thesis of Winer (see the passage referred to above, p. 67, note 2 [↑]), viz., that if we are to ascertain what was the “independent” (as distinct, i.e., from the LXX-Greek, which was conditioned by the original) Greek of the Jews, we must rely “upon the narrative style of the Apocryphal books, the Gospels, and the Acts of the Apostles “. There are considerable elements in “the” Apocrypha and in “the” Gospels which, as translations, are as little “independent” as the work of the LXX.—With regard also to certain portions of the Apocalypse of John, the question must be raised as to whether they do not in some way go back to a Semitic original.

160 Cf. Julicher, Einleitung in das N. T., 1st and 2nd ed., Freiburg (Baden) and Leipzig, 1894, p. 235: important observations by Wellhausen in GGA. 1896, p. 266 ff.—We must at all events conceive of this kind of translation as being quite different from the translation of Josephus’s Jewish War from Aramaic, which was undertaken in the same half-century, and which might be called “scientific” (cf. p. 67, note 1 above [↑]). Josephus desired to impress the literary public: the translators of the Logia desired to delineate Christ before the eyes of the Greek Christians. The very qualities which would have seemed “barbaric” to the taste of the reading and educated classes, made upon the Greeks who “would see Jesus” the impression of what was genuine, venerable—in a word, biblical.

161 The author recalls, for instance, what is said in Wellhausen’s Israelitische and Judische Geschichte, Berlin, 1894, p. 312, note 1.—Meanwhile this important problem has been taken in hand afresh by Arnold Meyer (Jesu Muttersprache, Freiburg (Baden) and Leipzig, 1896) and others; cf. especially G. Dalman, Die Worte Jesu, vol. i., Leipzig, 1898.

162 Also against the unmethodical way in which peculiarities in the diction of Paul, for example, are explained by reference to mere external similarities in the Synoptics. What a difference there is—to take one instructive example—between the Synoptical ἐν τῷ ἰσχυρῶν (Mark 3:22, etc.) and the Pauline ἐν Χριστῷ ἡσο ! See the author’s essay Die neutestamentliche Formel “in Christo Jesu” untersucht, pp. 15 and 60.

163 Compare the prologue to Luke’s Gospel. The author is unaware whether the task of a comparative investigation with regard to the languages of the translated and the independent parts respectively of the Gospels has as yet been performed. The task is necessary—and well worthwhile.

164 Even in those cases in which Paul introduces his quotations from the LXX without any special formula of quotation, or without other indication, the reader may often recognise them by the sound. They stand out distinctly from Paul’s own writing, very much as quotations from Luther, for example, stand out from the other parts of a modern controversial pamphlet.

165 This was probably the case, e.g., with Paul, who according to Acts 21:40 could speak in the “Hebrew language”. That means probably the Aramaic.

166 So far as the author is aware no Jewish Inscription in Hebrew is known outside of Palestine before the sixth century A.D.; cf. Schurer, ii., p. 513 (= 3 iii. p. 93 f.) [Eng. Trans., ii., p. 284], and, generally, the references given there.

167 Aristotle rejoiced that he had become acquainted with a man, a Jew of Coele-Syria, who **λληνικςν,οτ διαλτμνον,λλκατψυχ** (Josephus, c. Ap. 22).—The sentence (De confusion ling. § 26) [M. p. 424], **στιδςμνβραοιλγουσι “φανουηλ,” ςδμες** is of great interest in regard to Philo’s opinion as to his own language: he felt himself to be a Greek. Cf. H. A. A. Kennedy, Sources of New Testament Greek, Edinburgh, 1895, p. 54, and the present writer’s critique of this book GGA. 1896, p. 761 ff.

168 Acute observations on this point will be found in J. Freudenthal’s Die Flavius Josephus beigelegte Schrift Ueber die Herrschaft der Vernunft, Breslau, 1869, p. 26 f.

169 The author ad opts this easily enough misunderstood expression from Buresch, Rh. Mus. f. Phil. N. F., xlv. (1891), p. 207.

170 When the author (in 1894) wrote the above, he was unaware that E. L. Hicks, in The Classical Review, 1887, had already begun to apply the Inscriptions to the explanation of the N.T. W. M. Ramsay called attention to this, and gave new contributions of his own in The Expository Times, vol. x. p. 9 ff. A short while ago I found a very important little work in the University Library at Heidelberg, which shows that the Inscriptions had begun to be drawn from a hundred years ago: the booklet, by Io. E. Imm. Watch, is called Observationes in Mattizaeum ex graecis inscriptionibus, Jena, 1779; and is not without value even at the present day.

171 So far as the author can judge, this process shows itself more clearly in the Catholic and the Pastoral Epistles than in Paul.

172 Altertumer von Pergamon, viii. 1, Berlin, 1890, p. xvii.

173 This matter is further dealt with in the author’s little work Die sprachliche Erforschung der griechischen Bibel, ihr gegenwertiger Stand and ihre Aufgaben, Giessen, 1898; cf. also GGA. 1896, pp. 761-769; 1898, pp. 120-124, and 920-923; ThLZ. xxi. (1896), p. 609 ff., and xxiii. (1898), jp. 628 ff.; Theologische Rundschau, i. (1897-98), pp. 463-472.

174 Essays in Biblical Greek, Oxford, 1889, p. 37.

175 HApAT. iii. (1853), p. 155 f.

176 Mahaffy, ii. [64].

177 The Persian loan-word recalls the Persian dominion over Egypt: cf. **παρδειςος** below.—It may appear strange that the LXX do not use **γγεαρος**, etc., though **γγεαρος**, perhaps also derived from the Persian, is found in those portions which belong to the Persian period, and might have prompted them to use a cognate Greek substantive. But they translate both it and the Aramaic **γγεαρος** in every passage by **πιστολ**, just because there was not any Greek word formed from **γγεαρος** for letter.—For the orthography **γγαρεω**, cf. III. i. 1 below.

178CIG. iii. No. 4956, A 21.

179 What is the Aramaic word which is rendered by **ⲛⲓⲅⲁⲣⲉⲱ** in Matthew 5:41?

180 Cf. Buresch, Rhein. Mus. fur Philologie, N. F., xlv. (1891), p. 219: "The Persian loan-word **ⲛⲓⲅⲁⲣⲉⲱ**, which was naturalised at a very early date, must have come to be much used in the vernacular—it is still found in the common dialect of Modern Greek".

181Papyri Graeci regii Taurinensis musei Aegyptii, i. Turin, 1826, p. 60.

182 I., pp. 53 and 64.

183Notices, xviii. 2, p. 308.

184 P. 31.

185Ch. G. Wilkii Clavis Novi Testamenti philologica³, Leipzig, 1888, p. 28.

186 Frankel, p. 129. The word occurs also in Polybius in the same sense. W. Schulze has also called the attention of the author to the Inscription of Sestos (c. 120 B.c.), line 27; on this cf. W. Jerusalem, Wiener Studien, i. (1879), p. 53.

187 For particular references see Mahaffy, i. (1891), Index [88], cf. Kenyon, p. 46; Notices, xviii. 2, p. 131. For the etymology, W. Schulze, Quaestionesepicae, Gutersloh, 1892, p. 464; the **ⲛⲓⲁⲫⲁⲗⲁⲛⲧⲁⲥⲓⲥ** in Aristot. iii. 11 presupposes **ⲛⲓⲁⲫⲁⲗⲁⲛⲧⲟⲥ**.

188 So with Hebrews 9:28.

189 If, that is to say, the LXX treated the conceptions **ⲛⲓⲁⲫⲁⲗⲁⲛⲧⲉⲓⲥ** and **ⲛⲓⲁⲫⲁⲗⲁⲛⲧⲟⲥ** as equivalent.

190 E. Kuhl, Meyer, xii.5 (1887), p. 165.

191Cf. Kahl, p. 166 f.

192 Mahaffy, i. [47].

193**ⲛⲓⲁⲫⲁⲗⲁⲛⲧⲉⲓⲥ** were equally possible; cf. p. 91, note 1.

194 Mahaffy, i. [48], translates: "But concerning the debts chaged against me, which I dispute, I shall submit to the decision of Asklepiades".

195 It is true that **ⲛⲓⲁⲫⲁⲗⲁⲛⲧⲉⲓⲥ** occurs also in the technical sense of *referre* (cf., besides the dictionaries, A. Peyron, p. 110), frequently even in the LXX, and one might also translate the clause: as to the debts alleged (before the magistracy) against me; **ⲛⲓⲁⲫⲁⲗⲁⲛⲧⲉⲓⲥ** would then mean something like *sue for*. But the analogies from the Attic Orators support the above explanation. In LXX 1 Kings 20:13 f. [MT 1 Samuel 20:13] **ⲛⲓⲁⲫⲁⲗⲁⲛⲧⲉⲓⲥ** **ⲛⲓⲁⲫⲁⲗⲁⲛⲧⲉⲓⲥ**, we have **ⲛⲓⲁⲫⲁⲗⲁⲛⲧⲉⲓⲥ** in a quite similar sense. Cf. Wellhausen, *Der Text der Bb. Sam.*, p. 116 f., for the origin of this translation.

196 A. Blackert, *De praepositionum apud oratores Atticos usu quaestiones selectae*, Marp. Catt., 1894, p. 45.

197Cf. also the other forensic expressions of the section: **ⲛⲓⲁⲫⲁⲗⲁⲛⲧⲉⲓⲥ** ver. 23, and **ⲛⲓⲁⲫⲁⲗⲁⲛⲧⲉⲓⲥ** ver. 24.

- 198 Sin is often viewed as a debt in the early Christian sphere of thought. —Cf. III. iii. 2 below. [↓]
- 199 With regard to the orthography, cf. the Programme of W. Schulze, *Orthographica*, Marburg, 1894, p. xiv. ff.; Winer-Schmiedel, § 5, 30 (p. 64).
- 200 “Peculiar to the LXX,” Cremer 7, p. 554 (= 8 587).
- 201 Kenyon, p. 38.
- 202 For the orthography cf. p. 91, note 4.
- 203 Contra Cremer 7, p. 554 (= 8 587); *Clavis*3, p. 84.
- 204 *Notices*, xviii. 2, p. 276.
- 205 Kenyon, p. 38.
- 206 *Notices*, xviii. 2, p. 175.
- 207 Leemans, i., p. 3.
- 208 Upon this cf. Leemans, p. 5.
- 209 Kenyon, p. 88.
- 210 Frankel, *Altertumer von Pergamon*, viii. 1, p. 13 f.
- 211 Waddington, iii. (Ph. Le Bas et W. H. Waddington, *Inscriptions grecques et latines recueillies en Grece et en Asie Mineure*, vol. iii., part 2, Paris, 1870), No. 1652 (p. 390).
- 212 *Bull. de corr. hell.* iv. (1880), p. 50 = Gull. Dittenberger, *Sylloge inscriptionum Graecarum*, Leipzig, 1883, No. 228.
- 213 Frankel, p. 12.
- 214 Frankel, p. 14.
- 215 References in Frankel, p. 16.
- 216 Upon this cf. also the investigations of Meister, *Berichte der 1 Kgl. Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften*, 1891, p. 13 ff., to which Wendland has called attention (*Deutsche Litteraturzeitung*, 1895, p. 902).
- 217 *Libri apocryphi Veteris Testamenti Graece*, Leipzig, 1871, p. 475. Similarly the corrected text of 1887 in the edition of L. van Ess.
- 218 Cf. on this O. F. Fritzsche, *HApAT*. v. (1859), p. 201.
- 219 O. F. Fritzsche, *HApAT*. v. (1859), p. 201.
- 220 De Wette, guided by a true feeling, has obviated this objection by rendering ■πατι by a substantive.
- 221 Textual-critical note to the passage in his edition of the LXX, Cambridge, 1887 ff.
- 222 This is placed in the text by Tischendorf and Swete.

223 From his standpoint a fairly good conjecture!

224 Naturally the word is not given in the lexica to the Greek Old Testament or the Apocrypha; nor is it given by Tromm, either in the Concordance or in the accompanying Lexicon to the Hexapla, by B. de Montfaucon and L. Bos. The Concordance of E. Hatch and H. A. Redpath, Oxford, 1892 which takes into account the variants of the most important manuscripts, was the first to bring the misunderstood word to its rightful position; although that book seems to err by excess of good when it constructs from the clerical error of ■A a new word ■ρεταλ■γιον.

225 Field, ii., p. 130. The Hexaplar Syriac thereupon in its turn took this word of Symmachus not as = ε■φημ■α, but as = acceptio eloquii, Field, *ibid*.

226 Cf. Print edition of BS, p. 93, note 6. = ■πετ■ Upon this cf. also the investigations of Meister, *Berichte der 1 Kgl. Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften*, 1891, p. 13 ff., to which Wendland has called attention (*Deutsche Literaturzeitung*, 1895, p. 902).

227 *Essays*, p. 40 f.

228 That is, ■πετ■ as synonymous with δ■ξα. The word may be used in this sense in 4Ma. 10:10 also (contra Cremer 7, p. 154 = 8, p. 164).

229 *Les Aretalogues dans l'antiquité*, Bull. de corr. hell. ix. (1885), p. 257 ff. The present writer is indebted to W. Schulze for the reference to this essay.

230 P. 264.

231 P. 264 f.

232 The correct interpretation in Cremer 7, p. 153 (= 8, p. 163 f.), also points to this. But in the other passage there discussed after Krebs, *Joseph. Antt.* xvii. 55, ■πετ■ most probably denotes virtue.

233 Kenyon, p. 78 f.; Wessely, p. 138; Dieterich, *Abraxas*, p. 64. The Papyrus was written in the fourth century A.D.; the present writer cannot decide as to the date of the composition, particularly of line 400 ff., but considers that it may, without risk, be set still further back.

234 A. Dieterich, *Abr.*, p. 65.

235 In his attempt to restore the hymn, i., p. 29.

236 *Mnemosyne*, xvi. (1888), p. 11. The present writer quotes from A. Dieterich, p. 65; cf. p. 51.

237 *CIG.* iii., No. 2715 a, b *Waddington* iii. 2, Nos. 519, 520 (p. 142).

238 Cremer 7, p. 153 (= 8, p. 163), guided by the context, points to the true interpretation by giving self-manifestation; similarly Kuhl, *Meyer* xii.5 (1887), p. 355, performance, activity (*Wirksamkeit*); the translation virtue (H. von Soden, *LTC.* iii. 22 [1892], p. 197) must be rejected altogether. Moreover Hesychius appears to the present writer to be influenced by 2 Peter 1:3 when he, rightly, makes ■πετ■ = θε■αδ■ναμις.

239 Cf. B. Jacob, *ZAW.* x. (1890), p. 283 f.

240 Giac. Lumbroso, Recherches sur reconomie politigue de l'Égypte sous les Lagides, Turin, 1870, p. 191.

241 Jean-Ant. [not M.] Letronne, Recherches pour servir a l'histoire de l'Égypte pendant la domination des Grecs et des Ramains, Paris, 1823, p. 56; Lumbroso, Rech. p. 191. Also in the Inscription of Cyprus, CIG. ii., No. 2617 (Ptolemaic period), an Egyptian official, probably the governor, is so named.

242 A. Peyron, p. 24.

243 A. Peyron, i., p. 175.

244 A. Peyron, ii., p. 65.

245 Kenyon, p. 11.

246 Kenyon, p. 41.

247 Elsewhere the LXX translate it more naturally by φραγξ and χεμαρρος.

248 In LXX Psalms 125:4 f. [MT Psalms 126:4], the "fifth" translation of the Old Testament also has φσεις = streams (Field, ii., p. 283).

249 Similar cases in Wellhausen, Der Text der Bb. Sam., p. 10 f.—This supposition must be taken into account in Ezekiel 47:3 διλθεν ντδατιδωρφσεως, which, in its connection (it is previously stated that the water issued from under the αθριον = atrium), signifies: he walked in the water, in the water (the nominative has been set down mechanically) of release, i.e., in the (previously mentioned) released water. So must a reader of the LXX have understood their words; the remark of Jerome (in Field, ii., p. 895) that the LXX had rendered it aqua remissionis, rests upon a dogmatic misconception; φσεις here can be translated only by dimissio. Now the Hebrew text has water of the ankles, i.e., water that reaches to the ankles. This is the only occurrence of ██████████, ankles, in the O.T. C. H. Cornill, Das Buch des Propheten Ezechiel, Leipzig, 1886, p. 501, conjectures that what the LXX translated was ██████████. The author thinks it still more probable that their φσεις represents the dual of ██████████, cessation. But the most natural supposition is that they did not understand the παξλεγμανον, and simply transcribed aph'sajim, the context prompting them not merely to transcribe, but to make out of their transcription an inflected word. The present writer will not reject the supposition that this singular passage might also be explained in the following way: The Greek translator did not understand the knotty word, and translated—or transcribed—it δωρως (cf. ως twice in ver. 4) αφες (cf. LXX Ezekiel 28:16 [MT Ezekiel 27:16], Codd. 23, 62, 147 ναφεκ, Codd. 87, 88, Hexapl. Syr. ναφεγ; Theodotion ναφεκ, unless ναφεκ [= ██████████] read by Parsons in a Cod. Jes. originally stood there; these data are borrowed from Field, ii., p. 842); Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion, who understood the strange word, have a corresponding rendering, ωςστραγλων (Field, p. 895). From δωρωςαφες some inventive brain fabricated δωρφσεως, which could then have the sense explained above. The translator of Ezekiel has, in many other cases, shown tact in merely transcribing Hebrew words which he did not understand (Cornill, p. 96).—The reading δωρφαιρσεως of the Complutensian seems to be a correction of δωρφσεως made purely within the Greek text itself.

250 Mahaffy, ii. [119] f.

251 Mahaffy, ii. [38].

252 φεσις seems to bear the meaning of sluice and canal exactly.

253 Cf. below, under διρυξ. [↓] 254 [English, "Jubilee".]

255 In this way, and in no other, did the LXX construe the genitives, as we see from ver. 15 ; so in ver. 13, where the article belongs to σημασις. A Greek reader indeed, ignoring the context, might understand the expression thus: year of the φεσις of the signal, i.e., in which the signal was given; φημι does occur in similar combinations.

256 The expression Ezekiel 46:17 is such.

257 Cremer⁷, p. 439 (= 8, p. 466).

258 Notices, xviii. 2, p. 368.

259 This εργ occurs still in the (Berlin) Egyptian documents of the second and third centuries A.D. (U. Wilcken, *Observationes ad historiam Aegypti provinciae Romanae depromptae e papyris Graecis Berolinensibus ineditis*, Berlin, 1885, p. 29).

260 Recherches, p. 90. Brunet de Presle (Notices, xviii. 2, p. 471) gives the extraordinary explanation—with a mark of interrogation, it is true—conge militaire.

261 Letronne, *Recueil des inscriptions grecques et latines de l'Egypte*, vol. Paris, 1842, p. 244 ff. = CIG., iii. No. 4697.

262 Line 12 and elsewhere.

263 Mahaffy, ii. [2].

264 B. Weiss, Meyer, i. 18 (1890), p. 169.

265 HC. 2 (1892), p. 76.

266 Cf. the remark below upon the Gospel quotations, sub υς. [↓]

267 Cf., with reference to λαμβνειν = ■■■■■, LXX Isaiah 46:4 [MT Isaiah 46:4], where the same verb is rendered by ναλαμβνειν.

268 Thus A. Resch, *Aussercanonische Paralleltexte au den Evangelien*, 2 Heft (TU. x. 2), Leipzig, 1894, p. 115.

269 Field, ii., p. 510.

270 Field, ii., p. 535.

271 Field, ii., p. 505.

272 Field, II., Auct., p. 39.

273 Die alttestamentlichen Citate im N.T., Vienna, 1878, p. 34. Bohl finds his Volksbibel (People's Bible) quoted in this passage also. But the Volksbibel, or, more properly, a version that was

different from the LXX, would hardly have transposed the two clauses of the original.

274 Cf., upon βαστ■ζειν in Josephus, Guil. Schmidt, De Flav. Jos. elocution, Fleck. Jahrb. Suppl. xx. (1894), p. 521. Upon βαστ■ζω, in Galatians 6:17 see VII, below, the study on the "Large Letters" and the "Marks of Jesus," Galatians 6:1-18. [↓]

275 Had we a discreetly prepared Synonymic of the religious expressions of Early Christianity—of which there is as yet, one may say, a complete want—we should then have a defence against the widely-currents mechanical method of the so-called Biblical Theology of the N.T. which looks upon the men whose writings stand in the Canon less as prophets and sons of the prophets than as Talmudists and Tosaphists. This dogmatising method parcels out the inherited territory as if Revelation were a matter of a thousand trifles. Its paragraphs give one the idea that Salvation is an ordo salutis. It desecrates the N.T. by making it a mere source for the history of dogma, and does not perceive that it was, in the main, written under the influence of Religion.

276 M. H. E. Meier and G. F. Schomann, Der Attische Process, neu bearbeitet von J. H. Lipsius, Berlin, 1883-1887, ii., pp. 717, 719, 720.

277 M. H. E. Meier and G. F. Schomann, Der Attische Process, neu bearbeitet von J. H. Lipsius, Berlin, 1883-1887, ii., p. 717 f.

278 M. H. E. Meier and G. F. Schomann, Der Attische Process, neu bearbeitet von J. H. Lipsius, Berlin, 1883-1887, ii., p. 721 f. ; K. F. Hermann, Lehrbuch der Griechischen Rechtsalterthümer, 3rd edition by Th. Thalheim, Freiburg and Tübingen, 1884, p. 77.

279 Hermann-Thalheim, p. 78.

280 A. Peyron, p. 32, cf. p. 120, and E. Revillout, Etudes sur divers points de droit et d'histoire Ptolemaïque, Paris, 1880, p. xl. f.

281 Notices, xviii. 2, p. 355.

282 The text is, indeed, mutilated, but is sufficient for our purpose.

283 According to Hermann-Thalheim, p. 78, note 1, βεβαιωτ■ς, for instance, has become nothing but an empty form in the Papyri.

284 Notices, xviii. 2, p. 250.

285 Notices, xviii. 2, pp. 25 S, 259.

286 Notices, xviii. 2, p. 244.

287 Notices, xviii. 2, p. 241.

288 Cf. above, Pap. Par. 62 (2nd cent. B.C.).

289 Recherches, p. 78. But the passage belonging to the 2nd cent. B.C., indicated above, is more significant than the one of 600 A.D. quoted by him.

290 Which fact explains the variants about to be mentioned.

291 In the same chapter we also found a pertinent application of ■φεις as a legal conception.

292 Field, i., p. 212.

293 Field, i., p. 212.

294 Field, i., p. 212.

295 Field, i., p. 212.

296 This interpretation is not impossible. For a legitimate sale an oath was requisite, e.g., according to the “laws of Ainos” (the name is uncertain) The buyer must sacrifice to the Apollo of the district; should he purchase a piece of land in the district in which he himself dwells—he must do the same; and he must take an oath, in presence of the recording authorities and of three inhabitants of the place, that he buys honourably: similarly the seller also must swear that he sells without falsity (Theophrastus περιϋμβολαων in Stobaeus, Flor. xlv. 22); cf. Hermann-Thalheim, p. 130 ff.

297 Cf. the terms ββαιος, Hebrews 2:2, Hebrews 3:6, Hebrews 9:17, and βεβαιω, Hebrews 2:3, which in the light of the above should probably also be considered as technical.

298 Upon the form of this (Sorites or Anadiplosis), cf. Paul’s words in Romans 5:3-5, Romans 10:14 f.; also James 1:3 f., and LXX Hosea 2:21 f. [MT Hosea 2:21 f.], Joel 1:3 f. [MT Joel 1:3 f.]

299 Paulus Tarsensis Jurisconsultus, seu dissertatio de jurisprudentia Pauli Apostoli habita, Franecker, 1722. The essay has often been reprinted: an edition Bayreuth, 1738, 36 pp. 4to lies before the present writer. A new treatment of the subject would be no unprofitable task.

300 Paul hopes, Php 2:23 (as also appears from the tone of the whole letter), for an early and favourable judgment on his case.

301 In Hermann-Thalheim, p. 77.

302 Anecdota Graeca, i. Berlin, 1814, p. 219 f.

303 Hermann-Thalheim, p. 77; Meier-Sehomann-Lipsius, ii., p. 721.

304 Cf. also below, III. iii. 4. [↓]

305 The κυρω of Galatians 3:15, for instance, which is likewise forensic, is a synonym. Cf., besides, Pap. Par. 20 (600 A.D., Notices, xviii. 2, p. 240) : περισεωςτςκακυραςοσηςκαβεβαας.

306 Catena Graecorum Patrum in N.T. ed. J. A. Cramer, v., Oxford, 1844, p. 357.

3071 Corinthians 1:6, 1 Corinthians 1:8 (observe νεγκλτους and πιστς), Romans 15:8cf. Mark 16:20.

3082 Corinthians 1:6, Romans 4:16; cf. 2 Peter 1:10, 2 Peter 1:19.

309 Field, ii., p. 243.

310 In reference to the orthography cf. Winer-Schmiedel, § 5, 26 a (p. 55 f.) The Papyri have γνημα; cf. below, III. i. 2. [↓] 311 Clavis3, p. 78.

312 Mahaffy, i. [47].

313 Cf. Index in Mahaffy, ii. [190].

314 He probably knows the word from his Bible-readings: 1 Corinthians 10:10 is an allusion to LXX Numbers 14:27 [MT Numbers 14:27.] 315 Clavis3, p. 82.

316 Mahaffy, ii. [23].

317 Notices, xviii. 2, p. 367.

318 Kenyon, p. 41.

319 Cf. Lumbroso, Recherches, p. 231.

320 On the technical meaning of this word see below, $\sigma\delta\iota\delta\omicron\chi\omicron\varsigma$. [↓] 321 Cod. A has quite a different reading.

322 So De Wette renders ; similarly E. Reuss: the scribe, who as captain . . . ; A. Kamphausen (in Kautzsch) translates the text as altered in accordance with Jeremiah 52:25 by and “the” scribe of the commander-in-chief. The present writer cannot perceive why this alteration should be made “as a matter of course” (W. Nowack, Lehrbuch der heb. Archaologie, i., Freiburg and Leipzig, 1894, p. 360). But it is scarcely possible, with K. H. Graf (who does not change the text, but explains the article as referring to the following relative clause, and translates the scribe of the captain of the host), to pronounce categorically that “The captain of the host cannot be called a $\sigma\delta\iota\delta\omicron\chi\omicron\varsigma$: that title pertains only to the people who use the pen” (Der Prophet Jeremiaerklart, Leipzig, 1862, p. 628).

323 The $\gamma\rho\alpha\mu\mu\alpha\tau\alpha\iota\nu$ of Cod. A is the same form ($\alpha\iota = \epsilon$) with the affixed ν of the popular dialect (Winer-Schmiedel § 9, 8, p. 89).

324 If the article was really taken from 2 Kings 25:19 and inserted in the Hebrew text here, then the translation of the LXX is an altogether pertinent rendering of the original, and the supposition of Siegfried-Stade, p. 467, viz., that the LXX read the passage in Jeremiah without $\sigma\delta\iota\delta\omicron\chi\omicron\varsigma$, would not be absolutely necessary. The LXX, in rendering the original by a firmly-fixed terminus technicus, could leave untranslated the $\sigma\delta\iota\delta\omicron\chi\omicron\varsigma$, which was irrelevant for the sense; the taking of it over would have ruptured the established phrase $\gamma\rho\alpha\mu\mu\alpha\tau\epsilon\sigma\tau\epsilon\delta\upsilon\nu\mu\epsilon\omega\nu$.—The author has subsequently noticed that the most recent editor of Jeremiah actually emends the text here by the Book of Kings for internal reasons, and explains the chancellor, under whom the army was placed, as a military minister who took his place beside the chancellor mentioned elsewhere (F. Giesebrecht, Das Buch Jeremia [Handkomm. zum A. T. iii. 21], Gottingen, 1894, p. 263 f.).

325 Thus O. Thenius, Die Bücher der Könige (Kurzgef. ex. Handb. zum A. T. ix.), Leipzig, 1849, p. 463.

326 In this technical $\gamma\rho\alpha\mu\mu\alpha\tau\epsilon\sigma$ the fundamental meaning of scribe seems to have grown quite indistinct: LXX Isaiah 22:15 [MT Isaiah 22:15], Cod. A, has preserved the translation $\gamma\rho\alpha\mu\mu\alpha\tau\epsilon\sigma$ for house-steward, a reading which, as compared with $\tau\alpha\mu\alpha\varsigma$ (which is better Greek), e.g. of Cod. B, decidedly gives one the impression of its being the original; with reference to $\gamma\rho\alpha\mu\mu\alpha\tau\epsilon\sigma$ as a designation of a civil official in Egypt, cf. Lumbroso, Recherches, p. 243 ff. The word is

common elsewhere in the latter sense. When the LXX speak of the Egyptian task-masters, in LXX Exodus 5:6, Exodus 5:10, Exodus 5:14-15, Exodus 5:19 [MT Exodus 5:6, Exodus 5:10, Exodus 5:14-15, Exodus 5:19], as γραμματεῖς, it is not only a verbal, but, from their standpoint, also an accurate translation. They subsequently designate Israelitic officials also in this way. In LXX Isaiah 33:18 [MT Isaiah 33:18], γραμματικῶς is used for γραμματεῖς in this sense.

327 Cf. Grimm, ad loc., and Wellhausen, Israelitische und Judische Geschichte, p. 209.

328 Grimm, ii., p. 682.

329 Field, i., p. 413.

330 Viz., the regulative position which falls to the lot of legal documents.

331 Cremer⁷, p. 241 (= 8, p. 255).

332 Cremer⁷, p. 241 (= 8, p. 255).

333 Cf. the similar alteration of the idea of covenant into that of testament, and, upon this, Cremer, p. 897 (= 8, p. 946).

334 The γῆγραφα of Pilate, John 19:22, is also to be understood in this pregnant sense.

335 Mahaffy, ii. [102].

336 In the O.T. cf., e.g., LXX Nehemiah 10:34 [MT Nehemiah 10:34 ff.] and, in particular, LXX Job 42:18 (in the Greek appendix to the Book of Job [No Hebrew Parallel]).

337 Notices, xviii. 2, p. 210.

338 Leemans, i., p. 77; on this Leemans, p. 133, remarks: “γράφειν: in contractu scribere”.

339 As to the date see below, sub νόμα. [↓] 340 Notices, xviii. 2, p. 172.

341 P. Cauer, Delectus inscriptionum Graecarum propter dialectum memorabilium², Leipzig, 1883, No. 457.

342 It is not in this pregnant sense that Plutarch uses γῆγραπται, but simply as a formula of quotation; cf. J. F. Marcks, Symbola critica ad epistolographos Graecos, Bonn, 1883, p. 27. So also LXX Esth. 10:5.

343 Cf. LXX Deuteronomy 4:2, Deuteronomy 12:32 [MT Deuteronomy 4:2, Deuteronomy 12:32,], LXX Proverbs 30:6 [MT Proverbs 30:6], and later Revelation 22:18 f.

344 It was allowed, e.g., in Attic Law “to add codices to a will, or make modifications in it”; cf. Meier-Schomann-Lipsius, ii. p. 597.

345 Upon the revocation of a will cf. Meier-Schomann-Lipsius, ii., p. 597 f.

346 Cf. upon this E. Reuss, Die Geschichte der Heiligen Schriften Neuen Testaments⁶, Brunswick, 1887, § 303, p. 340, and Julicher, Einleitung in das N. T., p. 303.

347 Novus Thesaurus, ii. (1820), p. 87.

348HApA.T. iv. (1857), p. 90.

349 A. Peyron, i. p. 24.

350 A. Peyron, i. p. 56 ff. On this see Brunet de Presle, Notices, xviii. 2, p. 228, and Lumbroso, Recherches, p. 195.

351 As such frequent also in the London Papyri of the 2nd cent. B.C. ; cf. on these, Kenyon, p. 9. On the military signification of διδοχος cf. Lumbroso, Recherches, p. 224 f.

352Cf., in regard to later usage, F. Krebs, Agyptische Priester unter romischer Herrschaft, in Zeitschr. fur agyptische Sprache and Alterthumskunde, xxxi. (1893), p. 37.

353Cf. E. Kautzsch, [Über] die Derivate des Stammes alttestamentlichen Sprachgebrauch, Tubingen, 1881, p. 59.

354Cf. Kautzsch, p. 56 f., on the inadequacy of the German gerecht for the rendering of the Hebrew word.

355 LXX Deuteronomy 25:15 [MT Deuteronomy 25:15], ληθιν v.

356 Kautzsch, p. 57 ff. In Arabic the same word is used, according to Kautzsch, to describe, e.g., a lance or a date [the fruit] as correct.

357 Cremer⁷, p. 270 (= 8, p. 284).

358 Letronne, Recueil, p. 467, cf. p. 468 f.; also Letronne, Recherches, p. 396 f., Lumbroso, Recherches, p. 290. Pliny, Nat. Hist. v. 58, speaks in the same way of the iustum incrementum, and Plutarch, de Isid. et Osid., p. 368, says: δμσην βασις περμμφιν, τανδικαα, δεκατεσσρωνπηχ v.

359 Cf. also the Egyptian measure δικαιτατονμστρον in F. Hultsch's Griechische und romische Metrology², Berlin, 1882, p. 636.

