

The idea is that those who have heard words of blasphemy are thereby themselves infected, and that by laying their hands on the offender they transfer to him this uncleanness to be carried with him outside the camp and to perish with him when he is stoned to death.

The only serious objection to the above theory appears to Volz to be this, that an animal upon which uncleanness and curse had been laden could not have been offered in sacrifice to Jahweh at all. This objection he gets over by supposing that originally the sin-offering was destined not for Jahweh but for *demons unfriendly to man*. Evidence of this he finds not only in the goat of Azazel (Lv 16), but in the custom of pouring out all the blood of the guilt-offering at the base of the altar (Lv 4⁷), no doubt as an offering to the underground black demons; and also in the very fact that the victim in such offerings was so frequently a goat, the animal most akin to those demonic goat-like forms whose worship was common in Israel even in later times (Lv 17⁷). It is needless to say that such propitiating of demons appears in many other religions.

One difficulty still remains, if we accept the theory that the original destination of the sin-offering was hostile demons. We hear of the laying on of hands also in offerings which have no relation to sin. In Ex 29^{15, 19} = Lv 8^{18, 22} Aaron and his sons, at their installation in office, lay their hands also upon the ram for the burnt-offering and the ram of consecration, with whose blood they are sprinkled; in Lv 3^{2, 8, 13} the same rite is mentioned in connexion with the peace-offering; in Nu 8¹² the children of Israel lay their hands upon the Levites who are presented as a wave-offering and in substitution for the first-born. In this last instance it is quite possible to explain the act in the same sense as in the sin-offering; in Ex 29 = Lv 8, again, it is difficult to resist the impression that different strata of ritual are mixed up. Upon the whole it appears to Volz most probable that the usage of laying on of hands was originally peculiar to the sin- or guilt-offering, and from this passed on to the other offerings without its original significance being carried with it.

J. A. SELBIE.

Maryculter, Aberdeen.

Recent Research in the Language of the New Testament.

BY THE REV. H. A. A. KENNEDY, M.A., D.Sc., CALLANDER.

II.

No reference has as yet been made to the department of lexicography. The dictionaries of Grimm-Thayer and Cremer still hold the field. And yet this province has passed through a transformation since these important works were written. We doubt whether a 'biblico-theological' lexicon on the lines of Cremer will ever again appear. It was of real value that attention should be emphatically called to the remoulding of terms which Christianity brought about. But it is of questionable advantage for any honest student of the N.T. language to have the content of the words and phrases which express the conceptions of Biblical Theology fixed for him at second-hand in complete isolation from the history of the thought by which those conceptions were reached.

In any case it is utterly unscientific in a linguistic investigation to take as starting-point the difference between the type of speech in question and the original language of which it is a modification, instead of discovering its characteristics rather from the point of view of its growth and historical development. The plan of Grimm, extended and improved as it has been for English students by Professor Thayer, appears to us more scientifically fruitful for the N.T. And for years this book has been indispensable. But it requires to be rewritten. Not only have the innumerable investigations in the department of Biblical Theology brought fresh light to bear on the content of familiar N.T. words, but the vast accumulation of new material afforded by the discovery of

papyri in Egypt, by the scientific treatment of epigraphy, and by the keen study devoted to the post-classical authors, necessitates a complete revision of statements of facts. Thus, *e.g.*, the valuable lists added by Dr. Thayer are already antiquated. The Dutch scholar J. M. S. Baljon has published five parts of a *Grieksch-theologisch woordenboek* (Utrecht, 1896-97). We are not acquainted with the work, but, to judge from notices by so competent a critic as Blass, it appears to be largely an expanded version of Cremer, into which a good many inaccuracies have been allowed to intrude. It is more than doubtful whether the time has arrived for attempting a new scientific lexicon. The sources to be drawn upon are extending rapidly from year to year. A new papyrus may at any moment, in an unexpected way, illustrate the Biblical vocabulary. There is a huge mass of material already available which will need to be patiently sifted.

