

A CRITICISM OF DR. HATCH'S "ESSAYS IN BIBLICAL GREEK," BY DR. HORT. (A FRAGMENT.)

p. 199. (On Isa. xlii. 1-4.) Dr. Hort writes, "Justin has nothing which is not in either LXX. or Mt. except (1) (once) *καὶ* before Ἰσραήλ; (2) *προσδέξεται* instead of (LXX.) *προεδέξατο*, a natural assimilation to *ἀντιλήψομαι*; and (3) *ἐκλεκτοῦ μου* for *ὁ ἐκλεκτός μου, προσδέξατο κτλ*, which keeps the chief points."

p. 200. (Same passage continued.) Dr. Hort writes, "Again all is in LXX. and Mt.": and on the statement "the quotation must be from Isaiah and not from St. Matthew," "Nay, *contendit* proves the quotation to be mixed"; adding just below, "Again De pat. 3, *non contendit, non reclamavit*, but *in plateis* follows."

p. 201. (Same passage continued.) "LXX. exactly translates Hebrew. The confusion is in the Hebrew text, not the Greek."

p. 207f. Dr. Hatch conjectures that "the present reading of the LXX. [in Psalm cxviii. (cxix.) 120, 'καθήλωσον ἐκ τοῦ φόβου σου τὰς σάρκας μου'] is due to a scribe's recollection of the composite psalm which Barnabas here [c.v.] quotes, or possibly adapts."

This conjecture provokes a threefold note of admiration, and is undermined by the remark, "Both LXX. and Aquila simply follow the rabbinical instead of the Biblical sense of the verb *קָרַף* ('bristles' = 'nails')."

p. 209. The suggestion as to the quotation of Isaiah xl. 12 is disposed of in the words, "Only a natural reduction to simple antithesis, heaven and earth"; and it is pointed out that the quotation from c. lxvi. 1 agrees, "as far as it goes, with Acts vii. 49 (*ὃ δέ* for *καὶ ὃ* in all MSS. but B)."

p. 211 (2). Dr. Hatch speaks of "unknown sources" of the quotation in *Tryph.*, 24. Dr. Hort writes below:

"(1). Psalm cxxviii. (cxxvii.) 4, 5, *ἰδοὺ οὕτως εὐλογηθήσεται ἄνθρωπος ὁ φοβούμενος τὸν Κύριον*. *Εὐλογῆσαι σε Κύριος ἐκ Σιών, καὶ ἴδοις τὰ ἀγαθὰ Ἱερουσαλὴμ πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας τῆς ζωῆς σου* (cp. Ps. xxxiv. (xxxiii.) 11, 12, *Δεῦτε τέκνα, ἀκούσατέ μου, φόβον Κυρίου διδάξω ὑμᾶς*. *Τίς ἐστὶν ἄνθρωπος ὁ θέλων ζῶν, ἀγαπῶν ἰδεῖν ἡμέρας ἀγαθῶν*);

"(2). Jeremiah iii. 17, . . . καλέσουσι τὴν Ἱερουσαλὴμ θρόνον Κυρίου, καὶ συναχθήσονται πάντα τὰ ἔθνη εἰς αὐτήν.

p. 212. (On the same passage.) Dr. Hatch's remarks on the sense in which ἀνήκει is used by Justin and LXX. respectively are modified by a note pointing out that in Isaiah ii. 9 ἀνίημι is used even more exactly than in Justin in the sense of "pardon" (οὐ μὴ ἀνόσω αὐτούς) for the verb ἄψω; and that ἀνίημι often means "release."

Just afterwards Dr. Hort thinks it "very doubtful" whether Justin, quoting Isaiah ii. 5, 6 in *Tryph.*, 135, did take ἀνήκει in the sense of "forsook": "he probably had in mind the *new* house of Jacob."

Dr. Hort has no notes on chapter vi. "on Origen's Revision of the LXX. Text of Job."

p. 247. Opposite the words near the foot of the page "dated A.D. 734" Dr. Hort has written "1434."

p. 256. (On Ecclesiasticus xx. 27, 28.) The last word of the Greek is corrected to ἀδικίαν. Dr. Hatch's view that "the fifth line of the Latin is out of harmony" is questioned. "Rather it carries on the second line. Acceptableness to great people gives opportunities of increasing one's store, and so by alms getting atonement for sins. The fourth Latin line comes in very badly with its morality among the [maxims of] prudence. It seems to represent a duplicate rendering of the preceding line (ὁ ἐργαζόμενος γῆν ἀνυψώσει θημωνίαν αὐτοῦ). Probably ΠῚΤῚ, 'righteousness,' was read for ΠῚΥ, 'a heap' (of corn), rendered θημωνία."