360 Winer-Lunemann, § 31, 5 (p. 200).

361 Mahaffy, iii., [72].

362 Theodotion (ver. 3) translates the same passage thus: καδαπαντοςζατ v [Bel] σεμιδλεωζρτβαιδδεκα (Libri apocrypha V. T. graece, ed. O. F. Fritzsche, p. 87).

363 Cf. the author's work Die neutest. Formel "in Christo Jesu," p. 55 f.

364 Mahaffy, ii. [72] 365 Mahaffy, iii., [72].

366 Notices, xviii. 2, p. 131.—The same words are found in Pap. Lugd. M. (Leemans, p. 59); Leemans, p. 63, explains ες as a periphrasis for the genitive similarly W. Schmid, Der Atticismus, iii. (1893), p. 91. One should notice in this latter work the other observations upon the prepositions—they are of importance for biblical philology.

367 Winer-Lunemann, § 65, 3 (p. 563); Schmiedel, HC., ii. 1 (1891) p. 143.

368 § 48, d (p. 363).

369 Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Sprachgebrauchs, p. 157.

370 P. 284.

371 The $\nu\tau\beta\delta$, which should possibly be restored as the original reading in line 12 of the leaden tablet of Adrumetum to be discussed in Art. IV., might be explained as a reminiscence of these LXX passages, in view of its association with the many other quotations from the LXX found there.—In the passage in Lucian, Dial. Mort. 23 3, $\kappa\alpha\theta\iota\kappa\mu\epsilon\nu\nu\tau\beta\delta$ the ν is regarded as doubtful (Winer-Lunemann, p. 364).

372 Cf. on this point Lumbroso, Recherches, p. 136 f.

373 Notices, xviii. 2, p. 172.

374 Clavis3, p. 151.

375 The word does not occur in the LXX. In 2Ma 4:8, $\nu\tau\epsilon\upsilon\zeta\iota\varsigma$ signifies conference.

376 A. Peyron, i., p. 101.

377 Cf. the indexes of Leemans, of the Notices, xviii. 2, of Mahaffy and Kenyon.

378 Kenyon, p. 34.

379a In addition to Wisdom 8:21, a later testimony, Pap. Berol. 7351 (BU. viii., p. 244, No. 24613) 2-3 cent. A.D. $\epsilon\delta\tau\epsilon\varsigma\tau\iota\nu\kappa\tau\zeta\kappa\alpha\mu\rho\alpha\varsigma\nu\tau\upsilon\gamma\chi\nu\omega\tau\theta\epsilon\pi\rho\mu\nu$, is significant in regard to the use of this word in religious speech. (Romans 8:27, Romans 8:34, Romans 11:2, Hebrews 7:21, Clem. Rom. 1 Cor. 56¹).

379b A. Peyron, p. 102; Lumbroso, Recherches, p. 254; Mahaffy, ii., p. 28.

380 Mahaffy, ii. [6], cf. p. 6.

381 Hieron. de vir. inl. 61; cf. P. D. Huetii, Origenianorum, i. 8 (Lomm. xxii., p. 38 f.).

382 Upon the usage of the word in ecclesiastical Greek and Latin, cf. the Greek and Latin Glossaries of Du Cange. The $\pi\alpha\zeta\lambda\epsilon\gamma\mu\epsilon\nu\nu\gamma\omicron\pi\alpha\rho\kappa\tau\eta\varsigma$ of Clem. Rom. 1 Cor. 34¹ seems to be allied.

383 Cod. A reads $\lambda\tau\omicron\nu$ (thus the $\iota\lambda\alpha\sigma\tau\omicron\nu$ of the second hand should perhaps be restored).

384 Mahaffy, ii. [45]. The word refers to the king.

385 Cf. Clavis3, p. 184, in the concluding note, and G. Heinrici, Meyer vi. ; (1890), p. 25.

386 Mahaffy, ii., [41.] 387 Mahaffy, ii. [4], p. 30.

388 Field, i., p. 174.

389 Winer-Schmiedel notes the “unambiguous” ones, § 8, 13 (p. 85).

390 References in Guil. Schmidt, De Flavii Iosephi elocutione, Fleck. (Jbb. Suppl. xx. (1894), p. 369. Specially important are the many examples given there from Josephus, in whose writings a similar use of $\kappa\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ is also shown.—A more out-of-the-way example of this worn-out $\kappa\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$

may be mentioned here. In the second (spurious) Prologue to Jesus Sirach, near the middle, it is said: (τῶν βιβλίων) Σιρχοῦ τοῦ μετὰ τῶν πλιν λαβῆν τοῦ κεκαταλιπενοῦ (Libri apocr. V. T. ed. O. F. Fritzsche, p. 388). O. F. Fritzsche assigns this Prologue to the 4th-5th cent. A.D., HApA T. v. (1859), p. 7; in his edition of 1871, ad loc., he seems to agree with K. A. Credner, who dates it cent. 9-10.

391 K. Meisterhans, Grammatik der attischen Inschriften², Berlin, 1888, p. 194.

392 Genuine examples are readily found in all of these except Revelation, in which **δῖος** does not occur at all. The reason of this is not, of course, that they all wrote “New Testament” Greek, but that they wrote at a time when the force of **δῖος** had been long exhausted. The Latin translations, in their frequent use of the simple *suus* (A. Buttmann, p. 102, note), manifest a true understanding of the case.

393 § 22, 7 (p. 145 f.). Here we read: “no example can be adduced from the Greeks”; reference is made only to the Byzantine use of **οκεος** and the late-Latin *proprius* = *suus* or *ejus*. A. Buttmann, p. 102 f., expresses himself more accurately.

394 **πθεμα** is wanting in Cod. 58 only; in Codd. 19, 30, etc., it stands before **λαστριον**. A second hand makes a note to **λαστριον** in the margin of Cod. vii. (an Ambrosianus of cent. 5,—Field, p. 5), viz., **σκαπασμα** (covering), (Field, i., p. 124). Cremer⁷, p. 447 (= 8, p. 475), following Tromm, quotes also LXX Exodus 37:6 [≈ MT Exodus 26:37] for **καπρεθ**, = **λαστριονπθεμα**. But the Complutensian alone has it there—not the manuscripts.

395 The Concordance of Hatch and Redpath is therefore inaccurate in affirming, sub **πθεμα**, that this word has no corresponding Hebrew in Exodus 25:16 [17], and also in quoting this passage sub **λαστριον** instead of sub **λαστριος**.

396 This is also the opinion of Philo, cf. p. 128 below. [↓]

397 Against Cremer⁷, p. 447 (= 8, p. 475), who has no hesitation in identifying **λαστριον** with **καπρεθ**. His taking **λαστριον** as a substantive in this passage would have better support if the word stood after **πθεμα**; it could then be construed as in apposition to **πθεμα**. The passage he quotes, LXX Exodus 30:25 [MT Exodus 30:25 [not 35] is not to the purpose, for, at the end of the verse, **λαιον χρσμαγιον σται** should be translated the (previously mentioned) oil shall be **αχρσμαγιον σται**, and, at the beginning of the verse, **χρσμαγιον** appears to be in apposition to **λαιον**. If Cremer takes **λαστριον** as a substantive = propitiatory cover, then he could only translate LXX Exodus 25:16 [MT Exodus 25:17] by and thou shalt make a propitiatory cover as a cover of pure gold, which the original does not say.

398 The apparent equation **λαστριον** = **καπρεθ** is found only in Exo., Lev., Num.

399 The present writer cannot understand how Cremer⁷, p. 447 (= 8, p. 475), inverting the facts of the case, can maintain that **λαστριονπθεμα** is an expansion of the simple **λαστριον** = **καπρεθ**. This is exactly the same as if one should explain the expression *symbolum apostolicum* as an “expansion” of the simple *apostolicum*, which we do in fact use for Apostolic Symbol. But, besides, it would be very strange if the LXX had expanded an expression before they had used it at all! No one can dispute that **λαστριονπθεμα** is their earliest rendering of **καπρεθ**. Then it must also be conceded that the simple **λαστριον** is an abbreviation. We

have in this a case similar to that of the breviloquence *Jobel* and of *φκεσις* (cf. p. 100 above.) [↑]
400 This fact is almost always overlooked in the commentaries.

401 In the same way they probably read in *Amos* 9:1 ██████████ instead of ██████████, capital of a column, and translated *λαστριον*, unless the *θυσιαστριον* of *Cod. A* and others (Field, ii., p. 979) should be the original; cf. the same variant to *λαστριον* in LXX *Exodus* 37:6 [= MT *Exodus* 26:37] (in Field, i., p. 152) and LXX *Leviticus* 16:14 [MT *Leviticus* 16:14].

402 Hardly any one would maintain in regard to this that *ξιλασμις* in the LXX “means” *kappreth*.

403 Had the Greek translators understood the construction here, they ought certainly to have written *καππρεθου*.

404 Cremer p. 447 (= 8, p. 475).

405 It is to be doubted whether the Hebrew concept *kappreth* was present to the mind of the writer at all: in any case it is wrong to assume forthwith that he consciously described *kappreth* as *λαστριον*. It is exactly the same as if one were to assert that wherever the word *Gnadenstuhl* (mercy-seat) occurs in the biblical quotations of German devotional books, the original being *kappreth*, the writers describe the *kappreth* as *Gnadenstuhl*. In most cases the writers will be simply dependent upon Luther, and their usage of the word *Gnadenstuhl* furnishes nothing towards deciding the question how they understood *kappreth*. Cf. p. 134 1.—Similarly, *Hebrews* 9:5 is an allusion to LXX *Exodus* 25:20 [MT *Exodus* 25:21]; what was said about the passage in Philo holds good here.

406 Cremer7, p. 447 (= 8, p. 475).

407 Field, i., p. 23 f. The present writer agrees with Field in this matter, and believes that Symmachus desired by this rendering to describe the Ark as a means of propitiation: God was gracious to such as took refuge in the Ark.

408 Cremer 8, p. 474, joins *λαστριον* with *μνμα* and therefore construes *λαστριον* adjectivally—as did the present writer in the German edition of this book, pp. 122 and 127—which is not impossible, but improbable. See note 2 on p. 127 of the German edition.

409 Cremer 7, p. 448 (= 8, p. 475).

410 The absence of the article is more important than Cremer supposes; if “the” *kappreth*, “the” *λαστριον*, was something so well known to the readers as Cremer asserts, then it would be exactly a case where the article could stand with the predicate (contra E. Kuhl, *Die Heilsbedeutung des Todes Christi*, Berlin, 1890, p. 25 f.).

411 Winer-Schmiedel, § 16, 2b, note 16 (p. 134) refers only to the Byzantine Theophanes Continuatus.

412 Meyer, iv.8 (1891), p. 164 f. and elsewhere.

413 This *λαστριον* should not be described as a sacrifice.

414 W. R. Paton and E. L. Hicks, *The Inscriptions of Cos*, Oxford, 1891, p. 126.

414b For this expression see below, subv[]ςθεο[]. [↓] 415 The editors, p. 109, number it among the Inscriptions on votive offerings and statues.

416 Paton and Hicks, p. 225 f.

417 Cremer⁷, p. 448 (=8, p. 476).

418 By the time of Paul the ceremony in which the kapp[]reth played a part had long disappeared along with the Ark of the Covenant; we can but conjecture that some mysterious knowledge of it had found a refuge in theological erudition. In practical religion, certainly, the matter had no longer any place at all.

419 Die christliche Lehre von der Rechtfertigung and Versohnung dargestellt, ii. 3, Bonn, 1889, p. 171.

420 Cf. A. Ritschl, p. 168; the opinions advanced there have urgent need of correction.

421 The quotation is from [C. J. Bottcher] Liederlust für Zionspilger, 2nd edition, Leipzig, 1869, p. 283.

422 I.e., literally: My father, look upon Jesus, the sinner's throne of grace! Tr.

423 Luther undoubtedly took this nuance from Hebrews 4:16, where the θρ[]νοϋς τ[]ς χ[]ριτος is spoken of: this also he translates by Gnadenstuhl.

424 Recherches, p. 109, note 7.

425 O. F. Fritzsche HApAT. i. (1851), p. 32, in reference to this passage. Thus also the Greek lexica.

426 In LXX Joshua 5:12 [MT Joshua 5:12] we should most probably read κ[]αρπ[]σαντο.

427 Schleusner explains κ[]αρπ[]ω = aufero by κ[]αρπ[]ω = decerpo, but it is only the middle voice which occurs in this sense.

428 Zu den griechischen Sacralalterthumern, Hermes, xxvii. (1892), pp. 161 ff.

429 The passages he brings forward, in which the meaning, at least, of to sacrifice for κ[]αρπ[]ω is implied, may be extended by the translation sacrificium offero given by the Itala, as also by the note "κ[]αρπ[]σαι, θυσι[]σαι" in the MS. glossary (?) cited by Schleusner. Schleusner also gives references to the ecclesiastical literature.

430 He counts also LXX Deuteronomy 26:14 [MT Deuteronomy 26:14] among the LXX passages in this connection, but it is the non-ceremonial sense of to burn which κ[]αρπ[]ω has there.

431 This of course does not "properly" signify to offer a sacrifice which consists wholly of fruits (Grimm, HApAT. iv. [1857], p. 366), but to burn completely.

432 Stengel, p. 161.

433 For the orthography cf. Winer-Schmiedel, § 5, 7 g (p. 36).

434 In the non-Johannine passage about the adulteress.

435 A. Buttmann, p. 26 f., Winer-Lunemann, § 37, 3 (p. 234).

436 The Concordance of Hatch and Redpath puts, very strangely, a point of interrogation to καθ'. Holmes and Parsons (Oxf. 1798) read "κα■uncisinclus." for καθ'. But the facsimile (ed. H. H. Baber, London, 1816) shows KAT' quite distinctly.

437 A. Buttmann, p. 105.

438 In O. F. Fritzsche, *Libraapocrypha V. T. graece*, 4Ma. 4:26, 5:2, 8:5, 8, 13:13 (in which the connected verb stands in the plural), 4Ma. 13:17, 14:12, 15:5 (καθ'■να■καστον —according to AB, which codices should not be confused with the similarly designated biblical MSS.; cf. Praefatio, p. xxi.), 4Ma. 15:16, 16:24.

439 The author cannot of course assume the responsibility of guaranteeing this.

440 Nor does it occur in the Epistle to the Hebrews. If we could assign 4 Maccabees to an Alexandrian writer, we should have the first example of it in that book.

441 Hence also the frequent corrections in Mark 14:19 and John 8:9.

442 Cf. also LXX 2Es 6:20 [MT Ezra 6:20] ■ωζε■ςπ■ντες, which indeed is perhaps a Hebraism, and LXX 1 Chronicles 5:10 [MT 1 Chronicles 5:10], Cod. A [N.B.] ■ωςπ■ντες (Field, i., p. 708).

443 A. Buttmann, p. 274.

444 Mahaffy, i. [59].

445 Cremer 7, p. 560 (= 8, p. 592). But before this there had been noted in the *Thesaurus Graecae Linguae*, Diod. Sic. i. 21, τ■τρ■τονμ■ροστ■σχ■ρασα■το■ςδο■ναιπρ■στ■στ■νθε■νθεραπε■αζτεκα■λειτουργ■ας.

446 Cf. upon this H. Weingarten, *Der Ursprung des Monchtums*, ZKG. i. (1877), p. 30 ff., and R-E 2, x. (1882), p. 780 ff.

447 Notices, xviii. 2, p. 268.

448 Notices, xviii. 2, p. 277.

449 Leemans, i., p. 9.

450 Leemans, i., p. 30.

451 Kenyon, p. 19.

452 Kenyon, p. 28.

453 Notices, xviii. 2, p. 279.

454 Leemans, i., p. 11.

455 Kenyon, p. 7.

456 Kenyon, p. 28.

457 Wessely, Die griechischen Papyri Sachsens, Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Sgl. Sachs. Gesellsch. der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, philo 1.-histor. Classe, xxxvii. (1885), p. 281.

458 Notices, xviii. 2, p. 289.

459 Notices, xviii. 2, pp. 137 and 143.

460 Leemans, p. 43.

461 Leemans, p. 49.

462 Leemans, p. 52.

463 A Berlin Papyrus of date 134 B.C. (Ph. Buttmann, AAB. 1824, hist.-phil. Klasse, p. 92) uses λειτουργία for the duties of the funeral society mentioned below under λογιάν. Similarly in Pap. Land. iii., 146 or 135 B.C. (Kenyon, pp. 46, 47). But it is doubtful whether such duties were of a ceremonial character.—Further examples of λειτουργία in the religious sense, from the Inscriptions, in H. Anz, Subsidia ad cognoscendum Graecorum sermonem vulgarem e Pentateuchi versione Alexandrina repetita, Dissertationes Philologicae Halenses, vol. xii., Halle, 1894, p. 346.

464 Cremer 7, p. 562 (= 8, p. 595).

465 Mahaffy, ii. [130].

466 Tromm and Cremer also give LXX Exodus 39:23 [MT Exodus 39:43]; probably they intend LXX Exodus 39:18 [MT Exodus 39:41], where the word is found only in Cod. 72 and the Complutensian in regard to the confused state of the text, cf. Field, i., p. 160.

467 Erklärung einer Agyptischen Urkunde in Griechischer Cursivschrift vom Jahre 104 vor der Christlichen Zeitrechnung, AAB. 1820-21 (Berlin, 1822), hist.-phil. Klasse, p. 4.

468 P. 30.

469 Mahaffy, i. [59] ; cf. [60].

470 Th. Ch. Edwards, A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians, London, 1885, p. 462, even maintains that Paul coined the word.

471 Clavis 3, p. 263.

472 Pap. Taur. i., 2nd cent. B.C. (A. Peyron, p. 24). For the name brother, cf. p. 87 f. above [↑]; νεκρά A. Peyron, i., p. 77, takes to be res mortuaria. For these guilds in general, cf., most recently, Kenyon, p. 44 f.

473 Kenyon, p. 46.

474 Notices, xviii. 2, pp. 143, 147.

475 Leemans, p. 60.

476 Mahaffy, ii. [127].

477 This Papyrus, it is true, is not dated, but is "a fine specimen of Ptolemaic writing" (Mahaffy, ii. [127].), and other taxation-rolls which are published in xxxix. date from the time of Ptolemy II.

Philadelphus, i.e., the middle of the 3rd cent. B.C. For further particulars see below, III. iii. 2.

478 Winer-Schmiedel, § 16, 2a (p. 134).

479 Kenyon, p. 32.

480 Kenyon, p. 47.

481 Ph. Buttmann, AAB., 1824, hist.-phil. Kl., p. 92, and, on this, p. 99.

482 A. Peyron, p. 45.

483 Issued by Mahaffy, p. 43, undated.

484 Mahaffy, ii. [122].

485 Notices, xviii. 2, p. 351.

486 The author has subsequently seen that L. Dindorf, in the *Thesaurus Graecae Linguae*, v. (1842-1846), col. 348, had already noted $\chi\omicron\upsilon\epsilon\iota\alpha$ in the London Papyrus (as in the older issue by J. Forshall, 1539). He certainly treats $\lambda\omicron\gamma\alpha$ and $\lambda\omicron\gamma\epsilon\alpha$ in separate articles, but identifies the two words and decides for the form $\lambda\omicron\gamma\epsilon\alpha$.

487 For the $\epsilon\zeta$ following $\lambda\omicron\gamma\epsilon\alpha$ cf. p. 117 f. above. [↑]

488 Kenyon, p. 46. Also in line 17 of the same Papyrus, $\lambda\epsilon\iota\tau\omicron\upsilon\rho\gamma\iota\omega\nu$ should doubtless be read instead of $\lambda\epsilon\iota\tau\omicron\upsilon\rho\gamma\omega\nu$. Cf. also line 42 and Pap. Par. 5 (Notices, xviii. 2, top of p. 143).

489 Wetstein, ad loc.

490 Winer-Schmiedel, § 11, 4 (p. 97).

491 Kenyon, p. 134.

492 B. Weiss, Meyer i. 27 (1885), p. 231.

493 Leemans, i., p. 69.

494 Leemans, p. 74.

495 Mahaffy, ii. [79].

496 Mahaffy, ii., p. 32.

497 It is true that the edition is stereotyped, but the plates were corrected at certain places before each reprint.

498 Cf. Schleusner, Nov. Thes. s. v.

499 Thus also Tischendorf6 (1880), and Swete (1894).

500 Passages in Cremer7 p. 676 f. (= 8, p. 710).

501 Mahaffy, ii. [2].

502 Mahaffy, [32].

503 Mahaffy, [154].

504 Mahaffy, [32].

505Cf. above, p. 121 f. [↑]

506 The synonymous phrase **■ντευξιν■ποδιδ■ναι** (or **■πιδιδ■ναι**) **τ■βασιλε■** occurs frequently in the Papyri of the 2nd cent. B.C. (Kenyon, 9, 41 and 10, 11, 17, 28).

507It is undated, but an approximate point is afforded by its affinity with long series of similar decrees from Mylasa (Waddington, iii. 2, Nos. 403-415), of which No. 409 must have been written not long after 76 B.C. The date given above seems to the author to be too late rather than too early.

508 The very same formula is found in the Inscription CIG. ii. No. 2694 b, which also comes from Mylasa, and in which, as also in CIG. ii. No. 2693 e, Boeckh's reading **το■ζκτημ■τωνδ■ζε■ζτ■το■θεο■■νομα** is to be corrected by that of Waddington.

509 In connection with No. 338, p. 104.

510 Cremer⁷, p. 678 (= 8, p. 712).

511Clavis³, p. 328.

512 Mahaffy, ii. [38].

513 Mahaffy, ii. [42].

514 Mahaffy, ii. [113].

515 Kenyon, p. 36.

516 Kenyon, pp. 55, 56.

517 Notices, xviii. p. 357.

518 Examples in Guil. Schmidt, De Flav. los. eloc. Fleck. Job. Suppl. xx. (1894), pp. 511, 531.

519 Mahaffy, ii. [150].

520 Mahaffy, ii. [68].

521 Mahaffy, ii. [104].

522 Mahaffy, ii. [134].

523Cf. also Pap. Lond. cxxxi., 78-79 A.D. (Kenyon, p. 172).

524 The Mishna still uses **■■■■■■■■■■** only for park in the natural sense (Schurer, p. 464, = 3, p. 553) [Eng. Trans., ii., p. 183 note 88].

525Cf. G. Heinrici, Das zweite Sendschreiben des Apostel Paulus an die Korin thier erklart, Berlin, 1887, p. 494.

526Clavis³, p. 339.

527 Mahaffy, i. [54].

528 Mahaffy, i. [55].

529 Mahaffy, ii., p. 23.

530 Upon Jews in the Fayytun cf. Mahaffy, p. 43 f., [14].

531 **π**ολλ**ν**ιος is a sort of translation of the name **ων** **θ**ας.

532 Mahaffy, ii. [45]. The word is frequently to be found in Inscriptions; references, e.g., in Letronne, Recueil, p. 340; Dittenberger, Sylloge Nos. 246 30 and 267 5.

533 Particulars in Guil. Schmidt, De Flav. los. eloc., Fleck. Jbb. Suppl. xx. (1894), p. 511 f. Reference there also to CIG. ii., No. 2297.

534 De dialecto Macedonica et Alexandrina, p. 110 f.

535 Cf. p. 140 above. [↑] 536 Cf. Lumbroso, Recherches, p. 266 f 537 Notices, xviii. 2, p. 207.

538 Notices, xviii. 2, p. 305.

539 Notices, xviii. 2, p. 306.

540 Notices, xviii. 2, p. 297.

541 Cf. Brunet de Presle, Notices, xviii. 2, p. 297, and Lumbroso, Recherches, p. 266.

542 Field, i., pp. 712, 767, It is these which De Lagarde uses to determine the Lucianus: his accentuation of LXX 1 Chronicles 9:26 [MT 1 Chronicles 9:26], **παστοφορι****ν**, is not correct.

543 Better reading than in Mahaffy, i. [37]; see Mahaffy, p. 22.

544 The Papyrus reads **ενωιδα** ; that is also the Attic orthography—found in a large number of Inscriptions from 398 B.C. onwards, Meisterhans², pp. 51, 61.

545 Field, ii., p. 139.

546 Kenyon, p. 30.

547 Frankel, p. 140.

548 W. Jerusalem, Die Inschrift von Sestos and Polybios, Wiener Studien. i. (1879), p. 34; cf. p. 50 f., where the references from Polybios are also given.

549 The author does not clearly understand the relation of this translation to the (corrupt) original.

550 If the original should not be derived from **■■■■**; cf. Job 14:2 where the LXX Job 14:2 translate **κπ** **πτω**.

551 Cf. Lev. [not Luc. as in Cremer 7, p. 886 (= 8, p. 931)] Leviticus 19:23.

552 Cornill, Das Buch des Propheten Ezechiel, p. 258.

553 Which would be translated they bound.

554 For this Codex cf. Cornill, p. 15.

555 Field, ii., p. 803.

556 The reading οκ δεισαν, which is given in two late minuscules, and from which Cornill makes the emendation οκ δεισαζ (as a 2nd person singular imperfect founded on a false analogy) as being the original reading of the LXX, appears to the author to be a correction of the unintelligible δησαν which was made in the Greek text itself, without reference to the original at all.

557 Field, ii., p. 803, where a general discussion is given of the materials which follow here.

558 Should have been circumcisis, if Jerome was presupposing περιετμηθη.

559 Cremer7, p. 886 (= 8, p. 931). The remark is evidently traceable to the misleading reference of Tromm.

560 Similarly περιτομη, occurring only in LXX Genesis 17:12 [MT Genesis 17:12] and LXX Exodus 4:26 [MT Exodus 4:26]. In LXX Jeremiah 11:16 [MT Jeremiah 11:16] it has crept in through a misunderstanding of the text; cf. Cremer7, p. 887 (= 8, p. 932).

561 J. Benzinger, Hebraische Archaologie, Freiburg and Leipzig, 1894, p. 154.

562 The author does not know how the Greek Egyptians came to use the compound with περι. Did the corresponding Egyptian word suggest it to them? Or did the anatomical process suggest it to them independently?

563 Kenyon, p. 32, cf. p. 33.

564BU. xi., p. 337 f., No. 347.

565 Cremer7, p. 887 (=8, p. 932).

566 And circumcision as σημειον: cf., in reference to this, LXX Genesis 17:11 [MT Genesis 17:11] and Romans 4:11.

567 F. Krebs, Philologus, liii. (1894), p. 586, interprets σημιος differently, viz., free from bodily marks owing to the presence of which circumcision was forborne.

568 Winer-Schmiedet, § 9, 6 (p. 88).

569 Mahaffy, ii. [137].

570 Guil. Schmidt, De Flav. Ios. eloc., Fleck. Jbb. Suppl. xx. (1894), p. 498.

571 Field, ii., p. 315.

572 Mahaffy, ii. [24].

573 On the πεκτορες in Athens, cf. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Aristoteles and Athen, i., Berlin, 1893, p. 196.

574 Mahaffy, ii. [42].

575 Mahaffy, ii. [42].

576 Further details in E. Revillout, *Le Papyrus grec 13 de Turin in the Revue egyptologique*, ii. (1881-1882), p. 140 f.

577 Field, ii., p. 265.

578 Leemans, i., p. 3.

579 Leemans, i., foot of p. 3.

580 Mahaffy, ii. [10].

581 Mahaffy, ii. [125].

582 CIG. iii., No. 4717: on this, as on the title *πρεσβυτεροι* in general, cf. Lumbroso, *Recherches*, p. 259.

583 A. Peyron, ii., p. 46.

584 U. Wilcken, *Observationes ad historiam Aegypti provinciae Romanae depromptae e papyris Graecis Berolinensibus ineditis*, Berlin, 1885, p. 29 f.

585 Schürer, ii., p. 132 ff. (= 3ii., p. 176 ff.). [Eng. Trans., ii., p. 150 f.] 586 Schürer, ii., p. 144 ff. (= 3 ii., p. 189 ff.). [Eng. Trans., ii., p. 165 ff.]

587 Cf. the use of the word *πρεσβυτεροι* in the Apocrypha and in Josephus.

588 In any case it is not correct to contrast, as does Cremer⁷, p. 816 8, p. 858), the word *πυσκοπος*, as the “Greek-coloured designation,” with the term *πρεσβυτεροι* (almost certainly of Jewish colouring). The word was a technical term in Egypt before the Jews began to speak of *πρεσβυτεροι*, and it is similarly to be found in the Greek usage of the imperial period in the most diverse localities of Asia Minor.

589 This reference to the *πρεσβυτεροι* of Asia Minor has of course a purely philological purpose. The author does not wish to touch upon the question regarding the nature of the presbyterial “Office”. It may have been developed quite apart from the name—whatever the origin of that may have been.

590 Both Inscriptions are contemporary with No. 2214, which is to be assigned to the 1st cent. B.C.

591 Possibly, with Paton and Hicks, p. 148, to be assigned, more exactly, to the time of Claudius.

592 Cf. the data of Schurer, p. 147 f., note 461. [Eng. Trans. ii., i., p. 169, note 461.] 593 O. Benndorf and G. Niemann, *Reisen in Lykien and Karien*, Vienna, 1884, p. 72.

594 Lumbroso, *Recherches*, p. 280 ; the Papyrus passage—certainly not fully legible—in *Notices*, xviii. 2, p. 347. Lumbroso defends his reading in *Recherches*, p. 23, note 1.

595 Mahaffy, i. [47].

596 Mahaffy, i. [59].

597 Mahaffy, i. [43]. The passage is mutilated.

598 Mahaffy, ii. [113]. In this an ο■κον■μος submits an account of his house-keeping. The present writer thinks that the σιτομετρια which occurs in this account should be taken as the plural of σιτομ■τριον, and not as a singular, σιτομετρ■α. The passage is mutilated.

599 Edited by De Lagarde, Librorum V. T. canonicorum pars prior graece, Gottingen, 1883.

600 The simple φ■λακος of our LXX text is marked with an asteriscus by Origen, Field, i., p. 516.

601 Mahaffy, ii. [39].

602 Mahaffy, ii. [16]. On σκευοφυλ■κιον cf. Suidas.

603 Winer-Schmiedel, § 5, 27 e (p. 60).

604 Mahaffy, ii. [59].

605 Mahaffy, ii. p. 33.

606 Field, ii., p. 442.

607 In the LXX this passage is wanting ; Aquila translates στ■λωσις ; Theodotion, στ■λωμα (Field, ii., p. 442.).

608 Novus Thesaurus, v. (1821), p. 91.

609 Cf. the German Stand for market-stall. [Also the English stand = support, grand-stand; etc.—Tr.] 610 Mahaffy, ii. [51].

611 Mahaffy, ii. p. 30.

612 Cf. subφ■λος below. [↓]

613 Recherches, p. 189 f. Also the Inscription of Delos (3rd cent. B.C.), Bull. de corr. hell. iii. (1879), p. 470, comes into consideration for Egypt: the Χρ■σερμος there named is συγγεν■ς βασιλ■ως Πτολεμα■ου.

614 Frankel, pp. 166 and 505.

615 Mahaffy, [61].

616 Ch. A. Lobeck ad Phryn. (Leipzig, 1820), p. 378.

617 Cf. the old scholium to the passage, σ■ματατο■ς δο■λους■σως λ■γει (Field, i., p. 52).

618 Mahaffy, ii. [125] ff.

619 Field, i., p. 412.

620 Field, i., p. 464.

621 Field, i., p. 52 f.

622 In this passage the interpretation ass is not in any way necessary; the she-ass of Balaam, which is called ■■νος in the LXX, might quite well be designated there by the general term beast

of burden.

623Clavis3, p. 447.

624 Mahaffy, [68].

625 It should be stated that Mahaffy sets a? to βους.

626 Mahaffy, ii. [75].

627 Mahaffy, ii. [79].

628Gramm. des mutest. Sprachgebrauchs, p. 141.

629 § 34, 3b, note 2 (p. 223 f.).

630Clavis3, p. 441.

631 7th edition, p. 907 = 8, p. 956.

632 The solemn expression υ■ζ or τ■κναθεο■ has, of course, no connection with this, as it forms the correlative to θε■ζπατ■ρ.

633 One dare hardly say, with respect to this passage, that “Matthew” “quotes” from the original Hebrew text; the present writer conjectures that “Matthew,” or whoever wrote this Greek verse, translated its Hebrew original, which, already a quotation, had come to him from Semitic tradition. The Old Testament quotations of “Matthew” agree, in most passages, with the LXX: wherever the Semitic tradition contained words from the Hebrew Bible, the Greek translator just used the Greek Bible in his work, i.e., of course, only when he succeeded in finding the passages there. The tradition gave him, in Matthew 21:5, a free combination of Zechariah 9:9 and Isaiah 62:11 as a word of “the Prophet”: he could not identify it and so translated it for himself, a similar case is Matthew 13:35; here the tradition gave him, as a word of “the Prophet Isaiah,” a saying which occurs in Psalms 78:2, not in Isaiah at all; but as he could not find the passage, ρμ■νευσεδ’α■τ■ζ■νδυνατ■ζ. Similarly, in Mark 1:2 f., a combination of Malachi 3:1 and Isaiah 40:3 is handed down as a word of “the Prophet Isaiah”: only the second half was found in Isaiah and therefore it is quoted from the LXX; the first half, however, which the Greek Christian translator could not find, was translated independently, and, in the form in which it occurs in Matthew 11:10 and Luke 7:27, it is taken over as an anonymous biblical saying. — In all these passages we have to do with biblical sayings which do not form part of the discourses of Jesus or of His friends or opponents, and which therefore do not belong to the earliest material of the pre-Synoptic Gospel tradition. But the peculiar character of the quotations just discussed, which the author cannot interpret in any other way, requires us to postulate that a sort of “synthetic text” (verbindender Text), and, in particular, the application of certain definite O.T. words to Christ, had been added, at a very early period, to this primitive Semitic tradition; here and there in the Gospels we can still see, as above, the method by which they were rendered into Greek.

