

pray. Belief in Him must be due to the submission of the will. Following must be an act of love. It may be a paradox, but it is true, that if none could love Him until they believed in Him, neither could any believe in Him until they loved Him.

It was by no new manner of working that He kept Himself to His own after He rose from the dead. And it was no surprise to them. For He had told them that it would be so. 'Yet a little while, and the world seeth Me no more; but ye see Me.' They could not understand it then. 'How is it,' asked Judas, 'that Thou wilt manifest Thyself unto us, and not unto the world?' Jesus' answer went to the root of the matter. 'If a man love Me, he will keep My word: and My Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him.'

It would have been easy to show Himself to the world after the resurrection. But would the world have seen Him? Before the resurrection the world saw Him, but what did they see? What He was they did not see, and they would not have seen it after the resurrection. The time is past for even the disciples to see Him merely. Now they must look into Him, now they must know Him. And so, even to them, He is not visible as before. He comes and goes. He is seen, He is unseen. When He is seen, they see

more than they did before; and when He is unseen, they begin to see Him best of all.

'Lord, how is it that Thou wilt manifest Thyself unto us, and not unto the world?' We are asking Judas' question still. Do we not burn to show Him to the world, and He will not let us? He holds Himself back. The world cries, Let us see Him if He is risen. We know that He is risen. We know that the historical proofs of the resurrection are just as good as ever they can be, just as good as history can make them. And we wonder that the world does not see it and believe. The world does see it. The intellect of the world is on the side of the resurrection. But until it pleases God to reveal His Son in the individual's heart, the proof of the resurrection is powerless.

'My knowledge of Christianity,' says Canon Armitage Robinson (we have followed his sermon somewhat fitfully, but we shall close with his very words), 'my knowledge of Christianity will depend on my religious education, on my intellectual powers, on my keeping my mind unbiassed and ready to accept evidence, on my diligence in studying the great problems of religion and life. My knowledge of Christ will depend on something wholly different from these, on the attitude of my will towards Him, on my reverence, my obedience, my love.' 'If a man love Me, . . . we will come.'

Recent Research in the Language of the New Testament.

BY THE REV. H. A. A. KENNEDY, M.A., D.Sc., CALLANDER.

I.

WITHIN the last two or three decades, the scientific study of the Greek language has passed through a complete revolution. This has resulted not only from the more accurate investigation of details by specialists, but, above all, from the rigid application of the historical method which has been

made possible by the increasing store of materials. Modern Greek has been carefully and systematically studied. The conditions of Hellenism have come into clearer view. The later developments of the language, in their varieties, have been examined from the historical standpoint in their

organic connexion with the earlier and purer phenomena of the great classical literature. That epoch to which the Greek writings of the Bible belong has received its share of the new light. More especially within the past fifteen years or so, many important books and pamphlets have appeared which are genuine contributions towards the formation of a truer estimate of the language at the various stages of its history. We propose, in one or two papers, to call attention to the more valuable works bearing closely on the language of the N.T. which have recently been published, pointing out the special significance of each, as it appears to us, and thus giving a rapid survey of the main sources of material with which the student of N.T. Greek has now to deal.

In 1889 the late Dr. Hatch, complaining of the lack of attention paid to the language of the N.T., went so far as to say: 'There is no good lexicon. There is no philological commentary. There is no adequate grammar' (*Essays*, p. 1). These were exaggerated statements, due, perhaps, to the high standard which the ardent scholar who made them had set before him. For the grammars of Winer and Buttmann were then available, and the lexicons of Cremer and Grimm-Thayer, to name only the best known works. And in all the scholarly commentaries of recent times there was, at least, valuable philological material to be found dispersed here and there. At the same time it could not be denied that the works just named, although still in many important respects valuable, no longer represented the positions reached by scientific research. Winer's grammar, which had held the field for years, had marked an epoch in N.T. study. It was a needful protest against that arbitrary treatment of the N.T. diction which made it impossible to find a sure basis for exegesis. But in his desire to vindicate the regularity of N.T. usage, Winer was carried too far towards the opposite extreme. Again and again he seeks to minimize the difference between the syntax of classical Greek and that of the N.T. Hence his book is overweighted by an enormous mass of classical parallels, many of which are superfluous, and many irrelevant. On the other hand, he still clings more or less to the idea of a special N.T. diction with laws and principles of its own, although many of the results at which he has arrived are a direct protest against such a belief. The very careful notes which Dr. Moulton added to his

