

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

hope for nothing more from them. Once more the eager hungry heart is thrown back upon itself. But there must be pity, there must be justice, somewhere; in heaven, if not on earth; in death, if not in life; in God, if not with men: and, wherever it is, he will find it or perish in the search. "To be a seeker," said Cromwell, "is to be of the next best sect to being a finder." Job was both seeker and finder, for at last he finds the justice he has sought so long. How, and where, we are about to see.

S. COX.

THAT CHRIST SPOKE GREEK—A REPLY.

I TRUST I shall not outrun the patience of readers of *THE EXPOSITOR* by saying a few words in reply to the paper of Dr. Sanday contained in the February number. If indeed it were true, as Dr. Sanday somewhat strangely says, that the difference between us "is not really so very great," the labour which I now undertake might well be spared. But the difference is, both in theory and practical results, in fact, immense. On his hypothesis, almost all the words which the Son of God really uttered in this world have perished, and only a reflection of them has been preserved; while, on mine, the words of Christ are still possessed in the language in which they were spoken. On his hypothesis, Christianity in the form in which it was taught by Christ Himself has disappeared, so that what He uttered in Hebrew has, in a way by no means easy to explain, descended to us only in Greek;¹ while, on mine, we still have access in our existing Gospels to

¹ Comp. Jowett's "Epistles of St. Paul," i. 452. Second Edition.

the *integri fontes* of the Christian faith. On his hypothesis, the labours of exegetes in trying to bring out the exact meaning of our Lord's words are, to a great extent, worthless, since in many cases there were certainly no strictly corresponding expressions in Hebrew; while, on mine, such efforts are quite legitimate and proper, since they are put forth in connection with the language which was actually employed. I trust, therefore, that the importance as well as interest of the subject will plead my apology for once again recurring to it.

Dr. Sanday begins by making a large number of concessions highly creditable to his candour. These are to me not a little encouraging, as indicating that the question is now in a very different condition from what it was some years ago. No one, probably, will henceforth undertake to defend the position occupied by Pfannkuche and Milman, or even by Renan,¹ and many others.

The first thing which calls for notice in Dr. Sanday's paper is a note which occurs at p. 83. I am there blamed for attaching too much importance to the fact that Josephus tells us respecting Gadara and Hippos that they were *Greek* cities. This does not imply, it is said, the use of the Greek language. It may mean nothing more than that these cities were peopled by Gentiles, since, as every one knows, Greek and Gentile are in the New Testament convertible terms.

It seems to me, I confess, a pretty strong assertion which is made, when we are told that cities expressly styled "Greek" did not make use of the Greek lan-

¹ In the *Vie de Jésus* (chap. iii.) we read, "Il n'est pas probable qu'il ait su le grec." I need not say how far this is from being the standpoint of Dr. Sanday.

guage. All probability is surely against such a statement. And even granting that we are to understand simply that the cities referred to were inhabited by Gentiles, does Dr. Sanday wish us to believe that these Gentiles learned Aramaic? I can hardly imagine that such is his serious intention. Let it be remembered that he himself has said, in the first page of his paper, "There is no question that the Jews of our Lord's time were practically bilingual." This being so, what inducement could these Gentiles have to learn the Jews' language? And yet it is only on the supposition of their having done so that the force of my argument in connection with the Sermon on the Mount can by any possibility be evaded. If, then, Dr. Sanday does really mean to affirm that these Gentiles, or indeed any others, learned the language of the Jews, I beg to ask what evidence is producible to that effect. So far as I know, there is none. And until some proof is brought forward, the words of Dr. Sanday must be regarded as simply begging the question. That people styled "Greeks," and that cities styled "Greek cities," made use of the Greek language, is surely the dictate of common sense, and ought, unless refuted by sufficient evidence, to be rested in as the fair and natural conclusion.¹ No one, indeed, seems hitherto to have questioned the fact that these cities were in every respect Greek. Let me refer only to the eminent Hebraist and historian Ewald. He says of Hippos, Gadara, and Scythopolis, that they were "*wholly* Greek cities,"² and he would therefore, we must believe, have

¹ These apt words from an idyll of Theocritus here suggest themselves—*Δωριστεῖν ἔξεστι, ἑοῦν, τοῖς Δωριεσσιν*--"Dorians, I think, may be allowed to speak Doric." So Greeks may surely be allowed to have spoken Greek.