634 See further p. 307 f. below. [↓] 635 These might be added to.

636 The translator of the same combination in Matthew 21:5 has scrupulously imitated the original by his υ■ζ ■ποζυγ■ου.

637 Thus the unanimous tradition of all the Codices except 239 and, the Syro-Hexaplar (Field, ii., p. 754) which read υοφαρτρας, an emendation prompted by the Hebrew text.

638 The author does not know in what proportion these cases are distributed among the several books of the LXX, or to what degree the special method of the particular translator influenced the matter.

639 The genus “Hebraisms” must be divided into two species, thus: “Hebraisms of translation,” and “ordinary Hebraisms”.

640 These are the passages given by Cremer 7, pp. 907 and 901 (= 8, pp. 956 and 950) with the references corrected.

641 In the passage 2 Samuel 2:7, cited by Cremer for υζθαντου, stands υοζδυνατος. Probably 2 Samuel 12:5 is meant.

642 LXX Psa. 88:23 [MT Psalms 89:23] υζνομας, and 1Ma 2:47 υζτας περιφανας may be added to these.

643 The references to this in the Clavis³, p. 429, at the end of the article τκνον, are not accurate.

644 Particulars in Waddington, iii. 2, p. 26.

645 On this cf. also Paton and Hicks, The Inscriptions of Cos, p. 125 f. υζγεροσας is also found in these, Nos. 95-97.

646BU. vi., p. 180, No. 174.

647 Particular references are unnecessary. The author would name only the Inscription of Tarsus, interesting to us by reason of its place of origin, Waddington, iii. 2, No. 1476 (p. 348), also in honour of Augustus : — ΑτοκρτοραΚα]σαραθεου Σεβαστνδμ]ος Ταρσων. Perhaps the young Paul may have seen here the expression Son of God for the first time—long before it came to him with another meaning.

648 It may be just indicated here that the history of the terms used by Christians of the earlier time teaches us that other solemn expressions of the language of the imperial period were transferred to Christ.

649Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte, i.2, Freiburg, 1888, pp. 103,159. [Eng. Trans., i., pp. 116 f., 179 f.]

650 Jacob, ZAW. x., p. 283. The examples in the Papyri and the Inscriptions are exceedingly numerous. Cf., in addition to the literature instanced by Jacob, Letronne, Rech., p. 58, A. Peyron, p. 56, Grimm, HApAT. iii. (1853), p. 38, Letronne, Notices, xviii. 2, p. 165, Bernays, Die heraklitischenBriefe, p. 20, Lombroso, Rech., pp. 191 ff., 228.

651 The expression φλοστοΚαισαρος, John 19:12, is doubtless to be understood in the light of Roman usage; but, again, amicus Caesaris is most likely dependent upon the court speech of the Diadochi.

652 Cf. James 2:23, Clem. Rom.1 Corinthians 10:1, 17:2.

653 The expression Gottesfreund (friend of God), again, used by the German mystics, is certainly dependent on the biblical passages, but they use it in a sense different from that mentioned in the text.

654 The designation of Abraham in particular (the standard personality of Judaism and of earlier Christianity) as the φιλοθεος accords with the position of honour which he had in Heaven.

655 W. Beyschlag, Meyer, xv. 5 (1888), p. 144.

656 Grimm, HApAT. vi. (1860), p. 145.

657I.e. the foregoing article. The present article was published later by itself.

658ThLZ. xx. (1895), p. 487.

659 This again refers to a previous remark in which Blass had “willingly conceded” to the author his “general, and not always short, reflections”.

660 Blass has here fallen into a misunderstanding. The present writer remarked (above, p. 84 [↑]) that he who undertakes to glean materials from the Inscriptions for the history of the New Testament language, is not merely obeying the voice of science, “but also the behests of reverence towards the Book of Humanity”. The “Book of Humanity” is the New Testament. We are of opinion that every real contribution, even the slightest, to the historical understanding of the N.T. has not only scientific value, but should also be made welcome out of reverence for the sacred Book. We cannot honour the Bible more highly than by an endeavour to attain to the truest possible apprehension of its literal sense.

661 Blass writes denkbar, conceivable, but the sentence in that case seems to defy analysis. After consultation with the author, the translator has substituted dankbar, and rendered as above.—Tr.

662 He noticed only later that Blass had previously, ThLZ. xix. (1894), p. 338, incidentally made the statement that the New Testament Greek should “be recognised as something distinct and subject to its own laws”.

663 Gottingen, 1896. [Eng. Trans., London, 1698.] 664 In the note to this Blass refers to the author’s Bibelstudien, p. 57 f. above, p. 63 f. [↑]).

665 Wilke Clavis Novi Testamenti Philologica, Leipzig, 1879.

666 Wilke Clavis Novi Testamenti Philologica, Leipzig, 1888 [quoted in this article as Clavis3].

667 The author quotes the Corrected Edition, New York, 1896.

668 8th Edition, Gotha, 1895.

669 Those parts of the N.T. which go back to translations must be considered by themselves.

670On the other hand, the Greek Bible contains much, of course, which may promote the understanding of the Inscriptions and Papyri.

671 No intelligent reader will blame the author for having, in his investigations regarding the orthography and morphology, confined himself simply to the giving of materials without adding any

judgment. Nothing is more dangerous, in Textual Criticism as elsewhere, than making general judgments on the basis of isolated phenomena. But such details may occasionally be of service to the investigator who is at home in the problems and has a general view of their connections.

672 Above, pp. 161-169 [↑]; cf. also GGA. 1896, pp. 761-769: and ThLZ. xxi. (1896), pp. 609-615, and the other papers cited above, p. 84. [↑]

673 *Alttertumer von Pergamon* herausgegeben im Auftrage des Koniglich Preussischen Ministers der geistlichen, Unterrichts- und Medicinal-Angelegenheiten, Band viii.; *Die Inschriften von Pergamon* unter Mitwirkung von Ernst Fabricius und Carl Schuchhardt herausgegeben von Max Frankel, (1) Bis zum Ende der SOnigszeit, Berlin, 1890, (2) Romische Zeit.—*Inschriften auf Thon*, Berlin, 1895 [subsequently cited as Perg. or Frankel].

674 *Inscriptiones Graecae insularum Maris Aegaei consilio et auctoritate Academiae Litterarum Regiae Borussicae editae. Fasciculus primus Inscriptiones Graecae insularum Rhodi Chalces Carpathi cum Saro Casi . . .* edidit Fridericus Hiller de Gaertringen, Berolini, 1895 [subsequently cited as IMAe.].

675 *Aegyptische Urkunden aus den Etiniglichen Museen zu Berlin* herausgegeben von der Generalverwaltung: *Griechische Urkunden. Erster Band*, Berlin, [completed] 1895; *Zweiter Band, Heft 1-9*, Berlin, 1894 ff. [subsequently cited as B U.].

676 *Corpus Papyrorum Raineri Archiducis Austriae*, vol. i. *Griechische Texte* herausgegeben von Carl Wessely, i. Band : *Rechtsurkunden* unter Mitwirkung von Ludwig Mitteis, Vienna, 1895 [subsequently cited as PER.].

677 We need only think of the importance of Pergamus for the earlier period of Christianity.

678 See below, *subκαθαρ■ζω, βι■ζομαι, ■λ■σκομαι*. [↑] 679 See above, p. 81. [↑] W. Schmid makes some pertinent remarks in GGA. 1895, p. 36 f.

680 Cremer 8, p. xiii. (Preface to the 4th edition).

681 Winer-Schmiedel, § 5, 13 c (p. 44) ; Blass, *Grammatik*, p. 9 [Eng. Trans., p. 8].

682 Winer-Schmiedel, § 5, 20 c (p. 50) ; Blass, *Grammatik*, p. 21 [Eng. Trans., p. 20 f.].

683 “Delm. as well as Dalm. occurs also in Latin” (Blass, *Gramm.*, p. 21. [Eng. Trans., p. 21.] P. Jürges has called the author’s attention also to the excursus CIL. iii. 1, p. 280.

684 Winer-Schmiedel, § 5, 23 b (p. 53 f.) ; Blass, *Gramm.*, p. 23 [Eng. Trans., p. 23]. “πε■v = π■vελv”. In connection with this and with other details W. Schmid, GGA. 1895, pp. 26-47, has already called attention to the Papyri.

685 All the Papyri cited here are from the Fayyûm.

686 F. Krebs, the editor of this document, erroneously remarks on p. 46.

687 This passage is also referred to by Blass, *Gramm.*, p. 11. [Eng. Trans., p. 10, note 4.]

688 Blass similarly asserts, *Gramm.*, p. 11 [Eng. Trans., p. 10], that the duplication is “established” in the Semitic form.

689 The matter is still more evident in proper names. For example, **ⲡⲙⲑⲁϥ**, as the name of Nabataean kings, is undoubtedly “established” by etymological considerations; on the other hand, the Inscriptions and other ancient evidence, so far as the author knows, all give **ⲡⲙⲧⲁϥ**, and thus **ⲡⲙⲧⲁ** in 2 Corinthians 11:32 may be considered “established” without the slightest misgiving. It is exceedingly probable (according to the excellent conjecture of Scharer, *Gesch. d. jud. Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, i., Leipzig, 1890, p. 619 [Eng. Trans., i., p. 359]) that this spelling was influenced by the desire to Hellenise the barbaric name by assimilation to **ⲡⲣⲉⲧ**.—Moreover, also Blass, *Gramm.*, p. 11 [Eng. Trans., p. 11], takes this view in regard to **ⲙⲱⲛⲏϥ**.

690 Cf. the case of **ⲙⲗⲁⲃⲙ** for **ⲙⲣⲁⲃⲙ**, as above, with the well-known **ⲙⲗⲁⲃⲙⲣⲏⲕⲏϥ** for **ⲙⲣⲁⲃⲙⲣⲏⲕⲏϥ**.

691 Above, p. 109 f. [↑]; cf. Blass, *Gramm.*, p. 11 [Eng. Trans., p. 11].

692 The author has not found the spelling with vv anywhere in the Papyri.

693 Winer-Schmiedel, § 5, 26 a (p. 56).

694 The problem of orthography became later a point of controversy in the History of Dogma; cf. A. Harnack, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, 3, Freiburg and Leipzig, 1894, p. 191 f. [Eng. Trans., iv., p. 12 ff.] *Bel = Bel and the Dragon, a.k.a. Daniel 14.

696 Cf. Winer-Schmiedel, § 5, 27 d (p. 59); Blass, *Gramm.*, p. 10. [Eng. Trans., p. 10.]

697 Cf. also BU. 69 s (Fayyum, 120 A.D.) **ⲛⲟⲙⲙⲓⲛⲁⲧⲟϥ**.³ Above, p. 158. [↑] 698 Examples of this abbreviation from the Inscriptions are given by Frankel, p. 341.

699 Winer-Schmiedel, § 8, 1 (p. 80 f.); Blass, *Gramm.*, p. 25 [Eng. Trans., p. 25], gives other examples from the Papyri.

700 Winer-Schmiedel, § 9, 6 (p. 87); Blass, *Gramm.*, p. 27 [Eng. Trans., p. 27].

701 Winer-Schmiedel, § 9, 6 (p. 87), note 4; here we already find the Papyrus, *Notices*, xviii. 2, 230 (154 A.D.), cited in reference to the form.

702 Winer-Schmiedel, § 9, 11 (p. 90).

703 Exhaustiveness is not guaranteed: it was only lately that the author directed his attention to the point. In particular, he has no general idea as to the usage of the common forms in the Papyri.

704 Cf. Tischendorf on Romans 16:3 and Acts 18:2.

705 Cf. A. Meyer, *Jesu Muttersprache*, Freiburg and Leipzig, 1896, p. 47 f., and E. Nestle, *Philologica sacra*, Berlin, 1896, p. 19 1.

706 The reference from the Inscriptions for this name which is given below belongs to the 3rd or 4th century A.D. P. Jensen has called the author's attention to a much older passage. In the Aramaic Inscription of Palmyra No. 73, of the year 114 B.c. (in M. de Vogue's *Syrie Centrale*, *Inscriptions Semitiques* . . ., Paris, 1868, p. 53) mention is made of a Barnebo (**ⲙⲁⲣⲛⲉⲃⲟ**).

707 Blass, *ThLZ*. xx. (1895), p. 488, holds this supposition to be absolutely impossible. According to A. Hilgenfeld, *Berl. Philol. Wochenschr.*, 1896, p. 650, it deserves consideration, but also

requires to be tested. The author stands by his hypothesis quite confidently—the more so as Blass has not mentioned his counter-reasons. He has been informed by several well-known Semitists that they accept it; cf. most recently, G. Delman, *Die Worte Jesu*, vol. i., Leipzig, 1898, p. 32.—From the genitive βαρνα, CIG. 4477 (Larissa in Syria, ca. 200 A.D.) we may most likely infer a nominative Bapvas. The author does not venture to decide whether this might be a pet form of βαρναβης (cf. Heinrici, Meyer, v 8. [1896], p. 525).

708 Aram. פלתיאל , i.e., son of the palace, Or son of Therach, Terah (LXX θαρρα and θαρα, but, as a place-name, with τ for פNumbers 33:27 f. ταραθ)

709 The author does not know of any other examples of π for פ. The accentuation —פס should probably be preferred to the Πατפס given by Frankel.

710 Cf. Wendt, Meyer, iii. 6/7 (1888), p. 235.

711 Winer-Schmiedel, § 12, 7 (p. 103).

712 For the reading see Winer-Schmiedel, Supplement, p. 359.

713 Winer-Schmiedel, § 13, 2, Note 2 (p. 104) ; Blass, Gramm., p. 57. [Eng. Trans., p. 57.] 714 Winer-Schmiedel, § 13, 10 (p. 109) ; Blass, Gramm., p. 42. [Eng. Trans., p. 43.] 715 Winer-Schmiedel, § 13, 10 (p. 109) ; Blass, Gramm., p. 43. [Eng. Trans., p. 43.]

716 The Editor, P. Viereck, makes the unnecessary observation, “1. [read] καταλππ.

717 Winer-Schmiedel, § 13, 10 (p. 110); Blass, Gramm., p. 43. [Eng. Trans., p. 43.]

718 Cf. Print edition, p. 68. note. 2 = To the literary sources here indicated there have lately been added certain fragments of reports which refer to the Jewish War of Trajan, and which were probably drawn up by an Alexandrian Jew: Pap. Par. 68 (Notices, xviii. 2, p. 383 ff.), and Pap. Lond. 1 (Kenyon, p. 229 f.); cf. Schurer, i., p. 53; further particulars and a new reading in U. Wilcken, *Ein Aktens-Nick zum jadischn Kriege Trajans*, Hermes, xxvii. (1892), p. 464 ff. (see also Hermes, xxii. [1887], p. 487), and on this GGA. 1894, p. 749. Pap. Berol. 8111 (BU. xi., p. 333, No. 341), is also connected with it. I cannot, however willing, discover the slightest difference in respect of language between the readable part of the fragments, which unfortunately is not very large, and the non-Jewish Papyri of the same period. Independently of their historical value, the fragments afford some interesting phenomena, e.g., κωστωδα (Matthew 27:65 f., Matthew 28:11 κωστωδα, Matthew 27:66 Cod. A κωστωδα; Cod. D has κωστωδα), χρεοιδολοι (Luke 17:10, cf. Matthew 25:30). The identification of the σοιουδαοι with the successors of the σιδαοι of the Maccabean period, which Wilcken advances, hardly commends itself; the expression does not refer to a party within Alexandrian Judaism, but is rather a self-applied general title of honour.—Wilcken, further, has in view the publication of another Papyrus fragment (Hermes, xxvii., p. 474), which contains an account of the reception of a Jewish embassy by the Emperor Claudius at Rome. (This publication has now seen the light; for all further particulars see the beginning of the author's sketch, “Neuentdeckte Papyrus-Fragmente zur Geschichte des griechischen Judenthums,” in ThLZ. xxiii. (1898), p. 602 ff.).

719 Winer-Schmiedel, § 13, 13 (p. 111 f.) ; Blass, Gramm., p. 44 f. [Eng. Trans., p. 45 f.] 720 Winer-Schmiedel, § 13, 13 (p. 112); Blass, Gramm., p. 45. [Eng. Trans., p. 46.] 721 Most likely an

assimilation to φελον.

722 Winer-Schmiedel, § 13, 14 (p. 112 f.); Blass, Gramm., p. 45 f. [Eng. Trans., p. 46.] 723 The editors accentuate προεγμουσαν.

724 Winer-Schmiedel, § 13, 15 (p. 113); Blass, Gramm., p. 45. [Eng. Trans., p. 46.]

725 Conversely, -ασι for -αν in BU. 275 5 (Fayyûm, 215 A.D.) πλθασι.

726 Winer-Schmiedel, § 13, 16 (p. 113 f.) ; Blass, Gramm., p. 46. [Eng, Trans., p. 46.]

727 Winer-Schmiedel, § 14, 11 ff. (p. 121 f.); Blass, Gramm., p. 48 f. [Eng Trans., p. 49 f.] Neither writer takes notice of 1 Corinthians 7:3 ποδιδτω.

728 It is true that line 23 has μδιδατ (cf. Supplement, p. 358). The editor, F. Krebs, accentuates 3/51, and explains thus : “1. [read] δδει = δδωσι. The present writer considers this impossible: δδι (=δδει) is rather an imperative of δδωμι, formed in accordance with τθει. Similarly BU. 602 6 Fayyûm, 2nd cent. A.D.) δεδι (= δδει) on the analogy of τθει. Other assimilations to the formation of τθημι in the Fayyûm Papyri are: 360 8 (108-109 A.D.) the imperative παρδετε, and 159 3 (216 A.D.) ξδετο; the latter form already in PER. ccxxii.18 (2nd cent. A.D.).

729 πιδδω could also be an abbreviation of πιδδωμι, specially as it occurs in a common formula. Hence the editor, U. Wilcken, writes πιδδω(μι).

730 Apocope of the preposition, like BU. 86 7 (Fayyûm, 155 A.D.) καλεψ; in contrast with line 12 of the same Papyrus καταλεψ (not, however, παδσω, B U. 39 20 which has been corrected, in accordance with a more exact reading p. 354, to ποδσω). Cf. Winer-Schmiedel, § 5, 22 c, note 47 (p. 53).

731 Winer-Schmiedel, § 14, 17 (p. 123); Blass, Gramm., p. 48. [Eng. Trans., p. 49.]

732 The particular sentence (from a private letter) is not quite clear to the author, but he considers it impossible that the form could be derived from the well-known δνω. F. Krebs also places δνοι in connection with δνωμα in his index.

733 It is significant that Thayer should note this usage in Xenophon (An. 2, 5, 14) and Polybius (1, 9, 7; 74, 13 ; 86, 5, etc.), while Clavis3 does not.

734 P. Wendland, Deutsche Litteraturzeitung, 1895, col. 902, refers further to Schenkl's Index to Epictetus, and to Viereck, Sermo graecus, p. 75.

735 Frankel, p. 353.

736 Winer-Schmiedel, § 4, 2 a (p. 27), counts this usage among the “imperfect” Hebraisms. It would be better to abolish this term from Winer's Grammar.

737 Below, p. 290 f., [↓] with a reference to the examples of Wilamowitz-Moel-lendorff in Guil. Schmidt, De Flavii Iosephi elocutione observations criticae, Fleck. Jbb. Suppl. xx. (1894), p. 516.

738 The passage in Demosthenes had been cited by G. D. Kypke, Observationes sacrae, Wratisl. 1755, ii., p. 109; after him by Winer for example (e.g., 4[1836], p. 183, 7[1867], p. 185, and Blass,

Gramm., p. 104 [Eng. Trans., p. 106]. The author's attention was called to Kypke by Wendt on Acts 20:26 (Meyer, iii.6/7 [1888], p. 444. The right view is advocated also by Cremer⁸, p. 489.

739 In regard to both of these passages, Professor Wilcken of Breslau observes, in a letter to the author, that νομα is there used "for the possessor of the name, the person," but that the translation name answers quite well. —The present writer would, with Luther, render the word by name in the New Testament passages also, so that the special character of the usage might not be obliterated.

740 In Corpus Papyrorum Raineri, i. 1, 270, note, L. Mitteis translates this passage: alles Vermögen meiner Mutter ist in seinem Besitz [all the property of my mother is in his possession].

741 A different case is 153 27 (Fayyûm, 152 A.D.) πογραψασθαυτνκαμλωνπογραφ. . . π'νματοσαυτν. What we have here is the entering on the list of a camel under the name of its new owner. Still, that which is specified as π'νματος of any one is, in point of fact, his property. One sees that here, as also in the above formulm, there can be no thought of a new meaning of the word, but only of a realising of its pregnant fundamental meaning.

742 But not in Mark 9:38 A and Matthew 7:22, where the dative is instrumental.

743 ThLZ. xx. (1895), p. 488, 744 Cf. W. M. Ramsay, The Expository Times, vol. ix., p. 567 f.

745 Profangraecitæ et biblischer Sprachgeist, Leipzig, 1859, p. 62: "γπη does not occur as a genuine term, so far as the references in the Lexica avail, in the κοιν either".

746 Clavis⁵, p. 3: "In Philone et Josepho legi non memini" (after Bretschneider).

747 Cremer⁸, p. 14, "this word, apparently formed by the LXX, or, at any rate, in their circle (Philo and Josephus do not have it)"

748 The present writer had not the book by him when he wrote the article evycirn in the German Bibelstudien.

749 The passage relates to the apparent contradiction between LXX Deuteronomy 1:31 [MT Deuteronomy 1:31] and LXX Numbers 23:19 [MT Numbers 23:19].

750 Inscriptions Graecae Siciliae et Italiae additis Graecis Galliae Hispaniae Britanniae Germaniae inscriptionibus consilio et auctoritate Academiae Litterarum Regiae Borussicae edidit Georgivs Kaibel, . . . Berolini 1890.

751 Kaibel, Epigrammata Graeca ex lapidibus conlecta, Berlin, 1878, p. 296 f., treats the Inscription under No. 728 as a Christian one, but without giving his reasons.

752 So the editor, Wilcken, restores; the author considers that κατγωστ[οι] is also possible.

753 Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Sprachgebrauchs, Berlin, 1859, p. 192.

754 Strictly speaking, this point is out of place in the above paragraph, but it is discussed here in order to avoid breaking up the article ν.

755 The editor's proposal to change ν into seems to the present writer wrong. Cf. also the passage B 543 5, quoted below.

756 ■■v with the subjunctive is found three times (lines 4. 12. 17) in the same Papyrus.

757 Winer-Lunemann, p. 277, β at the foot.

758 Notices et extraits des manuscrits de la bibliotheque imperiale, vol. xviii., part 2, Paris, 1865, p. 232 f.

759 For μ■χω cf. the analogous cases in Winer-Lunemann, top of p. 244.

760 This peculiar form (developed from ε■πov ?) must in any case be interpreted as indicative.

761 ■π■ταv and ■ταv with the future indicative in the Sibyllists are treated of by A. Rzach, Zur Kritik der Sibyllinischen, Orakel, Philologus, liii. (1894), p. 283.

762 HC. ii. 1 (1891), p. 98, ad loc. 1 Corinthians 6:18.

763 In the LXX in innumerable passages (H. W. J. Thiersch, De Pentateuchi versione Alexandrina libri tres, Erlangen, 1841, p. 108); in the Apocrypha, Ch. A. Wahl, Clavis librorum V. T. Apocryphorum philologica, Leipzig, 1853, p. 137 f., enumerates 28 cases; in the N.T. Clavis3 gives 17. Many other cases, without doubt, have been suppressed by copyists or editors.—U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff considers ■■■v, 3 John 1:5, to be an “orthographic blunder” (Hermes, xxxiii. [1898], p. 531), but this is a mistake.

764 It is only the Papyri of the (early and late) imperial period which have been collated by the author in regard to this question.

765 This conjecture is confirmed by a Papyrus in the British Museum, from the Thebaid, belonging to the year 132 A.D.; given in Grenfell’s An Alexandrian Erotic Fragment and other Greek Papyri chiefly Ptolemaic, Oxford, 1896, No. xviii. 27, p. 40: κα■■ξο■■vα■p■ται.

766 In almost every case the editors of the Berlin and the Vienna Papyri prefer to read ■v instead of ■■v, but what we have to do with here is not really a clerical error. ■■v should be read in every case, just as it is written. In Vol. II. of the Berlin documents, ■■v has for the most part been allowed to remain, and rightly so.

767 Pap.: η. Wessely, p. 255, accentuates ■sic.

768 Proceeding from this twice-occurring ε■ with (■■v =) ■v following, we can understand the peculiar negative ε■μ■τι■v, in 1 Corinthians 7:5. Schmiedel, HC. ii. 1 (1891), p. 100, explains thus: “ε■μ■τι■v = ■■vμ■τι, as Origen reads”. This equation ought not to be made; it only explains the meaning of the combination, but not its special syntactic character. ε■μ■τι■v has philologically nothing to do with the ■■v in ■■vμ■τι; ■v, occurring here after ε■, is rather exactly the same as if it occurred after a hypothetical relative, thus: unless in a given case, unless perhaPsa. The fact that the verb (say, ■ποστερ■τε or γ■νηται has to be supplied is absolutely without importance for the grammatical determination of the case. —Blass, Gramm., p. 211 [Eng. Trans., p. 216], counts ε■μ■τι■v among the combinations in which ε■ and ■■v are blended together. We consider this hypothesis untenable, on account of the ■v. A. Buttmann, p. 190, note, agrees with it, though indeed he also refers to the explanation which we consider to be the correct one, pp. 189, bottom line, and 190, first two lines. It is confirmed by the ε■■v of the Papyrus.

769Der Brief an die Hebraer erläutert, part 2, Berlin, 1840, pp. 248-250.

770HApAt. ii (1853), p. 138; cf. i. (1851), p. 186.

771 Further, the hypothesis of blending, considered purely by itself, is inconceivable. If εμν is a Hebraising form, as regards one half of it, then ε must have the sense of μ. But then also the formula takes on a negative sense, so that, e.g., Hebrews 6:14 would read: Truly if I bless thee and multiply thee—[scil. : then will I not be God, or something similar].

772 That the author of either Papyrus was a Jew is impossible.

773 Thus, e.g., in the Berlin MS., immediately before, we have, conversely, χρηων for χρειων. (The document is otherwise well-written, like that of Vienna). Cf. also BU. 316 12 (Ascalon, 359 A. D. ε [=] καετινιτρνματικαλτε”, and, conversely, 261 33 (Fayyûm, 2nd-3rd cent. A.D.) μμ, without doubt for εμ.

774 Krebs writes εισις in the Berlin MS., and adds the note : “ I. [i.e., read] 775 Wessely writes εισις μην, and adds “ 1. [= read] μν”.

776 The note on p. 416 of the Etymologicum magnum, viz., πρημαρκικνπερκαδιδιφθγγουγρφεται, has in itself no weight; it but repeats the documentary information found in the passage quoted in connection with it, Hebrews 6:14 = LXX Genesis 22:17 [MT Genesis 22:17.]

777 A. Buttmann, p. 20, refers to the similarly-formed Greek names of mountains (Κιθαριν, λικν, etc.).

778 The author is not quite able to determine whether the mistake in procedure which underlies the above-named identification should be attributed to W. Grimm, or whether it is a result of the erroneous view of Chr. G. Wilke. In any case we may characterise the mistake in the pertinent words of the latter (Die Hermeneutik des Neuen Testaments systematisch dargestellt, zweiter Theil: die hermeneutische Methodenlehre, Leipzig, 1844, p. 181): “Exegetes are frequently in the habit of giving to this or the other word a meaning which belongs only to some word which is combined with it, and which does not apply to the word in question, either in this combination or elsewhere “.

779 The passages which follow, so far as the author knows, have in no case been previously noticed.

780 Winer-Schmiedel, § 10, 4 (p. 93); the author perceives here that also Niese and Bekker always write λαιν in Josephus. The relevant passages are cited in Clavis3, p. 140.

781 The editor, Krebs, writes οκς, but the word most likely belongs to the name of the field, and should thus, according to our custom, be written with a capital. The two names, in the author's opinion, should be set in the Index subΟκςΚανν[.] and ΟκςΣα[. . .]λοχ.

782 The later editors accentuate thus.

783 This could be asserted only of the reading in Mark 11:1 according to B 784 Winer-Schmiedel, § 10, 4 (p. 93), and Winer7, § 29, 1 (p. 171).

785 Tischendorf's Apparatus ignores the whole matter.

786 Specially the Peschito must be taken into consideration; cf. Winer, p. 171. So far as the author can decide, it implies **■λατι■ν** in all the passages in Luke. But he cannot guarantee this.

787 To mention a similar case: When we read the title of a book, e.g., "Jesu Predigt in ihrem Gegensatz zum Judenthum. Ein religionsgeschichtlicher Vergleich von Lic. W. Bousset, Privatdocent in Gottingen," we would not say that Privatdocent is used as an indeclinable, but would decide that it is one of the many cases of a more lax usage of the nominative in titles of books. [In German we ought, properly speaking, to write "Privatdocenten," i.e., the dative.—TR.]

788 Sources of New Testament Greek, Edinburgh, 1895, p. 90.

789 Cf. also Blass, Gramm., p. 125 [Eng. Trans., p. 127 f.] "**■ν■πιον**. . . . , **κατεν■πιον** , **■ναντι** . . . , **κατ■ναντι** . . are derived from the LXX, and are unknown in profane authors even of later times ".—Yet on p. xii. Blass refers to **■ναντι** as being profane Greek!!

790 Also in line 6 the editor, Krebs, restores **■ν[■πι] ον**; in that case the combination **μεταδιδ■νατι■ν■πιον** would be repeated here also. Wilcken, however, questions the correctness of this restoration, and proposes **■ν[τειλ]ον**, as he has informed the author by letter.

791 See Print edition, p. 203, note 2. = This conjecture is confirmed by a Papyrus in the British Museum, from the Thebaid, belonging to the year 132 A.D.; given in Grenfell's An Alexandrian Erotic Fragment and other Greek Papyri chiefly Ptolemaic, Oxford, 1896, No. xviii. 27, p. 40: **κα■ξο■να■ρ■ται**.

792 The testimony of Origen renders it probable that this word is actually a "biblical" one; thus, strictly speaking, it should not be treated here.

793 HApAT. iv. (1857), p. 35.

794 The author is indebted for this and the following passage to a reference of Frankel, p. 315, relating to Perg. 461.

795 Sources of N.T. Greek, p. 119.

796 He certainly discusses the other possibility, viz., that the word was used previously to the LXX.

797 Italics from Cremer.

798 The one copy CIA. iii. 73 is the rough draught, so to speak: the other has had the language corrected, and gives a longer text.

799 = Dittenberger, Sylloge No. 379.

800 Examples from classical antiquity in Frankel, p. 188 f.

801 Einleitung in das Neue Testament, 1st and 2nd edn. Freiburg and Leipzig, 1894, p. 31.

802 Cf., in line is of the same edict, **τα■ζκυριακα■ψ■φοις**.

803 This [i.e., the German] translation is from a letter of Wilcken. The author has since found in BU. 620 15 (Fayyilm, 3rd cent. A.D.) **προσετ■θη■ντο■ζκυριακο■ζλ■γο[ις]**.

804 This is the Richter Inscription named above.

805 $\theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ is also used in a corresponding manner: the $\theta\epsilon\alpha\iota\delta\iota\alpha\tau\acute{\omicron}\xi\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, in Pap. Par. 69 iii. 20 (Elephantine, 232 A.D.), edited by Wilcken, *Philologus*, liii. (1894), p. 83, cf. p. 95, are imperial arrangements.

806 The earliest passages are given in A. Harnack's *Bruchstucke des Evangeliums and der Apokalypse des Petrus* (TU. ix. 2), Leipzig, 1893, p. 67.

807 HC. iv 2 (1893), p. 318.

808 The author is indebted to a communication of his friend B. Bess of Gottingen for the information that Lightfoot, p. 694 f., gives the following references for $\Sigma\epsilon\beta\alpha\sigma\tau\alpha$: CIG. 4715 and Add. 5866 c (both of the time of Augustus), 4957 (Galba) from Egypt; from Ephesus, an Inscription of the year 104 A.D.; from Traianopolis, Lebas and Waddington, 1676 (130 A.D.). The investigations of Usener are given in the *Bullettino dell' Instit. di Corr. Archeol.*, 1874, p. 73 ff.

809 The author hopes at some future time to be able to make an investigation of the use of $\kappa\omicron\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ and $\kappa\omicron\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma\mu\nu$ to designate deities and emperors in the imperial period.