translation of Winer, embodying much material from the best commentators and grammarians, and drawing attention to the phenomena of Modern Greek, greatly enriched the English edition. But no one felt more keenly than he the need of a revision of the entire subject-matter. This work could not have fallen into more competent hands than those of Professor P. W. Schmiedel, who brought out the first part of his revised edition of Winer in 1894. This embraced the general introduction and *Formenlehre*. Two portions of part ii. (Syntax) appeared in 1897 and 1898, including article, pronouns, and a section of the treatment of nouns. Many qualifications were necessary for such a task—a wide knowledge of the relevant literature, a thorough grasp of the biblical writings and the theological conceptions contained in them, exegetical tact and insight, scientific accuracy in matters of fact, the power of terse condensation,—and all these were combined, to a unique extent, in Dr. Schmiedel. One almost regrets that he did not write an independent book. Whole sections, as it is, are entirely new. Those which he has retained from Winer are largely rewritten. An enormous mass of learning has been packed into elaborate footnotes. Nothing more clearly marks the advance which has been made than Schmiedel's treatment of *Forms*. In dealing with orthography, aspiration, nominal and verbal inflexion, etc., exhaustive use has been made of the inscriptions, the critical texts, the various readings of the MSS, and of numerous philological and grammatical dissertations ranging over a wide field of Greek literature. The LXX is fully dealt with. Almost every noteworthy publication bearing on the later period of the language finds some place in the investigation. This thoroughgoing treatment of the *formal* side of the N.T. language was a pressing necessity, as that affords the best clue for reaching a true estimate of its character. Up till now, the discussion of this section of the subject had been of a very desultory character. Many of the more abnormal forms continued to be classified in the antiquated fashion of Sturz in his work *De Dialecto Macedonica et Alexandrina* (1808), and this in spite of the publication of such notable books as Brugmann's *Griechische Grammatik* (ed. 2, 1889), the grammar of G. Meyer (*Bibliothek indogermanischer Grammatiken*, Bd. iii.), and the revision of the *Formenlehre* in Kühner's *Ausführliche Grammatik* by F. Blass (2 vols., 1890-92). The materials

afforded by the Greek N.T. had to be examined in the light of the facts and principles presented by these special researches. It may be said that Schmiedel has brought this department of N.T. grammar up to date. The results are most important. From phenomena such as *-av* for *-ασι(ν)* in third plur. perf., second aorists with first aorist endings like *ἤνεγκα*, *εἶδατε*, forms of the type of *εἴχουσαν* or *ἐδολιοῦσαν*, etc. etc., we can gain an idea of the particular stratum to which the diction belongs. And a combined view of the facts clearly points, of course, to the non-literary speech of the day, which it would be hazardous to label with the exclusive name of 'Alexandrian,' although the LXX, a product of that region, is one of the richest storehouses of this particular type of language. What has appeared of Schmiedel's syntax shows the same combination of exhaustive treatment with condensed statement. The discussion of the article, one of the most delicate problems in N.T. exegesis, gives ample room for the subtle exegetical refinements of which Schmiedel is a master. One may trace, at times, excessive acuteness, but this section, as a whole, reveals great judgment and affords the needed help. It is to be fervently desired that the remainder of the work may soon see the light.

It was with something of surprise that N.T. students received the announcement of a N.T. grammar by Professor Blass of Halle. Justly famous as one of the very foremost of living classical scholars and the author of *Die Attische Beredsamkeit*, he was known in the province of theology only through his learned commentary on the *Acts of the Apostles*, and this chiefly on account of his keenly argued theory of two recensions in that book. Naturally, the work raised great expectations, and these have been largely justified. The *Grammar* is planned on a smaller scale than Schmiedel's *Winer*. It is definitely intended to be a convenient handbook for students. And already it has reached a wide circulation, a second edition having been soon called for (Eng. tr. by Thackeray, 1898). The author's masterly grasp of the Greek language and literature as a whole has necessarily contributed much that is suggestive and illuminating. Of special value is the fact that he constantly comments on the various readings of the most important MSS. This aspect of N.T. grammar had been, to a great extent, overlooked. Blass is often inclined to deal very cursorily with

