

A CRITICISM OF DR. HATCH'S "ESSAYS IN
BIBLICAL GREEK," BY DR. HORT. (A FRAG-
MENT.)¹

THIS volume of 293 pages contains "the substance of the lectures delivered at Oxford by Dr. Hatch during his terms of office as Grinfield Lecturer on the Septuagint. It thus gathers up for us the chief points of the labour bestowed by a man of rare power, knowledge, and freedom from prepossession, upon a field of criticism which opens directly into several more important subjects, and in which a trained, historic sense like his is of special value. From beginning to end the book abounds in minute and careful work, directed and interpreted by vigorous intelligence. Its true importance, however, will be best understood by clear recognition of the limitations explicitly pointed out by Dr. Hatch himself in the preface. His work is exactly what he calls it, "almost entirely tentative in its character." "It is designed not so much to furnish a complete answer to the questions which it raises as to point out to students of sacred literature some of the rich fields which have not yet been adequately explored, and to offer suggestions for their exploration." Not a few of the results obtained, and some even of the methods employed, will hardly hold their ground. But that is of secondary importance. It is enough that the book is throughout a practical invitation to Biblical students of all grades of maturity to verify current assumptions, that it reminds

¹ *Essays in Biblical Greek.* By Edwin Hatch, M.A., D.D., Reader in Ecclesiastical History, Oxford. Oxford, 1889.

them of a large mass of valuable evidence as yet hardly brought into use, and that it enforces and illustrates the need of scientific procedure in the handling of this and all other evidence.

The seven essays included in the volume fall under two heads, the Greek vocabulary of the Bible (I.-III.), and the text of the Septuagint and Apocrypha (IV.-VII.). Perhaps, however, more justice would be done to the ideas which seem to have governed Dr. Hatch's own studies by saying that five essays (I.-III., V., VI.) deal with the evidence to be obtained from the LXX. for the examination of problems external to itself, while the remaining two (IV., VII.) are concerned with the textual criticism of the LXX. and Apocrypha.

The reader will do well not to be frightened at some paradoxes which enliven the opening paragraphs of Essay I. (On the Value and Use of the Septuagint). Without at all concurring in Dr. Hatch's sweeping disparagement of all that has been hitherto done for the elucidation of the language of the New Testament, one must needs welcome so stout an ally against the delusion of finality; for assuredly much of the vocabulary of the New Testament, and even some parts of its grammar, stand urgently in need of fresh and more methodical investigation.

The series of paragraphs in which Dr. Hatch discriminates various causes of difference between "Classical" Greek and that of the New Testament are in substance admirable and instructive, though exception might be taken to some verbal details and many examples. Their value fortunately does not depend on the strange initial assertion that "in almost every lexicon, grammar, and commentary" the New Testament is chiefly interpreted according to Attic standards. Dr. Hatch rightly distinguishes these causes of difference under two heads, roughly described as time and

country. Differences due to the lapse of time, he points out, arose partly from causes external to language, such as "the rise of new ideas, philosophical and theological, the new social circumstances, the new political combinations, the changes in the arts of life, and the greater facilities of intercourse with foreign nations" (p. 3); partly from those spontaneous changes in living speech which literary archaism is powerless to arrest. Thus far, he says, the LXX. and New Testament "may be treated as monuments of Post-Classical Greek," and their language illustrated from "contemporary secular writers": but the several books which make up both the LXX. and the New Testament vary largely among themselves in philological as well as in literary character, and in many cases contemporary Greek fails to give an adequate philological explanation such as it supplies elsewhere. Hence account has to be taken, secondly, of difference of country. This consists partly in difference of physical and social conditions, as shown by the change from the Attic metaphors of the law-courts, the gymnasia, and the sea, to metaphors suggested by "the conditions of Syrian life," and still more by the change from the religious and moral ideas of the Greeks to those of a Semitic race, "whose traditions came down from Moses and the Prophets." In the striking paragraphs here condensed (pp. 9 ff.) respecting physical and social differences, it seems to be too hastily assumed by implication that the LXX. translators, no less than the Apostles, were inhabitants of Palestine; and no allowance is made for the influence of the Hellenized cities of the sea-board on the whole country. But what is said of the effect of differences of religious and moral ideas is undoubtedly true, though not the whole truth.

