

But there is no reason to distrust the *Acta*; they have been received by Ruinart among the *Acta Sincera*, and Ruinart's judgment was rarely mistaken. A minuter examination would show further reason to trust these special *Acta*, but it seems unnecessary to defend them until some better reason has been shown for distrusting them.

Maximus is said to have suffered *apud Asiam*, and, again, *apud Asiam provinciam*. The analogy of the *Acta* of Peter and Andreas shows that probably *Asiam* is a false reading of the name of some city; and several authorities conjecture *Asisiam*, and transfer Maximus to Liburnia (in which *Asisia* was situated). Certainly *apud* is not particularly suitable with the name of a province (though allowable in these *Acta*); moreover, one authority speaks of Maximus in *Asia civitate*. Now the *Acta* of Peter and Andreas show that Optimus was governor of Asia, for they mention the two (Asian) cities, Lampsacus and Troas, as the scene of martyrdom. Hence, if any change is needed, we must look for the name of an Asian city. Further, there is another Maximus, who is said to have suffered *apud Ambiensem provinciam* on a different

day of the year; and all authorities recognize the probability that these two *Maximi* are different forms of one martyr, distorted through errors in the transmission of an original text. The correct reading seems to have been corrupted both to *Asiam* and to *Ambiensem*.

The true reading is probably *apud Apiam*. The city Apia, now called Abia, was situated in the province Asia; and *apud Apiam* might readily be corrupted, on the one hand to *Asiam*, on the other hand to *apud Abiam*. *Apud Asiam provinciam*, which occurs in the concluding formula of the *Acta*, probably was the first to be corrupted; it was understood that the province was meant, and the word *provinciam* was introduced; and, after this, further corruption was inevitable, either *Asiam* or *Abiensem*. The insertion of *m* in *Ambiensem* may be compared to *Andrianus* for *Adrianus* (found in the records of Onesiphorus), and *Antalia* for *Attalia*. It is no real argument against this suggestion that one authority says Maximus suffered at Ephesus; this is a mere inference from *Asiam provinciam*: Ephesus was the capital of the province Asia.

Recent Foreign Theology.

The 'Kurzer Hand-Commentar.'

THIS excellent series of commentaries on the O.T. continues to make steady progress. One of the most recent additions¹ to it contains the Books of Canticles, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, and Esther. At present we desire to notice the commentary on Ruth by Bertholet and that on Esther by Wildeboer. To the others we may return on a future occasion.

Bertholet, upon the ground of the contents and the linguistic features of Ruth, postulates for this book a relatively late date. As to the question whether the author of the book meant to narrate pure history, or whether a 'tendency' (even supposing a traditional basis underlies the contents) is not to be detected in his work, Bertholet has no hesitation about accepting the second alternative.

¹ *Die fünf Megillot*. Erklärt von Budde, Bertholet, und Wildeboer. Freiburg i. B.: Mohr, 1898; London and Edinburgh: Williams & Norgate. Price 4s.

He rejects, however, the idea that the purpose of the book is to direct the eyes of the remnants of the Northern kingdom (after the Fall of Samaria) to the Davidic dynasty, with a view to the reunion of all Israel under that sway. As little can he accept the notion that the aim of the book is to be found in a desire to emphasize the duty and the blessing of levirate marriage, although he believes that in the case of Boaz and Ruth we have to do with levirate marriage according to the oldest conceptions of this institution (cf. Gn 28). Others have viewed the story of Ruth as a *midrash* intended to explain how David came to entrust his parents to the keeping of the king of Moab (1 S 22⁹), and also to supply a missing genealogy of David (see *ZATW*, xii. 43). But Bertholet objects to this, that what is emphasized in the book is the breaking off by Ruth from all connexion with Moab, that there is no trace of any connexion with the Moabite royal house, and that 4¹⁸⁻²² (containing the genealogy) did not probably

belong to the book originally at all. He himself believes that the book is best explained as a manifesto of the party opposed to the policy of Ezra and Nehemiah regarding the foreign marriages, its burden being to show how even among the despised Moabite women there might be found one worthy to be the mother of the best in Israel. This view he defends against Giesebrecht, although he is quite prepared to accept of the dictum of the latter that the book is intelligible only upon the supposition that David's Moabite descent upon the mother's side was accepted as a fact. At the same time he declines to attempt to draw the line between what is historical in the book and what is not, as well as to decide whether the author used a written 'source' or simply drew upon oral tradition.