p. 257. The remark at the foot of the page as to "triplication" extorts "??" and the sentence which follows ("The hypothesis is supported," etc.) "Why?"

p. 258. Dr. Hatch's treatment of the fourth couplet (of Eccles. xxviii. 3-7) is not approved, "Rather καταφθορὰ καὶ θάνατος [καὶ] ἐμμένει ἐντολαῖς. *Imminet*, i.e. *immanet*, by its unmotivated singular points to ἐμμένει." Dr. Hatch writes *imminent* all through.

The paragraph in which Dr. Hatch states his conclusion as to the whole passage is marked "?".

p. 258. (On Eccles. i. 13.) Dr. Hort is very doubtful about ἐλόγηθήσεται being clearly the true reading. He points out that in the Hebrew of iv. 16 εὔρησει χάριν does occur absolutely, "and is not contrary to analogy; while it might easily be a stumbling block" [to a scribe].

p. 259. (On i. 23.) Dr. Hatch regards *ἐφφροσύνη* as grammatically impossible because it involves a neuter sense for *ἀναδῶσει*. Dr. Hort remarks, "Neuter senses are common for compounds of *δίδωμι*; and *ἀναδίδωμι* has more than one such. The image here may either be [that] of a fountain or [that] of a springing plant."

p. 260. (On iv. 11.) "The Latin seems to show that the Greek verb was originally *ἐψύχωσε* or *ἐνεψύχωσε*" (Hatch).

"How can it show more than that this was its own Greek original?" (Hort).

"*ἐνεφυσίωσε* [*ἐνεψύσησε* ?]" (Hatch).

"No, the whole context most clearly confirms *ἐνεφυσίωσεν*" (Hort).

ib. (On iv. 15.) Dr. Hort does not accept either statements of fact or deductions. "*Adquiescit* is more likely to be a paraphrase of *προσέρχεται*. The sense is exactly given in *accedit*, the first of two renderings in *g.*"

ib. (On v. 6.) "But surely *ταχυνεῖ* was meant to ease the genitive *παρ' αὐτοῦ*, while it really weakens and changes the sense" (Hort). Dr. Hatch would read *ταχυνεῖ*.

p. 261. (On v. 6.) "The exegetical difficulty of the verse lies in *ἔλεος*," etc. (Hatch).

"Nay, the point is that from God proceeds not mercy only, as the sinner assumes, but both mercy and wrath" (Hort).

ib. "The clause *ἔλεος γὰρ καὶ ὀργὴ παρ' αὐτοῦ* is found also in xvi. 12, where the mention of mercy as well as wrath is quite appropriate" (Hatch).

"Not more than here. See the preceding and following lines in c. 16" (Hort).

p. 262. (On vii. 18.) "The original text of the LXX. was thus, in all probability, *μὴ ἀλλάξεως φίλον διαφόρου*" (Hatch).

"Probably, but not *because* the Latin and Syriac so read. There is, however, no reason to reject *ἔνεκεν*" (Hort).

p. 262. (On x. 17.) "To wither up is surely not a 'mild word' or inappropriate here: cf. Isaiah xl. 24, li. 12; Joel i. 11; Zechariah x. 2 (of men); Job xii. 15 (prob.); Isaiah xlii. 14; Jeremiah xxiii. 10; Amos i. 2 (of the land). *Ἐξ αὐτῶν* may well mean 'some of them.'"

ib. (On x. 27.) "The reading of (B) 155 is assuredly right. (B differs only by the mechanical insertion of a second *ἦ* after the *ων* [of *περιπατῶν*].) The forcible phrase 'working in all things'

was not understood, and some substituted *πόνοις* for *πάσιν*, while others inserted *καὶ περισσεύων* before *ἐν πάσιν*. So also the force of *περιπατῶν* (as a contrast to *ἐργαζόμενος*) being missed, it was turned out as otiose, and awkward with a second participle” (Hort).

p. 263. “The Latin and Syriac show that Codd. 23, 248, have preserved the original text” (Hatch).