These paragraphs lead the way to a generalization which is virtually the text of the first three essays, and the importance of which, if it be true in the rigorous sense in which

Dr. Hatch puts it forth as "an axiom" "too obvious to require demonstration," he certainly does not overrate. "Biblical Greek," he says (p. 11), "is thus a language which stands by itself. What we have to find out in studying it is what meaning certain Greek words conveyed to a Semitic mind. Any induction as to such meaning must be gathered in the first instance from the materials which Biblical Greek itself affords." The term "Biblical Greek" is familiar enough as a convenient label for the sum of words and constructions found in the LXX., Apocrypha, and New Testament. So used, it pre-supposes no theory. But Dr. Hatch's manner of using it virtually implies that "Biblical Greek" provides the only quarry which need be worked, for Greek as spoken or written by Jews, that within its own limits, subject to variations between author and author, it is substantially homogeneous, and that as a whole it is substantially different from all other Greek, "Classical," or "Post-Classical." On the strength of these assumptions it is suggested that the only safe key to the exact sense of words of the New Testament is their sense in the LXX. as ascertained by a careful comparison with the Hebrew originals; and we are warned against taking into account their sense or senses in non-Biblical Greek.

It may be surmised that Dr. Hatch had some misgivings that his usual language about "Biblical Greek" might be too sweeping. At p. 34 he classifies the vocabulary of "Biblical Greek" under three heads, for the first two of which he allows the use of evidence "from any contemporary records, whether Biblical or secular"; (1) words designating "concrete ideas"; (2) words expressing "abstract ideas," but "found only in those parts of the New Testament whose style is least affected by Semitic conceptions." The third class, said to comprise "the great majority [??] of New Testament words," consists of those which "express in their Biblical use the conceptions "of a

Semitic race." To these alone, words expressive of "abstract ideas," the special conditions of "Biblical Greek" are here implied to belong. But even under this limitation these conditions cannot be accepted to the required extent, that is, as making the LXX. (with or without the Apocrypha) an exact and adequate guide to the lexical usage or usages of the New Testament.

Even if every scrap of evidence about Jewish Greek outside the Greek Bible had perished, it would be rash to assume that all the antecedents of N.T. Greek are derived from the elder books in Greek, or from the particular form (or forms) of language spoken by their writers. Assuredly the existence of a written Greek translation did not abolish the power of the Hebrew original of the Old Testament proper to affect the conceptions attached by Jews to Greek words, either directly or through an Aramaic interpretation. As a matter of fact the New Testament itself, great as are its debts of language to the LXX., abounds likewise in reminiscences of the Old Testament clothed in language unknown to the LXX., and implying independence of it. Of equally mixed origin, it is reasonable to believe, was the moral and religious element in the Greek of Palestinian Jews generally; and it is from Palestinian Greek that the language of the different writers of the New Testament must have mainly sprung. While then neither the Hebrew equivalents nor the LXX. usage of words belonging to this class can be safely neglected, we must not expect to be able to ascertain securely all that they meant to Jews by merely looking them out, as it were, in the LXX.

Again the homogeneousness which seems to be assumed within "Biblical Greek" itself does not correspond to the facts. Dr. Hatch himself, as we have seen, at times recognises important differences of language among the books of the New Testament. But the diversity extends further. Doubtless there is a great though far from absolute simi-

larity throughout most of the Old Testament proper; and moreover Dr. Hatch is justified in appealing (p. 30) to the Hexaplar versions or revisions as evidence that peculiarities of the prevailing LXX. vocabulary lived on down to a time later than the New Testament. But widely different types of language stand side by side in the Apocrypha, as the four books named from the Maccabees suffice to show. To make out his case, Dr. Hatch should therefore have produced evidence for identifying the language of the New Testament (or at least of certain parts of it) with that particular type of "Biblical Greek" which prevails in the LXX. proper and Hexapla. This, however, he has not attempted to do: the list of words on p. 13 makes no such profession, and with good reason. In a large proportion of cases, the fact that words and senses of words found in the New Testament are not now found earlier elsewhere except in the LXX. or Apocrypha, is, in all probability, due only to the comparative scantiness of the extant remains of late non-Biblical Greek, especially Greek having a popular rather than a literary character.