The commentary of Bertholet is marked by the care and erudition we have learned to expect from the author of the *Stellung der Israeliten* etc., and the commentary on *Hesekiel* in the same series.

Wildeboer's *Esther* is also worthy of its author. One of its most interesting features, to which alone we refer on this occasion, is the elaborate discussion it contains of the vexed question of the origin of the Feast of Purim. It is pretty generally conceded nowadays that before we can discover the real features of this institution, the Jewish colouring it bears in the Book of Esther must be stripped off, that book being unhistorical, and there being no Persian word *pūr* = 'lot.' Lagarde at one time connected Purim with the Persian All Souls Festival *Farwardigān*, emphasizing the argument supplied by such LXX forms as *φουρδαία*, *φρουραία*. Afterwards he thought of the Mandæan פִּוּרְיָא, 'meal,' and its synonym in old Syriac, פִּוּרְיָא. In this he was followed by Zimmern, who pointed out that the Syriac word was = the Assy. *puhru*, 'assembly,' which conducts us to the feast of the Babylonian gods celebrated at the New Year's Festival *Zagmuku*. In this way the personality of *Mordecai* assumes significance, for *Marduk* presides at this assembly of the gods where destinies for the year are determined. Wildeboer objects to this, that no example can be cited of such a complete disappearance of the Assy. *h* as would be implied in the identity of פִּוּרְיָא with פִּוּרְיָא. The coincidence between *Marduk* and *Mordecai*, indeed, remains, but no sufficient account is given of the prominent rôle of *Esther*, which points

rather to an *Istar* than a *Marduk* legend, or of many of the other personalities of the book.

Wildeboer believes the solution of the problem to have been reached, at least in all essentials, by Professor Jensen, who carries us to Babylon and Elam for the basis of the story of Esther. We will take the liberty of translating part of a letter from Jensen to Wildeboer, which the latter has been allowed to publish:—

'*Esther* reminds us of *Istar*: *Mordecai* of *Marduk*. *Esther* is the cousin of *Mordecai* as *Istar* probably of *Marduk*. For the latter is a son of *Ia*, while *Istar* is a daughter of *Anu*. But *Anu*, *Bil*, and *Ia* are presumably viewed as brothers. It may also be noted that *Hadassa* = Assy. *hadaššatu*, originally = "myrtle," then = "bride," and that this is certainly the prototype. *Haman* reminds us of *Humman* (*Homman*), the national god of the Elamites: *Vašti* of *Mašti* or *Vašti* of the Elamite Inscriptions—the name of a divinity with the attribute *xana* which is nowhere ascribed except to the goddess *Kiri(rī)ša*, probably the wife of *Humman*. . . . *Haman's* wife is called *Zereš*, for which perhaps we should read *גִּרִּיֶּשָׁא* = *Giriša*, from *Kiriša* (?). In any case, the story of Esther has to do with Elamite affairs. The Elamites are the ancient foes of the Babylonians; *Humman* is the foe of *Marduk* as *Haman* is of *Mordecai*. The history that underlies the story of Esther must have dealt with a defeat of the Elamites or of an Elamite king. So much appears certain. . . .'

Now it is known from the cuneiform texts that *Assurbanipal* brought back to its original station at *Erech* an image of *Istar*, which in the year 1635 (1535) had been taken by the Elamites to 'a place that was not seemly.'