810 Cf. p. 142 ff. above. [↑]

811 So reads the Papyrus: which $\sigma\phi\omega\nu\epsilon\varsigma$ are meant the author does not clearly understand.

812 HApAT. iv. (1857), p. 183 f.

813 The edition of Van Ess, like Wahl in the *Clavis librorum V.T. Apocry. phorum*, p. 44, reads $\nu\delta\rho\alpha\lambda\omicron\gamma\alpha$. This is a printer's error in Wahl, as is $\nu\delta\rho\alpha\phi\omicron\nu\omega$ a little farther on (cf. the alphabetical order). The author cannot say whether $\nu\delta\rho\alpha\lambda\omicron\gamma\alpha$ is a possible form.

814 Above, p. 143. [↑]

815 A construction like e.g., $\epsilon\zeta\kappa\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\tau\alpha\lambda\nu\tau\omega\nu\lambda\gamma\omicron\varsigma$, a sum of about sixty talents.

816 Swete writes $\pi\omicron\iota\eta\sigma\mu\epsilon\nu\zeta\tau\epsilon\kappa\alpha\tau' \nu\delta\rho\omicron\lambda\omicron\gamma\epsilon\omicron\nu\epsilon\zeta\gamma\rho\nu\omicron\delta\rho\alpha\chi\mu\zeta\delta\iota\sigma\chi\iota\lambda\alpha\varsigma$. . . What $\kappa\alpha\tau' \nu\delta\rho\omicron\lambda\omicron\gamma\epsilon\omicron\nu$ is meant to signify we do not understand.

817 "Of the time of Hadrian at the earliest" (Wilcken re this Papyrus).

818 The author has subsequently noticed in Pape that even the *Etymologicum Magnum* quotes the word from Xenophon!! The New Testament lexicographers really ought to have noted this. The note of the Et. M. in regard to $\phi\epsilon\iota\lambda$ is as follows: ... $\sigma\pi\alpha\nu\omega\zeta\delta\epsilon\rho\eta\tau\alpha\iota\nu\chi\rho\sigma\epsilon\iota\epsilon\rho\sigma\kappa\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota\delta\omicron\pi\alpha\rho\Xi\epsilon\nu\omicron\phi\nu\tau\iota\nu\tau\omicron\zeta\text{Π}\epsilon\rho\text{Π}\rho\omega\nu$.

819 But on p. 296 this Papyrus is assigned to the 2nd cent.

820 We do not quite understand this; the sacred debt is perhaps a debt owing to the temple treasury.

821 Winer-Lunemann, p. 391.

822 The author has not as yet met with the word, in the sense of prayer, in heathen usage. But the question as to its "formation" is sufficiently answered by showing that it occurs outside of the Bible.

It is improbable that the heathen usage is in any way to be traced back to Jewish influence.

823 References in Scharer, *Geschichte des jadischnen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, ii. (1886), p. 370 = 3 ii., p. 444 (Eng. Trans. ii., p. 69).

824 References in Scharer, *Geschichte des jadischnen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, ii. (1886), p. 370 = 3 ii., p. 444 (Eng. Trans. ii., p. 69), and in Thayer s. v. The latter cites also Cleomedes 71, 16.

825 Wilcken, *Berl. Philol. Wochenschr.*, xvi. (1396), col. 1493 (Review of Willrich, *Juden und Griechen var der makkab. Erhebung*, Gottingen, 1895).

826 In the case of a Graecism like σουδριον (authenticated hitherto only for the N.T.), if anywhere at all, we have to deal with a simple case of chance.

827 Above, p. 92. [↑] 828 Profangraecitaet and biblischer Sprachgeist, Leipzig, 1859, p.

829 These references have rightly been adopted by Cremer 8, p. 159.

830 This quotation is from Frankel, p. 315.

831 We have in this combination a synonym for λλοτριοπισκοπος hitherto authenticated only for Christian usage; this compound becomes intelligible by comparison with δικος.

832 Cf. also Blass, *Gramm.*, p. 88, note 1 [Eng. Trans., p. 88, note 3]: “ λσκεσθαιμαρτας, Hebrews 2:17, strikes as being strange by reason of the object : the classical (ξ)ιλσκ. θειν means ‘to dispose Him in mercy towards one’. Similarly, however (=expiare), also LXX and Philo.”

833 Dittenberger, *Sylloge*, No. 379. Cf. p. 216 above in reference to καθαρζω. [↑] 834 Cf. 2 Thessalonians 3:11.

835 Meyer, i. 1 8 (1890), p. 363.

836 HC. i.2 (1892), p. 239 f.

837 There is a second α placed above the first α in the original.

838 Cf. Jdt 2:27 τπεδαξελκμησε.

839 Quoted in Kennedy, *Sources of N.T. Greek*, p. 126 f.

840 The author gives this quotation because it yields further epigraphic materials. Kennedy, *Sources of N.T. Greek*, p. 102, also refers to the Inscriptions (CIG. 3595, “ etc.”).— Cf. now also A. Schulten, *Mittheilungendes Kaiserlich-Deutschen Archaol. Instituts, Romische Abtheilung*, xiii. (1898). p. 237 841 See p. 105 ff. above. [↑]

842 Wessely, *Corpus Papyrorum Raineri*, i. 1, 151; but no example is given there. The word might signify receipt for rent or hire, not deed of conveyance as Wessely supposes.

843 Above, p. 108 f. [↑]

844 επισκοπο can be read quite plainly, thereafter either an ι or the fragment of another letter. The editor writes ππισκοποι in his transcription. But as only one name follows it would be more

correct to read πσκοπο[ς]. It appears thus in the index, p. 235, which contains many a tacit correction.

845 Wessely reads PER. xxx. 5 f. (Fayyûm, 6th cent. A.D.) τουαγιουωαννουτουευλογουκαιευαγγελιστου, and translates of Saint John, the apostle and evangelist. Should not θεολογου be read?

846 The editor, in the index, p. 238, remarks upon this “πλοθος, i.q., κοινον”.

847 Agyptische Priester unter romischer Herrschaft in the Zeitschrift fur agypt. Sprache and Alterthumskunde, xxxi. (1893), p. 31 ff.—Reference is made on p. 34 to Wilcken, Kaiserl. Tempelverwaltung in Agypten, Hermes, xxiii., p. 592, and Arsinoitische Tempelrechnungen, Hermes, xx., p. 430.

848 There is one passage belonging to the Ptolemaic period attesting πρεσβτεροι in this sense which is not cited here by Krebs. In CIG. 4717 2 f. (Thebes in Lower Egypt, between 45 and 37 B.C.) it is said: [δο]ξετοςπδιοσπλεωστ[ςμεγλης]ερεσιτο[μεγστουθεομο]νρασωνθρκατοςπρεσβυτρουςκατοςλλοιςπσι. Here the πρεσβτεροι plainly belong to the priesthood.

849 The Soknopaios-temple in the Fayyûm, belonging to imperial times, is meant.

850 See the corrected reading in the Supplement, p. 397.

851 They seem always to have formed a college (of 3, 4 or 5 persons).

852 According to Krebs, p. 35, πρεσβτεροι was thus used—without the addition of ερες—even in the Ptolemaic period [as above, CIG. 4717 2f.].

853 Frankel, p. 821, in ref. to Perg. 477 (time of Claudius or Nero): “This and the following Inscription (478, imperial period) prove the existence in Pergamus of a Gerousia, for which institution, particularly frequent in Roman Asia Minor, reference may be made to the careful discussion of Menadier (Ephesii, p. 48 ff.) and its continuation by Hicks (Greek Inscriptions in the Brit. Mus., iii. 2, p. 74 ff.). According to these, the Gerousia is to be thought of as an official body whose authority lay in sacred affairs. Otherwise Mommsen, Rom. Gesch. 5, 326.”

854 A. Harnack, Lehrbuch, der Dogmengeschichte, i.2 (Freiburg, 1888), p. 385 [Eng. Trans., ii., p. 131]: “One might perhaps say that the internal form of the churches was altered by no other development so thoroughly as by that which made priests of the bishops and elders “.

855 Cf. the similar circumstances in regard to προφτης, p. 236. [↑]

856 F. Krebs, Agyptische Priester unter romischer Herrschaft in the Zeitschrift fur agypt. Sprache und Alterthumskunde, xxxi. (1893), p. 36.

857 F. Krebs, Agyptische Priester unter romischer Herrschaft in the Zeitschrift fur agypt. Sprache und Alterthumskunde, xxxi. (1893), p. 36.

858 There were priestly prophets in other places. We doubt indeed, whether, in IMAe. 833 6 ff. (Rhodes, 1st cent. u.c.) προφατεσαςντστεικαπιλαχνερεςλου, the προφατεσας actually refers to priestly duties. Compare, however, the passages in Kaibel, IGrSI. Index, p. 740

subπροφήτης.

859 A. Harnack, Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte, i 2, p. 183 [Eng. Trans., i., p. 214].

860 Eine ägyptische Statue aus Tyrus in the Zeitschr. für ägypt. Sprache und Alterthumskunde, xxxi. (1893), p. 102.

861 κωμίζων, carrying in the procession. This Inscription is a little reminiscent of the passage from the Leiden Papyri on p. 354.

862 Hermes, xx., p. 287, note 7.

863 The Papyrus was written about this time; the text itself may be older.

864 Meyer, iv. 8 (1891), p. 595.

865 HC. ii. 2 (1891), p. 184.

866 B U. 248 40 (letter from the same person and to the same as in 249) τμήμα γδαλασφραγ(ιζμενα) might also be added.

867 Cf. the Index of personal names in the IMAe. These Inscriptions have θεσπν. The formula κατγνεσιν, 19 10, 884 14 (?) 964 add., expresses the antithesis to it.

868 The IMAe. mostly read so; also θυγατροποιαν in 646 2.

869 Meyer, xvi. 5 (1896), p. 427.

870 Der Antichrist, Göttingen, 1895, p. 7.

871 Meyer, xvi. 5, p. 431.

872 Meyer, xvi. 5, p. 432.

873 Cf. Der Antichrist, p. 8: "At the same time I am quite conscious that in the last resort I do not attain to an understanding of the eschatological-mythological ideas".

874 Der Antichrist, p. 132 ff.

875 According to Bousset, the mark seems to have been originally a serpent-mark: the reference to the name of the beast was added by the writer of the Apocalypse (Der Antichrist, p. 133). But nothing is added: and therefore in Meyer, xvi. 5, p. 432, it is more accurately put that the mark is "changed in meaning".

876 In the passages cited by Bousset the buying (and selling) is intimately connected with the famine.

877 Whether the use of this imperial χρυσμα is found elsewhere is unknown to the author. But he is of opinion that it is not; otherwise it would be inconceivable that Mommsen, who finds in John 13:16 f. an allusion to the imperial money (Römische Geschichte, v. 4, Berlin, 1894, p. 522), should not have lighted upon the author's conjecture. Wessely also, in his issue of PER., treats the matter as something new.

878 Wessely in ref. to PER. xi., p. 11.

879L is the common abbreviation for **■**τους.

880 We have found only imperial seals in the Papyri.

881 The author applied, March 15, 1897, to the directors of the Imperial and Royal Printing Establishment at Vienna with the request to lend him the cast of this fac-simile for his book. The directors, to their great regret, could not grant this request, "as the editors of the work *Corpus Papyrorum Raineri* are unable, on principle, to give their consent to it". [Reply of 22nd March.] 882 In connection with PER. xi., p. 37.

883 In connection with PER. xi., p. 34.

884 We are of opinion that, by a more exact examination of the fragments of bills of sale and similar documents of the 1st and 2nd centuries, so far as their originals are extant, we might discover traces of a seal in other instances.

885 ο**■**κονομ**■**α = document is often found in the Papyri.

886 The supposition that the day of the month also belonged to the seal is in itself improbable, as, in that case, the plate must have been altered daily; it is further opposed by the fact that the preserved seals only give the year.

887 Even if all the imperial seals were as large as that of Trajan in PER. xi., which, with its diameter of 9.7 centimetres, could find sufficient room only on the brows of thinkers and the hands of the proletariat, yet our hypothesis would lose nothing in probability; surely we do not wish to control the seer with the centimetre rod. But there was manifestly no prescribed standard diameter for the seal; cf. that on BU. 183, or even the original stamp of Augustus; a seal of its size could quite well have found room on forehead or hand.

888 Examples are also to be found in other places.

889 Cf., if the restoration be correct, Perg. 223 (ca. 156 B.C.) **■**ναστ[ρεφο. μ**■**νη]νκαλ[**■**ς] κα**■**ε**■**σεβ**■**ςκα**■**[**■**ξ**■**ωστ**■**ςθε**■**ς], said of Bito, a priestess of Athena.

890 As the author has not the Turin Papyri by him, he quotes according to Corp. Papp. Raineri, i. 1, p. 12.

891 **■**μολογ**■**α = contract.

892 See p. 107 f. [↑]

893 It was remarked on p. 114, note 3 [↑], that the formula is also found without this technical meaning. As examples of this we have the **■**ναγ**■**γραπται of Josephus (references in Hans Droner, *Untersuchungen Über Josephus*, Thesis, Marburg, 1896, pp. 54 note 1, and 85), Arrian (cf. Wilcken, *Philologus*, liii. [1894], p. 117 f.), and most likely of other authors as well. I am indebted to a kind communication of Dr. Hans Droner for the information that Josephus frequently employs **■**ναγ**■**γραπται for O.T. references also, while he certainly uses γ**■**γραπται very seldom for these; γ**■**γραπται in c. Ap. ii. 18 refers to a non-biblical quotation.

894 Benndorf and Niemann, *Reisen in Lykien und Karien*, i., Vienna, 1894, p. 77; for the date see p. 75.

895Hermes xvi. (1881), p. 172, note; cited by Frankel, p. 16.

896 The citation is made from the issue of this Papyrus (from Notices et extraits, xviii. 2, pp. 890-399) by Wilcken in Philologus, liii, (1894), p. 82.

897 The restorations are certain.

898 With this we must not confound κδιδνατνχερα, BU. 405. (Fayyûm, 348 A.D.) where χερ means manuscript, document.

899 See also Grimm on 2Ma 4:34, HApAT. iv. (1857), p. 93.

900 This formula often occurs in the PER. also.

901Cf. Frankel, p. 55.

902 This passage is quoted from Frankel, p. 186, who also refers to the active παρασχναχρσιμοναντνπατρδι, CIG. 2771 i. 10 (Aphrodisias), and would restore Perg. 25315 in a similar way.

903 Meyer, iv. 8 (1891), p. 512.

904 HC. iii. 1 (1891), p. 209.

905 Citation from Frankel, p. 134.

906Cf. A. H. Franke on Php 2:2 (Meyer, ix.5 [1886], p. 84).

907 Meyer, xii. 6 (1897), p. 136.

908 The more general meaning also is found in BU. 388 ii. 24 (Fayyûm, 2nd-3rd cent. A.D.).

909 Italics from Cremer.

910 Dittenberger, Sylloge, No. 379. See, in reference to καθαρζω, p. 216.

911 Cf. its antithesis, επρσδεκτος, also said of a sacrifice, Romans 15:16 and 1 Peter 2:5, like θυσαδεκτPhp 4:18 and LXX.

912 An additional reference for this word; cf. p. 122.

913 Meyer, xii.6 (1897), p. 87 ff.

914 Tholuck also, in Beitrage zur Spracherklarung des Neuen Testaments, Halle, 1832, p. 45, makes this conjecture, with a reference to Wahl; but he has no example at his disposal.

915 It is very highly probable that the Greek writer Oecumenius still understood it as an adjective in these passages; he interprets δοκμιοντκεκριμνονλγει, τδεδοκιμασμων, τκαθαρν, (Tischendorf in reference to James 1:3). The substitution, in some minuscules, of δκιμος for δοκιμος, in both the New Testament passages (as in the Papyrus document PER. xxv. 4), likewise supports the view that late Greek copyists understood the word. The formation of the word is plain: δοκιμος comes from δκιμος, as λευθριος from λεθερος, and καθριος from καθαρς.

916 Cf. most recently Blass, *Gramm.*, p. 151 f. [Eng. Trans., p. 155.] 917 See p. 250, *subτ■γν■σιον*. [↑]

918 τ■γ■ could also be connected with the verb as an instrumental dative: but that would make the sentence more enigmatic than ever. We do not understand the suggestion of Cremer⁸, p. 340, at the end of the article *δοκ■μιον*.

919 Corrected reading in the Supplement, p. 395.

920 Meyer, xv. 5 (1888), p. 222.

921 *Wiener Studien*, i. (1879), p. 47.—Cf. also A. Wilhelm, *GGA.*, 1898, p. 227: “The *κακοπαθ■α*, with which the travelling of embassies, particularly over sea, is usually associated, is prominently mentioned in numberless psephismata”.

922 Further particulars in Winer-Schmiedel, § 5, 13 c (p. 44 f.).

923 Also in BU. 233 11 to be thus read, not *■ρταβιωτ[. . .]*.

924 Quotation from Mommsen, *Römische Geschichte*, v. 4, Berlin, 1894, p. 429.

925 See p. 64, note 2. [↓] 926 *Gr. des Neutest. Griechisch*, p. 257. [Eng. Trans., p. 263.] 927 Improved reading in Supplement, p. 357.

928 Above, p. 148. [↑] 929 Stratonike came originally from Cappadocia.

930 Meyer, iii. 6/7 (1888), p. 52.

931 Frankel, p. 267, remarks on this that *ε■σι■ναιε■ζτ■ντ■πον* is used like *ε■σι■ναιε■ζ■ρχ■ν*, (e.g. Speech against Neaira, 72, Plutarch’s *Praec. Ger. Reip.* 813 D). *■ρχ■* is similarly used in Jude 1:6; cf. LXX Genesis 40:21 [MT Genesis 40:21].

932 Cf. L. Dukes, *Literaturhistorische Mittheilungen über die ältesten hebraischen Exegeten, Grammatiker u. Lexikographen* (Ewald & Dukes, *Beitrttge*, ii.), Stuttgart, 1844, p. 53; Schurer, p. 700 ff. [Eng. Trans., ii., iii., p. 168 f.]; J. Hamburger, *Real-Encyclopadie für Bibel und Talmud*, ii., Leipzig, 1883, p. 1234.

933 A similar relation subsists in kind between the materials of literary speech and of popular speech.

934 J. Grimm, *Deutsche Mythologie*, ii.3, Göttingen, 1854, p. 1060, says “Superstition formed in some ways a religion for the homes of the lower classes throughout”.

935 Cf. F. Piper, *Mythologie der christlichen Kunst*, Erste Abth., Weimar, 1847, p. ix. f.

936 The author here follows the information which G. Maspero, the first editor of the Inscription, gave in the *Collections du Musée Alaoui*, première série, 8e livraison, Paris, 1890, p. 100 ff. A phototypic facimile of the tablet forms the frontispiece of *BIBELSTUDIEN*. Only after the original issue of the present work did the author learn of the sketch by Josef Zingerle in *Philologus*, liii. (1894), p. 344, which reproduces the text from *Revue archéologique*, iii t. xxi. (1893), p. 397 ff. (Reprint from *Collections du Musée Alaoui*, p. 100 ff.) The text has been discussed also by A. Hilgenfeld, *Berl. Philol. Wochenschrift*, xvi. (1896), p. 647 ff.; R. Wunsch, *CIA. Appendix* (1897),

xvii. f. ; and L. Blau, *Das altjudische Zauberwesen* (1898), p. 96 ff. The tablet has been noticed (with observations by A. Dieterich) by F. Hiller von Gaertringen in the *Sitzungsberichter der Berliner Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 1898, p. 586. Cf. also Schurer, 3 iii., p. 295 f. Individual textual conjectures and exegetic proposals are found in the various critiques of the *BIBELSTUDIEN*. The author hopes subsequently to take special advantage of the new exegetic material afforded by Hilgenfeld and Blau in particular. In the following he has corrected his former reading Δομιτιανv (line 6) to Δομιτιανv, and (line 15) vατv to v'ατv. Hilgenfeld's assertion (p. 648) that Δομιτιανv, should be read throughout is erroneous.

937 In 1889 a tabula devotionis had been discovered in the Necropolis of Adrumetum, and it was discussed by M. Breal and G. Maspero in the fifth instalment of the *Collections* (1890) just cited; it, too, contains a love-spell, but is, apart from a few Divine names, free from biblical ideas and phrases. A third tablet of Adrumetum, the publication of which was prospectively announced on the cover of the eighth instalment, has not yet been issued. Professor Maspero of Paris, Member of the Institute of France, had the great kindness to inform the author (16th April, 1894) that the contents of this tablet and similar unpublished pieces were likewise non-Jewish. In *CIL. viii., Suppl. i.* (1891), sub Nos. 12504-12511, there have recently been brought together some tabulae execrationum discovered in Carthage, of which the last affords some parallels to our tablet: see below.—Cf. now the copious material collected by R. Wunsch in the *CIA. Appendix continens defixionum tabellas in Attica regione repertas*, Berlin, 1897; also M. Siebourg, *Ein gnostisches Goldamulet aus Gellep*, in *Bonner Jahrbucher*, Heft 103 (1898), p. 123 ff.

938 We imagine that these are the three holes upon the right margin of the tablet.

939 We have indicated the divergent readings of Maspero by M. The numerous errors in accentuation which his text contains are not noted here. Restorations are bracketed [], additions (). We have left unaccented the Divine names and the other transcriptions, not knowing how these were accented by the writer of the tablet and the author of his original text. To furnish them with the "traditional" accents given in the editions of the Greek Bible, so far as the names in question occur there, serves no purpose, to say nothing of the fact that these "traditional" accents themselves cannot be scientifically authenticated. Cf. Winer-Schmiedel, § 6, 8 b (p. 75 f.). [Eng. Trans., p. 59.] 940 Maspero, p. 101.

941 Cf. upon these A. Dieterich most recently, *Fleckeisen's Jahrb. Suppl. xvi.*, p. 788 ff.; as regards the literature cf. also *CIL. viii., Suppl. p. 1288*, and specially Wunsch, *CIA. Appendix* (1897).

942 Cf. M. Breal, in the fifth instalment of the already-cited *Collections* (1890), p. 58.

943 On this species of Magic cf. the instructive citations of E. Kuhnert, *Feuerzauber*, *Rhein. Museum für Philologie*, N. F., vol. xlix. (1894), p. 37 ff.

944 Maspero, p. 107 f.

945 Maspero, p. 107.

946 This is directly supported by the fact that several of the best-known Bible names in the tablet are corrupt; they have been incorrectly copied. Cf. the Explanation.

947Cf. p. 323. [↓]

948 C. Wessely, On the spread of Jewish-Christian religious ideas among the Egyptians, in *The Expositor*, third series, vol. iv. (London, 1886), No. xxi. (incorrectly xiii. on the part), pp. 194-204. Further in A. Dieterich, *Abraxas*, p. 136 ff.; *Blau*, p. 112 ff.; *Schurer*, 3 p. 298 ff. A small collection of Hellenistic-Jewish invocations of God, which might be made on the basis of the Magic Papyri and Inscriptions, would be, in consideration of the relatively early period of their composition, certainly not without interest as regards the LXX-Text. Reference may also be made here to the biblical passages found in the Inscriptions. The author is unaware whether these have been treated of collectively from the standpoint of textual criticism. They are also instructive for the history of the way in which the Bible has been used. In very few cases will they be found to have been derived from direct biblical readings.—Beginnings of the task here indicated have been made by E. Bohl, *Theol. Studien u. Kritiken*, 1881, p. 692 ff., and E. Nestle, *ibid.*, 1883, p. 153 f. Materials from the Inscriptions have recently been largely added to.

949 ii., p. 504 (=3 iii. p. 26). [Eng. Trans., ii., ii., p. 231, note 48.]

950Hamburger, ii., p. 283. We may compare the idea of the Gospels, that demons reside in lonely and desert regions (Matthew 12:43); the ■νθρωπος■νπνε■ματι■καθ■ρτ■ had his dwelling among the tombs (Mark 5:3). In Bar 4:35, devastated cities are already recognised as dwelling-places of demons.

951 Maspero, p. 105. It was believed that the soul of such a person had to hover about the grave so long as he should have lived had not his life come to an untimely end (Maspero, *ibid.*). With reference to the notion as a whole cf. E. Rohde, *Psyche, Seelencult und Unsterblichkeitsglaube der Griechen*, Freiburg in Baden and Leipzig, 1894, p. 373 f. (= 2 p. 410 f.) ; also Kuhnert, p. 49.

952 In J. B. Pitra, *Spicilegium Solesmense*, iii., Paris. 1855, p. 305.

953 Kenyon, p. 69.

954 A. Dieterich, *Fleckeisen's Jahrb. Suppl.* xvi., p. 810; Leemans, ii., p. 31.

955 The form might also be a corruption of *Ιακουβ*, *Pap. Lond.* cxxi. 649 (see below, p. 324), and *Pap. Par. Bibl. nat.* 2224 (Wessely, p. 100); similarly in a leaden tablet from Carthage published by A. L. Delattre, *Bulletin de correspondance hellenique*, xii. (1888), p. 300 = *CIL.* viii., *Suppl.* i., No. 12511. —But the other assumption is supported by the following *Ισραμα* (= *Ισραηλ* = *Ιακωβ*).

956 Cf., for instance, the Gem found in ancient Cyrenaica—Baudissin, *Studien*, i., p. 193. Further particulars, especially also patristic authorities, in R. Heim, *Incantamenta magica Graeca Latina*; *Fleckeisen's Jahrb.* *Suppl.* xix. (1893), p. 522 ff.

957 *Contra Celsum*, v. 45 (Lomm., xix., p. 250 f.): ■κα■■■■■νμ■■■ν■καλ■■■■■ρκ■■■ν■νομ■■■ζ■■■θε■■■ν■βρα■■■μκα■■■θε■■■ν■σα■■■κκα■■■θε■■■ν■ακ■■■βτ■■■δετιν■■■ποι■■■σαι■■■ν■■■τοιτ■■■λ■■■γοντιτα■■■τα. ■■■νδ■■■λ■■■γ■■■■■θε■■■ςπατρ■■■ς■■■κλεκτο■■■τ■■■ς■■■χο■■■ςκα■■■■■θε■■■ςτο■■■γ■■■λωτοςκα■■■■■θε■■■ςτο■■■πτερνιστο■■■ο■■■τωσο■■■δ■■■νποιε■■■τ■■■νομαζ■■■μενον■■■ςο■■■δ■■■λλοτιτ■■■νμηδεμ■■■ανδ■■■ναμιν■■■χ■■■ντων. Cf. *ibid.*, i. 22, and iv. 33, and also G. Anrich, *Das antike Mysterienwesen in seinem Einfluss auf das Christentum*. Gottingen, 1891, p. 96.

958 If Romans 16:1-27 is [or belongs to] a letter to Ephesus.

959 Particulars in Kuhnert, p. 41, note 7. With regard to the later Jewish usage, cf. Schwab, Coupes a inscriptions magiques in the Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology, xiii. (1890-91), p. 585 f., and J. Wohlstein, Uber einige aramaische Inschriften auf Thongefassen des kgl. Museums zu Berlin, in the Zeitschrift fur Assyriologie, viii. (1893), p. 331, and ix. (1894) p. 19 f.

960 Notices et extraits des manuscrits de la bibliothegue imperiale, vol. xviii. pt. 2, Paris, 1865, p. 425.

961 With regard to the whole expression, cf. the passage of the aforementioned leaden tablet from Carthage in Bull. de corr. hell., xii., 302 = CIL. viii., Suppl. i., No. 12511: ■ξορκ■ζω ■μ■ζκατ■το ■π■νωτο■ο■ρανο■θεο■το■καθημ■νου■π■τ■νχερουβι, ■διορ■σαστ■νγ■νκα■χωρ■σαστ■νθ■λασσαν, Ιαωκτλ. The nominatives are illustrative of the formal rigidity of these expressions.

962 Aquila alone has ■κτισεν (F. Field, Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt 2 tomi, Oxonii, 1875, i., p. 7).

963 Field, ii., p. 217.

964 Cf. A. Dieterich, Abrayas, p. 139 f.

965 Hamburger, i.3 (1892), p. 735.

966 Heim, 493 f. The passages which follow, to which the author's notice was directed by A. Dieterich, are taken from Heim. Cf. also Centuria illustrium quaestionum . . . a Joh. Jac. Hermanno, Herbornensi, Herbornae Nassov iorum, 1615, decas septima, quaestio pinta.

967 Heim, 493 f.

968 Heim, 493.

969 Heim, 493.

970 In M. Ihm, Incantamenta magica, Rh. Mus. f. Phil., N. F., xlviii. (1893), p. 635.

971 Heim, pp. 488, 547.

972 Heim, p. 554.

973 Hamburger, i.3, p. 53; Schurer, ii., p. 381 (= 3 ii., p. 458). [Eng. Trans., ii., ii., p. 82, note 143.]

974 Moreover, ■δυτον is very infrequent in "biblical" literature; it is found only in LXX 2 Chronicles 33:14 [MT 2 Chronicles 33:14], Cod. A.

975 Cf. Hamburger, i.3, p. 52 ff., with reference to the point as viewed by post-biblical Judaism.

976 And not in magic only!

977 Kenyon, p. 68; Wessely, i., p. 129. More definitely still in Pap. Lugd. J 384, iv. 11 f. (Fleck. Jbb. Suppl. xvi., p. 800; Leemans, p. 17): μ■λλωτ■μ■γα■νομαλ■γεινΑωθ (or Θωθ), ■ν . . . π■ζδα■μωνφρ■σσει.

978Cf., e.g., Hamburger, ii., pp. 283 and 75; also J. A. Eisenmenger, Entdecktes Judenthum, 1700, p. 165; the present author cites this work according to the copy in his possession, which was ostensibly printed in the year after the birth of Christ 1700, but as it announces itself as Dessicbey 40. Jahr von der Judenschafft mit Arrest bestrickt gewesen, nunmehr aber Durch Autoritat eines Hohen Reichs-Vicariats relaxirte Johann Andrea Eisenmengers . . . Entdecktes Judenthum, it could manifestly have been printed at the earliest in 1740. The explanation probably is that, in the copies of the edition of 1700 (cf. C. Siegfried in the Allg. deutschen Biographie, v. [1877], p. 772 ff.), the interdict on which was cancelled about 1740, the original title-page was supplanted by the present misleading one.

979Cf. Wessely's Index sub ■δη.

980 J. Krall, Koptische Amulete, in Mittheilungen aus der Sammlung der Papyrus Erzherzog Rainer V. Vienna, 1892, pp. 118, 121.

981 Delattre, in Bulletin de correspondance hellenique, xii. (1888), p. 302, takes from the unmistakable ΗΔΗΗΔΗΤΑΧΥΤΑ the extraordinary reading “■δη, ■δη, τα ■τα (?)”.

982 Field, ii., p. 218.

983 Cf. A. Buttmann, Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Sprachgebrauchs, Berlin, 1859, pp. 78, 158, 162, 273 f. As to the questionableness of commonly asserting such periphrases to be “Hebraising,” see above II., subκατ■. [↑] 984■κβρ■ζω, LXX Nehemiah 13:28[MT Nehemiah 3:8], 2Ma 1:12, 2Ma 5:8 (Cod. A).

985 Cremer, Biblisch-theologisch, es Worterbuch der Neutestamentlichen Greiciteit, 7 Gotha, 1893, p. 393 (= 8 [1895], p. 415).

986 U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff in Guil. Schmidt's De Flavii Iosephi clocutione observationes criticae, Fleck. Jbb. Suppl. xx. (1894), p. 516.

987■πραγμα is used for the lion's prey in LXX Ezekiel 22:25 [MT Ezekiel 22:25]; cf. LXX Ezekiel 19:3, Ezekiel 19:6[MT Ezekiel 19:3, Ezekiel 19:6].

988 Not used.

989 Further particulars in Patrum Apostolicorum opera recc. 0. de Gebhardt, A. Harnack, Th. Zahn, fast. i., part. i.2, Leipzig, 1876, p. 42.

990σοφ■ζομαι sapiens fio, sapio, often in LXX, e.g., LXX 3Ki. 4■27 [31] [MT 1 Kings 4:27 (31)]; specially frequent in Sir.

991 The vox media■νδ■λλομαι would then stand here sensu bono, as in Clem. Rom. 1 Cor. 23■3sensu malo.

992Cf. also Aquila LXX Psa. 47■14 [MT Psalms 48:14] and the observations of Field, ii., p. 169, thereon.

993Re the vulgar φcf. Winer-Schmiedel, § 5, 27e (p. 59 ff.): ■φ■πτας is also found in Pap. Par. Bibl. nat. 1353 (Wessely, i., p. 78).

994Cf. also LXX Psalms 96:10 [MT Psalms 97:10] ο■γαπ■ντεστ■νκ■ριονμισε■τεπονηρ■ν.

995 A. Hilgenfeld in Berl. Philol. Wochenschrift xvi. (1896), p. 647 ff., considers that the author was a follower of the Samaritan Simon Magus.

996Cf. with reference to “Homeromancy,” especially Pap. Lond. cxxi. (third century A.D.), and the remarks upon this of Kenyon, p. 83 f.

997 A. Wuttke, Der deutsche Volksaberglaube der Gegenwart, 2nd edition, thoroughly revised, Berlin, 1869, p. 321 f.

998 Cf. the author’s sketch entitled Die neutestamentliche Formel “in Christo Jesu” untersucht, Marburg, 1892, p. 66 f.

999 We would point out that this judgment upon the LXX refers only to its syntax. But even in this respect the investigation of Egyptian and vernacular Greek will, as it advances, reveal that many things that have hitherto been considered as Semitisms are in reality Alexandrianisms or popular idioms. With regard to the vocabulary the translators have achieved fair results, and have not seldom treated their original with absolute freedom. This matter has been more thoroughly treated in Articles II. and III. of the present work.