Once more, the exclusion of the evidence of non-Biblical Greek is as little to be accepted as the excessive simplification in respect of Jewish Greek generally, and specially of "Biblical Greek." Every abstract Greek word by which a translator, or author, or speaker, replaced a Hebrew or Aramaic word bore with it associations of its own derived from its use by Greeks; and thus for many a reader or hearer it might add a touch of Hellenic colouring to the Jewish thought which it transmitted. Even had it been otherwise in the first instance, yet in subsequent usage an exact correspondence of sense, negative and positive, between Greek vocables and their Semitic originals, if indeed imaginable under any conditions, would have been manifestly impossible without such an absolute seclusion of Greek-speaking Jews from the miscellaneous world of

Greeks as assuredly did not exist either at Alexandria or in Palestine. In a large part of the New Testament, and especially in the Epistles, a fresh influence came into action, the reflex influence from a new world of readers. When once Gentiles had been admitted on equal terms within the Christian fold, the language used in developing and applying for their benefit the original Palestinian message could not but be affected by the recollection that most of them were Greeks by birth and nurture. On the other hand, this accessory enrichment of the sense of words from Greek associations must not be confounded with the unconscious partial substitution of Hellenic for Biblical ideas in post-apostolic times, about which much has been written of late, and the reality of which is beyond question, while there is room for wide difference of opinion as to its extent and significance.

Thus far we have been considering Dr. Hatch's theory of "Biblical Greek." It remains to examine the method by which he proposed to apply it to the reform of New Testament lexicography. The following sentences will suffice to bring out the main points of the view from which he starts. "That which gives the LXX. proper a value in regard to Biblical philology which attaches neither to the Apocrypha nor to any other book, is the fact that it is a translation of which we possess the original." "That which makes the possession of this key to its meaning of singular value in the case of the LXX., is the fact that to a considerable extent it is not a literal translation, but a Targum or paraphrase." This "fact . . . enables us to check this common tendency of students [viz., 'to lay too great a stress upon the meaning of single words, to draw too subtle distinctions between synonyms, to press unduly the force of metaphors,' etc.] . . . by showing us how many Greek words express the shades of meaning of a single Hebrew word, and, conversely, how many different Hebrew words explain to us

the meaning of a single Greek word." "These special characteristics of the Septuagint may be grouped under three heads: (1) it gives glosses and paraphrases instead of literal and word for word renderings; (2) it does not adhere to the metaphors of the Hebrew, but sometimes adds to them and sometimes subtracts from them; (3) it varies its renderings of particular words and phrases" (pp. 14 ff.). Then follow some eighteen pages of examples and illustrations from the LXX. and the Hexaplar translations. The conclusion must be given in full. "It is obvious that the determination of this relation [that viz. of a New Testament Greek word found in the LXX. 'to the Hebrew words which it is used to translate'] is a task of considerable difficulty. The extent and variety of the LXX., the freedom which its authors allowed themselves, the existence of several revisions of it, necessitate the employment of careful and cautious methods in the study of it. As yet, no canons have been formulated for the study of it; and the final formulating of canons must from the nature of the case rather follow than precede the investigations which these essays are designed to stimulate.

"But two such canons will be almost self-evident:

"(1) A word which is used uniformly, or with few and intelligible exceptions, as the translation of the same Hebrew word, must be held to have in Biblical Greek the same meaning as that Hebrew word.

"(2) Words which are used interchangeably as translations of the same Hebrew word, or group of cognate words, must be held to have in Biblical Greek an allied or virtually identical meaning" (p. 35).

On the first "canon" a few words must suffice. It takes for granted not only strict identity of sense through the whole literature of Biblical Greek, but also (1) strict identity of sense between a Hebrew word and its nearest Greek equivalent; and (2) invariable success of the Greek trans-

lators in pitching upon that nearest equivalent when they employ one rendering throughout the Old Testament. It finds its ultimate and sufficient criterion in Hebrew lexicography, which is tacitly treated as though in regard of the class of words here in view it had no unsolved or imperfectly solved problems of its own. The one example given (p. 20) as of “a single Greek word” thus corresponding “to a single Hebrew word,” is too inappropriate to have been taken except *per incuriam*; but it happens to be otherwise instructive. The Hebrew original of δούλος, which occurs about 323 times (exact verification would not be worth while) has six other representatives, παῖς (about 315 times), θεραπείων (about 44), οἰκέτης (about 29), παιδάριον (once), ὑπηρέτης (once), ὑπήκοος (once).