² "Völlig Hellenische Städte."—*Gesch. d. Volk. Isr.* iv. 266.

been somewhat surprised to learn that their inhabitants did not necessarily make use of the Greek language.

The linguistic condition of the cities of Decapolis is thus really decisive as to the language of the Sermon on the Mount, and therefore decisive as to the whole question at issue. But there is another fact to which I called attention, that Dr. Sanday has entirely overlooked. It matters nothing to my argument whether the great discourse reported by St. Matthew was delivered on one or more occasions. But it does matter that *this* point be noticed, that among those who listened to a portion of it at least were inhabitants of *Tyre and Sidon*. Will Dr. Sanday venture to maintain that these people understood Aramaic? If so, the learned world will probably be curious to hear the proof, since it has hitherto held that even Syro-Phœnician had ceased, at the time referred to, to be the medium of public intercourse in these regions. I formerly referred to Gesenius in proof of this point: let me now quote another learned authority to the same effect. Sperling, in his masterly work entitled "*De Nummis non Cusis*," alluding to the fact that all the Tyrian coins of this period bore Greek inscriptions, remarks in explanation: "For after the successors of Alexander the Great and the Greeks got possession of Syria, the people of the country both spoke Greek and wrote only in Greek, while they managed all their matters, the coining of money inclusive, according to the customs of the Greeks; and the ancient Tyrian or Phœnician writing and inscription completely vanished and perished."¹ I refer, then, with confidence, to the statement formerly made, that Greek was at the time

¹ Page 51.

the language of Phœnicia. Dr. Sanday, as I have remarked, has not said one word in contravention of that statement. But it demands to be faced, and either refuted or accepted. If it can be refuted, then let it disappear from my argument for ever. But if it must be accepted, let it carry with it its own proper conclusion. What that conclusion must be, is obvious from Luke vi. 17. There we read respecting Christ, "And he came down with them (the apostles), and stood in the plain, and the company of his disciples, and a great multitude of people out of all Judæa and Jerusalem, and from the sea coast of Tyre and Sidon, who came to hear him, and to be healed of their diseases." The discourse which that mixed multitude of Jews and Phœnicians listened to simultaneously, and in common understood, must have been delivered in the Greek language.

Dr. Sanday next tells us (p. 84) that "the mass of the nation hated all that was Greek.". This is one of those sweeping assertions not unfrequently found in connection with the question under consideration. It is apt to produce considerable impression by the very vehemence with which it is made; and, accordingly, I am inclined to ascribe to the feeling thus excited, more perhaps than to anything else, the unwillingness displayed to admit the force of my argument. But I entreat the reader to withstand its force until it becomes something more than assertion, and to keep his mind open till some proof has been brought forward in support of the only point here truly relevant, viz., that the Jews of the period hated the Greek *language*.

Very different is the opinion expressed by the illustrious Rabbinical scholar, Lightfoot. "The Jews," he

says, referring to the early Rabbis, "do well near acknowledge the Greek for their mother-tongue even in Judæa."¹ This is not very like hating the language. To the same effect, Zunz, an eminent scholar of our own day, declares: "The speech of Greece stood among the Jewish wise men of Palestine in high esteem."² In this opinion he is joined by the learned Jewish writer, Frankel, who says: "In the Talmud itself the Septuagint is only referred to in terms full of respect."³ In fact, there are passages which ascribe nothing less than Divine inspiration to the Greek version of the Old Testament.⁴ But turning away from these later views, let us see what inference is to be derived from the earliest Hebrew literature bearing upon the question.

The compilation of the Mishna was begun by the Rabbi Judah about the middle of the second century of our era, and was completed some fifty or eighty years afterwards by his disciples. The object of this work was to preserve from perishing the maxims and decisions of former Rabbis, so that the substance of part of it, doubtless, belongs to a date anterior to the birth of Christ. Now, among its statutes, we find one of Simeon, the son of Gamaliel, to the effect that it was not allowable for the Jews to compose books "except in the *Greek* language." Again, we read that a bill of divorcement might be written and signed either in *Greek* or Hebrew, and was equally valid, whether the one language or the other was employed. These passages indicate something very different from that hatred of Greek attributed by Dr. Sanday to the Jews

¹ "Works," by Pitman, xi. 25.

² *Vorträge*, p. 10.

³ *Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta*, p. 61.