No better example of what lexical revision will mean could be found than that afforded by Deissmann's *Bibelstudien* (1895) and *Neue Bibelstudien* (1897), which have just been issued together in an English translation. Next to Schmiedel's *Winer*, these volumes form, perhaps, the most instructive contribution to N.T. linguistic science which the last decade has seen. They embrace a varied content. Prolegomena to the Letters and Epistles of the Bible, illustrations of the LXX from epigraphy, Biblical proper names, verbal forms,—all the discussions are fertile in suggestion, but most attractive to the student are the direct contributions to the history of the language of the Greek Bible. These largely consist of the examination of separate words and phrases as illustrated by papyri and inscriptions, with important introductory paragraphs on the character of the so-called 'Biblical Greek.' The various discussions are concrete examples of the views set forth in the introductory sections. If we mistake not, specimens of Deissmann's most interesting results were given in this Journal some time ago. In our judgment Deissmann has done an invaluable service to the study of the N.T. by clearly setting forth the point of view from which the language must be surveyed, the criteria which are to be applied to it, the presuppositions which have to be borne in mind if its characteristics are to be rightly estimated. We must dwell upon this matter for a moment, as it really fixes

a standard for all future research. It has been tacitly assumed in most of the works dealing with the language of the N.T. that that language is, in itself, a type which can be viewed separately from the Greek of its period, whether written or spoken. Thus, *e.g.*, Hatch in his *Essays* definitely isolates the diction of the LXX and N.T. under the designation of 'Biblical Greek,' and, in consequence, makes the LXX the exclusive norm for interpreting the N.T. writings. Deissmann makes clear on a wide inductive basis what the present writer had attempted to do much more crudely in a dissertation published some years ago (*Sources of N.T. Greek*, 1895), that the language of both these groups of writings must be studied in its organic connexion with the Greek of that late epoch to which they belong. The Egyptian papyri corroborate what we might have supposed *à priori*, that the LXX reflects the Alexandrian diction of its environment. The inscriptions and more popular memorials of the Imperial Age reveal in the same way that the N.T. writers use the speech current in their day, inspiring it, of course, with their own conceptions, and at many points necessarily remoulding its terms. A Hebraistic colouring is far more visible in the LXX than in the N.T., because it attempts to be a faithful translation of a group of Hebrew documents. It is the necessities of translation which chiefly account for the Semitic strain in it, not the fact that the Greek has passed through the mould of Semitic minds. For a writer like the translator of *Sirach* can compose his prologue precisely in the style of current Greek; as soon as he begins to translate, the Semitic original shines through his rendering. This gives for the N.T. an important caution as to making a distinction between those writings which were originally written in Greek and those which are translations of a Semitic original. The result for criticism may be the obtaining of a criterion of real value for the Synoptic problem and others. As regards the Jewish background of many words and phrases in the Gospels, reference may be made here to G. Dalman's excellent work, *Die Worte Jesu*, Bd. i. (Leipzig, 1898). His explanations are sometimes too ingenious, but most of his discussions repay careful study. Keeping in view, then, the fundamental fact that the Greek used by the translators of the LXX and the various writers of the N.T. is not a

special type by itself, either Jewish or Biblical, but the Greek commonly spoken and, for ordinary business purposes, written in that Eastern world from which the Biblical literature sprang, modified, as the case might be, by the culture or ability of the separate writers, we can understand that the LXX is bound to have an important bearing on the language of the N.T. The works of the *κωινή* writers are, as a rule, literary. This is true even of the writings of Jews like Josephus and Philo. The language of the LXX, and, to a large extent, of the N.T. books, is non-literary, like that of the papyri and inscriptions, although often it is very difficult to draw the line.