The second “canon” includes three sets of cases which have been distinguished in the previous exposition (pp. 21 f.); (1) a plurality of Greek renderings of a single Hebrew word in the same book or group of books; (2) the same in different books (here it is allowed that no more than “a close similarity of meaning” can be safely inferred); and (3) a plurality of Greek renderings of each out of a plurality of Hebrew words.

Dr. Hatch himself notices a large class of *prima facie* variations of rendering which do not yield material for trustworthy inferences of the kind proposed (p. 20, 3b); that is, variations due to the occurrence of paraphrastic instead of literal renderings. Several classes of such paraphrastic renderings are enumerated and exemplified at pp. 16–20; as substitutions of simply descriptive terms for “designations of purely Jewish customs” or for “ordinary Hebraisms” of diction, and of interpretative for crudely literal renderings; free dealing with metaphor by addition, variation, or obliteration; and modifications of rendering due to “local colouring,” that is, suggested by the context. This last form of paraphrase Dr. Hatch illustrates by the

numerous and dissimilar renderings of the Hebrew word for *give*, due to its peculiar elasticity of use. But in truth it is too natural not to be of wide occurrence in many translations, chiefly taking the form of the rendering of a specific by a generic word when the precise force of the specific original in relation to the context is not obvious, or of a generic by a specific word for the sake of greater apparent precision. A careful weeding out of such renderings will considerably reduce the *prima facie* evidence for laxity of language in the LXX. Another class of *prima facie* aberrant renderings that might with advantage have been noticed as irrelevant is due to a kind of harmonism, the introduction of words or phrases from other somewhat similar and perhaps more familiar passages. But still worthier of clear recognition in this place were two other classes of deceptively aberrant renderings, those which represent various readings (or it may be sometimes hasty misreadings) of the Hebrew due to similarity of letters, and those which represent modifications of sense in late Hebrew as compared with Biblical Hebrew.

When however all irrelevant matter has been cleared away, there remains a considerable mass of variation of rendering to which Dr. Hatch's proposed method would be undeniably applicable if it were right in principle. But is it indeed true, in the case of any translation, that different renderings of the same original word (or of the same group of words similar in sense) must be taken to have had for the translator a virtually identical meaning? Because a translator has been unconsciously led by the influence of context or association or mere accident to vary his rendering, employing in different places words having a common element of meaning but also (in ordinary use) more or less difference, it is surely rash to conclude that he had no implicit sense of the distinctive force of each word employed by him, and would have been ready in all places to use his several

renderings indiscriminately, much less to use them indiscriminately in original composition. Doubtless one translator will differ from another, as one author from another, in instinctive exactness in seizing the distinctive sense attached by educated usage to each of a series of partially synonymous words; and a tendency to blur distinctions is a natural result of either dulness or want of cultivation. Doubtless also the translators of most parts of the LXX., though not deserving to be called dull or uncultivated,

[Here Dr. Hort's MS. comes to an end. What follows is an attempt to make available for readers of Dr. Hatch's book the notes written by Dr. Hort in the margin of his copy].

p. 4. ἐπισκιάζειν. Dr. Hort points out that in Exodus xl. 29 the original is יָצַו, which in Numbers ix. 18, 22 is represented by σκιάζειν.

p. 50. ἐλεημοσύνη (α). Dr. Hort's note is "Nay, the meaning is 'We shall (thou shalt) have mercy from God.' The nine places in which ἐλεημοσύνη represents ἡλεῖ all refer to God's mercy, and have a motive in the context."

The passages referred to are Deuteronomy vi. 25 and xxiv. 13 (15), cited by Dr. Hatch as places in which no other meaning than "righteousness" is possible for ἐλεημοσύνη.

p. 65. 1 Kings ix. 7 and Ezekiel xiv. 8. εἰς ἀφανισμόν for εἰς παραβολήν. The rendering due to a confusion in Hebrew with יָצַו or יָצַו (ἀφανισμός).

p. 92. Dr. Hatch argues from the substitution of ὑποκριτής by Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion for the LXX. ἀσεβής in several places as a rendering of הָיָה, "that early in the second century, and among Greek-speaking Jews, ὑποκριτής had come to mean more than merely 'the actor of a false part in life.' It counoted 'positive badness.'" Dr. Hort's comment is, "No; [these places] merely shew the later translators took the Hebrew not in its Biblical sense, 'profane,' but in its undoubted rabbinical sense, 'hypocrite.'"