1000 The Synoptic Gospels, for instance, naturally occupy a special position, in so far as their constituent parts go back in some way to Aramaic sources. But the syntactic parallels to the LXX which they show are not so much an “after-effect” of that book as a consequence of the similarity of their respective originals.

1001Grimm, HApAT. iv. (1857), p. 45.

1002 Grimm, HApAT. iv. (1857), p. 45. The ■μν■δ■ακρυπτ■ of Hermes Trismegistos (given by A. Dieterich in Abraxas, p. 67), for example, affords information on this point, though, of course, it is very markedly pervaded by biblical elements.

1003 Observe, however, the form seen already in certain Psalms.

1004 For a somewhat more remote application of this thought cf. J. Bernays, Die heraklitischen Briefe, Berlin, 1869, p. 29. The magic Papyri yield a multitude of examples of the idea.

1005HApAT. iv. (1857), p. 77.

1006 The author, however, finds, even previous to verse 23, features which are to be explained by the “edifying tendency” of the book.

1007 Schurer, ii., p. 740 (= 3 iii., p. 360). [Eng. Trans., ii., ii. p. 211 f.]

1008 According to the “fourth” Book of Maccabees, which uses this narrative for purposes of edification, it was not Heliodorus, but Apollonius, who tried to plunder the Temple. J. Freudenthal, in Die Flay. Joseph. beigelegte Schrift Ueber die Herrsch. der Vernunft, p. 85 f., is inclined to reject both reports as suspicious, but to consider that of 4 Maccabees. to be the better of the two: it “reports simply and without ornament that which is told in 2 Maccabees with distorted exaggeration”. The present writer cannot agree with this opinion; what Freudenthal calls in the one case “simple and without ornament” and in the other “distorted exaggeration,” should only, in view

of the wholly distinct purposes of the two books, be characterised by the formal antitheses concise and detailed respectively. The hybrid form, Apollodoros, of which L. Flathe speaks in his *Geschichte Macedoniens*, ii., Leipzig, 1834, p. 601, was in all probability formed from the Apollonius of 4 and the Heliodorus of 2Macc. (Freudenthal, p. 84).

1009 Grimm, p. 69.

1010 *Bulletin de correspondance hellenique*, i. (1877), p. 285.

1011 On this, see p. 310 f. below. [↓] 1012 *Bull. de corr. hell.*, (1879), p. 364.2 See p. 159 above. [↑]

1013 In that case the Inscriptions must certainly have been written before 175 B.C.; for in that year Heliodorus carried out his φιλοστοργία ἐναντιβασιλῆα, which is here extolled, in a strange way, viz., by murdering the king.

1014 Frankel, *Altertumer von Pergamon*, viii. 1, p. 110, cites Polyb. v. 41 and Joseph. Antt. xii. 7 2.

1015 Inscriptions Nos. 172-176 (first half of 2nd cent. B.C.) in Frankel, p. 108 f.

1016 This interpretation, proposed by Grimm, p. 69, is maintained also by Frankel, p. 110.

1017 This variation is found here only.

1018 Against Freudenthal, p. 86, who attributes the alteration to Syncellus.

1019 I.e., if the restoration. in No. L be correct, as the author holds to be very probable.

1020 See p. 187 f. above. [↑] 1021 *Problems im Aposteltexte neu erortert*, Gotha, 1883, p. 8 ff.

1022 Even Jerome, *Liber interpretationis Hebraicorum nominum*, 67 23 f. (*Onomastica sacra Pauli de Lagarde studio et sumptibus alterum edita*, Gottingen, 1887, p. 100), has not straightway adopted the etymology given in Acts; he gives three interpretations: Barnabas filius prophetae uel filius uenientis aut (ut plerique putant) filius consolations.

1023 The author fails to understand how Nun should have originally been transcribed Ναυν. It seems to him more probable that the LXX read ■■■■■■, or that Ναυη (or Ναβη) or Ναβι was in actual use as a personal name, and that they substituted it for Nun.

1024 K. Humann and O. Puchstein, *Reisen in Kleinasien und Nordsyrien*, Textband, Berlin, 1890, p. 398. A much older Inscription has already been cited, p. 188 above.

1025 For this τ■νκα■ see below, p. 313 f. [↓]

1026 ■πολλιν■ριος is (cf. ■πολλ■νιος = ■ων■θας, p. 149 ante, subπαρεπ■δημος) an imitation of the theophoric Βαρνεβο■ς; but one need not on that account have recourse to any such religious-historical equation as Nebo = Apollo, as the editors suggest.

1027 Field, ii., p. 522.

1028 The A-sound is also found in the Babylonian and Assyrian primary forms. It is not impossible that the name Ναβη, discussed above, if not coined by the LXX, may be connected in origin with Nebo.

1029 In that case this accentuation would commend itself as preferable to the “traditional” Βαρνββας.—Blass, *Gramm. des neutest. Griechisch*, p. 123, also writes Βαρναββς; on p. 31, Βαρνββας. [Eng. Trans., pp. 125 and 31.] 1030 Winer-Schmiedel, § 5, 27 a, note 56 (p. 58). Many similar cases are given there.

1031LXX, βδεναγ). Note the rendering of the E-sound by a here also.

1032 His name is Μανναv; that is, of course, ██████████. The Alexandrinus likewise transcribes Menachm in LXX 4Ki. 15:16 [MT 2 Kings 15:16 ff. by Μανναv, while the other Codices have Μανναμ. The termination -ην gave the foreign name a kind of Greek look: pet names in -ην are occasionally used by the Greeks (A. Fick, *Die Griechischen Personennamen nach ihrer Bildung erklärt*, 2nd ed. by F. Bechtel and A. Fick, Göttingen, 1894, p. 28). It will hardly be necessary in this case to assume the arbitrary interchange of μ and ν which occurs not infrequently in the transcription of Semitic proper names (cf. on this point, Winer-Schmiedel, § 5, 27 g, and note 63 [p. 61]).

1033 Grimm, HApAT. iii. (1853), p. 6.

1034 The word appears to be confirmed also by the Syriac versions, Grimm, HApAT. iii. (1853), p. 7.

1035 It cannot be urged against this that the view thus obtained does not correspond with the historical circumstances (i.e. the παδες among whom Alexander divided his empire could hardly be all his συνκτροφοι in the proper sense); but the writer of Macc. certainly held this opinion. The variant σντροφοι may perhaps be explained by the attempt of some thoughtful copyist to get rid of the historical discrepancy; σντροφοι in the technical sense presently to be determined was more accurate: the thoughtless thinker of course allowed the πνετητος to stand.

1036 Holtzmann, H.C. i.2 (1892), p. 371.

1037 Cf. p. 159 above, subσυγγενς. [↑] 1038 Frankel, pp. 111, 129, 164 ff.

1039 Frankel, p. 111 f.

1040Recherches, p. 207 ff.

1041 P. 305.

1042 Winer-Lunemann, § 18, 1 (p. 102), refers only to quite late writings. On the other hand, the painstaking Wetstein had already in 1752 annotated the passage “Inscriptiones”! That means more for his time than dozens of other “observations” by the industrious and open-eyed exegetes of last (18th) century.

1043Der Atticismus, iii. (1893), p. 338.—His authorities are to be supplemented by the Inscription of Mylasa in Caria, Waddington, iii. 2, No. 361 (imperial period), by a multitude of examples from Lycian Inscriptions,—see the lists of the Gerontes of Sidyma in O. Benndorf and G. Niemann, Reiser, in Lykien and Karien, Vienna, 1884, p. 73 ff. (time of Commodus)—likewise by many passages from the Egyptian documents in the Royal Museum at Berlin, e.g., Nos. 39; 1412; 200; 2772; 281. In the Pap. Berol. 6815 (BU. ii., p. 43, No. 30) we even find ΜρκουvτωνουΔιοκρουκαΠτολεμαου, an evidence of the fixedness and formulaic

currency of this ■κα■.

1044 W. Schmid, *Der Atticismus*, iii. (1893), p. 838.

1045 Guil. Schmidt, *De Flav. Ios. Elocution*, *Fleck. Jahrb. Suppl.* xx. (1894), p. 355 f.

1046 For the text see Gull. Schmidt, p. 355.

1047 For the text see Gull. Schmidt, p. 355.

1048 Cf. H. H. Wendt, Meyer, iii. 6/7 (1888), p. 284.

1049 Winer-Schmiedel, § 16, 9 (p. 143).

1050 We must not confuse these cases, in which non-Jewish names of similar sound were attached to the Jewish, with those in which non-Jewish names of similar sound were substituted for the Jewish; those who had adopted new names bore these alone in their intercourse with strangers. Thus the name ■■σων, common among Jews, is a substitute for ■ησο■ς; the Apostle Symeon (Peter) is usually called Σ■μων, not because (as Clavis³, p. 400, still maintains) this word is a transcription of ■■■■■■■■■■, but because it resembles Συμε■ν, the actual transcription of the Hebrew name (so, of Peter, Acts 15:14, 2 Peter 1:1). Σ■μων is a good Greek name (Fick-Bechtel, p. 251); thus, too, the Vulgate substitutes Cleophas (= Κλεοφ■ς, Fick-Bechtel, p. 20 and foot of p. 164; not to be confounded with Κλεοπ■ς in Luke 24:18, Fick-Bechtel, middle of p. 164) for the (probably) Semitic name Κλωπα(ς) ? Accent ? [John 19:25]; the author does not know what authority Clavis³, p. 244, has for saying that the Semitic form of Κλωπα(ς) is ■■■■■■■■■■, still less how P. Feine, *Der Jakobusbrief*, Eisenach, 1893, p. 16, can maintain that it is “elsewhere recognised” that Κλωπ■ς is Greek, and = Κλεοπ■ς; similarly Σιλουαν■ς seems to be a substitute for the Semitic Σιλας.

1051 BU. ix., p. 274, No. 2772.

1052 The frequently-noted circumstance that in the accounts of Paul's conversion, Acts 9:4, Acts 9:17, Acts 22:7, Acts 22:13, Acts 26:11, he is addressed by Jesus and Ananias as Σαο■λ may be explained by the historian's sense of liturgical rhythm;—compare the way in which he puts the name Συμε■ν (for Peter, whom he elsewhere calls Σ■μων and Π■τρος) in the mouth of James in a solemn speech, Acts 15:14. Similarly, the early Christians did not Graecise, e.g., the venerable name of the patriarch Jacob: ■ακ■β had a “biblical,” ■■κωβος a modern, sound. In the same way Paul appears to have made a distinction between the ancient theocratic form ■ερουσαλ■μ and the modern political name ■ερος■λυμα: when he uses the former, there is ever a solemn emphasis upon the word, especially noticeable in Galatians 4:25-26 (cf. Hebrews 12:22, Revelation 3:12, Revelation 21:2, Revelation 21:10); but also as the dwelling-place of the saints, Jerusalem is more to him than a mere geographical term: hence in 1 Corinthians 16:3, Romans 15:25 ff., he lovingly and reverently marks a distinction by writing ■ερουσαλ■μ; lastly, in Romans 15:19 this form again best suits the subject, viz., an enthusiastic retrospect of the diffusion of the gospel. We must also bear in mind that the Gospels preserve many of our Lord's sayings in Aramaic; see p. 76 above. The assertion of A. Buttmann, *Gramm. des neutest. Sprachgebr.*, p. 6, that, when Paul is addressed, the “popular” (??—for the readers of the Greek Book of Acts ?) form Σαο■λ is regularly employed, is contradicted by Acts 26:24, Acts 27:24.

1053 Cf. Acts 13:21, and also Romans 11:1 and Php 3:5.

1054 See Print edition p. 68 above. = To the literary sources here indicated there have lately been added certain fragments of reports which refer to the Jewish War of Trajan, and which were probably drawn up by an Alexandrian Jew: Pap. Par. 68 (Notices, xviii. 2, p. 383 ff.), and Pap. Lond. 1 (Kenyon, p. 229 f.); cf. Schurer, i., p. 53; further particulars and a new reading in U. Wilcken, Ein Aktens-Nick zum jadischn Kriege Trajans, Hermes, xxvii. (1892), p. 464 ff. (see also Hermes, xxii. [1887], p. 487), and on this GGA. 1894, p. 749. Pap. Berol. 8111 (BU. xi., p. 333, No. 341), is also connected with it. I cannot, however willing, discover the slightest difference in respect of language between the readable part of the fragments, which unfortunately is not very large, and the non-Jewish Papyri of the same period. Independently of their historical value, the fragments afford some interesting phenomena, e.g., κωστωδ■α (Matthew 27:65 f., Matthew 28:11 κουστωδ■α, Matthew 27:66 Cod. A κωστουδ■α; Cod. D has κουστουδ■α), ■χρε■οιδο■λοι (Luke 17:10, cf. Matthew 25:30). The identification of the ■σοι■ουδα■οι with the successors of the ■σιδα■οι of the Maccabean period, which Wilcken advances, hardly commends itself; the expression does not refer to a party within Alexandrian Judaism, but is rather a self-applied general title of honour.—Wilcken, further, has in view the publication of another Papyrus fragment (Hermes, xxvii., p. 474), which contains an account of the reception of a Jewish embassy by the Emperor Claudius at Rome. (This publication has now seen the light; for all further particulars see the beginning of the author's sketch, "Neuentdeckte Papyrus-Fragmente zur Geschichte des griechischen Judenthums," in ThLZ. xxiii. (1898), p. 602 ff.)

1055 The name, indeed, is mutilated in almost all the passages, so that the restoration Σα■λος would also be possible, but in Col. vii. of the edition of Wileken, Hermes, xxvii. (1892), p. 470, Πα■λος can be distinctly made out.

1056 The following phenomenon is perhaps instructive on this point. In several passages of Acts mention is made of a ■ω■ννης■πικαλο■μενοςΜ■ρκος, either by this double name or by his Jewish name ■ω■ννης; in Acts 13:13 it is particularly evident that ■ω■ννης has been used purposely: the man had forsaken the Apostle Paul and had returned to Jerusalem. Quite differently in Acts 15:39; he now goes with Barnabas to Cyprus, and this is the only passage in Acts where the Greek name Μ■ρκος, standing alone, is applied to him. This may, of course, be purely accidental.

1057 With this should be compared Professor W. M. Ramsay's brilliant section on the same subject, St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen², London, 1896, pp. 81-88.—Tr.

1058 GGA. 1870, part 21, p. 801 ff. Cf. Symmikta, i., Gottingen, 1877, p. 14 f.

1059 Cf. upon this E. W. Hengstenberg, Die Authentic des Pentateuchs, i., Berlin, 1836, p. 226 f.

1060 With reference to the itacistic variation of the termination, cf. the quite similar variants of the termination of the transcription Ε■μαλκουα■ Macc. 11:39. ■μαλκου■, Σινμαλκου■, etc., and on these C. L. W. Grimm, HATAT. iii., Leipzig, 1853, p. 177.

1061 Hengstenberg, p. 227.

1062ZAW. iii. (1883), p. 298.

1063 Wrongly questioned by F. Dietrich; cf. p. 327 below.

1064 F. Dietrich reads Ιαου.

1065 Studien zur semitischen Religionsgeschichte, Heft i., Leipzig, 1876, p. 197 ff.

1066 At that time there were only the preliminary notes of C. J. C. Reuven's: Lettres a. m. Letronne sur les papyrus bilingues et grecs . . . du musee d'antiquites de l'universite de Leide, Leiden, 1830.

1067 Edited by G. Parthey, AAB., 1865, philol. und histor. Abhh., 109 ff.

1068 In his publication, Papyri Graeci musei antiquarii publici Lugduni Batavi, vol. ii., Leiden, 1885.

1069 DAW. philos. -histor. Classe, xxxvi. (1888), 2 Abt. p. 27 ff. and xlii. (1893), 2 Abt. p. 1 ff.

1070 Papyrus magica musei Lugdunensis Batavi, Fleckeisen's Jahrb. Suppl. xvi. (1888), p. 749 (= the edition of Papyrus J 384 of Leiden). Dieterich, Abraxas, Studien zur Religions-Geschichte des spateren Altertums, Leipzig, 1891, p. 167 (= edition of Papyrus J 395 of Leiden). The author has to thank his colleague and friend the editor (now in Giessen) for divers information and stimulating opposition.

1071 F. G. Kenyon, Greek Papyri in the British Museum, London, 1893, p. 62 ff.

1072 Cf. A. Julicher, ZKG. xiv. (1893), p. 149.

1073 Cf. E. Schurer, Geschichte des jadisichen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi, 3 3, Leipzig (1898), p. 294 ff., and especially L. Blau, Das altjudische Zauberwesen (Jahresbericht der Landes-Babbinerschule in Budapest, 1897-98), Budapest, 1898.

1074 Wessely, p. 36 ff. Though A. Harnack, Geschichte der altchristlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius, i., Leipzig, 1893, p. ix., maintains that the age of the Magic Literature is as yet quite undetermined, this must so far be limited as that at least a terminus ad quem can be established on palmographical and internal grounds for a not inconsiderable part of this literature.

1075 The Book of Acts—if we may insert this observation here—manifests in this passage an acquaintance with the terminology of magic. Thus the expression τ[ο]περ[εργ]α, used in Acts 19:19, is a terminus technicus for magic; cf., in addition to the examples given by Wetstein, ad loc., Pap. Lugd., J 384, xii. 19 and 21, περιεργ[α] and περιερ[ε]ζομαι (Fleck. Jahrb. Suppl. xvi., p. 816: cf. Leemans, p. 73). So also πρ[ο]ξ[ι]ς, Acts 19:18, a terminus technicus for a particular spell, of which the indexes of Parthey, Wessely and Kenyon afford numerous examples. The ordinary translation artifice (Rinke) obliterates the peculiar meaning of the word in this connection. [English A.V. and R.V. deeds even more completely].

1076 Cf. the indexes of Leemans, Wessely and Kenyon.

1077 In the form ιαοα in Pap. Par. Bibl. nat. 996 (Wessely, p. 69). It is to be regretted that the editor does not give the library number of this Papyrus.

1078 Fleck. Jahrb. Suppl. xvi., p. 798 ; Leemans, p. 15. K. Buresch, ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΚΛΑΡΙΟΣ, Untersuchungen zum Orakelwesen des spatteren Altertums, Leipzig, 1889, p. 52, unnecessarily brackets the ν of ιαων.

1079 Kenyon, p. 105; Wessely, p. 44. We do not give Wessely's numbering of the lines, which is different from Kenyon's. In line 327 of the same Papyrus we are not quite certain whether La is meant for a Divine name or not.

1080 U. F. Kopp, *Palaeographia critica*, iv., Mannhe. n, 1829, p. 226.

1081 Kenyon, p. 67 ; Wessely, i., p. 128.

1082 Wessely, i., pp. 68 and 121.

1083 Wessely, i., p. 144.

1084 Combined from Ιαω and Ια (cf. Baudissin, p. 183 f., and F. Dieterich, p. 294).

1085 Wessely, i., 126.

1086 Wessely, i., p. 120. This passage, so far as regards the history of religion, is one of the most interesting: Jesus is named as the God of the Hebrews; observe the Divine names combined with αs (in reference to αβελεβελ, cf. Baudissin, p. 25, the name of the King of Berytus ■β■λαλοζ); on α■α and ■αβα see below, pp. 326 and 333 f.; with reference to θωθ (Egyptian deity) in the Papyri, cf. A. Dieterich, *Abraxas*, p. 70.

1087 Wessely, i., p. 75.

1088 Cf. upon these, p. 329 below. [↓] 1089 Wessely, p. 84.

1090 Wessely, p. 94.

1091 Kenyon, p. 66; Wessely, i., p. 127.

1092 *Philologus*, Suppl. v. (1889), p. 44 f.

1093 That is, A instead of Λ; tacitly corrected by Wessely, *Wiener Studien*, viii. (1856), p. 182.

1094 Wessely, p. 68.

1095 *Abraxas*, p. 97.

1096 The ι of ιαη must, in that case, on account of the metre and the διο■λλαβοζ, be pronounced as a consonant (cf. on this point, Kuhner-Blass, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*, i3. 1, Hanover, 1890, p. 50).

1097 Hengstenberg, p. 227; F. Dieterich, p. 287.

1098 A. Dieterich, *Abr.*, p. 196; Leemans, p. 141.

1099 Cf., in particular, Baudissin, p. 194 1.

1100 P. 294.

1101 Kenyon, p. 69; Wessely, p. 130.

1102 Kenyon, p. 80; Wessely, p. 139.

1103 Wessely, p. 126.

1104 A. Dieterich, Abr., p. 201.

1105 Kenyon, p. 67; Wessely, p. 128.

1106 Parthey, p. 154. We begin the word with α, and affix the θ to the previous word; cf. Kenyon, p. 111, line 849, αμβριθηρα.

1107 P. 195.

1108 Cf., for example, the Φαρεθθης of Artapanus (Eusebius, Praep. ev. ix. 18), and, upon this, J. Freudenthal, Hellenistische Studien, Heft 1 and 2, Breslau, 1875, p. 169.

1109 With this expression, also common in the Book of Enoch, compare LXX Numbers 16:22 [MT Numbers 16:22], Numbers 27:16 [MT Numbers 27:16].

1110 Kenyon, p. 80; Wessely, i., 139. We have given the passage in extenso because it is particularly instructive in respect to the Syncretism of this literature.

1111 Considered by A. Dieterich to be a palindrome of the ιεουωηι.

1112 A. Dieterich, Fleck. Jahrb. Suppl. xvi., p. 304; Leemans, iii., p. 23.

1113 A. Dieterich, Abr., p. 195 f.; Leemans, p. 141 f.

1114 A. Dieterich, Abr., p. 197; Leemans, p. 145.

1115 P. 63: “ The exact pronunciation of that name . . . was preserved a profound secret, but several approximations were made to it; among which the commonest is the word Ιαω . . . , which was sometimes expanded, so as to employ all the vowels, into Ιαωουηε”.

1116 Cf. on this point Baudissin, p. 245 ff.; Parthey, p. 116 f.; A. Dieterich, Abr., p. 22 f.

1117 The 12th Jahresb. Aber das K. K. Franz-Josephs-Gymn. in Wien, 1886.

1118 Wiener Studien, viii. (1886), p. 183.

1119 Let one example suffice: Pap. Lugd. J 395, xx. 1 ff. (A. Dieterich, Abr., p. 200; Leemans, p. 149 f.): ■πικαλο■μα■σειυεσοαεηιαωαεηιαηηιουωεσηεουαηωηιωηιαηιωουηασηηαηιωα
ιωαιωηεουιωαωτ■μ■γα■νομα.

1120 De laude dei per septem vocales in the Commentationes Soc. Reg. Scient. Gotting., i. (1751), p. 245 ff.

1121 Cf. Wessely, p. 42, on the “frivolity” (Leichtfertigkeit) with which the copyists treated the magic formulae. The state of the text generally with regard to Semitic names in Greek manuscripts, biblical and extra-biblical, is instructive.

1122 CIG. p. 757.

1123 Wiener Studien, viii. (1886), p. 182.

1124 Kenyon, p. 98 ; Wessely, ii., p. 34.

1125 Wessely, i., p. 95.

1126 Wessely, i., p. 89. This passage renders it possible to restore the text of the Inscription CIG. iii., No. 5858 b, and of the quotation from Pap. Lond. cxxi. 419, with certainty ; observe the palindrome ερηκισιθφηαραραχ, etc.

1127 Cf. also κριεαρχανδαραφωταζαπυριφωταζαβυθ . . . (Pap. Par. Bibl. nat. 631-6.32; Wessely, p. 60).

1128 De tabulis devotionis plumbeis Alexandrinis, Rhein. Mus. fur Philologic, N. F., ix. (1854), p. 375.

1129 De tabulis devotionis plumbeis Alexandrinis, Rhein. Mus. fur Philologic, N. F., ix. (1854), p. 374.

1130 The French scholar's assertion is only to be explained by the fact that the form of Satan's name is, in French, Belzebuth or Belsebuth. We have not been able to ascertain when this form can be first vouched for, or how it is to be explained. Should we find in the variant belzebud of (Vulgate) Codex mm, Matthew 10:25 (Tischendorf), authority for saying that the T-sound has supplanted the original ending b or l in later Latin, and so in French also? What form is found in the "Romance" Bibles?

1131 Cod. B., occasionally also ■ of the N.T. yield the form βεεζεβουλ; cf. on this Winer-Schmiedel, § 5, 31 (p. 65).

1132 Viva-voce information by W. Schulze. Cf. Winer-Schmiedel, § 5, 21 b (p. 51), on κολλοριον.

1133 Cf. Franz, p. 757. Franz, in his explanation of the syllable βυθ, recalls the βυθς of the Valentinians. It is more correct to point to the frequently occurring (Egyptian?) termination in -υθ—the β is got from ζεβαωθ. Cf. the name of deities and months θωυθ, the formations βιενυθ (Kopp, iv., p. 158), μενυθυθιαω (Pap. Lond. CXXI. 820; Kenyon, p. 110; Wessely, p. 49), ωβυθιε (Pap. Par. Bibl. nat. 1799; Wessely, p. 89). Cf. on Egyptian female names in -υθ, A. Boeckh, AAB., hist.-Php. Klasse, 1820-1821, p. 19.

1134 Cf. also H. Lewy, Die semitischen Fremdwörter im Griechischen Berlin, 1895, pp. 38, 42 f., 225.

1135 Kenyon, p. 65; Wessely, i., p. 127.

1136 Kenyon, p. 67; Wessely, p. 128.

1137 F. Dietrich, p. 282: "The principal thing is, however, that the pronunciation Jahava has no historic authority whatever. If Theodoret had intended to signify that, while ■■■■ was pronounced ■αβ■ by the Samaritans, the Jews pronounced this full form of the name with a at the end, then he would have written ■ουδαοιδ■■αβ■, which is warranted by none of the variants." But "historic authority" for this form has now been shown as above.

1138 Wessely, i., p. 120.

1139 With the form θαβαωθ cf. ταβαωθ, Pap. Par. Bibl. nat. 1413 (Wessely, i., p. 80), Pap. Lond. xlii. 62, 6:3, in which the form ιαβοε follows (Kenyon, p. 67; Wessely, p. 128), Pap. Lugd. J 384, iii. 7 (Fleck. Jahrb. Suppl., xvi., p. 798; Leemans, p. 15).

1140 Wessely, i., p. 85.

1141 Wessely, p. 82.

1142 Kopp, iv., p. 159 f.

1143 Cf. above on $\iota\alpha\omega\theta$. [↑] 1144 Wessely, i., p. 126.

1145 Kenyon, p. 94; Wessely, ii., p. 31.

1146 Kenyon, p. 68; Wessely, p. 120.

1147 Abr., p. 68.

1148 In R. Helm's *Ltcantaineuta iuuujica Graeca Latina*; Fleck., *JahrbbSuppl.* xix. (1893), 523.

1149 Kenyon, p. 76, cf. the note to line 357; Wessely, i., pp. 135, 136.

1150 Kenyon, p. 118; Wessely, ii., p. 52.

1151 Wessely, i., p. 100.

1152 Cf. on the Jewish diaspora in Egypt, Hugo Willrich, *Juden and Griechen, vor der makkabdischen Erhebung*, Göttingen, 1895, p. 126 ff.; and, against Willrich, Schurer, *ThLZ.* xxi. (1896), p. 35. Cf. also Wilcken, *Berl. Philol. Wochenschrift*, xvi. (1896), p. 1492.

1153 E. Schurer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes ins Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, ii., Leipzig, 1886, p. 502 (= 3 iii., p. 24). [Eng. Trans., ii., p. 230.]

1154 In J. P. Mahaffy, *The Flinders Petrie Papyri*, ii., Dublin, 1893 [14]. The paging of the text is always given in brackets [] in Mahaffy. Vol. i, was published in Dublin, 1891.

1155 Mahaffy, ii. [97], conjectures that these are translations of Eldad and Esau. With this he makes the further conjecture that the name $\theta\epsilon\phi\lambda\omicron\varsigma$, common in the imperial period, occurs here for the first time. But the name is found earlier, and Mahaffy's question whether it is perhaps a "Jewish invention" must be answered in the negative.—The author has made further observations on Samaria in the Fayyûm in *ThLZ.* xxi. (1896), p. 611.

1156 Mahaffy, ii. [87] ff.

1157 Vopisc., *vita Saturnini*, c. 8. 1 (*Scriptores historiae Augustae*, ed. Peter, vol. ii., p. 225): *nemo illic archisynagogus Judaeorum, nemo Samarites, nemo Christianorum presbyter non mathematicus, non haruspex, non aliptes*. Schurer refers to this passage, ii., p. 502 (= 3 p. 24). [Eng. Trans., II., p. 230.] Cf. also c. 7. 4.

1158 Compare with the expression $\delta\omicron\nu\alpha\mu\iota\varsigma\tau\omicron\theta\epsilon\omicron\kappa\alpha\lambda\omicron\upsilon\mu\eta\mu\epsilon\gamma\lambda\eta$, *Pap. Par. Bibl. nat.* 1275 ff. (Wessely, i., 76), $\pi\iota\kappa\alpha\lambda\omicron\mu\alpha\sigma\epsilon\tau\eta\mu\epsilon\gamma\sigma\tau\eta\nu\delta\omicron\nu\alpha\mu\iota\nu\tau\eta\nu\tau\omicron\omicron\rho\alpha\nu$. ($\lambda\lambda\omicron\iota$: $\tau\eta\nu\tau\omicron\omicron\rho\kappa\tau$) $\pi\kappa\upsilon\rho\omicron\theta\epsilon\omicron\tau\epsilon\tau\alpha\gamma\mu\eta\nu$. See also Harnack, *Bruchstücke des Evangeliums und der Apokalypse des Petrus* (TU also ix. 2), 2 Aufl., Leipzig, 1893, p. 65 f.

1159 See O. F. Fritzsche, *HApAT.* v. (1859), p. xiii.

1160 Schurer, ii., p. 595 (=3 iii., p. 159). [Eng. Trans., ii., iii., p. 26.] 1161 Cf. HApAT. v. (1859), p. xv.

1162 Recueil, i. (1842), p. 277.

1163 P. xiii.

1164 Bulletin de corr. hell., i. (1877), p. 36 f.

1165 In Letronne, Recueil, i., p. 246 = CIG. iii., No. 4697. Lumbroso, Recherches, p. xxi., has already referred to this.

1166 See his words as cited above. J. Franz, in CIG. iii., p. 338, agrees with Letronne, and refers to line 29 of the Inscription. But the present writer is again unable to see how the words occurring there, viz., **■ωςτο■γδ■ου ■τους**, can signify the years of the priests' service.

1167 The author thinks that the explanation given by Letronne (year of their priesthood) is somewhat forced.

1168 Notices, xviii. 2, p. 220 f.

1169 Notices, xviii. 2, p. 130.

1170 Notices, xviii. 2, p. 153. Brugsch translates thus: under the priest of "the" king Ptolemy. . . .

1171 Grimm, HApAT. iv. (1857), p. 249.

1172 Grimm, HApAT. iv. (1857), p. 249.

1173 According to 3Ma. 4:20, the number of the Jews was so enormous that, when their names were being entered in the lists before their execution, pens and papyrus ran short!

1174 In a critical note upon the text of the passage in his edition of the Old Testament Apocrypha.

1175 Notices, xviii. 2, p. 178 f.

1176 Notices, xviii. 2, p. 203.

1177 Cf. **διδειλ■φάμεν** in the other two edicts. The official language of the Ptolemaic period may depend here also (ante, p. 104 ff.) on the usage of Greek jurisprudence. The identical usage of the infinitive is found in an Inscription on a building in Tegea (ca. 3rd cent. B.C., Arcadian dialect), line 24f.: **■μφά■νευδ■τ■μβολ■μενον■π■το■μ■σσοιτ■ςζαμ■αυ** (edited by P. Cauer; see p. 114, note 2, above [↑]). These examples of the absolute infinitive in edicts might be largely supplemented from Inscriptions.

1178 To say nothing of their value as indicating the wishes and ideas of the waiters of them.

1179 3Ma. 7:20.

1180 In **τ■λευθερ■στεφανωθ■σεται, ■λευθερ■ας** might very easily arise from dittography, and this error, again, might result in **τ■ς■λευθερ■ας**.

1181 Brunet de Presle, Notices, xviii. 2, p. 303; he refers, inter alia, to Polyb. xiii. 95, **■στεφ■νωσαντ■ν■ντ■οχονπεντακοσ■οις■ργυρ■ουταλ■ντοις**, and to the use of **στεφ■νιον** for

reward in Pap. Par. 42 (153 B.C.); on this cf. the Thesaurus, and Lumbroso, Recherches, p. 285.—In reference to the whole subject see now E. Ziebarth, Popularklagen mit Delatorenprämien nach griechischem Recht, in Hermes, xxxii. (1897), pp. 609-628.

1182 See the remarks of Mahaffy, i., p. 48.

1183 Galatians 6:17.

1184 For το λουπο ?; cf. W. Schmid, Der Atticismus, iii., p. 135,.

1185 F. Sieffert, Meyer, vii. 7 (1886), p. 375.

11862 Corinthians 11:1-33.

1187 P. 376.

1188 Cf. J. J. Wetstein, Novum Testamentum Graecum, ii., Amsterdam, 1752, p. 238 f.: "Notae enim serviles potius invitabant aliorum conturneliam".