Accordingly, contributions to the linguistic study of the LXX will be of real importance for the N.T. Without doubt, the most noteworthy of recent publications in this department is the great Oxford *Concordance to the LXX*, planned by Dr. Hatch and brought to a conclusion by Mr. Redpath. This magnificent work ought to form the basis of many important investigations. A trustworthy lexicon is sorely needed. We are glad to notice that a grammar has been undertaken by Mr. H. St. J. Thackeray. When the large Cambridge *Septuagint* has appeared, this province of study will have been placed on a satisfactory footing. Meanwhile materials bearing on the language have been collected. There are many far-seeing suggestions in Hatch's *Essays in Biblical Greek*, in spite of the erroneous view he took of the diction as a whole, and he has presented the evidence for a number of words. As far back as 1841 H. W. J. Thiersch had published a useful dissertation on the Septuagint version of the Pentateuch. This deals with the principles followed in the translation, the type of language employed, and the Hebraisms. Thiersch had made judicious use of the papyri then discovered, and in matters of orthography had examined the usage of several important MSS. Some of his results on linguistic points in the Pentateuch have still to be reckoned with, although so great an advance in knowledge has been made since his time. A most interesting and valuable essay by H. Anz has appeared in the *Dissertationes Philologicae Halenses*, vol. xii. pt. 2 (Halle, 1894), entitled 'Subsidia ad cognoscendum Græcorum sermonem vulgarem e Pentateuchi versione Alexandrina repetita.' He has adopted the method of investigating those verbs in Genesis and Exodus which seemed to depart from

the usage of the best Attic prose, or were not to be found in the best writers. These he usually arranges according to the first author in which they occur, and then attempts to write a short history of each. In making his researches he has taken into account the most important of recent discussions on the later language, including the Egyptian inscriptions published by Flinders Petrie and Gardner, and, to a certain extent, the papyri. His results are of genuine importance. Lexical for the most part, they form a distinct contribution to the history of non-literary or colloquial Greek, and disclose many strange facts as to the diffusion of words and constructions. His main thesis is the paramount influence of the colloquial Attic (which leaves, e.g., such clear traces on the language of Comedy) upon the further development of popular Greek, including that spoken in Egypt. The Ionic elements so marked in that type are not only due to the original connexion of Attica with the Ionians, but also to the subsequent commercial relations of the two peoples and, at a later stage, to the fusion of Athenians and Ionians in districts such as Lower Egypt. Here is a specimen of the method which Anz adopts. The verb *λειτουργεῖν* is common in classical Greek = discharge the stated public services at Athens. In Aristotle and the Palatine Anthology it is already used in a colourless sense = perform. In the Egyptian papyri, however, it is frequently applied to the sacred service of a god in his temple. An Attic inscription of the second century B.C. seems to pave the way for this signification. And Diodorus, among the writers of the *κωινή*, has the expression *πρὸς τὰς τῶν θεῶν θεραπείας τε καὶ λειτουργίας* (i. 21, on the worship of Isis and Osiris). We are quite prepared, therefore, to find numerous instances in Exodus where it describes the service of the priests in the tabernacle. Hence it readily takes the sense of Christian service in the N.T., which assumes the priesthood of all believers. Attention must also be called to the interesting chapter on 'The Greek of the Septuagint,' with numerous examples, in Dr. Swete's admirable *Introduction to the O.T. in Greek*, and we may mention, in addition, a suggestive dissertation by Apostolides, *Du Grec Alexandrin et de ses rapports avec le grec ancien et le grec moderne* (Alexandria, 1892).

It is impossible here to name the various publications of Egyptian papyri which are of such

primary value for 'Alexandrian' Greek. We may mention, however, as specially noteworthy the *Aegyptische Urkunden aus den Königl. Museen zu Berlin, Griechische Urkunden*, i. 2. 1-9 (1892-96); the *Flinders Petrie Papyri*, ed. by Mahaffy (*Cunningham Memoirs* of Royal Irish Academy, 1891, 1893); and the *Greek Papyri*, published by Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt, including *Alexandrian Erotic Fragment, etc.* (Oxf., 1896), *Revenue Laws of Ptolemy Philadelphus* (Oxf., 1896), *New Classical Fragments* (Oxf., 1897), *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, i. ii. (London, 1898-99). Two grammatical works we have not been able to see, *Grammatik der griech. Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit*, by E. Mayser (Leipz., 1898), and S. Witkowski's *Prodromus grammaticæ papyrorum græcarum ætatis Lagidarum* (Cracow, 1897).