p. 141. On Genesis i. 9. In correction of the assumption that apparere in a Latin rendering points to ἀναφανῆναι in the Greek

text rendered, while *videri* points to *ὀφθῆναι*, Dr. Hort remarks, "In nearly all the twenty-five places from New Testament, *ὀφθῆναι* is rendered by both *videor* and *appareo*; but *appareo* largely predominates, especially in the later texts, and apparently is the only rendering in Augustine."

p. 141 f. On Genesis i. 24. A ponderous endeavour to make out "that in very early times *τετράποδα* was substituted for the more usual *κτῆνη* as the translation of *רֶמֶשׂוֹת*," elicits the remark, "*τετράποδα* is the rendering ten times in Exodus and Leviticus, *κτῆνη*, as a *v. l.* here comes of course from the next verse." The statement that the hypothesis is confirmed by the quotation of the passage in St. Basil and St. Cyril of Jerusalem (who both have *κτῆνη*) is met by the question, "Why so? Is their LXX. text exceptionally pure?": and the suggestion that the hypothesis explains the other variants in the MSS. by the question, "What does this mean? Given the two renderings, whatever their origin, conflation would easily make a doublet."

p. 143. Genesis i. 26. "Evidently the much quoted sentence was traditionally current in a simplified form with *ἡμετέραν* transposed and (mostly) with the second *καθ'* omitted. But it does not follow that any MS. of LXX. ever had this."

On the words, "The controversial importance of the pronoun is shown by the Gnostic controversies, *Epiphani. Hæres.*, 23. 1, 5," Dr. Hort writes, "But not of its position; and indeed the whole may be a mare's nest of Epiphanius."

p. 145 f. On Genesis ii. 2, 3. Rather than regard *τῆ ἕκτῃ* as the earliest instance of a dogmatic gloss for *τῆ ἐβδόμῃ*, it is "simpler to suppose that sequence of facts suggested sequence of days."

p. 148. On Gen. ii. 7, Dr. Hatch writes: "The variants which are found in Philo, *ἐπέπνευσεν* ['once only,' says Dr. Hort] and *ἐνεφύσησεν*, *πνοήν* and *πνεῦμα*, have parallels in the Latin versions, which show that they existed side by side in very early times."

Dr. Hort's comment is: "Surely only duplicate renderings of a single Greek text. Similarly Cyprian (*Ep.*, 93. 7) has *inspiravit* in Isa. xx. 22." Lower down on the same page, with reference to the quotations from Wisdom xv. 11, he remarks: "*ἐμπνέω*, a most natural word by Greek usage."

p. 150. (On Gen. ii. 19.) Philo's "*τοῦτο ὄνομα τοῦ κληθέντος ἦν*" does not "confirm the reading *αὐτοῦ*" (for *αὐτῷ*) but "rather it proceeds from the same instinct."

p. 152. (On Gen. iv. 3.) Dr. Hatch asserts that *δῶρον* and *θυσία* are commonly interchanged in the LXX. as translations of *minchah*. Dr. Hort's comment on this assertion is: "It is not at all true that *δῶρον* and *θυσία* are commonly interchanged in the LXX. as renderings of *minchah*. *Δῶρον* is used for presents not oblations except in this one place clearly; and also 1 Chronicles xvi. 29; 2 Chronicles xiii. 23; Isaiah lxvi. 20; where Jehovah is the recipient, but [as the following verses show] the offerings are regarded as presents to Him. (In 1 Kings viii. 64; Isa. xix. 21, *δῶρον* is spurious.)"

p. 152. (On Gen. viii. 21.) Dr. Hort adds that Philo omits *αὐτοῦ* also in the earlier part of the fragment next quoted, and then proceeds to give the full form of the part of that fragment which is quoted, noting that what Dr. Hatch gives is "an abridgment of the Armenian text." The full form is "*ὅρα γὰρ αἰῶς ἐγκεχάραται πάντων, ὡς φησιν, ἡ διάνοια ἐπιμελῶς καὶ οὐ παρέργως, τουτέστιν συγκεκόλληται καὶ προσήρμοσται.*" Then it is clear that *ἐγκεχάραται* (instead of being "an alternative translation of *נָצַף*") "is only part of an explanation: 'si inest, primum non existit obiter, sed intus insculptum et adhaerens ei.'" Dr. Hort further suggests that the LXX. probably read *נָצַף* for *נָצַף* ("the mind of men is inclined"), and that *ἐγκεῖται* is due to this reading.

