

Requests and Replies.

Can one of your learned readers tell us about those very large type sentences in both O.T. and N.T.? e.g. Jer. xxiii. 6, THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS; John xix. 19, etc. How many are there so printed in the A.V.? What is their history?

In the R.V. the Oxford printers seem to have put the O.T. ones back into ordinary type, and left the N.T. ones in small capitals.—J. F. H.

THE notation appears in the following places, according to Scrivener's critical edition of the Authorized Version:—Ex 3¹⁴ 28³⁶ (= 39³⁰ and Zec 14²⁰), Dt 28⁵⁸, Dn 5²⁶⁻²⁸, Mt 27³⁷ (and parallels), Ac 17²³, Rev 17⁵ 19¹⁶. In the use of capitals the Authorized Translators followed their predecessors of the Geneva and the Rheims N.T. Naturally, in a matter depending entirely on individual taste, there was variety in the details; even editions of the A.V. do not always agree. In the above case the Revisers use capitals, but they do not make any difference between these and the small capitals used to represent the Hebrew *Jehovah* (*Yahweh*) when translated *Lord* or *God*. The reason for the notation is generally obvious. It is employed when a phrase is used as a name, or when a phrase or a word appears as a kind of placard or title. In Jer 23⁶ the R.V. drops the capitals, having altered the phrase title to a sentence ('*The LORD is our Righteousness*'). In Zec 3⁸ and 6¹² the A.V. uses large capitals for the title '*the Branch*'; the R.V. drops them, doubtless because many other titles in a single word would make the same claim. An exception is fairly made in the first announcement of the name *Jesus* (Mt 1^{21,25}, Lk 1³¹), where the A.V. with large capitals and the R.V. with small bring out the emphasis of this significant name. There remain the cases where the names *Jah* and *Jehovah* are retained in translation. In Is 12² and 26⁴ they appear together, and the A.V. prints 'the LORD JEHOVAH,' the R.V. being content with small capitals for both. I should imagine that the use of these large capitals in the A.V. was prompted by a wish to distinguish between the ordinary and the special use, a distinction not really worth making. The A.V. has large capitals for the name *Jehovah* wherever it occurs; the R.V. has ordinary Roman in Is 49¹⁴, a place in which the A.V. had the

normal equivalent ('*the LORD*'). So with the form *Jah*, which the R.V. brings in for Ps 89⁸ (A.V. only in Ps 68⁴).

No particular principle is involved in the use of this device of printing. It might easily be extended: e.g. in Rev 19¹³ the title '*the Word of God*' has much the same claim as that in v. 16 ('*King of kings*'); and the last words of Ezekiel, '*The LORD is there*,' and St. Paul's '*Maran atha*,' in 1 Co 16²², might very well have been thus printed. A wider use of such typographical resources would, in my opinion, considerably improve our Bibles.

JAMES HOPE MOULTON.

Cambridge.

I was busy making notes from the article in *The Expository Times* for August 1898 on the Greek of LXX, when I suddenly came on the statement that λειτουργέω (acc. to Cremer) does not belong to profane Greek. My lexicon is far away at Cambridge, but surely there is the famous phrase in Demosthenes, ὅσας λειτουργίας λειτούργηκε, which Macaulay's Indian rendered, 'How many times he had performed divine service' Would you kindly explain a little. And would you also inform me if Deissmann is intelligible to a person who has very little German, and if he has ransacked all the papyri recently published? Has he, for example, any instances of ξυναρμολογουμένη?—J. H. A. H.

DEISSMANN quotes Cremer (7th ed.) to this effect: 'The LXX took over the word (λειτουργέω) for the ministry of the priests and Levites in the temple, for which the usage in profane Greek gave no direct occasion, since only one word of this family, λειτουργός, is used of priests only at a late date and very seldom.' Deissmann then proceeds to contest this from papyri of the second century B.C., both as to the verb and the noun. Of course Cremer's statement refers only to use in religious services, not in State service.

Deissmann seems to have ransacked the published collections of papyri pretty thoroughly.

He writes in an animated and picturesque, and not very difficult, style.

J. S. BANKS.

Headingley College, Leeds.

Is there any recent literature on the religious beliefs of the Ancient Egyptians which you can recommend to a beginner in the study of Comparative Religions?—A. D. E.

In the new edition of his *Land of the Monuments*, Mr. Pollard names the following works on that subject:—(1) *The Ancient Egyptian Doctrine of the Immortality of the Soul*, by Dr. A. Wiedemann. 1896. Twenty-one illustrations. 3s. (2) *The Religion of the Ancient Egyptians*, by the same author. Seventy-three illustrations. 12s. 6d. (3) *Religion and Conscience in Ancient Egypt*, by Professor Petrie. 1898. 2s. 6d.

EDITOR.

I should be obliged if one of your contributors would inform me, through the medium of *The Expository Times*, where the question of the language spoken by our Lord is discussed? Expositors usually assume that our Lord habitually spoke in Greek; I should like to know how far this assumption is warranted.—M. M. T.

In answering this question I suppose I may be pardoned in referring to my own book, entitled *Greek the Language of Christ and His Apostles* (Longmans & Co.). In this work the question will be found discussed in all its bearings, and proofs of a manifold kind brought forward to show that Greek was the language habitually used by Christ in all His public addresses to the people.

The correspondent adds that 'Expositors usually assume that our Lord habitually spoke in Greek.' This is undoubtedly true, if you attend only to their expositions of Christ's words, but these same writers will nevertheless be found maintaining, often with overbearing confidence, that the customary language of Christ was not Greek, but something which they are pleased to call Syro-

Chaldaic, the very existence of which may be disputed! I need hardly say further that this question as to the language commonly used by Christ is, as I have shown in the work above referred to, in many of its applications, of the highest practical importance.

ALEX. ROBERTS.

St. Andrews.

Can you recommend me the best critical commentary on Isaiah ii? I enclose card.—Scholastica.

It is a little difficult to answer 'Scholastica's' question directly, as the answer must depend in part upon her own needs and capacities, on neither of which I have any information. In the abstract, I consider Dillmann's *Commentary* (in the *Kurzgefasstes Exegetisches Handbuch*) to be the best critical commentary on Isaiah ii. There are, however, many critical questions connected with these prophecies which are discussed a good deal more fully in Cheyne's *Introduction to the Book of Isaiah* (1895). In case 'Scholastica' is not acquainted with German, I should recommend Cheyne's *Prophecies of Isaiah* (3rd ed., 1884), his recently published translation (with notes) in *The Polychrome Bible*, and the *Introduction* just mentioned, to be supplemented, where necessary, on exegetical points, by the last edition of Delitzsch's *Commentary* (translated). A very useful and well-written commentary, presupposing and summarizing the principal critical conditions, but not discussing critical problems so fully as the first-mentioned works of Dillmann and Cheyne, and without the same constant reference to the Hebrew, is the one by Skinner, which has appeared this year in the *Cambridge Bible for Schools*.

S. R. DRIVER

Oxford.

The Expository Times Guild of Bible Study.

For the session which begins with November 1898 and ends with June 1899, we propose to study the First Book of Psalms (*i.e.* Psalms i.-xli.) and the First Epistle of St. Peter.

The cheapest good commentaries on both

subjects will be found in the Cambridge Bible for schools and colleges. The volume on the Psalms is by Professor Kirkpatrick, that on St. Peter by the late Dean Plumptre.