1189 P. 238: "Sacras notas intelligit Paulus; se sacrum esse, cui ideo nemo eorum, qui Christum amant, molestus esse debeat, profitetur".

1190 Besides, Paul does not speak of the marks of Christ at all; he uses the name Jesus, otherwise rare in his writings.

1191 Beiträge zur Pentateuchkritik, ZAW. xiv. (1894), p. 250 ff.

1192 κατερος πιγρ ψειχειρ ατο το θεο εμι; see the remarks upon LXX 3Ki. 21:35 [MT 1 Kings 20:35 ff.], and LXX Zechariah 13:6 [MT Zechariah 13:6] in Stade, p. 313, also p. 314 ff.

1193 Stade, p. 301.

1194 Stade also draws attention to the protective-marks of the Passover night; as these, however, were not made upon the body, they come less into consideration here. But note that in Exodus 13:9, Exodus 13:16 feast of the Passover is compared to a sign upon the hand and upon the forehead.

1195 Note that the LXX has γρμματαστικτ here.

1196 LXX Genesis 17:11 [MT Genesis 17:11], Romans 4:11; cf. on this point Stade, p. 308.

1197 Cf., most recently, Stade, pp. 301, 303 ff.

1198 Etymologicum in Magnum, sub Γλλος.

1199 Revelation 13:16 f., Revelation 14:9 ff., Revelation 16:2, Revelation 19:20, Revelation 20:4. See ante, p. 240 ff.

1200 Revelation 14:1, Revelation 7:2 ff., Revelation 9:4. On the meaning of signs in the Christian Church, see the suggestions of Stade, p. 304 ff.

1201 We think it probable that the expression forms an antithesis to the previously mentioned circumcision (cf. Romans 4:11 σημεον περιτομς) and that emphasis is to be laid upon

το■■ησο■.

1202 Lettres ci, M. Letronne . . . sur les papyrus bilingues et grecs . . . du musee d'antiquites de l'universite de Leide, Leiden, 1880, i., pp. 3 ff., 36 ff. In the Atlas belonging to this work, Table A, some words from the passage under discussion are given in facsimile.

1203 Appendice (to the work just cited), p. 151.

1204 Papyrus egyptien demotique a transcriptions grecques du musee d'antiquites des Pays-Bas a Leide (description raisonnee, J. 383), Leiden, 1839. Our passage is found in Table IV., col. VIII. ; in the tables the Papyrus is signed A. [= Anastasy?] No. 65.

1205 Monumens egyptiens du musee d'antiquites des Pays-Bas a Leide, Leiden, 1839.

1206 Papyri graeci musei antiquarii publici Lugduni-Batavi, ii., Leiden, 1885, p. 5.

1207 Uber das agyptische Museum zu Leyden, in the Zeitschr. der Deutschen morgenlandischen Gesellschaft, vi. (1852), p. 250 f.

1208 Grammaire demotique, Berlin, 1855. A fac-simile of our passage is found on Table IX. of that book, a transcription on p. 202.

1209 Les arts egyptiens, in the Revue egyptologique, i. (1880), p. 164; cf. the same author's discussion of the Papyrus, *ibid.*, ii. (1881-1882), p. 10 ff. His book, *Le Roman de Setna*, Paris, 1877, was not accessible to the present writer.

1210 Collections du Musee Alaoui, premiere serie, 5e livraison, Paris, 1890, p. 66 f.; see the same author's discussion of the Papyrus in his *Etudes demotiques*, in the *Recueil de travaux relatifs á la philologie et a l'archeologie egyptiennes et assyriennes*, i. (1870), p. 19 ff. A study by Birch mentioned there is unknown to the present writer. Our passage is found on p. 30 f.

1211 Mittheilungen aus der Sammlng der Papyrus Erzherzog Rainer, v. (Vienna, 1892), p. 13 f.

1212 This Papyrus contains another and longer Greek incantation, most recently read and discussed by Revillout, *Rev. eg.*, (1880), p. 166 f.

1213 Cf. also the translation of Brugsch, *Gramm. dem.*, p. 202.

1214 Notices, xviii. 2, pp. 234, 435 f. Wessely, *Mitth. Rainer*, v., p. 14, explains that "ταφ■ here means mummy, as we learn in particular from the language of the wooden tablets which were employed in the conveyance of mummies as labels of recognition". See also Leemans, *Monumens*, p. 8. - C. Schmidt, *Ein altchristliches Muinienetikett* in the *Zeitschr. fur die agyptische Sprache und Alterthumskuncl*e, xxxii. (1894), p. 55, says, "I am of opinion that in Roman times ταφ■ was understood as the 'mummy' only".

1215 In reference to what follows, see Maspero, *Coll. Al.*, p. 66.

1216 De mysteriis, 6, (ed. G. Parthey, Berol., 1857, p. 245 f.):
■γ■ρτ■νο■ραν■νπροσαρ■ξιν■τ■κρυπτ■τ■ς ■σιδος■κφανε■ν■τ■ν■β■σσ■π■ρρητον
[for this we find, 6 7, p. 248, τ■ν■β■δ■π■ρρητα; cf. 1. 6 of our formula]
δε■ξιν■στ■σειντ■νβ■ριν, ■τ■μ■λητο■σ■ριδοςδιασκεδ■σειντ■Τυφ■νι.

1239 Josephus and Lukas, Leipzig, 1894, p. 350. Krenkel refers to Josephus, Antt. xx. 92; a more acute glance into Wetstein would have made him more cautious.

1240 Cf. Jude 1:3.

1241 See e.g., Julicher, Einleitung in das N.T., p. 151.

1242 The same may be said of the adjective and the verb. The “Fourth Book of Maccabees” forms an exception.

1243 These words are not found elsewhere in the New Testament.

1244 [But see Revisers’ text.—Tn.].

1245 B. Weiss, Lehrbuch der Einleitung in das N.T., Berlin, 1886, p. 439.

1246 For the accentuation see Winer-Schmiedel, § 6, 3 b (p. 68).

1247 Further, in the whole range of “biblical” Greek (apart from 2nd, 3rd and 4th Maccabees), μ■γιστος occurs elsewhere (if we may depend upon Tromm) only in LXX Job 26:3 [MT Job 26:3], and LXX Job 31:28 [MT Job 31:28]; moreover, the Alexandrinus reads μεγ■λη for μεγ■στη in the latter passage. μ■γιστος seems to be very rare also in the Papyri of the Ptolemaic period. According to the indexes we have only the idiomatic phrase ■■μο■μ■γιστον ■■σται, in Pap. Flind. Petr., ii., xiii. (19), ca. 255 B.C. (Mahafly, ii. [45]), and τ■ζμεγ■στηςθε■ζ■ρας, Pap. Par., 15, 120 B.C. (Notices, xviii. 2, p. 219), as a solemn designation, most probably a fixed form of expression, similar to that in our Inscription.

1248 The above-discussed series of purely formal assonances might be put forward as supporting this.

1249 How such formulae were used, spontaneously, so to speak, in the writings of other representatives of the new Faith, may be seen, e.g., in the relationship between certain Pauline passages and the solemn words made known to us by an Inscription of Halicarnassus of the early imperial period: see C. T. Newton, A History of Discoveries at Halicarnassus, Cnidus and Branchidae, ii. 2, London, 1863, p. 695.—Cf. also W. M. Ramsay, The Greek of the Early Church and the Pagan Ritual, in the Expository Times, vol. x., p. 9 ff.—A similar instance from ancient times has been noted by R. Kittel in Z A.W. xviii. (1898), p. 149: LXX Isaiah 45:1 ff. [MT Isaiah 45:1 ff.] shows dependence upon the court-phraseology made known to us by the clay-cylinders of Cyrus.

1250 The theory becomes still more probable when we compare the above conjecture with what Th. Zahn, Geschichte des Neutestamentl. Kanons, i. 1, Erlangen, 1888, p. 312 ff., says about the locality in which the Epistle “was first circulated, and gained the esteem of the church”; but see A. Harnack, Das N.T. um das Jahr 200, Freiburg i. B., 1889, p. 85 f.

1251 Of course, such expressions as may probably seem to be derived from the Alexandrian translation of the O.T. would not prove anything regarding the hypothetical Egyptian origin of the Epistle.

1252 So far as we are able, from a general knowledge of a portion of the Inscriptions of Asia Minor, to judge, the lexical relations of the Epistle do, indeed, point to Asia Minor or Syria. He gives but one example here, which he would likewise attribute to the fixed phraseology of solemn speech. In 2 Peter 1:4 we find the peculiar phrase, **■να. . γ■νησθεθε■αςκοινωνο■φ■σεως** ; with this compare a passage from a religious inscription of King Antiochus I. of Kommagene (middle of 1st cent. B.C.; discovered at Selik), viz., **π■σιν■σοιφ■σεωςκοινωνο■ντεζ■νθρω[π■]νης** (in Humann and Puelistein's *Reisen in Kleinasien und Nordsyrien*, Textband, p. 371). The resemblance had already struck the editors of the Inscription. The Kommagenian Inscriptions, moreover, afford other materials for the history of the language of early Christianity.

1253 For what follows cf. F. Dilsterdieck, Meyer, xvi.4 (1887), p. 289.

1254 See pp. 96 f. and 360 ff. The passage runs: . . . **λευχιμονο■ντασκα■■στεφανωμ■νουςθαλλο■ ■χοντασδ■μετ■χ■ρας** [for this construction of **μετ■**, which is found elsewhere in the idiom **μετ■χε■ρας ■χειν** (W. Schmid, *Der Atticismus*, iii., p. 285), cf. the variant of LXX Genesis 43:21 [MT Genesis 43:21], **τ■ς■ν■βαλεν■μ■νματ■χε■ραςτ■■ργ■ριον**, Codd. 31 and 83, i., p. 61] **■μο■ωσθαλλο■ζο■τινεςσυνπαρ■ν [τωνκα]■κιθαριστο■κα■κ■ρυκος■σονται■μνον**. The original orthography has been retained. On the fact cf. the remark of the scholiast upon Theocr. Id. ii. 12, quoted by the editor, Waddington, iii. 2, p. 143: **ο■παλαιο■τ■ν■κ■τηντρ■μορφον■γραφον χρυσεοσ■νδαλονκα■λευχε■μονακα■μ■κωναστα■νχερο■ν ■χουσανκα■λαμπ■δας■μ■νας**.

09 - LXX APOCRYPHA REFERENCES

1 Maccabees

25 καὶ ἐπέστειλεν αὐτοῖς κατὰ τοὺς λόγους τοῦτους· “Βασιλεὺς Δημήτριος τὸ θνήσκει τῶν Ἰουδαίων χάριεν. 26 ἐπεσυνετηρήσατε τὰς πράξεις μὲν συνθήκας καὶ ἐνεμείνατε τὰ φίλα μὲν καὶ οὐκ ἐπρόσεχωρῆσατε τοῖς χυθροῖς μὲν, κοίσαμεν καὶ ἤχημεν. 27 καὶ ἐνέμεναι τε τοῖς συντηρηῆσαι πράξεις μὲν πῶς, καὶ ἐνταποδοῦμεν γὰρ ἐν θῆναι ποιήτε μεθ’ ἡμῶν. 28 καὶ ἐφύσσομεν μὲν φέματα πολλὰ καὶ δόσομεν μὲν δόματα. 29 καὶ ἐνέπολιωμὲν καὶ ἐφῆμι πάντας τοὺς Ἰουδαίους πᾶσι φέρων κατὰ τὰς τιμὰς τοῦ ἄλλου καὶ πᾶσι τῶν στεφάνων, 30 καὶ ἐν τῷ τῶν τῶν σπορῶν καὶ ἐν τῷ τῶν μῶσους τοῦ καρποῦ τοῦ ξυλῶνου τοῦ ἐπιβλλόντος μοι λαβέν, ἐφῆμι πᾶσι τῶν σήμερον καὶ πᾶσι κείνα τοῦ λαβέν πᾶσι τῶν γῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ πᾶσι τῶν τριῶν νομῶν τῶν προστιθεμένων αὐτῶν πᾶσι τῶν Σαμαρείτιδος καὶ Γαλιλαίας, καὶ πᾶσι τῶν σήμερον μῶρας καὶ εἰς τὴν ἀναχρῶνον. 31 καὶ Ἰερουσαλὴμ τῶν γῆς καὶ φειμένη κατὰ τὴν ἁγίαν, ἀδεκῆται κατὰ τὴν ἁγίαν. 32 ἐφῆμι κατὰ τὴν ξουσαν τῶν κρας τῶν Ἰερουσαλὴμ καὶ δόδομι τῶν ῥχιερῶν, πῶς ἐν καταστῆσθαι ἐν αὐτῶν ἐνδρας, οὗς ἐν κλῆξεται αὐτῶν τοῦ φυλῆσσειν αὐτῶν. 33 καὶ πᾶσαν ψυχὴν Ἰουδαίων τῶν ἀχμαλωτισθεῖσαν πᾶσι τῶν Ἰουδαίων εἰς πᾶσαν βασιλεῖαν μου ἐφῆμι λευθῆραν δωρεν καὶ πᾶντες ἐφῆμι τῶσαν τοῖς φέρους κατὰ τὴν κτην ἐν αὐτῶν. 34 καὶ πᾶσαι ἀγορτα κατὰ τὴν σββατα καὶ νουμηνῆαι καὶ μῶραι ποδεδειγμέναι κατὰ τρεῖς μῶραι πᾶσι ῥορτῶν κατὰ τρεῖς μῶραι μετὰ ῥορτῶν ἴστωσαν πᾶσαι ἀγορτα τελεῖας καὶ ἐφῆμι πᾶσι τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν τῶν βασιλεῖαν μου. 35 καὶ οὐκ ἔξειξουσιν οὐδεὶς πᾶσι καὶ παρενοχλεῖν τίνα αὐτῶν περὶ πάντας πᾶσι πᾶσι. 36 καὶ προγράφωσαν τῶν Ἰουδαίων εἰς τὰς δυνάμεις τοῦ βασιλῆως εἰς τρεῖς χίλιας ἄνδρων, καὶ δοθῆσεται αὐτοῖς ξένιας καθέκει πᾶσι τὰς δυνάμεις τοῦ βασιλῆως. 37 καὶ κατασταθῆσεται ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐν τοῖς χυρῶμασι τοῦ βασιλῆως τοῖς μεγάλους, καὶ ἐκ τῶν κατασταθῆσεται πᾶσι χρεῖν τῶν βασιλεῖας τῶν οὖσιν εἰς πᾶσι καὶ οὐκ ἐπᾶσι τῶν καὶ οὐκ ῥχοντες ἴστωσαν ἐξ αὐτῶν καὶ πορευῆσθωσαν τοῖς νόμοις αὐτῶν. καθέκει καὶ προστάξεν βασιλεῖς ἐν γῆ Ἰουδαίας. 38 καὶ τοῖς τρεῖς νομοῖς τοῖς προστεθῆντας τῶν Ἰουδαίων πᾶσι τῶν χῆρας Σαμαρείας προστεθῆτω τῶν Ἰουδαίων πᾶσι τῶν λογισθῆναι τοῖς γενῆσθαι φέμενα, τοῖς μὲν πακοῖσαι ἁλλῆς ξουσαῖς ἁλλῆς τῶν ῥχιερῶν. 39 Πτολεμαῖδα κατὰ τὴν προσκυροῖσαν αὐτῶν δόδοκα δόμα τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς Ἰερουσαλὴμ εἰς τὴν προσκούςαν δαπνῆν τοῖς ἁγίοις. 40 καὶ γῆ δόδομι κατὰ τὴν νιαυτῶν δεκαπέντε χίλιας σκλῶν ῥγυροῦ πᾶσι τῶν λῶγων τοῦ βασιλῆως πᾶσι τῶν τῶν τῶν νηκῶντων. 41 καὶ πᾶν τῶν πλεονάζον, οὐκ ἐπέδοσαν οὐκ ἐπᾶσι τῶν χρεῖν, ἐς τὴν τοῖς πᾶσι τοῖς τεσιν, πᾶσι τῶν δόσοσιν εἰς τῶν ῥγα τοῦ οἴκου. 42 καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς πεντακισχίλιους σκλῶν ῥγυροῦ, οὗς ἐλμβανον πᾶσι τῶν χρεῖν τοῖς ἁγίου πᾶσι τῶν λῶγου κατὰ τὴν νιαυτῶν, κατὰ τὰ ταφῆται διτῶν κείν αὐτῶν τῶν ἐρεῖσι τοῖς λειτουργοῖσι. 43 καὶ σοῖς ἐν φέγωσιν εἰς τῶν ἐρῶν τῶν Ἰεροσολύμοις καὶ ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς ῥοῖς αὐτῶν ἐφέλλοντες βασιλικῶν πᾶσι πᾶσι πᾶσι, πολελῆσθωσαν

κα■π■ντα,■σα■στ■ν α■το■ς■ν τ■βασιλε■■μου. 44 κα■το■ο■κοδομηθ■ναι κα■το■
■πικαινισθ■ναι τ■ ■ργα τ■ν■γ■ων, κα■ ■δαπ■νη δοθ■σεται■κ το■λ■γου το■βασιλ■ως. 45
κα■το■ο■κοδομηθ■ναι τ■τε■χη■Ιερουσαλ■μ κα■ ■χυρ■σαι κυκλ■θεν, κα■ ■δαπ■νη
δοθ■σεται■κ το■λ■γου το■βασιλ■ως, κα■το■ο■κοδομηθ■ναι τ■τε■χη τ■ ■ν τ■
■Ιουδα■■”.

25 So he sent a message to them in the following words: "King Demetrius to the nation of the Jews, greetings. 26 Since you have kept your agreement with us and have continued your friendship with us, and have not sided with our enemies, we have heard of it and rejoiced. 27 Now continue still to keep faith with us, and we will repay you with good for what you do for us. 28 We will grant you many immunities and give you gifts. 29 "I now free you and exempt all the Jews from payment of tribute and salt tax and crown levies, 30 and instead of collecting the third of the grain and the half of the fruit of the trees that I should receive, I release them from this day and henceforth. I will not collect them from the land of Judah or from the three districts added to it from Samaria and Galilee, from this day and for all time. 31 Jerusalem and its environs, its tithes and its revenues, shall be holy and free from tax. 32 I release also my control of the citadel in Jerusalem and give it to the high priest, so that he may station in it men of his own choice to guard it. 33 And everyone of the Jews taken as a captive from the land of Judah into any part of my kingdom, I set free without payment; and let all officials cancel also the taxes on their livestock. 34 "All the festivals and sabbaths and new moons and appointed days, and the three days before a festival and the three after a festival—let them all be days of immunity and release for all the Jews who are in my kingdom. 35 No one shall have authority to exact anything from them or annoy any of them about any matter. 36 "Let Jews be enrolled in the king's forces to the number of thirty thousand men, and let the maintenance be given them that is due to all the forces of the king. 37 Let some of them be stationed in the great strongholds of the king, and let some of them be put in positions of trust in the kingdom. Let their officers and leaders be of their own number, and let them live by their own laws, just as the king has commanded in the land of Judah. 38 "As for the three districts that have been added to Judea from the country of Samaria, let them be annexed to Judea so that they may be considered to be under one ruler and obey no other authority than the high priest.39 Ptolemais and the land adjoining it I have given as a gift to the sanctuary in Jerusalem, to meet the necessary expenses of the sanctuary. 40 I also grant fifteen thousand shekels of silver yearly out of the king's revenues from appropriate places. 41 And all the additional funds that the government officials have not paid as they did in the first years, they shall give from now on for the service of the temple. 42 Moreover, the five thousand shekels of silver that my officials have received every year from the income of the services of the temple, this too is canceled, because it belongs to the priests who minister there. 43 And all who take refuge at the temple in Jerusalem, or in any of its precincts, because they owe money to the king or are in debt, let them be released and receive back all their property in my kingdom. 44 "Let the cost of rebuilding and restoring the structures of the sanctuary be paid from the revenues of the king. 45 And let the cost of rebuilding the walls of Jerusalem and fortifying it all around, and the cost of rebuilding the walls in Judea, also be paid from the revenues of the king." (NRSV)

Wisdom of Sirach

13:12 ■νελε■μων ■μ■ συντηρ■ν λ■γους κα■ ο■ μ■ φε■σεται περ■ κακ■σεως κα■ δεσμ■ν.

13:12 Cruel are those who do not keep your secrets; they will not spare you harm or imprisonment. (NRSV)

Judith 9

11 ο γρ ν πλθει τ κρτος σου, οδ δ δυναστεα σου ν σχουσιν, λλ ταπειν ε Θες, λαττων ε βοηθς, ντιλπτωρ σθενοντων, πεγνωσμων σκεπαστς, πηλιτισμων σωτρ.

11 "For your strength does not depend on numbers, nor your might on the powerful. But you are the God of the lowly, helper of the oppressed, upholder of the weak, protector of the forsaken, savior of those without hope. (NRSV)

2 Maccabees 15

7 δ Μακκαβαος ν διαλεπτως πεποιθς μετπισσης λπδος ντιλψεως τεξασθαι παρτο Κυρου

7 But Maccabeus did not cease to trust with all confidence that he would get help from the Lord.

3 Maccabees 2

33 ελλιδες δκαθειστκεισαν ντιλψεως τεξασθαι κατος ποχωροντας ξ ατν βδελσσοντο κας πολεμους το θνους κρινον κατς κοινς συναναστροφς καεχρηστας στρουν.

33 They remained resolutely hopeful of obtaining help, and they abhorred those who separated themselves from them, considering them to be enemies of the Jewish nation, and depriving them of companionship and mutual help.

Psa 118_170" id="Psa 118_170">

Psalms 118

170 εσλθοι τ ξωμου νπιν σου, Κριε καττλγι ν σου σαμε.

170 Let my supplication come before you; deliver me according to your promise.

1 [3] Esdras 8

4 κα δωκεν ατ βασιλες δξαν, ερντος χριν νπιον ατο ππντα τ ξιματα ατο.

4 And the king did him honour: for he found grace in his sight in all his requests.

2 Maccabees 14

30 δ Μακκαβαος αστηρτερον διεξγοντα συνιδν τν Νικνορα πρς ατν κατν εθισμνην πντησιν γροικτερον σχηκτα, νοσας οκπτοβελτστου τν αστηραν εναι, συστρψας οκλγους τν περ αυτν, συνεκρπετετο τν Νικνορα.

30 Notwithstanding, when Maccabeus saw that Nicanor began to be churlish unto him, and that he entreated him more roughly than he was wont, perceiving that such sour behaviour came not of

good, he gathered together not a few of his men, and withdrew himself from Nicanor.

Wisdom of Sirach 36

19 πλ■σον Σι■ν■ρεταλογ■ας σου, κα■ π■τ■ς δ■ξης σου τ■ν λα■ν σου.

19 Fill Sion with thine unspeakable oracles, and thy people with thy glory:

Judith 12

7 κα■ προσ■ταξεν ■Ολοφ■ρνης το■ς σωματοφ■λαξι μ■ διακωλ■ειν α■τ■ν. κα■ παρ■μεινεν ■ν τ■ παρεμβολ■ μ■ρας τρε■ς, κα■ ■ξεπορε■ετο κατ■ ν■κτα ε■ς τ■ν φ■ραγγα Βαιτυλο■α κα■ ■βαπτ■ζετο ■ν τ■ παρεμβολ■ π■ τ■ς πηγ■ς το■ ■δατος■

7 Then Holofernes commanded his guard that they should not stay her: thus she abode in the camp three days, and went out in the night into the valley of Bethulia, and washed herself in a fountain of water by the camp.

1 [3] Esdras 3

4 τ■τε ο■ τρε■ς νεαν■σκοι ο■ σωματοφ■λακες ο■ φυλ■ssonτες τ■ σ■μα το■ βασιλ■ως ε■παν ■τερος πρ■ς τ■ν ■τερον■

4 Then three young men, that were of the guard that kept the king's body, spake one to another;

Wisdom of Solomon 6

9 πρ■ς ■μ■ς ο■ν, ■ τ■ρанныι, ο■ λ■γοι μου, ■να μ■θητε σοφ■αν κα■ μ■ παραπ■σητε■

9 Unto you therefore, O kings, do I speak, that ye may learn wisdom, and not fall away.

1 Maccabees 2

47 κα■ ■δ■ωξαν το■ς υ■ο■ς τ■ς ■περηφαν■ας, κα■ κατευωδ■θη τ■ ■ργον ■ν χειρ■ α■τ■ν.

47 They pursued also after the proud men, and the work prospered in their hand.

1 Maccabees 5

42 ■ς δ■ ■γγισεν ■Ιο■δας π■ τ■ν χειμ■ρρουν το■ ■δατος, ■στησε το■ς γραμματε■ς το■ λαο■ π■ το■ χειμ■ρρου κα■ ■νετε■λατο α■το■ς λ■γων■ μ■ ■φ■τε π■ντα ■νθρωπον παρεμβαλε■ν, ■λλ■ ■ρχ■σθωσαν π■ντες ε■ς τ■ν π■λεμον.

42 Now when Judas came near the brook, he caused the scribes of the people to remain by the brook: unto whom he gave commandment, saying, Suffer no man to remain in the camp, but let all come to the battle.

2 Maccabees 4

29 κα■ ■ μ■ν Μεν■λαος π■λιπε τ■ς ■ρχιερωσ■νης δι■δοχον Λυσ■μαχον τ■ν ■αυτο■ ■δελφ■ν, Σ■στρατος δ■ Κρ■τητα τ■ν π■ τ■ν Κυπρ■ων.

29 Now Menelaus left his brother Lysimachus in his stead in the priesthood; and Sostratus left Crates, who was governor of the Cyprians.

2 Maccabees 4

31 συγγνο■ς δ■ ■ ■τερος ■τι γεννα■ως ■π■ το■ ■νδρ■ς ■στρατ■γηται, παραγεν■μενος ■π■ τ■ μ■γιστον κα■ ■γιον ■ερ■ν, τ■ν ■ερ■ων τ■ς καθηκο■σας θυσ■ας προσαγ■ντων, ■κ■λευσε παραδιδ■ναι τ■ν ■νδρα.

31 But the other, knowing that he was notably prevented by Judas' policy, came into the great and holy temple, and commanded the priests, that were offering their usual sacrifices, to deliver him the man.

2 Maccabees 14

26 ■Ο δ■ ■Αλκιμος συνιδ■ν τ■ν πρ■ς ■λλ■λους ε■νοιαν κα■ τ■ς γενομ■νας συνθ■κας, ■ναλαβ■ν ■κε πρ■ς τ■ν Δημ■τριον κα■ ■λεγε τ■ν Νικ■νορα ■λλ■τρια φρονε■ν τ■ν πραγμ■των■ τ■ν γ■ρ ■π■βουλον τ■ς βασιλε■ας ■Ιο■δαν δι■δοχον ■ναδ■δειχεν ■αυτο■.

26 But Alcimus, perceiving the love that was betwixt them, and considering the covenants that were made, came to Demetrius, and told him that Nicanor was not well affected toward the state; for that he had ordained Judas, a traitor to his realm, to be the king's successor.

Bel and the Dragon

22 κα■ ■ξ■γαγεν α■το■ς ■ βασιλε■ς ■κ το■ Βηλ■ου κα■ παρ■δωκεν α■το■ς τ■ Δανιηλ κα■ τ■ν δαπ■νην τ■ν ε■ς α■τ■ν ■δωκε τ■ Δανιηλ τ■ν δ■ Βηλ κατ■στρεψε

22 Therefore the king put them to death, and gave Bel over to Daniel, who destroyed it and its temple. (RSV)

Bel and the Dragon (Theodotion)

2 κα■ ■ν ε■δωλον Βηλ ■ ■σ■βοντο ο■ Βαβυλ■νιοι ■νηλ■σκετο δ■ α■τ■ καθ' ■κ■στην ■μ■ραν σεμιδ■λεως ■ρτ■βαι δ■κα δ■ο κα■ πρ■βατα τ■σσαρα κα■ ■λα■ου μετρητα■ ■ξ

2 The Babylonians had an idol called Bel, and every day they provided for it six bushels of fine flour, forty sheep, and six measures of wine.

Wisdom of Sirach 37

7 Π■ς σ■μβουλος ■ξ■ρει βουλ■ν, ■λλ■ ■στι συμβουλε■ων ε■ς ■αυτ■ν.

7 Every counsellor extolleth counsel; but there is some that counselleth for himself.

Wisdom of Sirach 37

8 ■π■ συμβο■λου φ■λαξον τ■ν ψυχ■ν σου κα■ γν■θι πρ■τερον τ■ς α■το■ χρε■α —κα■ γ■ρ α■τ■ς ■αυτ■ βουλε■σεται—, μ■ποτε β■λ■ ■π■ σο■ κλ■ρον

8 Beware of a counsellor, and know before what need he hath; for he will counsel for himself; lest he cast the lot upon thee,

Epistle of Jeremiah

9 ■στι δ■ κα■ ■τε ■φαιρο■μενοι ο■ ■ερε■ς ■π■ τ■ν θε■ν α■τ■ν χρυσο■ον κα■ ■ργ■ριον ε■ς ■αυτο■ς καταναλ■σουσι, δ■σουσι δ■ ■π' α■τ■ν κα■ τα■ς ■π■ το■ στ■γους π■ρναις.

9 And taking gold, as it were for a virgin that loveth to go gay, they make crowns for the heads of their gods.

2 Maccabees 4

8 ■παγγειλ■μενος τ■ βασιλε■ δι■ ■ντε■ξεως ■ργυρ■ου τ■λαντα ■ξ■κοντα πρ■ς το■ς τριακοσ■οις κα■ προσ■δου τιν■ς ■λλης τ■λαντα ■γδο■κοντα.

8 Promising unto the king by intercession three hundred and threescore talents of silver, and of another revenue eighty talents:

3 Maccabees 6

40 ε■ωχο■ντο δ■ π■νθ■ ■π■ το■ βασιλ■ως χορηγο■μενοι μ■χρι τ■ς τεσσαρεσκαιδεκ■της, ■ν ■ κα■ τ■ν ■ντυχ■αν ■ποι■σαντο περ■ τ■ς ■πολ■σεως α■τ■ν.

40 They feasted upon the king's provision up to the fourteenth day, and then asked to be sent away.

1 [3] Esdras 8

53 κα■ π■λιν ■δε■θημεν το■ Κυρ■ου ■μ■ν π■ντα τα■τα κα■ ■τ■χομεν ε■λ■του.

53 And again we besought our Lord as touching these things, and found him favourable unto us.

Wisdom of Sirach 1

15 μετ■ ■νθρ■πων θεμ■λιον α■■νος ■ν■σσευσε κα■ μετ■ το■ σπ■ρματος α■τ■ν ■μπιστευθ■σεται.

15 She hath built an everlasting foundation with men, and she shall continue with their seed.

4 Maccabees 17

22 κα■ δι■ το■ α■ματος τ■ν ε■σεβ■ν ■κε■νων κα■ το■ ■λαστηρ■ου το■ θαν■του α■τ■ν ■θε■α πρ■νοια τ■ν Ισραηλ προκακωθ■ντα δι■σωσεν.

22 For they became the atnipoised to the sin of the nation; and the Divine Providence saved Israel, aforetime afflicted, by the blood of those pious ones, and the propitiatory death.

Tobit 2 (Text of Codex Vaticanus and Alexandrinus)

12 κα■ ■π■στελλε το■ς κυρ■οις, κα■ ■π■δωκαν α■τ■ κα■ α■το■ τ■ν μισθ■ν προσδ■ντες κα■ ■ριφον.

12 And when she had sent them home to the owners, they paid her wages, and gave her also besides a kid.

(Text of Codex Sinaiticus)

12 καὶ ἔπεμψεν αὐτὴν οἱ κύριοι αὐτῶν καὶ ἔδωκαν αὐτῇ τὴν μισθὸν καὶ τὸν τῆς βδομάδος τοῦ ἁγίου τοῦ ἁγίου καὶ ἔπεμψεν αὐτὴν οἱ κύριοι καὶ ἔδωκαν αὐτῇ τὴν μισθὸν πάντα καὶ ἔδωκαν αὐτῇ ἕνα ἄγνον

12 When she sent back the goods to their owners, they would pay her. Late in winter she finished the cloth and sent it back to the owners. They paid her the full salary, and also gave her a young goat for the table.

Song of the Three Children (a.k.a. Daniel 14)

14 καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν ταῖς καιρῶν τοῦ τῶν ἄρχων καὶ προφῆτης καὶ ἡγούμενος, οὐδὲ ἄλοκαυτῶσις οὐδὲ θυσία οὐδὲ προσφορά οὐδὲ θυμιάμα, οὐ τῆς τοῦ καρπῶσαι ἐν πῆν σου καὶ ἐρεῖν ἰλεος

14 Neither is there at this time prince, or prophet, or leader, or burnt offering, or sacrifice, or oblation, or incense, or place to sacrifice before thee, and to find mercy.