p. 169. (On Gen. xlix. 10.) After perusing the paragraph suggesting *ὧ* τὸ ἀποκειμένον (τὰ ἀποκείμενα) αὐτῷ as the reading of the original version, it is like getting into fresh air to find written in the margin: "But how about the sense? *ὧ* makes the subject of *ἐλθῆ* a person who needs to be defined, and then *αὐτῷ* takes away all definitive force. Surely *ὧ* ἀπόκειται ("for whom it is reserved," exactly as Job xxxviii. 23 LXX.; nearly as Deut. xxxii. 34 Sym.) will account for all. It would be natural to change *ὧ* into *ὁ*, and so get an actual subject to *ἐλθῆ*, and then *αὐτῷ* would be added for clearness; some going further and making better Greek by τὰ ἀποκείμενα αὐτῷ."

On the words: "This hypothesis is supported by the combination, etc.," Dr. Hort comments, "How?"

p. 177 f. (On Isa. xxix. 13.) Dr. Hort thinks that the shortening of the much quoted text may be accounted for more simply by supposing—

(1) That the combination *ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ* with *ἐγγίξει* was not understood, and that *ἐγγίξει* was taken absolutely (as in Justin Martyr, quoted by Dr. Hatch, p. 178);

(2) That ἐν τῷ στόματι was taken with what follows, of which it then seemed to be an otiose repetition; hence the reading of \aleph^A ; and

(3) That the still shorter form was practically derived from the Gospels, aided by the apparent superfluity of ἐγγίζει taken absolutely, as a preface to the following clauses.

Dr. Hort decidedly questions the statement, "some good MSS. of St. Matthew give the longer form," and notes that the Latin quotations are "all detached" (p. 178).

p. 180. (On Ps. xxi. (xxii.) 23.) Dr. Hort notes: "[There is a] confusion with Psalm xxxv. (xxxiv.) 18, 'ἐξομολογήσομαί σοι [Κύριε,] ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ πολλῇ' with the not uncommon ψαλῶ σοι (τῷ Κυρίῳ, τῷ Θεῷ, etc.), and with Psalm lxxxix. (lxxxviii.) 6."

p. 181. The words in Barnabas c. ix., which are adduced as suggesting the existence of psalms breathing the spirit, and adopting the Greek phraseology of the existing Psalms, are regarded by Dr. Hort as an "easy paraphrase" of Psalm xxxiii. (xxxiv.) 13. So too the words in c. xv.

Micah vi. 6: ἐν τίνι καταλάβω τὸν Κύριον may have suggested (Dr. Hort thinks) the ἐν τινι ὀφθήσομαι of c. vi.

Dr. Hort points out that the words ὁσμὴ...αὐτῆν cited from c. ii. are from another source cited by Irenæus and Clement, and refers the reader to Harnack.

p. 191. (On the quotation by Justin of Psalm xxi. (xxii.) 3.) On Dr. Hatch's "only recorded instance" of ἀνείαν we find the comment: "A mere misprint of MSS. Dindorf found ἀγνίαν in the Paris MS., as ἀγνείαν in the better Colbert MS.; and points out rightly that the clause has slipped down from the chapter above. Perhaps 𐤀𐤂𐤏𐤏: in Psalm xlix. (xlviii.) 14, 𐤁𐤏𐤏 is rendered ἀνοία by Symmachus, ἀνοησία by Aquila."

p. 191. Justin twice quotes Psalm xxiii. (xxiv.) 7 with ἵνα εἰσέλθῃ in the place of the καὶ εἰσελεύσεται of LXX. From this and from the *ut ingrediatur* of Jerome's Psalter, for which Dr. Hatch would conjecture *ut ingrediatur*, he draws the inference that it may be supposed that ἵνα εἰσέλθῃ was "the reading which existed in the recension of the LXX. which was followed not only by Justin but also by the Old Latin versions."