“How can they?” (Hort).

ib. (On xi. 9). Dr. Hatch would reject *χρεία*. Dr. Hort writes: “The subject of verses 7–9 is excessive haste to speak or interfere. Hence *χρεία* means ‘need for thee to join in the dispute’ (practically ‘concern of thine’). So xxxv. 7, *Δάλησον νεανίσκε, εἰ χρεία σου*; cf. iii. 22, *οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶ σοι χρεία τῶν κρυπτῶν*.”

p. 264. (On xii. 12.) On Dr. Hatch’s suggestion, that the order in which the phrases occur in the Latin points to two of them being glosses, Dr. Hort says, “Yet many might think it a more natural order to have parallel lines rather than parallel couplets: and the Latin often transposes.”

ib. Just below Dr. Hatch writes, “The earliest text is probably that of St. August., *Speculum*, p. 130,” on which Dr. Hort exclaims, “Why, it is the Vulgate!”

p. 265. (On xii. 12.) To account for the variants *ἀναστρέφας* and *ἀνατρέφας* Dr. Hatch says, “It may be supposed that the common use of the verb in the LXX. as a neuter was unknown to some of the Greek scribes.” On the words “in the LXX.,” Dr. Hort annotates, “as in all Greek literature.”

On the same passage Dr. Hort writes further: “*ἀναστρέφας* *σε* gives much the more forcible sense, *ἀναστρέφας* the more obvious.”

p. 265. (On xiv. 20.) “The original reading was clearly *μελετήσῃ* = ‘meditabitur’” (Hatch).

“Plausible, certainly: but the evidence is suspicious; and what would suggest *τελευτήσῃ*? More probably *τελευτήσῃ* is a mis-translation, *ܪܡܢ* or (Aram.) *ܠܠܡܢ* read as *ܡܢ*.”

p. 266. (On xv. 6.) Dr. Hort writes: “Nay, *ἀνοίξει* in 5^b may have either (*a*) Wisdom, or (*b*) the man, for its subject. *a* has precedents in Ezekiel (iii. 27, xxiv. 27, xxxiii. 22; cf. Psalm l. 17, *χείλη* for *στόμα*), but is rare, and in Ecclesiasticus contrary to large usage. But the previous context might easily suggest it to scribes. Hence two parallel attempts to supply a verb, *εὐρήσῃ* on the (right) base of *b*; *thesaurizabit super* and *hereditabit illum* (causative) on the base of *a*.”

Dr. Hatch's conjecture to account for *εῖρήσει* is pronounced "most unlikely"; and his assertion that "*av* was a not uncommon error for *ευ*" provokes the question, "Does it ever occur?"

p. 266. (On xvi. 3.) τὸ πλῆθος, pronounced by Dr. Hatch "almost certain," is regarded by Dr. Hort as "surely a manifest correction. After verses 1 and 2 very bald."

Dr. Hatch cites C as reading ἐπὶ τὸν τόπον αὐτῶν. Dr. Hort notes that in C there is a hiatus at this point.

ib. (On xvi. 17.) Dr. Hort disagrees. "Μή has much greater force than καί. This line gives the reason for Ἀπό, etc., just as [verse] 4 does for [verse] 3."

p. 267. (On xvi. 18.) Dr. Hort cites Psalm cxiii. 24 (cxv. 16, Heb.), ὁ οὐρανὸς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τῷ Κυρίῳ τὴν δὲ γῆν ἔδωκεν τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων, and asks, "Why should it not be a parallelism of contrast, as in the Psalm?"

p. 267. (On xviii. 32.) Dr. Hort writes: "Latin probably read *τρυφῆ* as *τύρβη* and wrote 'in turbis immodicis.' A scribe reading this as 'in modicis' would naturally insert 'nec': this once being there, 'delecteris' would be an easy addition. The resemblance to 'comissatio' must be fallacious, though *συμβολή* sometimes has nearly this meaning (see my note in interleaved Fritzsche), as probably here. 'Commissio' is the exact etymological rendering of *συμβολή*, and gives some of its senses, e.g. a competition, with which 'adsidua' (? *προσεχής*) might naturally go. Προσδεθῆναι is elsewhere joined with *τρυφῆ* and with *ἡδονῆ* (see my note). But it is a hard verse."

p. 268. (On xix. 22.) Dr. Hort notes that the passage runs καὶ οὐκ ἔστι σοφία πονηρίας ἐπιστήμη, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν [ὅπου] βουλή ἀμαρτωλῶν φρόνησις: and in reply to the doubt thrown on ὅπου by Dr. Hatch he writes: "Yet Ecclesiasticus is fond of ὅπου in this scarcely local sense; and it is useful here, to mark the change of order (ἀμαρτωλῶν with βουλή, not with φρόνησις; though πονηρίας with ἐπιστήμη, not with σοφία). The omission of ὅπου was inevitable after οὐκ ἔστι σοφία."