Then as to the word פִּוּר, which according to the Book of Esther means 'lot.' In Assyrian, *pūru* or *būru* is now, at least with the meaning 'stone,' established. The etymology of גִּוּרָל and ψῆφος would suggest that פִּוּר is thus a Babylonian loan-word. Thus once more we are brought to Babylon for the source of Esther. Jensen, like Zimmern, regards the original Purim as identical with the Babylonian New Year's Festival at which destinies were assigned. We must refer our readers to Wildeboer's work for details of the way in which this is connected with the epos of *Gilgamiš*. In the latter Jensen finds two strata combined, one dealing with the sun-god of *Erech*, and the other with an ancient king of the same place, whose great achievement was the slaying of the Elamite king *Humbaba* (a composite of *Humman* and *ba*). When *Gilgamiš* came to be honoured at Babylon, his name was replaced by that of the national god *Marduk*, and as a consequence of this, *Humbaba*,

king of Elam, was replaced by *Humman*, the god of the Elamites.

Such, stated only in the barest outline, is Jensen's theory, which Wildeboer considers to hold the field. It would be unfair to quote further regarding the way in which the original legend is held to have assumed its present Judaized form. For this, as well as for an interesting discussion of the opinion of Schwally (*Das Leben nach d. Tode*, 42 ff.), that in the Feast of Purim we have a 'verkapptes Totenfest,' one must refer to the pages of Wildeboer, whose work, introduction and commentary alike, for thoroughness leaves nothing to be desired.

Bertholet on Herod the Great.¹

THIS is an attempt to reach a fair and thoroughly well-founded estimate of one against whom there is a strong initial prejudice in many quarters. Herod and the Massacre of the Innocents are in many quarters so inseparably associated, that one is apt to look at the whole history of this king in the light of the impression which that atrocity leaves upon the mind. Bertholet starts with deprecating this prejudice, especially as reasonable doubts, founded upon chronological and other grounds, have been cherished whether the massacre above referred to ever took place. Not that the latter is not thoroughly in harmony with the policy of Herod all through his reign.

In a very well-written, concise, yet exhaustive essay, Bertholet traces the rise of Herod to power, his relations with one after another of his Roman patrons, his domestic troubles, his extensive building operations, etc. The effect of the whole sketch is such as to lead one to assent to the estimate of Herod's character reached at the close of the essay. 'Great he certainly was not, tried by Jewish or Christian standards, but let us not forget that these are not the standards by which he ought to be tried. He belongs to antiquity, and if in that sphere a virtue lies in strength, and a greatness in the unconditional carrying out of cleverly devised purposes, in the unshrinking boldness by which, at however terrible a cost, self-preservation is achieved, it is hard to deny him the surname of the Great, which—at first perhaps merely for the sake of distinction—has been given to him by history. True

¹ *Herodes der Grosse*. 'Christliche Welt' Heft. Von Lic. A. Bertholet. Basle, 1898.

indeed—and herein the narrative is right which the early Christian community and the first evangelist borrowed from popular tradition—such greatness has no room beside it for Christ. "The strong need not the physician." . . . And yet, who knows whether one would ever have heard the name of Herod, but for the birth so near to him, though not indeed in the royal palace at Jerusalem, of a little child in lowly guise?'

Ménégoz on the Trinity.¹

PROFESSOR MÉNÉGOZ is one of the best known leaders of the *symbolo-fidéiste* theology, the principles of which are by this time familiar to the readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. In the pamphlet before us he sets himself to the task of disengaging in the trinitarian formula what is eternal and true from what is merely contingent and temporary. Commencing with an examination of the propositions of the *Quicumque* symbol, Ménégoz exhibits the serious difficulties which these present to the psychology of the present day, in spite of all the subtle refinings that have been attempted of such terms as *hypostasis* and *persona*. He shows, further, how the doctrine of the Trinity is never formally taught in the New Testament. This leads to the further question whether it is implicitly to be found there, and if so, in what sense? Here arise the questions of the teaching of the New Testament on the personality of the Holy Spirit and the deity of Jesus Christ. We have not space to go into details, but give merely Ménégoz' conclusions: 'We may formulate our notion of the Trinity thus: The Father is God transcendent; the *Logos* is God immanent in humanity, revealing Himself in history, and manifested in His fulness in Jesus Christ; the Holy Spirit is God immanent in us, giving witness to our spirit. More briefly: The Father is God *transcendent*; the Son is God immanent, "*objectivized*" (*objectivé*); the Holy Spirit is God immanent, *subjective*. And these three are but one. But the three are distinct as we represent them in our thought. And in distinguishing them, we conceive of all the three as personal. Each has his special rôle in relation to humanity. We represent them to our mind scarcely otherwise than the Fathers, but we are conscious that our

² *Étude sur le dogme de la Trinité*. Par E. Ménégoz. Paris: Fischbacher. 1898.

representation is purely subjective, and that, as a matter of fact, there are not three persons in God, but a single person manifesting Himself to our spirit under three different personal aspects.'