This last remark elicits two notes of admiration: for Tertullian has *et intrabit* and Cyprian *et introibit*, while the *ut ingrediatur* on which Dr. Hatch leans is in Jerome's *Hebrew* Psalter. Dr. Hort

thinks that Justin's *ἵνα εισέλθῃ* is "surely a very natural change, apart from the Hebrew; just as some MSS. of Ambrose 'de Fide,' i. 525^a, have 'Crede angelis dicentibus, Et elevamini, portæ æternales, ut introeat in te rex gloriæ, Dominus Sabaoth.'"

p. 192. On Psalm lxxxi. (lxxxii.) 7. Jerome's Psalter is again appealed to as a witness to the text of the LXX. Dr. Hort writes in the margin: "Hebrew Psalter again! and it is a mere matter of punctuation left open by the Latin words."

p. 193. Dr. Hatch says: "the text in *Τρυφή* corresponds almost exactly to the Vatican text of the LXX. Psalter." On this Dr. Hort notes: It "departs eight times from B: once it agrees with B against A, once with A against B."

p. 194. l. 7. "εἰδῶλα is used elsewhere, but δαιμόνια is not, as a translation of דַּיְמוֹנִים " (Hatch). "δαιμόνια occurs only in six other places, for five different Hebrew words" (Hort).

ib. (On v. 7.) "A phrase which may be compared with the current philosophical phrase *τῷ πατρὶ τῶν ὄλων*" (Hatch). "Found in Dial. 74, to which Otto refers" (Hort).

p. 196. (On Isa. iii. 10.) Dr. Hort adds: "Notice should have been taken of the borrowing in Sap. ii. 12, where the verb is *ἐνεδρεύσωμεν*."

p. 197. (On Isa. vii. 10-17.) The "singular reading" in Apol. 33 is "surely only a confused reminiscence of St. Matthew (who has *ἔξει* and *καλέσουσι*), with the additional touch *ἐροῦσιν ἐπί*, i.e., this will be the faith suggested by the name." And the *καλέσουσι* in Matthew is more probably the source of *ἐροῦσι* in Justin than *vice versa*. The suggestion that this translation of the last clause of the verse ("*ἐροῦσιν ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ Μεθ' ἡμῶν ὁ Θεός*") is "a unique survival of a lost targum" is marked ?? by Dr. Hort.

p. 198 contains the following notes. On the statement "*Τρυφή*. 43 reads *ἀπειθεὶ πονηρά* for the current LXX. reading *ἀπειθεὶ πονηρία*"—"probably a slip only."

On "*ἀπωθεῖν* is frequently used as the translation of בָּשָׂף , to despise"—"no, only *ἀπωθοῦμαι*, but also three times *ἀπειθέω* [is so used], including an instance from Isaiah (I.)"

On "it is *evident* from Tertullian . . . that the insertion existed,"—"Hardly, only possible; his combination exactly illustrates the scribe's process below" [i.e. in the lines which immediately follow].

On "used with *emphasis* in the Judæo-Christian controversy,"—"?? (a middle verse of a long quotation not afterwards referred to)."

At the close of this paragraph Dr. Hort writes, "Nothing is said of the curious *σκληρῶς αἰσεῖς* for *φοβῆ* in both places."

(*To be continued.*)

"LIBERTY OF THE TREE OF LIFE."

REVELATION II. 7.

II.

"To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the midst of the Paradise of God." What is the promise which these words convey? They are popularly thought to refer to a mystical and transcendental state—to a reward which shall be reaped in the world beyond the grave. They are taken to proclaim the existence of a second Paradise, of a new and higher Eden above the clouds and beyond the tomb, where the soul shall be nourished by a bread which the heart of man has not conceived. Now, however true such a doctrine is in itself, I do not think it is the idea of the present passage. I do not think the eyes of the seer of Patmos are here lifted above the present world at all. We have been misled by the phrase "in the midst of the Paradise of God." We commonly take it to mean "the tree which is in heaven." On the contrary, I understand it to signify "the tree which is spoken of in Genesis ii. 9." That the imagery is *built* on Genesis ii. 9 has, of course, never been disputed; but I propose to read the phrase as itself a quotation mark, "unto him that overcometh will I give to eat of that tree which in Genesis ii. 9 is said to be in the midst of the Paradise of God."

The effect of such a rendering is obvious. It removes the notion that the tree of life is something existing in heaven. When we are merely told that we shall be allowed to eat of