those minutiae of exegesis which have frequently commended themselves to commentators and have been carried to a pitch far beyond that which the language permits. At the same time, the main importance of N.T. grammar is that it builds the foundation for exegesis, and one misses in Blass that sympathetic treatment of exegetical problems, so marked in Winer, to which all philological investigation of the N.T. must necessarily lead up. Occasionally Blass gives wider room to conjectural emendation than we are accustomed to find in N.T. criticism. This is natural for a scholar who has done such important work in the textual criticism of the classics. And it is hard to say how far it may not be permissible. Various passages seem to cry out for the emendator. Yet it is too convenient a device for cutting knots to be used without the strictest self-control. We might have expected a considerably richer store of illustrations and parallels from those post-classical authors among whom Professor Blass moves with the authority of an expert. But all careful students must be grateful for the instructive use which has been made of the Apostolic Fathers, whose language, as we shall see, is only now beginning to receive the attention it merits as shedding light on N.T. usage. The closing paragraphs of the book, which deal with the rhetorical structure of the N.T., deserve careful notice. For there can be no question that rhetorical considerations must directly affect exegesis. Surprisingly little has been done in this field. The most serious attempt known to us to apply the norm of rhetorical structure to the elucidation of the thought is the *Beiträge zur Paulinischen Rhetorik* of Professor J. Weiss.¹ That useful dissertation is a proof of how much remains to be accomplished on similar lines.

In continuing our survey of recent grammatical works on the N.T., it is scarcely needful to do more than mention Burton's important *New Testament Moods and Tenses*. Most readers of this article will have gained a working acquaintance with it for themselves. It was a happy thought which prompted its appearance. The accurate interpretation of the moods and tenses must necessarily be a primary matter for scientific exegesis, probably altogether the most important. Professor Burton had a splendid example of what could be

¹The important work of Norden, *Die Antike Kunstprosa* (Leipzig, 1898), is also of real value on the question of rhetorical structure.

done in Goodwin's great treatise on the *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb* (rewritten and enlarged, 1889). He has studied his materials independently, while making a suggestive use of the work of others. Obviously in a discussion of this kind the subjective element must have a large place. In estimating the finer shades of meaning in a mood or a tense, different minds will tend to lay different degrees of emphasis on the peculiar force of the construction in its special surroundings. The thought as a whole, the manner of conceiving that thought, will certainly modify for the thinker the *nuance* which the structure of the clause or the particular verbal form might legitimately suggest. There is thus great room for sober practical judgment in coming to a decision. And that is a quality which Professor Burton possesses. He shows himself thoroughly alive to the risk of over-refining which many scholars, rigidly trained in the great classical masterpieces, have imported into N.T. interpretation, ignoring the tendency of the later language to neglect the subtle distinctions of an earlier and linguistically purer period. One danger it is difficult to escape. General principles have to be laid down, and usages grouped under heads of classification. The grammarian is apt to exalt into a principle a usage which, when its examples are carefully sifted, must be regarded merely as an occasional modification of some wider law. Or, on the other hand, there is the tendency, in the grouping of instances, to class together some which, while superficially alike, reveal differences when they are probed. But although this risk has not been entirely avoided, Professor Burton has given N.T. students an excellent working book.—Less widely known are the Abbé Viteau's instructive *Études sur le Grec du N.T.* (2 vols., Paris, 1893, 1896). The first is entitled *Le Verbe: Syntaxe des Propositions*. The second treats of *Sujet, Complément, et Attribut*. It is unfortunate that the study dealing with the elements of propositions should have appeared after that which is occupied with their syntax. The one would have most fittingly led up to the other. The result is a certain amount of overlapping. But the studies are very valuable. The author, who is evidently an accomplished classical scholar, takes a broad view of his subject. His grammatical principles are based on the study of the best of the earlier grammars. One misses several of the more important later works of German scholars.

Every possible aspect of the structure of clauses in the N.T. is examined, their mutual relations as well as their component parts. Especially valuable are the numerous parallels drawn from the language of the LXX. This makes the discussion fruitful beyond its own limits. Probably nothing can provide such important materials for rightly appreciating the precise relationship between the language of the N.T. and that of the LXX as a comparison of their grammatical structure. In that more than in vocabulary, etc., will their characteristics be disclosed. From this point of view, Viteau's work is an indispensable *Vorarbeit* for a scientific grammar of the LXX. Perhaps that which we have most to complain of in these volumes is a startling complexity of divisions and subdivisions. As a result, the discussion appears far less interesting than it is. And the author writes with a diffuseness which we do not expect to find in a French scholar, although he usually sums up his results at the close of each section. Possibly this apparent diffuseness may have had accuracy of statement for its aim. The method adopted is the patient one of tracing the structure of the clause from its psychological basis and then examining its exemplifications, with a copious supply of illustrative parallels.