Of course it is easy to say this is simply Sabelianism. The reproach is too obvious to escape Ménégoz, who would not be afraid of it, were it true, but who seeks to show that it is true only to a limited extent. As to his success in meeting this objection there will be different opinions, but no reader of the pamphlet will doubt of the sincerity and earnestness of the writer as he endeavours to translate into the language of to-day one of the most ancient and fundamental of Church formulas. No better illustration of the methods and the results of *symbolo-fidélisme* could be found.

J. A. SELBIE.

Maryculter.

The Greek of the Septuagint.

IN his larger work (*Bibelstudien*, Marburg, 1895) G. A. Deissmann illustrates from inscriptions and Egyptian papyri many Septuagint words which reappear in the New Testament. The peculiarities of Septuagint Greek are to be understood chiefly from two circumstances: The LXX translated a Semitic text into their own language; this language was the Ægypto-Alexandrian dialect. Both facts must be kept in mind. The translation of the sacred books of one language into another was an unheard-of undertaking at the time; and when we remember the absence of all rules and models we can only be astonished at the result. The chief difficulty lay in the syntactical construction. 'They often stumbled in the syntax of the Hebrew text; they threw over the Hebrew with his majestic gait their light native costume without being able to conceal under its folds the foreign nature of the stranger's movements. Thus arose a Semitic Greek on paper, never spoken before or afterwards, to say nothing of any literary use. The opinion that the translators had an easy task, because long-existent "Jewish Greek" assisted them in their syntactical work, is scarcely tenable. We have from Alexandria a whole series of other Jewish texts, but their peculiarities bear only the slightest resemblance to those of the LXX.' Thus the 'Hebraisms' of the Alexandrine A.T. prove nothing about the language actually spoken by

contemporary Hellenistic Jews; they prove nothing but the entire difference of Semitic from Greek syntax.

Our second point is that the LXX translators spoke and wrote the Egyptian Greek of the age of the Ptolemies. Their work is one of the most important examples of Egyptian Greek. Conversely its nature is best understood by comparison with the written remains of Greek Egypt, which we possess from the Ptolemy age down to Origen's days. We are able through recent papyrus discoveries to form a judgment on matters of Egyptian dialect for centuries. 'A great part of the papyri, for us the most valuable, comes from the Ptolemy age itself; these venerable leaves are in the original of just the same age as the work of the Jewish translators found in recent copies. It is a peculiar feeling of fascinating freshness, I may say of historical reality risen from the grave, that seizes us as we study these leaves. So also did the LXX—the much-talked of, the inaccessible—write on the same material, with the same letters and in the same tongue. The eventful history of twenty centuries has rolled over their work; issuing from a more influential form of Judaism than has ever again been seen, it helped Christianity to become a universal religion; it exercised the acuteness and the study of young Christian theology, and was to be found in libraries where Homer and Cicero would be sought in vain; it was then apparently forgotten, but in its daughter-translations it still ruled polyglot Christendom; handed down to us in mutilated form, not in its original truth, it presents so many riddles and problems, that not merely dense ignorance but often even the devotion of the cleverest is nonplussed. Meanwhile the equally old papyrus records were resting in their graves and under rubbish-heaps; but our curious age has brought them to light, and what they thankfully tell us of the past helps us to understand the Greek Old Testament. They afford us peeps into the highly developed civilization of the Ptolemy age; we learn the diffuse language of the court, the technical terms of industry, farming and law; we glance into the Serapis-cloister, and into domestic matters hidden from history. We hear the people and officials talk without reserve, because without any thought of making literature. Petitions and decisions, letters, accounts and receipts—these are the chief contents; the historian of the State will