⁴ Hertzog's *Real Encyc.* Art. *Alexan.* Uebers.

of our Saviour's day. I must repeat, therefore, that any dislike evinced to the use of that language was a thing of later date. For we, no doubt, also read in the Mishna, exactly in accordance with what we might infer from some passages in Josephus, that the study and employment of the Greek language were formally prohibited during the course of the wars conducted by Vespasian and Titus.¹

The fallacy in this assertion, that the Jews "hated *all* that was Greek," seems to be one that is well known to every student of logic. It is the *Fallacia a dicto secundum quid ad dictum simpliciter*. If the thesis propounded were that the Jews always hated the *religion* or *philosophy* of the Greeks, then the position would, I believe, be tenable, and we might thus reconcile apparently inconsistent passages which occur in the Rabbinical writings. This was pointed out by Paulus so long ago as 1803. He shews that the hatred of what was Greek applied to the Greek philosophy, and not to the Greek language. On the contrary, as is proved by citations from the Talmud, Greek was in habitual use among the Jews of Palestine, and the study of the language was regarded as perfectly legitimate.²

Dr. Sanday has most justly remarked that "the Jewish character did not change backwards and forwards like a shuttlecock." But who represents it as so changing? The Greek proclivities of the Jews for several generations before Christ constitute an unquestionable fact. This has been clearly demonstrated by Ewald in the section of his history entitled "The ir-

¹ See Surenhusius, *Misch. Megill.* 1, 8; *Gittin*, 9, 8; *Sotah*, 9, 14.

² Millin's *Magazin Encyclopédique*, 1805.

ruption of Grecian culture and art." Referring to the period in question, he says: "There soon were plenty of Jews and Samaritans who at once betrayed their predilection for the new culture by their adoption of Greek or Greek-like names. And this intrusion of the Greek element by no means limited itself to Alexandria or other Greek cities; it spread also speedily and powerfully to Jerusalem, and especially to Samaria, as many indications lead us to acknowledge."¹ This is obvious from the apocryphal books of the Old Testament. And when the author of the Second Book of Maccabees tells us that in his day Hellenism had become so prevalent in the land, shall we suppose that, without any cause which history recognizes, there was a sudden and violent recoil in the opposite direction? No; there is not a shadow of reason to believe that such a thing had taken place before our Lord's day. It was only at a later date, and owing to circumstances totally different from those of the time of Christ, that an outburst of fury and fanaticism against all that savoured of Gentilism actually took place.

The position of Dr. Sanday in reference to the Epistle to the Hebrews is somewhat peculiar, and will not, I venture to think, be regarded as satisfactory. Admitting the composition to be a letter, he believes that there is hardly any clue to its original destination. In this he departs both from the ancient Fathers and from the great majority of modern critics: These have felt constrained, in spite of all difficulties, to regard the Epistle as having been primarily intended for the Church in Palestine. The one grand barrier to this conclusion has been the language of the Epistle. I

¹ *Gesch. d. Volk. Isr.* iv. 282.

need not repeat what was formerly said on this point. Dr. Sanday appears to concede that the original destination of the Epistle *may* have been Palestine, but thinks that this proves nothing as to the language dominant in that country. I shall only remark on this, that the writer is evidently and very thoroughly *en rapport* with his readers, which could scarcely have been the case had he written to them, as Dr. Sanday is willing to imagine, in a language which perhaps not more than half of them understood. I cannot but feel that the argument I based on this Epistle remains untouched, though I might easily afford to part with it without any detriment to the cause for which I plead.

A somewhat desperate expedient is had recourse to by Dr. Sanday in order to escape from the conclusion derived from the knowledge of Greek manifestly possessed by the Apostle Peter. He thinks it "rather probable that St. Peter did not write his Epistle for himself." It is supposed that St. Mark acted on the occasion as his amanuensis and interpreter, writing at the Apostle's dictation, but changing, I presume, his Aramaic into Greek. Now this is surely to cut the knot instead of untying it. And not only is the hypothesis totally gratuitous, but it seems clearly opposed by the writing itself. Mark is conceived of as the author of the letter in its Greek form, and yet he is spoken of (Chap. v. 13) as "Marcus, my son!" It is in a very different way that the amanuensis of St. Paul introduces his own name when he says (Rom. xvi. 22), "I, Tertius, who wrote this epistle, salute you in the Lord." But even waiving this, what does Dr. Sanday say as to St. Peter's sermon on the day of Pentecost?