(On xxi. 17.) [διανοηθήσεται is] "doubtless an individualism of B, an easy assimilation."

p. 268f. (On xxii. 27.) Dr. Hort again draws a line through C. He notes that instead of *certum* Augustine has *astutum* (as the Vulgate has *astutia* for πανούργημα or πανοίργημα). For *cer-*

tum he suggests *cautum*. He observes that *πανούργος* is used by Polybius also in the sense of "clever," and that "the fact that it is always used in the LXX. of persons and not of things" (Hatch) is a reason why scribes should change *πανούργων* into *πανούργων*. He adds, "A prudent seal" makes better sense.

p. 269. (On xxiii. 10.) Again C struck out. Dr. Hort attaches no weight to "the antithetical clause *οικέτης ἐξεταζόμενος*" as indicating a single participle in the clause adduced. "Why match exactly?" he asks. And he adds, "Surely the omission of *καὶ ὀνομάζων* and the addition of *τὸ ὄνομα Κυρίου* are only different evasions of the difficulty of *καὶ ὀνομάζων* absolute." He indicates astonishment at the suggestion made to account for "the loss of the words *τὸ ὄνομα Κυρίου* in most MSS."

p. 270. (On xxv. 17.) "*ἄρκος* (= *ἄρκτος*) is unintelligible" (Hatch).

"Why not 'as grim as a bear'?" (Hort).

"It can hardly be doubted that the original reading was *ἄρκος*" (Hatch).

This remark elicits two notes of astonishment.

"*σάκκον* has probably the same sense as *ἄρκος*" (Hatch).

Double query (Hort).

"It was a cloth," etc. (Hatch).

"Rather, a bag or sack. See Blümner, *Priv. Alt.*, 194, 3; Becker, *Char.*, ii. 393f. But the evidence is very slight" (Hort).

Apoc. vi. 12, *ὁ ἥλιος ἐγένετο μέλας ὡς σάκκος τρίχινος*. Cf. Isaiah I. 3 (quotes Dr. Hort).

"Why not simply—

N

ΩC CAKKOC

ΩC APKOC

?" (Hort).

p. 271. (On xxv. 17.) On "taking it for an accusative" (l. 3) Dr. Hort says: "Surely quite possible, though *σάκκος* may be more likely."

On "drawn over it" (l. 7), he notes: "But in Greek usage, it was for the hair only."

(On xxv. 21.) C again disappears.

On "inadequately balanced" Dr. Hort writes: "only in number of words, not in meaning." *In specie* is "perhaps a double of

ἐπὶ κάλλος." εἰς τρυφήν is "surely interpolated for explicitness (as ἐξόδου below, v. 25)."

p. 271. (On xxv. 25.) Dr. Hort's note is: "Possibly, and this would not exclude speech: but v. 25 suggests a more comprehensive sense. Cf. Prov. xvii. 14, Heb. (Oddly ἐξουσίαν...λόγους, LXX.) Surely it implies ἐξόδου." ["It," *i.e.*, I suppose, the Latin. "This," *viz.*, ἐξουσίαν, I imagine.]

p. 272. (On xxvii. 27.) The statement that "the reading of Cod. B (ὁ ποιῶν πονηρὰ εἰς αὐτὸν κολισθήσεται) is grammatically impossible," calls forth a note of astonishment. "For εἰς see Wahl 160*b* fin., 161*a* (sp. εἰς κεφαλὴν)."

p. 280. (On xlv. 17.) Dr. Hort says: "Rather B₄ is a corruption of B₃: the duplicates are variously combined, and the reading of N² and A¹ is ingeniously wrong."

THE CHRISTIAN PROMISE OF EMPIRE.

REVELATION iii. 21.

"To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with Me in My throne." These words bear the stamp of their environment. They were written at a time when the ideal of all men was the possession of a throne. Alike to the Roman and to the Jew the dream of life was the dream of dominion. The son of Israel contemplated his Messiah who should make him ruler over all nations. The son of Rome was eager to complete his almost finished work of universal empire. So far the promise was in harmony with the place and with the hour. But from another point of view it was in striking contrast to both. Who were the men that claimed to be the recipients of this promise? A band of obscure slaves. To the proud Roman leading his armies to victory, to the proud Jew counting his ancestors by hundreds, there must have been something almost grotesque in the claim. Here was a company of men not yet dignified with the name of humanity—the butt of the satirist, the jest of the