lay them aside disappointed, and only to the inquirer into literature are the fragments of importance. But despite the apparently trivial contents, the papyri are of the greatest importance for understanding the LXX language, because they are direct sources, because the same circumstances are mentioned in the Bible and are translated into Egyptian Greek. 'One observation seems to me to be beyond question: the fondness of the translators for the technical expressions of their day. They too knew how to wrest from the Egyptians their treasures. Technical, often also non-technical, ideas of the Hebrew text they have reproduced by technical ideas of the age of the Ptolemies. By this means they have here and there Egyptianized, and from their standpoint also modernized, the Bible. Many peculiarities from which one might infer a difference of text are explained, as it seems to me, by the effort to make themselves intelligible to the Egyptians. From the standpoint of the modern translator this effort is of course unwarranted; ancient scholars, who had not the "historical" idea, followed quite simple methods, and if one cannot forgive them for obliterating the many local peculiarities of the Bible, on the other hand we may admire the skill with which they sought to discharge their wrongly conceived task.'

We cannot follow the author's discussions farther. He speaks strongly of the 'heaven-crying' need of a LXX lexicon, which ought not to wait till the text is put into better order; a lexicon is one of the conditions of such a text. He has also much suggestive remark on the change of meaning which words undergo in course of time, which therefore many of the terms of the LXX must have undergone before New Testament days. We must not at once identify New Testament words with Septuagint ones. The former are at most only finger-posts to the meaning of the latter. 'Even in express citations we have always to reckon with the fact that new contents are being pressed into old forms. In the Pauline idea of *faith* may be seen what I mean. Whether Paul discovered it or not, may be left undecided. At all events he thought he found it in the Bible and, outwardly regarded, he was right. But as matter of fact his idea of faith is different; no one will identify the *πίστις* of the LXX with the *πίστις* of Paul,' and so with other ideas. Paul has been called the 'great word-coiner.' We only

give specimens of Deissmann's method of illustration. The more elaborate instances are passed by.

Ἀγάπη.—Grimm says, 'Vox solum biblica et ecclesiastica,' and Cremer, 'Entirely foreign to profane Greek.' It is found, however, in Egyptian Greek. A letter of a Dionysius to Ptolemy (between 164 and 158 B.C.) is quoted in proof. 'Even granting that the LXX passages in which *ἀγάπη* occurs are all older than our papyrus, it is impossible to suppose that the word was formed by the LXX and passed thence into Egyptian Greek. The matter lies the other way: the LXX took over a word of the Egyptian vernacular, of which by chance we have only one example, thence it became current in the religious language of Jews and Christians, and its history shows how a vulgar, unclassical word might become a central idea of the universal religion, surpassing the tongues of men and angels.'

Ἀναστρέφομαι in the ethical sense (2 Co 1¹², etc.) is found in a Pergamos inscription (middle of 2nd cent. B.C.), where a royal official is said to be *ἐν πᾶσιν καιροῖς ἀμέμπτως ἀναστρεφόμενος*.

Ἀντίληψις in the LXX and the Apocrypha often for 'help.' It occurs often in petitions to the Ptolemies. The meaning of the word in 1 Co 12²⁸ the LXX found, as it seems, in the official language of the court in the Ptolemy days.

Ἀρετή (1 P 2⁹, 2 P 1³).—Cremer has shown that in Hab 3³ and Zec 6¹³ the LXX made use of an existing usage in rendering Hebrew words of 'glory' and 'praise' by this term. Inscriptions are quoted which make it probable that the word has also the meaning 'miracle, display of power.'

Γραμματεὺς.—'In the Old Testament an *official* is described as *writer*. The LXX translate literally *γραμματεὺς*, even in passages where "writer" seems to be used of affairs in the military sense.' We might think that in this they were slavishly following their text, for the use of the word in a military sense is foreign to Greek idiom. But they translated quite correctly from their standpoint: in Egyptian Greek *γραμματεὺς* is used as a designation of an officer.' Instances are given.