A most fruitful department of research has next to be considered, the later development of the Greek language in its bearing on the speech of the N.T. Obviously that line of development which depends on a *popular* basis will be of chief importance for our purpose. The language of the N.T. is essentially the spoken language of its own epoch, modified, as the case may be, by the various degrees of culture in the separate writers. But this spoken language has a continuous history which stretches through the Middle Ages and continues in Modern Greek. In this province, more notably than in the literature of the *κοινή* strictly so-called, we may expect to find real light thrown upon our subject. But all research must be carried on in close connexion with the historical growth of the speech. Most valuable cautions and hints for working backwards and forwards along the line of development of the 'popular' Greek are given by Professor Krumbacher in his masterly *Beiträge zu einer geschichte d. griech. sprache* (*Kuhn's Zeitschrift*, Bd. xxvii. p. 481 ff.). The method of which he approves—and no scholar has a better right to judge—is there exemplified by his exhaustive discussion of the words ἀκμήν—ἀκόμα.

He traces ἀκμήν from Xenophon through Theocritus, Polybius, Strabo, Gospel of Matthew, Josephus, Plutarch, Sextus Empiricus, Phalaris, Dositheus, Anacreon, Æsop, Palatine Anthology, Inscriptions, Joannes Moschos, until he shows how gradually, in the popular language, it ousted ἔτι. It occurs repeatedly in Middle-Greek texts, in poetry in the form ἀκόμα. In this guise, with dialectical

variations, it survives in Modern Greek. The whole investigation is a model of what may be done by rigidly adhering to the historical method. Well worth consultation, also, are Professor Krumbacher's most suggestive survey of the language in his great *Geschichte der byzantinischen Litteratur* (ed. 2 = Bd. ix. Abthg. 1 of Iwan von Müller's *Handbuch d. klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*), and a remarkable article by K. Buresch entitled Γέγωνα und anderes Vulgär-griechisch (Rheinisches Museum, xlvi. p. 193 ff.), in which he discusses many of the 'vulgar' forms, and gives fertile hints for their study and appreciation.

In spite of its close proximity to the N.T. period, the Greek of the Apostolic Fathers has for long remained a virgin soil for investigation. And yet, viewed from the historical standpoint, it is bound to yield valuable results. We saw that Blass made considerable use of some of these writers for purposes of grammatical illustration. Since the appearance of his work, H. Reinhold has published a useful dissertation, 'De Græcitate Patrum Apostolicorum Librorumque Apokryphorum Novi Testamenti Quæstiones Grammaticæ (*Dissertationes Philologicae Halenses*' (xiv. 1, Halle, 1898).

This treatise deals almost entirely with *Formenlehre*, only a dozen pages being given to syntax. But, as has been already noted, that is the true starting-point. The nominal and verbal *forms* do more than anything else to localize the language, to supply its historical setting. Questions of syntax will probably come next, and last of all the vocabulary, which is a more delicate matter to handle. Reinhold's results are very instructive. They point to a closer approximation of the phenomena he has examined to the 'vulgar' Greek than that which is visible in the N.T. This might be naturally expected in the case of the apocryphal *Acts* and *Apocalypses*, which were essentially 'plebeian' books. There is, in fact, a mixture of various types. While some writings, like the *Epistle to Diognetus*, have an echo of genuine classical elegance, and others, like *Hermas*, closely resemble the diction of the N.T., books such as the *Acts of Thomas* and *Acts of Pilate*, are plainly a direct reflexion of the common language of the market-place. Some of the later works, as, e.g., the *Martyrdom of Bartholomew*, exhibit that strange and uncouth medley of Attic, poetical, and popular elements which was so congenial to the Byzantine diction.