1 [3] Esdras 4

52 καὶ ἔτι τῆς θυσιαστηρίου ἄλοκαυτῶματα καρποῦσθαι καθῆμεραν, καθῆμερουσιν ἐντολῆν ἑπτάκαδεκα προσφέρειν, ἄλλα τῶν λαντα, δεκάκατῆν νιαυτῶν

52 And other ten talents yearly, to maintain the burnt offerings upon the altar every day, as they had a commandment to offer seventeen

Wisdom of Sirach 45

14 θυσία αὐτοῦ ἄλοκαυτῶσονται καθῆμεραν ἐνδελεχῆς δῆς.

14 Their sacrifices shall be wholly consumed every day twice continually.

4 Maccabees 18

11 τὴν ἐναιρεθῆντα Ἀβελ πῆν Κῆν, ἐνεγίνωσκε τε ἔμην καὶ τὴν ἄλοκαυτῶμενον Ἰσακ καὶ τὴν ἐν φυλακῆ Ἰωσῆφ.

11 He used to read to you the slaying of Abel by Cain, and the offering up of Isaac, and the imprisonment of Joseph.

3 Maccabees 5

34 ἡ καθῆς δὲ τὴν φίλων σκυθρωπῆς πεκρῶν, τοῦς συνηθροισμῶνους πῆλυσαν ἑκαστον πῆ τὴν ἑδῶν ἐσχολῶν.

34 The friends, too, stole out one by one, and dismissed the assembled multitudes to their respective occupations.

4 Esdras 7

53

53 And that there should be shewed a paradise, whose fruit endureth for ever, wherein is security and medicine, since we shall not enter into it?

4 Esdras 8

52

52 Heaven will be open to all of you. In fact, the tree that brings life has been planted, and the future world is ready. I have built the holy city, where you will have everything you need, including perfect rest. All things that are good and wise are waiting for you.

2 Esdras 8

29 γρυπνετε κα τηρετε ως στε νπιον ρχωντων τν ερων κα τν Λευιτν κα τν ρχωντων τν πατριν νν Ιερουσαλμ ες σκηνς οκου Κυρου.

29 Be watchful and keep them, until ye weigh [them] before the chief priests and the Levites, and the chiefs of families in Jerusalem, at the chambers of the house of the Lord.

2 Maccabees 4

6 ρα γρ νευ βασιλικς προνοας δνατον εναι τυχεν ερνης τι τ προγματα κα τν Σμωνα παλαν ο ληψμενον τς νοας.

6 For he saw that it was impossible that the state should continue quiet, and Simon leave his folly, unless the king did look thereunto.

1 Kings 7 (Cedex Alexandrianus)

2 α γενθη φ' ς μρας ν κιβωτς ν καρειαθιαρεμ πλθυναν α μραι, κα γνοντο εκοσι τη κα πβλεψεν πς οκος ισραηλ πσω κυρου

2 Maccabees 10

3 κα τν νεν καθαρσαντες τερον θυσιαστριον ποησαν κα πυρσαντες λθους κα πρ κ τοτων λαβντες, ννεγκαν θυσαν μετ διετ χρνον κα θυμαμα κα λχνους κα τν ρτων τν προθεσιν ποισαντο.

3 And having cleansed the temple they made another altar, and striking stones they took fire out of them, and offered a sacrifice after two years, and set forth incense, and lights, and shewbread.

Tobit 10

10 ναστς δ Ραγουηλ δωκεν ατ Σαρραν τν γυνακα ατο κα τ μισυ τν παρχωντων σματα κα κτηνη κα ργριον

10 Then Raguel arose, and gave him Sara his wife, and half his goods, servants, and cattle, and money.

Bel and the Dragon

32 σαν δ ν τ λκκ πτ λοντες, κα δδετο ατος τν μραν δο σματα κα δο προβατα τε δ οκ δθη ατος, να καταφγωσιν τν Δανηλ.

32 There were seven lions in the pit. Usually they were fed two bodies and two sheep daily, but now they were fed nothing so that they would devour Daniel.

2 Maccabees 8

11 ε■θ■ως δ■ ε■ς τ■ς παραθαλασσ■ους π■λεις ■π■στειλε προσκαλο■μενος ■π■ ■γορασμ■ν ■Ιουδα■κ■ν σωμ■των, ■πισχνο■μενος ■νεν■κοντα σ■ματα ταλ■ντου παραχωρ■σειν, ο■ προσδεχ■μενος τ■ν παρ■ το■ Παντοκρ■τορος μ■λλουσαν παρακολουθ■σειν ■π■ α■τ■ δ■κην.

11 Wherefore immediately he sent to the cities upon the sea coast, proclaiming a sale of the captive Jews, and promising that they should have fourscore and ten bodies for one talent, not expecting the vengeance that was to follow upon him from the Almighty God.

Wisdon of Solomon 7

27 μ■α δ■ ο■σα π■ντα δ■ναται κα■ μ■νουσα ■ν α■τ■ τ■ π■ντα καιν■ζει κα■ κατ■ γενε■ς ε■ς ψυχ■ς ■σ■ας μεταβα■νουσα φ■λους Θεο■ κα■ προφ■τας κατασκευ■ζει■

27 And being but one, she can do all things: and remaining in herself, she maketh all things new: and in all ages entering into holy souls, she maketh them friends of God, and prophets.

Wisdon of Solomon 7

14 ■νεκλιπ■ς γ■ρ θησαυρ■ς ■στιν ■νθρ■ποις, ■ν ο■ χρησ■μενοι πρ■ς Θε■ν ■στε■λαντο φιλ■αν δι■ τ■ς ■κ παιδε■ας δωρε■ς συσταθ■ντες.

14 For she is a treasure unto men that never faileth: which they that use become the friends of God, being commended for the gifts that come from learning.

2 Maccabees 4

47 κα■ τ■ν μ■ν τ■ς ■λης κακ■ας Μεν■λαον ■π■λυσε τ■ν κατηγορημ■των, το■ς δ■ ταλαιπ■ροις, ο■τινες, ε■ κα■ ■π■ Σκυθ■ν ■λεγον, ■πελ■θησαν ■ν ■κατ■γνωστοι, το■τοις θ■νατον ■π■κρινε.

47 Insomuch that he discharged Menelaus from the accusations, who notwithstanding was cause of all the mischief: and those poor men, who, if they had told their cause, yea, before the Scythians, should have been judged innocent, them he condemned to death.

Judith 1

12 κα■ ■θυμ■θη Ναβουχοδον■σορ ■π■ π■σαν τ■ν γ■ν τα■την σφ■δρα κα■ ■μοσε κατ■ το■ θρ■νου κα■ τ■ς βασιλε■ας α■το■, ε■ μ■ν ■κδικ■σειν π■ντα τ■ ■ρια τ■ς Κιλικ■ας κα■ Δαμασκη■ς κα■ Συρ■ας, ■νελε■ν τ■ ρομφα■ α■το■ κα■ π■ντας το■ς κατοικο■ντας ■ν γ■ Μω■β κα■ το■ς υ■ο■ς ■Αμμ■ν κα■ π■σαν τ■ν ■Ιουδα■αν κα■ π■ντας το■ς ■ν Α■γ■πτ■ ■ως το■ ■λθε■ν ■π■ τ■ ■ρια τ■ν δ■ο θαλασσ■ν.

12 Therefore Nabuchodonosor was very angry with all this country, and sware by his throne and kingdom, that he would surely be avenged upon all those coasts of Cilicia, and Damascus, and Syria, and that he would slay with the sword all the inhabitants of the land of Moab, and the children of Ammon, and all Judea, and all that were in Egypt, till ye come to the borders of the two seas.

Baruch 2

29 ἄν μὴ ἀκούσῃτε τὰς φωνὰς μου, ἐμὴν βίβησιν μεγάλη πολλή ἀτιή ποστρήσει ἐς μικρὴν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, ὅπου διασπείρω ἀποτομὰς κεφαλάων.

29 If ye will not hear my voice, surely this very great multitude shall be turned into a small number among the nations, where I will scatter them.

2 Maccabees 1

8 καὶ ἐνεπίρισαν τὴν πυλῶνα καὶ ἔξχεαν αἷμα ἄθῳν καὶ δεθήμεν τῷ Κυρίου καὶ ἐσηκοσθημεν καὶ προσηνώκαμεν θυσιῶν καὶ σεμδάλιν καὶ ἔψαμεν τοὺς λαχνοὺς καὶ προεθήκαμεν τοὺς ἄρτους.

8 And burned the porch, and shed innocent blood: then we prayed unto the Lord, and were heard; we offered also sacrifices and fine flour, and lighted the lamps, and set forth the loaves.

2 Maccabees 1

12 ἀποτομὰς γὰρ ἔξβρασε τοὺς παραταξάμενους ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ πύλαι.

12 For he cast them out that fought within the holy city.

2 Maccabees 5

8 πῶρας ὅν κακῶς ἐναστροφῶς ἐτυχεν ἠγκλεισθεὶς πρὸς Ἀρῆταν τὸν τὸν Ἀρῶν τῆρρανον, πύλιν κὶ πλεως φεγῶν, διωκόμενος πῶ πύτων καὶ στυγομενος ἐς τὸν νόμων ποστῆτης καὶ βδελυσσόμενος ἐς πατρίδος καὶ πολιτῶν δῆμιος, ἐς Αἴγυπτον ἔξεβρῆσθη.

8 In the end therefore he had an unhappy return, being accused before Aretas the king of the Arabians, fleeing from city to city, pursued of all men, hated as a forsaker of the laws, and being had in abomination as an open enemy of his country and countrymen, he was cast out into Egypt.

2 Maccabees 12

43 ποιησάμενος τε κατὰ ἄνδραλογίαν κατασκευάσματα ἐς ἄργυρου δραχμῶν δισχιλίας, ἔπεστειλεν ἐς Ἱεροσόλυμα προσάγαγεῖν περὶ ἑμαρτίας θυσιῶν, πύνυ καλῶς καὶ ἠστεῶς πύτων πύρ ἐναστῆσεως διαλογίζόμενος.

43 And when he had made a gathering throughout the company to the sum of two thousand drachms of silver, he sent it to Jerusalem to offer a sin offering, doing therein very well and honestly, in that he was mindful of the resurrection:

1 Maccabees 8

20 Ἰοῦδας ὁ Μακκαβαῖος καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ ἀποτομὰ καὶ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἔπεστειλαν ἡμῶς πρὸς ἡμῶς στήσαι μεθῶ ἡμῶν συμμαχίαν καὶ ἐρήνην καὶ γράφῃναι ἡμῶς συμμαχοὺς καὶ φίλους ἡμῶν.

20 Judas Maccabeus with his brethren, and the people of the Jews, have sent us unto you, to make a confederacy and peace with you, and that we might be registered your confederates and

friends.

2 Maccabees 11

16 ἦσαν γὰρ αἱ γεγραμμέναι τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις ἐπιστολαί, παρὰ μὲν Λυσίου περιχουσαι τὴν τριπλὸν τοῦτον Λυσίας τὴν πληθεῖ τὴν Ἰουδαίων χάριεν.

16 For there were letters written unto the Jews from Lysias to this effect: Lysias unto the people of the Jews sendeth greeting:

2 Maccabees 11

34 Ἐπεμψαν δὲ καὶ οἱ Ῥωμαῖοι πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἐπιστολὴν ἔχουσαν οὕτως· Κέντος Μέμμιος, Τίτος Μάνλιος, πρεσβῆται Ῥωμαίων, τὴν δὲ μὲν τὴν Ἰουδαίων χάριεν.

34 The Romans also sent unto them a letter containing these words: Quintus Memmius and Titus Manlius, ambassadors of the Romans, send greeting unto the people of the Jews.

Wisdom of Solomon 3

5 καὶ ὀλίγα παιδευθέντες μέγα ἐμργετηθῶσονται, ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς ἐπέρασεν αὐτοὺς καὶ ἐρεν αὐτοὺς ἕξους αὐτοῦ.

5 And having been a little chastised, they shall be greatly rewarded: for God proved them, and found them worthy for himself.

1 Maccabees 6

58 νῦν οὖν δέμεν δεξιῶν τοῖς ἐνθροποῖς τοῖς καὶ ποιῶμεν μετὰ αὐτῶν εἰρήνην καὶ μετὰ πάντας ἔθνους αὐτῶν.

58 Now therefore let us be friends with these men, and make peace with them, and with all their nation;

1 Maccabees 11

50 δός μοι δεξιῶς καὶ παυσσῶσαν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι πολεμοῦντες ἡμῶς καὶ τὴν πόλιν.

50 Grant us peace, and let the Jews cease from assaulting us and the city.

1 Maccabees 11

62 καὶ ἔξωσαν οὖν οἱ πρὸς Γάζης τὴν Ἰωνῆθαν, καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς δεξιῶς καὶ ἔλαβε τοὺς υἱοὺς ἄρχωντων αὐτῶν εἰς ἕμῃρα καὶ ἔξαπστείλεν αὐτοὺς εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ καὶ διήλθε τὴν χώραν ὡς Δαμασκόν.

62 Afterward, when they of Gaza made supplication unto Jonathan, he made peace with them, and took the sons of their chief men for hostages, and sent them to Jerusalem, and passed through the country unto Damascus.

1 Maccabees 13

50 καὶ βῆσαν πρὸς Σίμωνα δεξιῶς λαβέν, καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἔξβαλεν αὐτοὺς ἐκείθεν καὶ καθήρισε τὴν κρῆν πρὸ τὴν μίασμῶν.

50 Then cried they to Simon, beseeching him to be at one with them: which thing he granted them; and when he had put them out from thence, he cleansed the tower from pollutions:

2 Maccabees 11

26 ε■ ο■ν ποι■σεις διαπεμψ■μενος πρ■ς α■το■ς κα■ δο■ς δεξι■ς, πω■ ε■δ■τες τ■ν μετ■ραν προα■ρεσιν ε■θυμο■ τε ■σι κα■ δ■ως διαγ■νωνται πρ■ς τ■ν τ■ν δ■ων ντ■ληψιν

26 Thou shalt do well therefore to send unto them, and grant them peace, that when they are certified of our mind, they may be of good comfort, and ever go cheerfully about their own affairs.

2 Maccabees 12

11 γενομ■νης δ■ καρτερ■ς μ■χης κα■ τ■ν περ■ τ■ν Ιο■δαν δι■ τ■ν παρ■ το■ Θεο■ βο■θειαν ε■ημερησ■ντων, λαττωθ■ντες ο■ νομ■δες Αραβες ξ■ουν δο■ναι τ■ν Ιο■δαν δεξι■ν α■το■ς, πισχνο■μενοι κα■ βοσκ■ματα δ■σειν κα■ ■ν το■ς λοιπο■ς φελ■σειν α■το■ς.

11 Whereupon there was a very sore battle; but Judas' side by the help of God got the victory; so that the Nomades of Arabia, being overcome, besought Judas for peace, promising both to give him cattle, and to pleasure him otherwise.

2 Maccabees 13

22 δευτερολ■γησεν ■ βασιλε■ς το■ς ■ν Βαιθσορ■ δεξι■ν δωκεν, λαβεν, πει προσβαλε το■ς περ■ τ■ν Ιο■δαν, ττων γ■νετο,

22 The king treated with them in Bethsura the second time, gave his hand, took their's, departed, fought with Judas, was overcome;

1 Maccabees 11

58 κα■ π■στειλεν α■τ■ χρυσ■ματα κα■ διακον■αν κα■ δωκεν α■τ■ ξουσαν π■νειν ■ν χρυσ■μασι κα■ ε■ναι ■ν πορφρ■ κα■ χειν πρπην χρυσ■ν■

58 Upon this he sent him golden vessels to be served in, and gave him leave to drink in gold, and to be clothed in purple, and to wear a golden buckle.

2 Maccabees 12

12 Ιο■δας δ■ πολαβ■ν ■ς ληθ■ς ■ν πολλο■ς α■το■ς χρησ■μους, πεχρησεν ερπηνην ξειν πρ■ς α■το■ς κα■ λαβ■ντες δεξι■ς ε■ς τ■ς σκην■ς α■τ■ν χωρ■σθησαν.

12 Then Judas, thinking indeed that they would be profitable in many things, granted them peace: whereupon they shook hands, and so they departed to their tents.

2 Maccabees 14

19 διπερ ■πεμψε Ποσιδνιον κα■ Θεδοτον κα■ Ματταθ■αν δο■ναι κα■ λαβε■ν δεξι■ς.

19 Wherefore he sent Posidonius, and Theodotus, and Mattathias, to make peace.

2 Maccabees 11

19 ■■ν μ■ν ο■ν συντηρ■σητε τ■ν ε■ς τ■ πρ■γματα ε■νοϊαν, κα■ ε■ς τ■ λοιπ■ν πειρ■σομαι παρα■τιος ■μ■ν ■γαθ■ν γεν■σθαι.

19 And if then ye will keep yourselves loyal to the state, hereafter also will I endeavour to be a means of your good.

3 Maccabees 3

7 τ■ν δ■ περ■ τ■ν προσκυν■σεων κα■ τροφ■ν δι■στασιν ■θρ■λουν, φ■σκοντες μ■τε τ■ βασιλε■ μ■τε τα■ς δυν■μεσιν ■μοσπ■νδους το■ς ■νθρ■πους γεν■σθαι, δυσμενε■ς δ■ ε■ναι κα■ μ■γα τι το■ς πρ■γμασιν ■ναντιουμ■νους■ κα■ ο■ τ■ τυχ■ντι περι■ψαν ψ■γ■.

7 who said much of the exclusiveness of the Jews with regard to their worship and meats; they alleged that they were men unsociable, hostile to the king's interests, refusing to associate with him or his troops. By this way of speaking, they brought much odium upon them.

2 Maccabees 3

11 τιν■ δ■ κα■ ■Υρκανο■ το■ Τωβ■ου σφ■δρα ■νδρ■ς ■ν ■περοχ■ κειμ■νου —ο■χ ■σπερ ■ν διαβ■λλων ■ δυσεβ■ς Σ■μων— τ■ δ■ π■ντα ■ργυρ■ου τετρακ■σια τ■λαντα, χρυσ■ου δ■ διακ■σια■

11 And that some of it belonged to Hircanus son of Tobias, a man of great dignity, and not as that wicked Simon had misinformed: the sum whereof in all was four hundred talents of silver, and two hundred of gold:

2 Maccabees 14

38 ■ν γ■ρ ■ν το■ς ■μπροσθεν χρ■νοις τ■ς ■μειξ■ας κρ■σιν ε■σεννηγμ■νος ■Ιουδα■σμο■, κα■ σ■μα κα■ ψυχ■ν ■π■ρ το■ ■Ιουδα■σμο■ παραβεβλημ■νος μετ■ π■σης ■κτεν■ας.

38 For in the former times, when they mingled not themselves with the Gentiles, he had been accused of Judaism, and did boldly jeopard his body and life with all vehemency for the religion of the Jews.

3 Maccabees 6

41 συναιν■σας τε α■το■ς ■ βασιλε■ς ■γραψεν α■το■ς τ■ν ■πογεγραμμ■νην ■πιστολ■ν πρ■ς το■ς κατ■ π■λιν στρατηγο■ς μεγαλοψ■χως τ■ν ■κτεν■αν ■χουσαν.

41 The king commended them, and wrote the subjoined letter, of magnanimous import for them, to the commanders of every city.

Judith 4

9 κα■ ■νεβ■ησαν π■ς ■ν■ρ ■Ισρα■λ πρ■ς τ■ν Θε■ν ■ν ■κτεν■■ μεγ■λ■ κα■ ■ταπεινο■σαν τ■ς ψυχ■ς α■τ■ν ■ν ■κτεν■■ μεγ■λ■.

9 Then every man of Israel cried to God with great fervency, and with great vehemency did they humble their souls:

4 Maccabees 9

8 ■με■ς μ■ν γ■ρ δι■ τ■σδε τ■ς κακοπαθε■ας κα■ ■πομον■ς τ■ τ■ς ■ρετ■ς ■θλα ■ξομεν
κα■ ■σ■μεθα παρ■ Θε■, δι' ■ν κα■ π■σχομεν■

8 For we through this ill-treatment and endurance shall bear off the rewards of virtue.

Wisdom of Sirach 12

12 μ■ στ■σ■ς α■τ■ν παρ■ σεαυτ■, μ■ ■νατρ■ψας σε στ■ ■π■ τ■ν τ■πον σου■ μ■
καθ■σ■ς α■τ■ν ■κ δεξι■ν σου, μ■ποτε ζητ■σ■ τ■ν καθ■δραν σου κα■ ■π■ ■σχ■των
■πιγ■σ■ το■ς λ■γους μου κα■ ■π■ τ■ν ρημ■των μου κατανυ■σ■.

12 Set him not by thee, lest, when he hath overthrown thee, he stand up in thy place; neither let him sit at thy right hand, lest he seek to take thy seat, and thou at the last remember my words, and be pricked therewith.

1 (3) Esd. 1

48 κα■ ■π■στειλεν ■ Θε■ς τ■ν πατ■ρων α■τ■ν δι■ το■ ■γγ■λου α■το■ μετακαλ■σαι
α■το■ς, καθ■τι ■φε■δετο α■τ■ν κα■ το■ σκην■ματος α■το■.

48 And after that king Nabuchodonosor had made him to swear by the name of the Lord, he forswore himself, and rebelled; and hardening his neck, his heart, he transgressed the laws of the Lord God of Israel.

Wisdom of Sirach 43

29 φοβερ■ς Κ■ριος κα■ σφ■δρα μ■γας, κα■ θαυμαστ■ ■ δυναστε■α α■το■.

29 The Lord is terrible and very great, and marvellous is his power.

Susanna

42 ■νεβ■ησε δ■ φων■ μεγ■λ■ Σωσ■ννα κα■ ε■πεν■ ■ Θε■ς ■ α■■νιος ■ τ■ν κρυπτ■ν
γ■στης, ■ ε■δ■ς τ■ π■ντα πρ■ν γεν■σεως α■τ■ν,

42 Then Susanna cried out with a loud voice, and said, O everlasting God, that knowest the secrets, and knowest all things before they be:

1 [3] Esd. 6

13 κα■ ■κοδ■μητο ο■κος ■μπροσθεν ■τ■ν πλει■νων δι■ βασιλ■ως το■ ■Ισρα■λ μεγ■λου
κα■ ■σχυρο■ κα■ ■πετελ■σθη.

13 So they gave us this answer, We are the servants of the Lord which made heaven and earth.

Bel and the Dragon

5 κα■ ε■πεν ■ βασιλε■ς τ■ Δανιηλ δι■ τ■ ο■ προσκυνε■ς τ■ Βηλ κα■ ε■πε Δανιηλ πρ■ς τ■ν
βασιλ■α ο■δ■να σ■βομαι ■γ■ ε■ μ■ κ■ριον τ■ν θε■ν τ■ν κτ■σαντα τ■ν ο■ραν■ν κα■ τ■ν
γ■ν κα■ ■χοντα π■σης σαρκ■ς κυριε■αν

5 Who answered and said, Because I may not worship idols made with hands, but the living God, who hath created the heaven and the earth, and hath sovereignty over all flesh.

Wisdom of Sirach 36 [33]

11 ■ν πλ■θει ■πιστ■μης κ■ριος διεχ■ρισεν α■το■ς κα■ ■λλο■ωσεν τ■ς ■δο■ς α■τ■ν

11 In much knowledge the Lord hath divided them, and made their ways diverse.

12 ■ξ α■τ■ν ε■λ■γησεν κα■ ■ν■ψωσεν κα■ ■ξ α■τ■ν ■γ■ασεν κα■ πρ■ς α■τ■ν ■γγισεν ■π' α■τ■ν κατηρ■σατο κα■ ■ταπε■νωσεν κα■ ■ν■στρεψεν α■το■ς ■π■ στ■σεως α■τ■ν

12 Some of them hath he blessed and exalted and some of them he sanctified, and set near himself: but some of them hath he cursed and brought low, and turned out of their places.

13 ■ς πηλ■ς κεραμ■ως ■ν χειρ■ α■το■ π■σαι α■ ■δο■ α■το■ κατ■ τ■ν ε■δοκ■αν α■το■ ο■τως ■νθρωποι ■ν χειρ■ το■ ποι■σαντος α■το■ς ■ποδο■ναι α■το■ς κατ■ τ■ν κρ■σιν α■το■

13 As the clay is in the potter's hand, to fashion it at his pleasure: so man is in the hand of him that made him, to render to them as liketh him best.

14 ■π■ναντι το■ κακο■ τ■ ■γαθ■ν κα■ ■π■ναντι το■ θαν■του ■ ζω■ ο■τως ■π■ναντι ε■σεβο■ς ■μαρτωλ■ς

14 Good is set against evil, and life against death: so is the godly against the sinner, and the sinner against the godly.

Wisdom of Solomon 17

3 λανθ■νειν γ■ρ νομ■ζοντες ■π■ κρυφα■οις ■μαρτ■μασιν, ■φεγγε■ λ■θης παρακαλ■μματι ■σκορπ■σθησαν, θαμβο■μενοι δειν■ς κα■ ■νδ■λμασιν ■κταρασσ■μενοι■

3 For while they supposed to lie hid in their secret sins, they were scattered under a dark veil of forgetfulness, being horribly astonished, and troubled with strange apparitions.

Wisdom of Sirach 51

9 κα■ ■ν■ψωσα ■π■ γ■ς ■κετε■αν μου κα■ ■π■ρ θαν■του ρ■σεως ■δε■θην.

9 Then lifted I up my supplications from the earth, and prayed for deliverance from death.

Wisdom of Solomon 15

3 τ■ γ■ρ ■π■στασθα■ σε ■λ■κληρος δικαιοσ■νη, κα■ ε■δ■ναι τ■ κρ■τος σου ρ■ζα ■θανασ■ας.

3 For to know thee is perfect righteousness: yea, to know thy power is the root of immortality.

Wisdom of Solomon 8

17 τα■τα λογισ■μενος ■ν ■μαυτ■ κα■ φροντ■σας ■ν καρδ■ μου ■τι ■στιν ■θανασ■α ■ν συγγενε■ σοφ■ας

17 Now when I considered these things in myself, and pondered them in my heart, how that to be allied unto wisdom is immortality;

Wisdom of Solomon 8

13 Ἐξω δὲ αὐτὴν ἠθανασίαν καὶ μνήμην ἀβίων τοῖς μετ᾽ ἡμᾶς πολεψώ.

13 Moreover by the means of her I shall obtain immortality, and leave behind me an everlasting memorial to them that come after me.

Wisdom of Solomon 1

15 δικαιοσύνη γὰρ ἠθάνατος ἐστίν.

15 For righteousness is immortal:

3 Maccabees 2

21 Ἐνταῦθα πάντων πᾶπτης Θεοῦ καὶ πάντων ἁγίου ἐν ἁγίοις ἐσακοῦσας τῶν ἠθῆσμου λιτανεύσας, τὴν βρει καὶ ἠρῆσει μεγάλως πᾶρμῶνον ἠμῆστιξεν αὐτὴν

21 At that time God, who seeth all things, who is beyond all Holy among the holy, heard that prayer, so suitable; and scourged the man greatly uplifted with scorn and insolence.

2 Maccabees 7

35 οὐπω γὰρ τὴν τοῦ Παντοκράτορος πᾶπτου Θεοῦ, κρῆσιν κᾶφευγας.

35 For thou hast not yet escaped the judgment of Almighty God, who seeth all things.

2 Maccabees 3

39 αὐτῶς γὰρ τὴν κατοικίαν πούρῶνιον ἁχων, πᾶπτης ἠστὶ καὶ βοηθῶς κᾶνου τοῦ τᾶπου καὶ τοῖς παραγινομένων πᾶ κακῆσει τᾶπτων πᾶλλυσι

39 For he that dwelleth in heaven hath his eye on that place, and defendeth it; and he beateth and destroyeth them that come to hurt it.

2 Maccabees 12

22 πᾶφανεῶσης δὲ τῶς Ἰοῦδα σπεῶρας πᾶπτης καὶ γενομένου δῶους πᾶ τοῖς πολεμῶους, φῶβου τε κ τῶς τοῦ πᾶντα φορῶντος πᾶφανεῶσης γενομένου πᾶ αὐτοῶς, εῶς φυγῶν ῶρμησαν ἁλλοῦ ἁλλαχῶ φερῶμενος, ἠστε πολλῶκῶς πᾶ τὴν ἠδῶων βλᾶπτεσθαι καὶ ταῶς τὴν ξιφῶν κᾶμαῶς ἠναπεῶρεσθαι.

22 But when Judas his first band came in sight, the enemies, being smitten with fear and terror through the appearing of him who seeth all things, fled amain, one running into this way, another that way, so as that they were often hurt of their own men, and wounded with the points of their own swords.

2 Maccabees 15

2 τὴν δὲ κατῶν ἠνῶγκην συνεπομένων αὐτῶ Ἰουδαῶων λεγῶντων ἠηδαμῶς οὐτως ἠγρῶως καὶ βαρβῶρος ἠπολῶσῶς, δῶξαν δὲ ἠπομῶρισον τᾶ προτετιμηῶν πᾶ τοῦ πᾶντα

■φορ■ντος μεθ■ ■γι■τητος ■μ■ρ■.

2 Nevertheless the Jews that were compelled to go with him said, O destroy not so cruelly and barbarously, but give honour to that day, which he, that seeth all things, hath honoured with holiness above all other days.

2 Maccabees 4

49 δι■ ■ν α■τ■αν κα■ Τ■ριοι μισοπονηρ■σαντες τ■ πρ■ς τ■ν κηδε■αν α■τ■ν μεγαλοπρεπ■ς ■χορ■γησαν.

49 Wherefore even they of Tyrus, moved with hatred of that wicked deed, caused them to be honourably buried.

2 Maccabees 8

4 μνησθ■ναι δ■ κα■ τ■ς τ■ν ■ναμαρτ■των νηπ■ων παραν■μου ■πωλε■ας κα■ περ■ τ■ν γενομ■νων ε■ς τ■ ■νομα α■το■ βλασφημι■ν κα■ μισοπονηρ■σαι.

4 And remember the wicked slaughter of harmless infants, and the blasphemies committed against his name; and that he would shew his hatred against the wicked.

2 Maccabees 3

1 τ■ς ■γ■ας το■νυν π■λεως κατοικουμ■νης μετ■ π■σης ε■ρ■νης κα■ τ■ν ν■μων ■τι κ■λλιστα συντηρουμ■νων δι■ τ■ν ■Ον■ου το■ ρχιερ■ως ε■σ■βει■ν τε κα■ μισοπονηρ■αν,

1 Now when the holy city was inhabited with all peace, and the laws were kept very well, because of the godliness of Onias the high priest, and his hatred of wickedness,

Wisdom of Sirach 13

5 ■■ν ■χ■ς, συμβι■σετα■ σοι κα■ ■ποκεν■σει σε, κα■ α■τ■ς ο■ πον■σει.

5 If thou have any thing, he will live with thee: yea, he will make thee bare, and will not be sorry for it.

2 Maccabees 1

24 Κ■ριε Κ■ριε ■ Θε■ς ■ π■ντων κτ■στης, ■ φοβερ■ς κα■ ■σχυρ■ς κα■ δ■καιος κα■ ■λε■μων, ■ μ■νος βασιλε■ς κα■ χρηστ■ς,

24 O Lord, Lord God, Creator of all things, who art fearful and strong, and righteous, and merciful, and the only and gracious King,

25 ■ μ■νος χορηγ■ς, ■ μ■νος δ■καιος κα■ παντοκρ■τωρ κα■ α■■νιος, ■ διασ■ζων τ■ν ■Ισρα■λ ■κ παντ■ς κακο■, ■ ποι■σας το■ς πατ■ρας ■κλεκτο■ς κα■ ■γι■σας α■το■ς

25 The only giver of all things, the only just, almighty, and everlasting, thou that deliverest Israel from all trouble, and didst choose the fathers, and sanctify them

Prayer of Manasseh

1 κ■ριε παντοκρ■τωρ ■ θε■ς τ■ν πατρ■ων ■μ■ν το■ βρα■μ κα■ ■σα■κ κα■ ■ακ■β κα■ το■ σπ■ρματος α■τ■ν το■ δικα■ου, 1 Lord Almighty, the God of the fathers of us of the Abraham and Isaac and Jacob and of the seed of them the righteous.

2 ■ πο■σας τ■ν ο■ραν■ν κα■ τ■ν γ■ν σ■ν παντ■ τ■ κ■σμ■ α■τ■ν, 2 The having made the heaven and the earth with all the order of them.

3 The having bound the sea with the word of the command of you, the having closed the abyss and having sealed with the fearful and glorious name of you;

3 ■ πεδ■σας τ■ν θ■λασσαν τ■ λ■γ■ το■ προστ■γματ■ς σου, ■ κλε■σας τ■ν ■βυσσον κα■ σφραγισ■μενος α■τ■ν τ■ φοβερ■ κα■ ■νδ■ξ■ ■ν■ματ■ σου,

4 ■ν π■ντα φρ■σσει κα■ τρ■μει ■π■ προσ■που δυν■με■ς σου.

4 whom all things shudder and tremble from of face of power of you.

2 Maccabees 3

7 συμμε■ξας δ■ ■ ■Απολλ■νιος τ■ βασιλε■ περ■ τ■ν μηνυθ■ντων α■τ■ χρημ■των ■νεφ■νισεν■ ■ δ■ προχειρισ■μενος ■Ηλι■δωρον τ■ν ■π■ τ■ν πραγμ■των ■π■στειλε δο■ς ■ντολ■ς τ■ν τ■ν προειρημ■νων χρημ■των ■κκομιδ■ν ποι■σασθαι.