Γράφω.—Cremer rightly calls attention to the idea of authority acquired by the word and its related forms. If we ask whence this idea came, we must refer to the *juristic* conception of writing. 'Book religion, even historically considered, is legal religion.' Especially instructive is the fact that

the LXX usually render *Torah* by νόμος, 'although the two ideas are not synonymous, thus converting *teaching* into *law*.' Whatever share Rabbinism may have had in this, Greek had a similar usage. Papyrus records exhibit the meaning in Egyptian Greek; examples are given of the use of καθότι γέγραπται. It is noteworthy that the advocate Tertullian often calls the books of the New Testament *instrumenta*, i.e. *legal records*.

Ἐντυγχάνω, ἔντευξις.—Only in 1 Ti 2¹ 4⁵ in the New Testament, both times in the sense of *supplication*. This is generally explained by references to profane literature since Diodorus and Josephus. The LXX have not the word in this sense. The papyri show that it was in current use in the age of the Ptolemies.

Ἰδιος.—The LXX not seldom translate the possessive pronoun by ἴδιος, when the context does not require such an emphasis (Gn 47¹⁸, Dt 15², etc.). Still more strange are passages like Job 24¹², in which the word is added. But the emphasis is only apparent. We have here the earliest cases of the late Greek use of the word for ἑαυτοῦ and ἑαυτῶν. The Apocrypha of the Old Testament also confirm this use, and the New Testament writers, especially Paul, are greatly influenced by it. 'Exegesis has in many passages laid a stress on the word which the text does not possess.'

A long note, covering twelve pages, discusses the words ἱλαστήριος and ἱλαστήριον, the drift of which may be seen in the author's summary. 'In the Hebrew Bible *kappōreth* denotes *covering* (the Ark-covering); the Greek translators paraphrased this idea in a theological sense, as they did others, by calling it in harmony with its design ἱλαστήριον ἐπίθεμα, *propitiatory covering*, and then ἱλαστήριον, *propitiatory object*; the readers of the Greek Bible understood this term in its proper sense (also assumed by the LXX) as *propitiatory object*, since it was otherwise known to them in this sense; the German translator specialized this into *propitiatory instrument*, giving it a further shade of theological meaning in *throne of grace*; readers of the German Bible take the word, of course, in its proper sense, and in no other.'

Λειτουργίω.—Cremer notes that this word does not belong to profane Greek. The papyri, however, show that the word in its different forms was common in Egypt in reference to religious rites.

ὄνομα.—The characteristic biblical use of εἰς τὸ ὄνομά τινος is illustrated by the frequent occurrence in the papyri of ἔντευξις εἰς τὸ τοῦ βασιλέως ὄνομα (3rd cent. B.C.), the latter phrase meaning a direct petition, a petition to the King's Majesty. The form occurs also in inscriptions in Asia Minor. 'This case is instructive in relation to the religious ideas of the early Christians. It shows how much we need to be on our guard against asserting off-hand a dependence on the Greek Old Testament, or even a Semitism, when a Christian of Asia Minor uses native phrases which also occur in his Bible.'

Πρεσβύτερος.—The LXX translate *zāḱēn* both by *πρεσβύτερης* and *πρεσβύτερος*. The former was the most natural, the use of the comparative must therefore have had a special reason. It usually stands where the translators seem to have regarded the word as an official title. They found the word already in use in Egypt as a technical term for an official. An inscription of the Ptolemy days speaks of ὁ πρεσβύτερος τῆς κόμης. Other similar instances are given from the centuries immediately before Christ. The Alexandrian translators have thus used a technical expression of their own days. The same usage is found in Asia Minor, as is shown from inscriptions, and may have been current there as in Egypt.

Φίλος was the title of the highest court officials at the court of the Ptolemies, as is proved by the papyri and inscriptions. The same is true of the old Persians and the Greek kingdom of Syria. 'Hence from their standpoint the LXX quite correctly represent *prince* (Est 1³, etc.) by φίλος, and the same usage is common in the Books of the Maccabees. It is probable that the Alexandrian author of the Book of Wisdom followed this usage in calling the pious φίλους Θεοῦ (Wis 7²⁷). Philo says, πᾶς σοφὸς Θεοῦ φίλος, and in citing Gn 18⁷ he substitutes φίλον μου for 'my servant.' Thus φίλος Θεοῦ denotes high dignity before God, nothing less or more (Ja 2²³). In Jn 15¹⁵ the word is used, of course, in the ordinary sense.