There is still great room for the careful discussion of special points in N.T. syntax, in the light of contemporary philological research. The important investigations carried on under the direction of Professor Schanz in his *Beiträge zur Griechischen Syntax*, in the various portions of which are collected most accurate statistics of numerous constructions and other grammatical phenomena, afford abundance of matter which has still, in great measure, to be searched and applied, so far as it bears on the Greek of the N.T.—One most important source of help for syntactical discussions must be emphatically noted, namely, the invaluable articles and reviews by Professor B. L. Gildersleeve of the John Hopkins University, Baltimore, which appears in the *American Journal of Philology* and the *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, to say nothing of his excellent little edition of Justin Martyr's *Apology*. The acuteness and originality of Professor Gildersleeve's observations are remarkable. A review by him is often of more permanent value than many elaborate treatises.—As examples of the kind of investigation which lies within the reach of painstaking students we may mention that of C. W. Votaw on

The Use of the Infinitive in Biblical Greek (Chicago, 1896), and Professor Deissmann's important monograph, *Die Neutestamentliche Formel 'in Christo Jesu'* (Marburg, 1892). The former supplies full and accurate lists of the various infinitival constructions, the only kind of foundation on which a solid grammatical structure can be reared. The latter is an instructive instance of that grammatico-theological research which yields such luminous results for the interpretation of the N.T. While Deissmann's main aim is to penetrate to the heart of the apostle's central expression ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, he examines the N.T. use of ἐν in the light of the classical language, and, above all, in relation to the usage of the LXX. His method is a model of scholarly thoroughness and lucidity. To trace the history of a construction or part of speech in

this exhaustive fashion is to have all the materials at one's disposal for forming a conclusion as to its later usage, say, in the N.T. It is along similar lines that adequate results in this department can alone be reached. Of course all such investigations must rise above mere mechanical accuracy. There prevails a tendency to draw up elaborate lists and tables of facts which may mean little more than an expenditure of manual labour. To discern what is of real significance in such dreary tabulations, to combine the relevant facts with insight, that is the faculty needful if genuine knowledge is to grow. Sometimes Deissmann is apt to be carried away by a grammatical literalism which he has to justify by exercising ingenuity. But that is seldom. His work is usually of the most solid construction.

Gethsemane.

BY THE REV. GEORGE MILLIGAN, M.A., B.D., CAPUTH.

WE have three accounts in the Synoptic Gospels of what we are accustomed to describe as our Lord's Agony in the garden of Gethsemane (Mt 26³⁶⁻⁴⁶, Mk 14³²⁻⁴², Lk 22⁴⁰⁻⁴⁶). Nor need it cause us concern, though much has been made of the fact that we find no parallel account in the Gospel according to St. John. That Gospel is professedly a selection of certain events from our Lord's life, and if the scene in the garden did not fall in directly with the writer's aim there is nothing surprising in its omission. It is enough for us that St. John is clearly aware of its occurrence, and in one precious word has preserved the Saviour's own summing up of the final issue of His conflict (Jn 18¹¹, cf. vv. 1-2).

Of the Synoptic accounts, St. Matthew's is, on the whole, the fullest, and adds certain interesting and significant particulars to what is apparently the original and traditional account in St. Mark. In their main features, however, the two accounts closely correspond. St. Luke's narrative stands on a somewhat different footing. It may be taken as agreed that chap. 22⁴³⁻⁴⁴ form no part of the original text, though Westcott and Hort, who place them within double brackets, claim them as embodying a true evangelic tradition.¹ And

when they are left out, St. Luke's account is not only the shortest of the three, but undoubtedly gives a more 'subdued' report of the dread intensity of feeling under which the other two evangelists represent our Lord as labouring.² There is nothing, however, in his report to lead us to question its authenticity. And as we may safely set aside all attempts to resolve the Synoptic narrative into a mere mythical construction (as Strauss), or to analyse its constituent details into a reminiscence of certain events of Old Testament history (as Schleiermacher), we begin by assuming that the occurrence was real, and that the Synoptists have preserved for us an historically true account of it.

What happened was briefly as follows. After the farewell discourses, Jesus and the eleven apostles left the upper room, and, crossing the brook Kidron, came to a retired enclosure or garden known as Gethsemane, apparently because it contained an oil-press. Leaving the eight at the entrance, the Saviour took with Him, as on two other notable occasions, Peter and James and John, and no sooner did He find Himself alone with them than He 'began' to show signs of deep mental distress. How strong was the impression

¹ *The New Testament in Greek*, vol. ii. App. p. 64 ff.

² See especially Bruce, *With Open Face*, p. 296 ff.