7 Now when Apollonius came to the king, and had shewed him of the money whereof he was told, the king chose out Heliodorus his treasurer, and sent him with a commandment to bring him the foresaid money.

1Maccabees 3

32 κα■ κατ■λιπε Λυσ■αν ■νθρωπον ■νδοξον κα■ ■π■ γ■νους τ■ς βασιλε■ας ■π■ τ■ν πραγμ■των το■ βασιλ■ως ■π■ το■ ποταμο■ Ε■φρ■του ■ως τ■ν ■ρ■ων Α■γ■πτου.

32 So he left Lysias, a nobleman, and one of the blood royal, to oversee the affairs of the king from the river Euphrates unto the borders of Egypt:

2 Maccabees 10

11 α■τ■ς γ■ρ παραλαβ■ν βασιλε■αν ■νδειξεν ■π■ τ■ν πραγμ■των Λυσ■αν τιν■, Κο■λης δ■ Συρ■ας κα■ Φοιν■κης στρατηγ■ν πρ■ταρχον.

11 So when he was come to the crown, he set one Lysias over the affairs of his realm, and appointed him his chief governor of Celosyria and Phenice.

2 Maccabees 13

2 κα■ σ■ α■τ■ Λυσ■αν τ■ν ■π■τροπον κα■ ■π■ τ■ν πραγμ■των, ■καστον ■χοντα δ■ναμιν ■Ελληνικ■ν πεζ■ν μυρι■δας ■νδεκα κα■ ■ππε■ς πεντακισχιλ■ους τριακοσ■ους κα■ ■λ■φαντας ε■κοσιδ■ο, ■ρματα δ■ δρεπανηφ■ρα τριακ■σια.

2 And with him Lysias his protector, and ruler of his affairs, having either of them a Grecian power of footmen, an hundred and ten thousand, and horsemen five thousand and three hundred, and elephants two and twenty, and three hundred chariots armed with hooks.

2 Maccabees 13

23 μεταλαβεν πονενοσθαι τν Φλιππον ν Αντιοχε τν πολελειμνον π τν πραγμων, συνεχθη, τους Ιουδαους παρεκλεσεν, πετηγη κα μοσεν π πσι τους δικαιοις, συνελθη κα θυσαν προσγαγεν, τμησε τν νε κα τν τπον φιλανθρωπησε

23 Heard that Philip, who was left over the affairs in Antioch, was desperately bent, confounded, intreated the Jews, submitted himself, and sware to all equal conditions, agreed with them, and offered sacrifice, honoured the temple, and dealt kindly with the place,

3 Maccabees 7

1 βασιλες Πτολεμαος Φιλοπτωρ τους κατ Αγυπτον στρατηγος κα πσι τους τεταγμνοις π πραγμων χαρειν κα ρρσθαι 2 ρρμεθα δ κα ατο κα τ κνα μν, κατευθναντος μν το μεγλου Θεο τ πραγματα καθς προαιρομεθα.

1 King Ptolemy Philopator to the commanders throughout Egypt, and to all who are set over affairs, joy and strength.

2 Esdras 6

14 κα ο πρεσβτεροι τν Ιουδαων κοδομοσαν κα ο Λευται ν προφητε Αγαου το προφτου κα Ζαχαρου υο Αδδ κα νκοδμησαν κα κατηρτσσαντο π γμης Θεο Ισραλ κα π γμης Κρου κα Δαρεου κα Αρθασασθ βασιλων Περσν.

14 And the elders of the Jews and the Levites built, at the prophecy of Aegis the prophet, and Zacharias the son of Addo: and they built up, and finished [it], by the decree of the God of Israel, and by the decree of Cyrus, and Darius, and Arthasastha, kings of the Persians.

1 Maccabees 1

6 κα κλεσε τους παδας ατο τους νδξους τους συντρφους ατο π νετητος κα διελεν ατους τν βασιλεαν ατο τι ζντος ατο.

6 Wherefore he called his servants, such as were honourable, and had been brought up with him from his youth, and parted his kingdom among them, while he was yet alive.

2 Maccabees 9

29 παρεκομζετο δ τ σμα Φλιππος σντροφος ατο, ς κα διευλαβηθες τν υν Αντιχου, πρς Πτολεμαον τν Φιλομτορα ες Αγυπτον διεκομσθη.

29 And Philip, that was brought up with him, carried away his body, who also fearing the son of Antiochus went into Egypt to Ptolemeus Philometor.

1 Maccabees 7

5 κα λθον πρς ατν πντες νδρες νομοι κα σεβες ξ Ισραλ, κα Αλκιμος γετο ατν, βουλμενος ερατεειν.

5 There came unto him all the wicked and ungodly men of Israel, having Alcimus, who was desirous to be high priest, for their captain:

1 Maccabees 7

12 κα■ ■πισυν■χθησαν προς ■Αλκιμον και Βακχ■δην συναγωγ■ γραμματ■ων ■κζητ■σαι δικαιο, 12 Then did there assemble unto Alcimus and Bacchides a company of scribes, to require justice.

1 Maccabees 7

20 και καταστησε τ■ν χ■ραν τ■ Αλκ■μ■ και φ■κε μετ■ α■το■ δυναμιν το■ βοηθε■ν α■τ■ και π■λθε Βακχ■δης προς τ■ν βασιλ■α.

20 Then committed he the country to Alcimus, and left with him a power to aid him: so Bacchides went to the king.

21 και γων■σατο Αλκιμος περι τ■ς ρχιερωσ■νης, 21 But Alcimus contended for the high priesthood.

22 και συν■χθησαν προς α■τ■ν π■ντες ο■ ταρ■σσοντες τ■ν λα■ν α■τ■ν και κατεκρ■τησαν γ■ν Ιο■δα και πο■ησαν πληγ■ν μεγ■λην ■ν Ισρα■λ.

22 And unto him resorted all such as troubled the people, who, after they had gotten the land of Juda into their power, did much hurt in Israel.

23 και ε■δεν Ιο■δας π■σαν τ■ν κακ■αν, ■ν πο■ησεν Αλκιμος και ο■ μετ■ α■το■ ■ν υ■ο■ς Ισρα■λ π■ρ τ■ θνη,

23 Now when Judas saw all the mischief that Alcimus and his company had done among the Israelites, even above the heathen,

24 και εξ■λθεν ε■ς π■ντα τ■ ρια τ■ς Ιουδα■ας κυκλ■θεν και πο■ησεν κδ■κησιν ■ν το■ς νδρ■σι το■ς α■τομολ■σασι, και νεστ■λησαν το πορε■εσθαι ε■ς τ■ν χ■ραν.

24 He went out into all the coasts of Judea round about, and took vengeance of them that had revolted from him, so that they durst no more go forth into the country.

25 ■ς δε ε■δεν Αλκιμος ■τι ■ν■σχυσεν Ιο■δας και ο■ μετ■ α■το■, και γνω ■τι ο■ δυναται ποστ■ναι α■το■ς, και π■στρεψε προς τ■ν βασιλ■α και κατηγορησεν α■τ■ν πονηρ■.

25 On the other side, when Alcimus saw that Judas and his company had gotten the upper hand, and knew that he was not able to abide their force, he went again to the king, and said all the worst of them that he could.

1 Maccabees 9

54 Και ■ν ■τει τρ■τ■ και πεντηκοστ■ και καταοστ■ μην■ τ■ δευτ■ρ■ π■ταξεν Αλκιμος καθαιρε■ν τ■ τε■χος τ■ς α■λλ■ς τ■ν γ■ων τ■ς σωτ■ρας και καθε■λε τ■ ργα τ■ν προφητ■ν και ■νρξατο το καθαιρε■ν.

Moreover in the hundred fifty and third year, in the second month, Alcimus commanded that the wall of the inner court of the sanctuary should be pulled down; he pulled down also the works of the prophets

55 ■ν τ■ καιρ■ ■κε■ν■ ■πλ■γη ■Αλκιμος κα■ ■νεποδ■σθη τ■ ■ργα α■το■, κα■ ■πεφρ■γη τ■ στ■μα α■το■, κα■ παρελ■θη κα■ ο■κ ■δ■νατο ■τι λαλ■σαι λ■γον κα■ ■ντε■λασθαι περ■ το■ ο■κου α■το■.

55 And as he began to pull down, even at that time was Alcimus plagued, and his enterprises hindered: for his mouth was stopped, and he was taken with a palsy, so that he could no more speak any thing, nor give order concerning his house.

2 Maccabees 14

3 ■Αλκιμος δ■ τις προγεν■μενος ■ρχιερε■ς, ■κουσ■ως δ■ μεμολυμμ■νος ■ν το■ς τ■ς ■πιμειξ■ας χρ■νοις, συννο■σας ■τι καθ■ ■ντιναο■ν τρ■πον ο■κ ■στιν α■τ■ σωτηρ■α, ο■δ■ πρ■ς ■γιον θυσιαστ■ριον ■τι πρ■σοδος,

3 Now one Alcimus, who had been high priest, and had defiled himself wilfully in the times of their mingling with the Gentiles, seeing that by no means he could save himself, nor have any more access to the holy altar

1 Maccabees 13

42 κα■ ■ρξατο ■ λα■ς ■Ισρα■λ γρ■φειν ■ν τα■ς συγγραφα■ς κα■ συναλλ■γμασιν ■τους πρ■του ■π■ Σ■μωνος ■ρχιερ■ως μεγ■λου κα■ στρατηγο■ κα■ ■γουμ■νου ■Ιουδα■ων.

42 Then the people of Israel began to write in their instruments and contracts, In the first year of Simon the high priest, the governor and leader of the Jews.

1 Maccabees 14

27 κα■ το■το τ■ ■ντ■γραφον τ■ς γραφ■ς «■Οκτωκαιδεκ■τ■ ■Ελο■λ, ■τους δευτ■ρου κα■ ■βδομηκοστο■ κα■ ■κατοστο■ - κα■ το■το τρ■τον ■τος ■π■ Σ■μωνος ■ρχιερ■ως

27 So then they wrote it in tables of brass, which they set upon pillars in mount Sion: and this is the copy of the writing; The eighteenth day of the month Elul, in the hundred threescore and twelfth year, being the third year of Simon the high priest

3 Maccabees 3

11 ■Εκε■νος μ■ν ο■ν τ■ κατ■ τ■ παρ■ν ε■ημερ■ γεγυρωμ■νος κα■ ο■ καθορ■ν τ■ το■ μεγ■στου Θεο■ κρ■τος, ■πολαμβ■νων δ■ διηνεκ■ς ■ν τ■ α■τ■ διαμ■νειν βουλ■, ■γραψε κατ' α■τ■ν ■πιστολ■ν τ■νδε■

11 Now the king, elated with his prosperous fortune, and not regarding the superior power of God, but thinking to persevere in his present purpose, wrote the following letter to the prejudice of the Jews.

3 Maccabees 2

29 τοις τε πογραφομνους χαρσσεσθαι κα δι πυρς ες τ σμα παρασμ Διονσου
κισσοφλλ, ος κα καταχωρσαι ες τν προσυνεσταλμνην αθενταν.

29 that those who were thus registered, were to be marked on their persons by the ivy-leaf symbol of Dionysus, and to be set apart with these limited rights.

Psalms of Solomon 15

8 τι τ σημεον το θεο π δικαους ες σωτηραν

8 For the mark of God is upon the righteous that they may be saved.

Psalms of Solomon 15

10 τ γρ σημεον τς πωλεας π το μετπου ατν

10 For the mark of destruction is upon their forehead.

3 Maccabees 4

20 λεγντων μετ ποδεξεως κα τν χαρτηραν δη κα τοις γραφικοις καλμους, ν
ος χρντο, κλελοιπναι.

20 They said, and proved, that paper and pens had failed them for the carrying out of their purpose.

3 Maccabees 7

20 ς κα νιερσαντες ν στλν κατ τν συμποσας τπον προσευς καθιδρσαντες,
νλυσαν σινες, λεθεροι, περχαρες, δι τε γς κα θαλσσης κα ποταμο
νασωζμενοι τ το βασιλως πιταγ, καστος ες τν δαν

20 These they registered as sacred upon a pillar, when they had dedicated the place of their festivity to be one of prayer. They departed unharmed, free, abundant in joy, preserved by the king's command, by land, by sea, and by river, each to his own home.

Job 42:18 (= 17α - 17ε)

17α γηραπται δ ατν πλιν ναστσεσθαι μεθ ν Κριος νστησιν.

17a and it is written that he will rise again with those whom the Lord raises up.

17β Οτος ρμνηεται κ τς Συριακς ββλου ν μν γ κατοικν τ Αστιδι, π
τοις ροις τς Ιδουμαας κα Αραβας, προπρχε δ ατν νομα Ιωββ.

17b This man is described in the Syriac book as living in the land of Ausis, on the borders of Idumea and Arabia: and his name before was Jobab;

17γ λαβν δ γνακα Αρβισσαν γενν υν, νομα Ενννν ν δ ατς πατρς
μν Ζαρ κ τν Ησα υν υς, μητρς δ Βοσρρας, στε εναι ατν πμπτον
π Αβραμ.

17c and having taken an Arabian wife, he begot a son whose name was Ennon. And he himself was the son of his father Zare, one of the sons of Esau, and of his mother Bosorrha, so that he

was the fifth from Abraam.

17δ καὶ οὗτοι οἱ βασιλεῖς οἱ βασιλευσάντες ἐν Ἐδῶμ, οἱ καὶ ἀτὰρ ῥέξε χῆρας πρὸς Βαλῆκ τὸν Βεὸρ, καὶ ὄνομα τῆς πόλεως αὐτοῦ Δενναβῆ· μετὰ δὲ Βαλῆκ Ἰωβῆβ ὁ καλοῦμενος Ἰὼβ μετὰ δὲ τὸν Ἀσὸμ ὁ πῦρχων ἡγεμὼν ἐκ τῆς Θαϊμαντιδος χῆρας μετὰ δὲ τὸν Ἀδῶδ υἱὸς Βαρῶδ, ὁ κτείνης Μάδιμ ἐν τῇ πεδῶν Μωῶβ, καὶ ὄνομα τῆς πόλεως αὐτοῦ Γεθθαίμ.

17d And these were the kings who reigned in Edom, which country he also ruled over: first, Balac, the son of Beor, and the name of his city was Dennaba: but after Balac, Jobab, who is called Job, and after him Asom, who was governor out of the country of Thaeman: and after him Adad, the son of Barad, who destroyed Madiam in the plain of Moab; and the name of his city was Gethaim.

17ε οἱ δὲ ἄλλοι οὗτοι φίλοι, Ἐλιφῆζ τῶν Ἡσαὺ υἱῶν, Θαϊμανῶν βασιλεῖς, Βαλδῶδ ὁ Σαυχαίων τῦραννος, Σωφῆρ ὁ Μιναίων βασιλεῖς.

17e And his friends who came to him were Eliphaz, of the children of Esau, king of the Thaemanites, Baldad sovof the Sauchaeans, Sophar king of the Minaeans.

2 Maccabees 4

8 Παγγεῖλμενος τῷ βασιλεὶ διήντηξέως ῤργυροῦ τετρακτὰ ἑξήκοντα πρὸς τοὺς τριακοσίοις καὶ προσόδου τινῶς ἑλλης τετρακτὰ ἑγδοκόντα.

8 Promising unto the king by intercession three hundred and threescore talents of silver, and of another revenue eighty talents:

Baruch 4

35 Πῦρ γὰρ πέλεσεται ἀπὸ παρὰ τοῦ ἀώνου εἰς ἡμέρας μακρὰς, καὶ κατοικηθήσεται ὑπὸ δαιμονῶν τὴν πλειόνα χρόνον.

35 For fire shall come upon her from the Everlasting, long to endure; and she shall be inhabited of devils for a great time.

4 Maccabees 4

26 Περὶ οὖν τῶν δόγματα αὐτοῦ κατεφρονέτο πρὸς τὸ λαόν, ἀτὰρ διὰ βασάνων ἑαυτὸν ἑκαστὸν τῶν ἔθνους ἐν γκαζέ μιανῶν πογευομένων τροφῶν ἑξίμνησθαι τὴν Ἰουδαίαν.

26 When, therefore, his decrees were disregarded by the people, he himself compelled by means of tortures every one of this race, by tasting forbidden meats, to abjure the Jewish religion.

4 Maccabees 5

2 ἑταῖρος ἑκαστὸν τῶν Ἑβραίων ἐπισπῆσαι, καὶ κρεῖν ἑσθίων καὶ ἐδωλοθῶν ἑναγκάζειν πογεῖσθαι.

2 ordered the guards to seize each and every Hebrew and to compel them to eat pork and food sacrificed to idols.

4 Maccabees 8

5 νεανῆται, φιλοφρονῶς γὰρ καθ' ἑνὸς ἑκάστου ἡμῶν θαυμάζω, τὸ κέλλος καὶ τὸ πλῆθος τοσούτων ἀδελφῶν περτιμῶν, ὁ μόνον συμβουλεύω μὴ μανῆναι τὸν ἀτῆν τὸν προβασανισθῆντι γέροντι μανῆαν, ἀλλὰ καὶ παρακαλῶ συνέξαντες μου τὸ συμβουλεύεσθε μῆς πολῶσαι φίλους.

5 O youths, with favourable feelings, I admire the beauty of each of you; and greatly honouring so numerous a band of brethren, I not only counsel you not to share the madness of the old man who has been tortured before, but I do beg you to yield, and to enjoy my friendship;

4 Maccabees 8

8 καὶ μεταλαμβάνετε ἑλληνικὸν βίου καὶ μεταδιατηθῆντες ἐντρύψατε ταῖς νεότησιν ἡμῶν.

8 and, conforming to the Greek mode of life, alter your rule, and revel in youth's delights.

4 Maccabees 13

13 εἷς δὲ ἕκαστος καὶ ἄλλήλους ἡμῶς πάντες φερόντες φαιδροὶ καὶ μῆλα θαρραλοὶ, αὐτοῖς, λέγον, τὸ θεῖον φιερούσμεν ἕξ ἑλῆς τῆς καρδίας τὸ δῆντι τῆς ψυχῆς καὶ χρῶμεν τὸ περὶ τὸν νόμον φυλακίσματα.

13 And one and all, looking on each other serene and confident, said, Let us sacrifice with all our heart our souls to God who gave them, and employ our bodies for the keeping of the law.

4 Maccabees 13

17 ὁπῶς γὰρ θανόντας ἡμῶς Ἀβραάμ καὶ Ἰσαάκ καὶ Ἰακώβ ἐπίδοξονται εἰς τοὺς κέλλους ἀτῆν καὶ πάντες οἱ πατέρες παίνουσι.

17 If we suffer thus, Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob will receive us, and all the fathers will commend us.

4 Maccabees 14

12 ἡ μήτηρ γὰρ τὸν πῆν νεανίσκων κένων ἐπνευγε τῆς φ' ἑνὸς ἑκάστου τῶν τέκνων στρέβλας.

12 For the mother of those seven youths endured the rackings of each of her children.

4 Maccabees 15

5 ὅσῳ γὰρ καὶ ἰσθενέψυχοι καὶ πολυγονίτεραι ἐπιρχουσιν ἀμῆτιρες, τοσούτον μᾶλλον εἰσι φιλοτεκνίτεραι.

5 for by how much mothers are by nature weak in disposition and prolific in offspring, by so much the fonder they are of children.

4 Maccabees 15

16 ἡ μικροτέρων μὲν νόνη μήτηρ πῶν πειρασθεῖσα περὶ τὸν ἀπ' αὐτοῦς δένων.

16 O thou mother, who wast tried at this time with bitterer pangs than those of parturition!

4 Maccabees 16

24 Δι■ το■των τ■ν λ■γων ■ ■πταμ■τωρ ■να ■καστον τ■ν υ■■ν παρακαλο■σα, ■ποθανε■ν ■πεισε μ■λλον ■ παραβ■ναι τ■ν ■ντολ■ν το■ Θεο■.

24 With these arguments, the mother of seven, exhorting each of her sons, over-persuaded them from transgressing the commandment of God.

Daniel 3

33 κα■ ν■ν ο■κ ■στιν ■μ■ν ■νο■ξαι τ■ στ■μα α■σχ■νη κα■ ■νειδος ■γεν■θη το■ς δο■λοις σου κα■ το■ς σεβομ■νοις σε.

33 And now we cannot open our mouths; we have become a shame and a reproach to your servants and to those who worship you.

4 Maccabees 10

10 ■με■ς μ■ν, ■ μιαρ■τατε τ■ραννε, δι■ παιδε■αν κα■ ■ρετ■ν Θεο■ τα■τα π■σχομεν■

10 We, O accursed tyrant, suffer this for the sake of Divine education and virtue.

Exoduc 37:6 LXX

6 κα■ το■ς στ■λους α■το■ π■ντε κα■ το■ς κρ■κους κα■ τ■ς κεφαλ■δας α■τ■ν κα■ τ■ς ψαλ■δας α■τ■ν κατεχρ■σωσαν χρυσ■ κα■ α■ β■σεις α■τ■ν π■ντε χαλκα■

6 and the five pillars of it with their hooks. He overlaid their capitals and their fillets with gold, and their five sockets were of brass.

Judith 2

27 κα■ κατ■βη ε■ς πεδ■ον Δαμασκο■ ■ν ■μ■ραις θερισμο■ πυρ■ν κα■ ■ν■πρησεν π■ντας το■ς ■γρο■ς α■τ■ν κα■ τ■ πο■μνια κα■ τ■ βουκ■λια ■δωκεν ε■ς ■φανισμ■ν κα■ τ■ς π■λεις α■τ■ν ■σκ■λευσεν κα■ τ■ πεδ■α α■τ■ν ■ξελ■κμησεν κα■ ■π■ταξεν π■ντας το■ς νεαν■σκους α■τ■ν ■ν στ■ματι ■ομφα■ας

27 Then he went down into the plain of Damascus, at the time of the wheat harvest, and burnt up all their fields, and destroyed their flocks and herds; he also pillaged their cities, and utterly laid waste to their countries, and struck down all their young men with the edge of the sword.

3 Kings 4 LXX

27 κα■ ■χορ■γουν ο■ καθεσταμ■νοι ο■τως τ■ βασιλε■ Σαλωμων κα■ π■ντα τ■ διαγγ■λματα ■π■ τ■ν τρ■πεζαν το■ βασιλ■ως ■καστος μ■να α■το■ ο■ παραλλ■σσουσιν λ■γον

27 And those officers supplied provisions for King Solomon, and for all who came to King Solomon's table, each one in his month; they let nothing be lacking.

3 Kings 4 LXX

31 καὶ σοφώσατο πᾶν πᾶντας τοὺς ἄνθρωπους καὶ σοφώσατο πᾶν Γαιθὸν τὸν
Εζρατὴν καὶ τὸν Αἰμὸν καὶ τὸν Χαλκαὶλ καὶ Δαρδὰ υἱοὺς Μὰλ

31 For he was wiser than all other men, wiser than Ethan the Ez'rahite, and Heman, Calcol, and Darda, the sons of Mahol; and his fame was in all the nations round about. (RSV)

10 - Source Materials Referenced in Deissmann's Bible Studies

Source Materials Referenced in Deissmann's Bible Studies

Acts 14:27 (Codex Bezae, D)

27 Παραγενόμενοι δε καὶ συνῆξαντες τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἐν γαλιαν σαῦθες ποήσεν αὐτοῖς μετὰ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτῶν καὶ ἵτι ἔνυξεν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν θύραν πστεως.

27 27 And when they were come, and had gathered the church together, they rehearsed all things that God had done for them with their souls, and that he had opened a door of faith unto the Gentiles.

Luke 5:11 (Codex Bezae, D)

11 οὐ δὲ κοῦσαντες πάντα κατλείψαν πᾶ τὰς γὰς καὶ κολοῦθησαν αὐτῷ.

11 When they heard they let everything on the land and they followed him Clement of Romt, 2Cor. 5:1

1 ἔθεν, ἔδελοῦ, καταλεῖψαντες τὴν παροικίαν τοῦ κῆσμου τοῦτου ποιησωμεν τὸ θῆλημα τοῦ καλῆσαντος ἡμῶς, καὶ μὴ φοβηθῶμεν ἔξελεθῆν κ τοῦ κῆσμου τοῦτου.

1 Wherefore, brethren, let us forsake our sojourn in this world and do the will of Him that called us, and let us not be afraid to depart out of this world.

Clement of Rome, 2 Corinthians 10:1

1 ἔστε, ἔδελοῦ μου, ποιῶσωμεν τὸ θῆλημα τοῦ πατρῶς τοῦ καλῆσαντος ἡμῶς, ἔνα ζῶσωμεν, καὶ διῶσωμεν ἡλλον τὴν ἔρετῶν, τὴν δὲ κακίαν καταλεῖψωμεν ἔς προοδοιῦρον τὴν ἔμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν, καὶ φῶγωμεν τὴν ἔσβειαν, μὴ ἡμῶς καταλῆβῆ κακῶ.

1 Wherefore, my brethren, let us do the will of the Father which called us, that we may live; and let us the rather pursue virtue, but forsake vice as the forerunner of our sins, and let us flee from ungodliness, lest evils overtake us.

Shepherd of Hermas, Similtudes 8

3:5 λῆγω αὐτῷ Κῆριε, διατῶ οὐς ἡμῶν ἔπῆλυσεν ἔς τὴν πῆργον, οὐς δὲ σοῦ κατλείψεν ἔσοι, φησῶ, παρῆβησαν τὴν νῆμον, ἔν ἔλαβον παρ' αὐτοῦ, ἔς τὴν ἡμῶν ἔξουσῶν κατῆλιπεν αὐτοῖς ἔς μετῆνοιαν ἔσοι δὲ ἔδη ἔηρῆστησαν τῶ νῆμῶ καὶ τετηρῆκασιν αὐτῶν, ἔπῆ τὴν ἔδῶν ἔξουσῶν ἔχει αὐτοῖς.

3:5 I say unto him; "Sir, wherefore did he send away some into the tower, and leave others for thee?" "As many," saith he, "as transgressed the law which they received from him, these he left under my authority for repentance; but as many as already satisfied the law and have observed it,

these he has under his own authority.”

Didache 13

3 π■σαν ο■ν ■παρχ■ν γεννημ■των ληνο■ κα■ ■λωνος, βο■ν τε κα■ προβ■των λαβ■ν δ■σεις τ■ν ■παρχ■ν το■ς προφ■ταις α■το■ γ■ρ ε■σιν ο■ ■ρχιερε■ς μ■ν.

3 Therefore thou shalt take the firstfruit of the produce of the winepress and of the threshing-floor and of oxen and sheep, and shalt give them as the firstfruits to the prophets, for they are your high priests.

Clement of Rome, 1 Corinthians

65:1 Το■ς δ■ ■πεσταλμ■νους ■φ' ■μ■ν Κλα■διον ■φηβον κα■ Ο■αλ■ριον Β■τωνα σ■ν κα■ Φορτου■ν τ■ ■ν ε■ρ■ν■ μετ■ χαρ■ς ■ν τ■χει ■ναπ■μψατε πρ■ς ■μ■ς, ■πως θ■ττον τ■ν ε■κτα■αν κα■ ■πιποθητην ■μ■ν ε■ρ■νην κα■ ■μ■νοιαν ■παγγ■λωσιν, ε■ς τ■ τ■χιον κα■ ■μ■ς χαρ■ναι περ■ τ■ς ε■σταθε■ας ■μ■ν.

65:1 Now send ye back speedily unto us our messengers Claudius Erhebus and Valerius Bito, together with Fortunatus also, in peace and with joy, to the end that they may the more quickly report the peace and concord which is prayed for and earnestly desired by us, that we also may the more speedily rejoice over your good order.

Clement of Rome, 1 Corinthians

23:2 δι■ μ■ διψυχ■μεν, μηδ■ ■νδαλλ■σθω ■ ψυχ■ ■μ■ν ■π■ τα■ς ■περβαλλο■σαις κα■ ■νδ■ξοις δωρεα■ς α■το■.

23:2 Therefore let us not be double-minded, neither let our soul indulge in idle humors respecting His exceeding and glorious gifts.

Clement of Rome, 1 Corinthians

56:1 Κα■ ■με■ς ο■ν ■ντ■χωμεν περ■ τ■ν ■ν τινι παραπτ■ματι ■παρχ■ντων, ■πως δοθ■ α■το■ς ■πιε■κεια κα■ ταπεινοφροσ■νη ε■ς τ■ ε■ξαι α■το■ς μ■ ■μ■ν ■λλ■ τ■ θελ■ματι το■ θεο■ ο■τως γ■ρ ■σται α■το■ς ■γκαρπος κα■ τελε■α ■ πρ■ς τ■ν θε■ν κα■ το■ς ■γ■ους μετ' ο■κτιρμ■ν μνε■α.

56:1 Therefore let us also make intercession for them that are in any transgression, that forbearance and humility may be given them, to the end that they may yield not unto us, but unto the will of God. For so shall the compassionate remembrance of them with God and the saints be fruitful unto them, and perfect.

Clement of Rome, 1 Corinthians

34:1 ■ ■γαθ■ς ■ργ■της μετ■ παρρησ■ας λαμβ■νει τ■ν ■ρτον το■ ■ργου α■το■, ■ νωθρ■ς κα■ παρειμ■νος ο■κ ■ντοφθαλμε■ τ■ ■ργοπαρ■κτ■ α■το■.

34:1 The good workman receiveth the bread of his work with boldness, but the slothful and careless dareth not look his employer in the face.

Clement of Rome, 1 Corinthians

10:1 ■βρα■μ, ■ φ■λος προσαγορευθε■ς, πιστ■ς ε■ρ■θη ■ν τ■ α■τ■ν ■π■κοον γεν■σθαι το■ς ■■μασιν το■ θεο■.

10:1 Abraham, called "the friend," was found faithful, inasmuch as he obeyed the words of God.

Clement of Rome, 1 Corinthians

17:2 ■μαρτυρ■θη μεγ■λως ■βρα■μ κα■ φ■λος προσηγορε■θη το■ θεο■, κα■ λ■γει ■τεν■ζων ε■ς τ■ν δ■ξαν το■ θεο■ ταπεινοφρον■ν■ ■γ■ δ■ ε■μι γ■ κα■ σποδ■ς.

17:2 Abraham was specially honoured, and was called the friend of God; yet he, earnestly regarding the glory of God, humbly declared, "I am but dust and ashes."

Clement of Rome, 1 Corinthians

23:2 δι■ μ■ διψυχ■μεν, μηδ■ ■νδαλλ■σθω ■ ψυχ■ ■μ■ν ■π■ τα■ς ■περβαλλο■σαις κα■ ■νδ■ξοις δωρεα■ς α■το■.

23:2 So let us not be double-minded; neither let our soul be lifted up on account of His exceedingly great and glorious gifts.

Decree of Stratonicea (English Translation)

. . . Whereas Tabae joined in the war against the generals and the forces of King Mithradates and opposed them most courageously on behalf of Asia and of Greece, it is the pleasure of the Senate and the Roman people that all the highest privileges shall be accorded them now and for the future; that now and for the future they shall keep in memory their alliance with the Senate and the Roman people; that whatever privileges thw dictator Lucius Cornelius Sulla with the advice of his advisory council, granted to them because of their valor and honor shall be confirmed, namely, that they shall enjoy these privileges on the same footing as their own laws and institutions and that, if they are so minded, they shall fortify the stronghold Thyessus, which lies within their own boundaries; that the Senate and the Roman people shall accord these privileges to them in a manner that is honorable, fitting, and worthy of them; that extraordinary audience shall be granted by the magistrates to envoys from Tabae who hereafter come to Rome . . .

Blass Blass, Grammar, p. 127, note. "1. ■ναντι occurs in inscriptions in translations of Roman senatus consulta, Viereck Sermo graecus Senat. Rom. (Gtg. 1888) p. 16, 66."

Blass Blass, Grammar, p. 68. "In the older language it frequently happens that in compound words of this kind the verb is given the first place (φερ■οικος, δηξ■θυθυμος), in the later language this does not often occur ; on compounds in ■ρχι- vide supra 3: ■θελοθησκ■α (-εια B, cp. 5) Colossians 2:23 based on ■θελ■θηρησκος (from θρησκ■ς) which is not found, cp. ■θελοδιδ■σκαλος Hernias, ■θελοδουλ(ε)■α Plato, ■θ■λεθρος; Demosth., ■θελοκακε■ν Hdt., (■θελο- expressing spontaneity) : φιλ■θεος, φιλ■γαθος and φ■λαυτος (Aristot.), (φιλ■πρωτος late language, and) (φιλοπρωτε■ω 3 Jo. 9 (no forms with μισο- appear in N.T.)."

Blass Blass, Grammar, p. 68. φρεναπ■της "2. I.e. one who deceives his own mind = 'conceited'; the word also occurs on a papyrus of the 2nd cent. B.C. (in rhetorical and artificial prose, Grenfell 'An Alexandrian erotic fragment,' Oxf. 1896, p. 3)."

Grow in Your Walk with Christ

Listen and read messages that will stir your heart for Christ and point you to deeper repentance and devotion.

- 50,000+ Sermons from speakers past and present
- 3,900+ Classic Christian Books freely readable online
 - 1,200+ Bible Translations and Commentaries
- Over 450k forum posts — Join our vibrant online Christian forum

www.sermonindex.net