A long and careful note treats of the use of *νίος* and *τέκνον* with genitive to denote, as in Hebrew, a relation of close connexion or dependence. This is generally dismissed at once as a Hebraism or a result of Hebrew or Semitic influence on the writer's mind. The author disputes the fact of such influence to the extent usually supposed. First of all he sets aside cases in which the phrase

is a simple translation of Hebrew texts,—by far the largest class. Then he sets aside citations and plain analogous formations. The original Greek texts, containing the phrase, are then such as Eph 2²⁻³ 5⁶, 1 P 1¹⁴, Gal 4²⁸, Ro 9⁸, 2 P 2¹⁴. Deissmann argues that as the translators of the Septuagint do not always slavishly limit themselves to a literal reproduction of the Hebrew *ben*, there is no need to suppose the New Testament writers to be following a Hebrew bias in the use of such phrases. There is nothing un-Greek, he says, in the phrase. Plato uses the term *ἐκγονος* in a similar sense. The stately speech of inscriptions and coins uses similar forms. 'Although therefore the *viōs* in such passages may be due primarily to the text, it is not un-Greek.'

'O *viōs* τοῦ Θεοῦ.—This New Testament designation goes back, of course, to the Old Testament; there its root is to be found. But when we ask how the Gentile Christians of Asia Minor, Rome, and Alexandria understood it, we are met by the fact that *viōs* Θεοῦ occurs in inscriptions of the

Roman emperors — Augustus and his successors. The Old Testament sense must have been more prominent in Christian teaching than our author seems to intimate. He also overlooks the horror which the worship of the Cæsars excited among the early Christians. He says: 'If it is certain that from the beginning of the 1st cent. Θεοῦ *viōs* was very common in the Græco-Roman world, this fact ought not any longer to be ignored by us: it is indirectly of great importance for the history of the early Christian designation of Christ. It does not, indeed, explain its origin and original meaning, but it makes a contribution to the question, how it might be understood in the empire.' 'In Corinth the gospel was understood differently from what it was in Jerusalem, and in Egypt differently from Ephesus. The history of our religion shows in its further course different modifications of Christianity; in succession and side by side we see a Jewish and an international, a Roman, a Greek, a German, and a modern Christianity.'

J. S. BANKS.

The Temptation of Christ.

BY PROFESSOR THE REV. J. H. BERNARD, D.D., TRINITY COLLEGE, DUBLIN.

THERE are few passages in the life of our Lord which present more difficulty than the incidents recorded in the Gospels as immediately following His baptism. For thirty years he had lived, so far as we may learn, a quiet, simple life in the humble household at Nazareth, a life of preparation for ministry, the greatness of His condescension in dwelling among men being known only to Himself. But at last the preaching of St. John the Forerunner having made the way plain for the fuller revelation that was in store, He was baptized in the waters of the Jordan, and the Voice from heaven announced to those who had ears to hear that this was in truth the Holy One of God, the Son of His good pleasure. And then it was that the Christ was led up into the wilderness of temptation. We cannot, indeed, suppose that on no other occasion did He feel the assaults of the Spirit of evil; but at this critical moment in His life on earth, the Prince of Darkness seems to have put forth all his powers. It would be presumptuous to suppose that a full

explanation is possible of the precise forms in which the threefold temptation presented itself to the sinless nature of Jesus. No man witnessed that struggle save He who endured it for our sakes. Little is told us of the circumstances, although, as the narratives of the Gospels must be derived at length from Christ's own words to His disciples, we may rest assured that all that is necessary for us to know is recorded. But the meaning of what we are told is not easy to unravel; and the relation of the three trials to each other is explained in widely different ways by those who have studied the Gospels most closely. The careful and learned exposition of Archbishop Trench in his *Studies in the Gospels*, and the notes of Mr. Sadler in his edition of the New Testament, seem on the whole to provide the most satisfactory English commentary on this awful and mysterious transaction; but even they have left gleanings for those who (although *longo intervallo*) come after them. And in particular the explanations of the second temptation (follow-