He has taken no notice of this in his paper; but I must be allowed again to press it on the attention of the reader. That sermon, be it observed, was addressed, among others, to "men of *Cyrene*, and strangers of Rome, Jews and *proselytes*." And I ask, Will any one maintain that these persons understood Hebrew? If so, I should like to see the proof. But if not so, St. Peter spoke at the time in Greek, and the clearest evidence is thus presented of the familiarity then possessed by the Jews with the Greek language.

Dr. Sanday presses me, I think somewhat unduly, with the admission which I have made, that Aramaic might still be called the vernacular language of Palestine. He asks (p. 92), "Is not the *vernacular* language of a country *the* language?" Yes, in one sense; but not necessarily so in another. Celtic may be said to be the vernacular tongue of many Scottish Highlanders, who yet scarcely ever hear it on public occasions. Gaelic may be said to be their mother tongue, but the language which they read in books, and which they listen to in public, is English. Many other illustrations might be derived from bilingual nations. And exactly so do I conceive it to have been in Palestine. The Aramaic was the representative of the old ancestral tongue, and as such was used in homely familiar intercourse. I am therefore willing to style it the vernacular language of the country, but I do so without the least prejudice to my argument. This must be obvious to all who have attended to the relations which I regard as having existed between the two languages. The Aramaic, I have elsewhere remarked, "might still be said, though with difficulty, and amid many exceptions,

to maintain its position as the mother-tongue of the inhabitants of the country.¹

We are told by Dr. Sanday that the occurrence of occasional Aramaic expressions in the Greek Gospels is quite as compatible with the belief that Christ habitually spoke the one language as the other. But in this I hardly think that he will carry with him the assent of any candid and considerate reader. Here we have documents which, on his hypothesis, have been, as a body, translated from the Aramaic, and which nevertheless retain, here and there, an expression from that language. Now, in such a case it is surely requisite, and should also be possible, to give some plausible reason for the retention of these words untranslated. Accordingly, many on Dr. Sanday's side of the question, recognizing the necessity, have made such an attempt. The results have been of the sorriest character—indeed, have at times bordered on the ludicrous. Dr. Sanday prudently lets the matter alone, though he is bound, like others, to offer some explanation. I beg to refer with considerable confidence to what was said on this point in my previous papers.

I need hardly say here that it is no argument whatever against my views to find *Aceldama* spoken of at Acts i. 19 as belonging to the "proper tongue" of the Jews. As I have discussed this passage at some length elsewhere,² I need not dwell on it here. Instead of any observations of my own, I shall quote the words of a writer who cannot be suspected of any sympathy

¹ "Discussions on the Gospels," p. 5. I may here remark that, while the tone of Dr. Sanday's paper is excellent throughout, there seems to me to be one jarring sentence. He asks, "Can we suppose that our Lord Himself used any other language than the vernacular?" Certainly we can, as the word "vernacular" is explained above. And let me add that we must look only at *facts*, and have nothing to do with *suppositions*.

² "Discussions on the Gospels," p. 302.

with me in the present question. "Some affirm," says the author of "Supernatural Religion," "that Verses 18 and 19 are inserted as a parenthesis by the author of the Acts, whilst a larger number contend that only Verse 19 is parenthetical. A very cursory examination of the passage, however, is sufficient to shew that the verses cannot be separated. Verse 18 is connected with the preceding by the *μὲν οὖν*, 19 with 18 by *καὶ*, and Verse 20 refers to 16, as indeed it also does to 17 and 18, without which the passage from the Psalm, as applied to Judas, would be unintelligible. Most critics, therefore, are agreed that none of the verses can be considered parenthetical."¹ Among the critics referred to in this last sentence are Meyer, Stier, De Wette, Zeller, and others of deservedly high reputation. Dr. Sanday, however, goes against them, and regards the words referred to as "an added note or comment by St. Luke." This seems to me, as it has to so many others, utterly impossible, on account of the Greek construction. I still regard the whole speech as that of St. Peter, to whom it is ascribed; and why should we doubt that he was now speaking in Greek, seeing that, as proved above, he unquestionably did so on the occasion referred to in the second chapter?

To save space, I shall not dwell upon the perhaps not very important remarks of Dr. Sanday on the Talmud and Targums. He quotes a passage from Credner on the subject, and I always listen to anything coming from that most admirable writer with the utmost respect. But not even Credner can convince me that, when our Lord said to his hearers, "Search the Scriptures," He referred them to an Aramaic trans-

¹ Vol. iii. p. 100.

lation of the Old Testament, of which we hear nothing in Jewish or patristic antiquity.

But I now come to deal with Josephus, to whom Dr. Sanday ascribes an overwhelming force in deciding the question at issue. This, I think, is hardly fair, since we have in the New Testament itself no fewer than eight different authors of the period, who ought all to have a voice in determining the matter. But Dr. Sanday has appealed to Josephus, and to Josephus let us go.

First of all, then, as every scholar knows, Josephus depends, for the most part, on the LXX. in his references to the Old Testament. Though a man of eminent learning among the Jews, it is clear that he knew but little of ancient Hebrew, and it is still more obvious that he knew nothing at all of those Aramaic Targums which have so often, without the least ground of evidence, been conjured into existence.

Next, Dr. Sanday forgets altogether that passage in the preface to his *History of the Jewish War*, in which Josephus tells us for *whom* he wrote it in Aramaic. Was it for the Jews of Palestine? Nay: but for "the barbarians of the interior"—the Jews of Babylon and the surrounding countries. And for whom did he translate that history into Greek? For those, as he himself tells us, who lived under the government of the Romans. Now, it is clear that the Jews of Palestine are excluded from the first class, and included in the second. They were *not* among those for whose sake Josephus wrote his history in Hebrew, and they *were* among those for whom he translated it into Greek. Is not the inference obvious?

But now we come to the passage in Josephus on

which Dr. Sanday appears to lay the greatest stress : I refer to the statement made by the Jewish historian at the close of the "Antiquities." Now, let the reader well observe to what conclusions Dr. Sanday's interpretation of the passage leads him. They are these : "A knowledge of Greek was common enough among the middle and lower classes (*i.e.*, the classes that would naturally be engaged in traffic, either with Hellenistic Jews or with foreigners) : among the upper classes (except, we should probably have to say, the Herodian court and party) it was rare, and few spoke it correctly ; but the idea that Greek was the current language of the country, is contradicted in every line." Can these be correct conclusions ? I am afraid they will hardly be accepted as such by many on Dr. Sanday's side of the question. Thus says Grinfield : "The knowledge of Greek was confined chiefly to the *upper* orders, and to the Roman officers."¹ Thus also Renan : "The Greek language was little spread in Judæa beyond the classes who had part in the government, and cities inhabited by pagans, like Cæsarca."² And so multitudes of others.

Thus, on the one hand, we have Dr. Sanday maintaining what his own friends would style the probably more than paradoxical opinion, that Greek was known by the *lower* classes among the Jews, but rarely by the *upper* ; and, on the other hand, we are told what seems more in accordance with the common-sense view of the subject, that, while the Greek language was known by the highly-educated among the Jews, it was scarcely heard among the community at large. May I not be forgiven for hoping that, amid such confusion of

¹ "Apology for the Septuagint," p. 76.

² *Vie de Jésus*, chap. iii.

thought on the subject, agreement will yet be found in the acceptance of my proposition ?

What was it that Josephus took such pains to learn ? Not Greek *cujuslibet generis*, for, by Dr. Sanday's admission that the Jews of the time were "bilingual," he had that without any trouble. What, then, could it have been, unless, as I have maintained, to write, as far as possible, in pure and classical Greek ? "Josephus imitates," says Ernesti, "with great care and considerable success, the writers of pure Greek, especially Polybius, both in single words and in the turn of his sentences, intermixing but few Hebraisms, and therein, as he himself says, departing from the custom of his fellow-countrymen." ¹ And a late able American scholar shews us that he takes the same view of the import of the passage when he says, "Josephus speaks with emphasis of the difficulty which even a well-educated Jew found in writing Greek with idiomatic accuracy." ² The real meaning of this much-vaunted passage in Josephus thus turns out to be in perfect harmony with the views which I have endeavoured to establish.

The other passage (*Contr. Ap.* i. 9) need not long detain us. Dr. Sanday himself admits that there may be in it "some exaggeration." Josephus is supposed to affirm that, of all in the Roman camp, he was the only one who understood Hebrew, or who, knowing both that language and the Greek, was capable of acting as interpreter between the Jewish deserters and the Romans. But this is absurd on the face of it, and in direct contradiction to numerous accounts contained

¹ "Institutes," ii. 184.

² Hadley's "Essays Philological and Critical," p. 413.

in his own writings.¹ Either, therefore, another meaning than "understood" must be given to *συμῆν*, or the passage must be regarded as one of many in which Josephus seeks, at the expense of perfect truthfulness, to magnify his own importance.

Flimsy indeed, then, are the arguments derived from Josephus on which Dr. Sanday rests with so much confidence. They absolutely result in nothing when carefully examined; nothing, I mean, that can be regarded as having any weight against my argument. In favour of that argument I have the whole New Testament, from beginning to end. In these papers I have, of course, given only the barest outline of the evidence, and must refer readers, who wish to see it fully stated, to my work upon the subject. But I should like, ere saying my last word on this question in *THE EXPOSITOR*, to direct attention to a passage in the Gospel of St. John, which is no doubt very familiar to Dr. Sanday, from his well-known and valuable labours in connection with that Gospel, but which I would venture yet again to commend to his consideration.

The passage referred to is John xx. 14-17, and I confidently submit it as decisive of the question at issue. All textual critics now admit that *Ἐβραϊστὶ* ought to be inserted in Verse 16, so that the passage will stand in English as follows: "She saw Jesus standing, and knew not that it was Jesus. Jesus saith unto her, Woman, why weepest thou? whom seekest thou? She, supposing him to be the gardener, saith unto him, Sir, if thou have borne him hence, tell me where thou hast laid him, and I will take him away. Jesus saith unto her, Mary. She turned herself, and said unto

¹ "Wars," iv 1, 5; v. 13, 7, &c.

him, in Hebrew, *Rabboni*; which is to say, Master. Jesus saith unto her, Touch me not; for I am not yet ascended to my Father: but go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father, and your Father; and to my God, and your God."

The following extract will shew how well fitted this passage is to impress every candid mind with the true linguistic condition of Palestine at the time. "Mary," says Röhr, "in her conversation with Christ, appears to have spoken Greek, until she understood that He was risen from the dead, when she addressed him in the more common Aramaic, saying, *Rabboni*."¹ This writer, however, does not see that the admission which he here makes is fatal to the theory which he maintains; for surely if the Aramaic had been "more common" in public intercourse among the Jews of that period than the Greek, it would at once have been used by Mary in addressing one whom she supposed to be "the gardener," and there would have been no indication in the narrative that any other language was generally employed by the Saviour and his disciples.

Let it be noticed by the reader that certainly one, and probably two, Hebrew terms are preserved in the passage, neither of which would have any meaning if the whole conversation had been carried on in that language. Jesus said to his affectionate follower, "Mary." This word at once recalled to her those tones which she loved so well: she recognized her Master in the person who now stood beside her; and, under the influence of deep emotion, she said unto Him, "*Rabboni*," making use of the same language in which He had probably uttered her name (*Mariam*).

¹ *Palästina*, Bib. Cab. p. 92.

We see at once a beauty and significance in the employment and preservation of these Hebrew terms, if the rest of the conversation was in Greek; but if it be supposed that the language used by Christ and Mary throughout was Hebrew, the meaning of these isolated expressions being retained in that tongue entirely disappears. And the restoration by criticism of the word *Ἑβραϊστὶ* renders the proof still more evident that Greek was the language usually employed by Christ and his disciples. For why, we may well ask, should the Evangelist remark that Hebrew was the language *now* used by Mary, if that was, in fact, the form of speech which she and her fellow-disciples generally employed? It must, I think, be difficult for any one to read the entire passage in the original without feeling that it leaves an almost irresistible impression in favour of the opinion that *Greek* was the language usually employed by Christ in discoursing with his followers, and that Hebrew was used only in their more private and familiar intercourse, or for special reasons, and on particular occasions.

A. ROBERTS.

RABBINIC ESCHATOLOGY.

It is not my object in the present paper to enter either directly or indirectly into controverted topics. It may be that it would be better for us all if it were more the habit of modern authorship to state, with the utmost impartiality, the historical and logical grounds for certain inferences, and to leave the reader to form his own conclusions from them, without startling him into rejection by any premature assertion of the conclusion at which the writer has himself arrived. This was the plan