

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



**PATREON**

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

**PayPal**

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_expositor-series-1.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php)

wished that they had had a gentler, and a lighter, and a more delicate and sensitive hand. For surely in these woods too—in these woods much more—“there is a spirit,” which a rude transplanting is only too apt to expel.

W. SANDAY.

---

*THE SENSE IN WHICH ST. PAUL CALLS  
HIMSELF AN ECTROMA.*

1 CORINTHIANS XV. 8.

“And last of all, as if it were unto the *ectroma*, he appeared also unto me.”

I.

It is obvious that the word *ectroma* is here applied in a highly figurative sense. But in order to determine the notion which it is intended metaphorically to convey, it will be necessary, in the first instance, to ascertain as precisely as we can the sense which the writer attributed to the term taken literally. In this latter enquiry the obvious course to pursue is, first of all, to refer to its use in that Hellenistical translation of the Old Testament which both the Apostle himself and the Christians whom he was addressing were constantly in the habit of perusing. In the Septuagint, then, the word *ectroma* occurs three times. The passages as given in that translation are as follows:—

(1) Numbers xii. 12, “Lest she become,” (or, according to another reading, “Let her not become,”) “as if a thing like unto death, as if an *ectroma* coming forth out of its mother’s womb.”

(2) Job iii. 16, “or an *ectroma* coming out of its mother’s womb, or as babes which saw not the light.”

(3) Ecclesiastes vi. 3, "I said, Good above him is the *ectroma*."

In both the second and the third of these passages the context makes it certain, that the particular object, which, in the Hebrew designated as *nephel*, is described by the LXX. as *ectroma*, is a still-born fetus. In the first passage it appears as subsisting in a lower stage of development than the *νήπιοι* who plainly are still-born. In the third passage the Preacher enlarges upon the circumstances of its condition thus: "For it came in vanity, and departeth in darkness, and its name shall be covered in darkness; moreover it shall not see the sun." In the first passage the Seventy have interpolated the words "as if an *ectroma*," not found in the Hebrew, apparently as a gloss on the preceding words "as if a thing like unto death." This confirms the conclusion that in their view an *ectroma* was a dead thing.

That deduction is corroborated by the sense of *nephel*, the Hebrew equivalent of *ectroma*, in the only other instance in which it occurs in the Hebrew Bible. This is Psalm lviii. 8, "As a snail which melteth let every one of them pass away; like the *nephel* of a woman, that they may not see the sun." In this case the LXX follows another reading of the Hebrew text, for which see p. 278. In reference to this Hebrew noun, Gesenius, in his *Thesaurus (in voc.)*, notes that it is used in the same sense in the Talmud.

Philo, St. Paul's somewhat senior coeval, employs the word *ectroma* with the same signification.

But the proof that this is the true and only meaning of *ectroma* is not found only in the usage of Hellenistic Greek: it appears also to have uniformly this signification in other Greek writers as well. It occurs repeatedly in Hippocrates, a medical writer of the fifth century before Christ; in Aristotle, in works of his on natural science; and in Galen, in the second century of the Christian era. I am apprized

by a letter which I have seen, written by a physician who is also a classical scholar, and who has investigated its use in Hippocrates and Aristotle, that "the result of his researches is that *ectroma* always means a lifeless abortion."

One more point of evidence may be mentioned, one which may be justly considered as of decisive cogency: this is the sense in which Greek commentators, and Greek grammarians, illustrating the use of noticeable phrases, have interpreted *ectroma*. They concur in giving it the meaning of an imperfectly formed still-born embryo.<sup>1</sup>

In our Authorised Version, the word *nephel*, both in the two passages (Job iii. 16, and Eccles. vi. 3) in which the Septuagint renders it *ectroma*, and in Psalm lviii. 8, the remaining instance of its occurrence in the Hebrew Bible, is represented by "untimely birth." This follows Luther's lead, who in each case gives in his German Bible "unzeitige Geburt."

This being so, it is difficult to understand on what grounds, in this passage of St. Paul, most of the English Versions, including the recent Revised form of the Authorised Version, have departed from the rendering which with all consistency Luther gives here also, and have substituted for it "one born out of due time;" the only important exceptions that I know being Wickliff's Version, which has "a dead-born child," and the Roman Catholic Version of Rheims which, following the Vulgate, gives with apparently the same sense "an abortive." We are naturally led to ask, Is any different notion intended to be conveyed by this substituted form, as compared with the "untimely birth" given in the three above-cited passages in the Old Testament? Can this new phrase be designed to suggest, or at all events to leave room for, the notion of (say) a seven-months child born alive and likely to live? If so, we are bound to

<sup>1</sup> The particulars which substantiate these statements the reader will find in an Additional Note, pp. 277-280.

take account of the fact that this last interpretation of the term is resisted by its use in every single passage adduced from any Greek writer; in no one instance, so far as I have been able to ascertain, does the word *ectroma* occur with reference to an ante-dated *living* birth.

The circumlocutory phrase "untimely birth" indicates, *i.e.*, points (so to speak) to the whereabouts of, the object recited by *ectroma*, without precisely naming it. In two respects it fails of being an exact equivalent: (1) it puts forward the notion of time, whereas the Greek word estimated by its etymological import makes no reference whatever to time; (2) it does not directly express the abortive character of the product, while *ineffectualness*, *frustration*, appears to be the predominant notion of the Greek word. "Abortion" will seem to be more nearly equivalent; for the "an abortive" of the Rheims Version is hardly English. The rendering "untimely birth," however, is recommended to our acceptance by the consideration that it naturally points the reader's attention back to those other passages in the Bible which plainly shew its meaning. Only, the reader of the English Bible will need to be warned that, in the original Greek, there is no such reference to *time* in the word *ectroma* as can be regarded as forming a connecting link between the word and the context: the supposition that there is, will prove, as I venture to think, altogether misleading.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> We have in the case before us one exemplification amongst many of that entirely unembarrassed outspokenness in respect to natural objects, which is characteristic of the virile tone of ancient literature, but which would be felt to be revolting in a writer of the present day, when all our literature (except of course such as is of a purely professional character), as well as the language of our public speakers and of our social intercourse, is so deeply pervaded and toned by sympathy for the feelings of the female sex. The difference between ancient and modern times in this respect is very remarkable; but in no portion of the literature of antiquity is it more noticeable than in our Sacred Books; for in these it strikes us the more in proportion as the moral tone characterizing these is the more elevated and pure. For other examples, we may refer in particular to such passages as Acts xi. 3; Gal. v. 12; Phil. iii. 2, 3, all in the Greek.

The whole evidence points to one conclusion, from which as I apprehend there is no escape: the meaning in which the Apostle here uses the word *ectroma* is that of the immature embryo which has come away from its parent in a miscarriage. Casting about for an image which shall adequately express the intense feeling which at this moment oppresses him of the utter insignificance of his own self-achieved moral and spiritual development, apart from the grace of God and as contrasted with the place among the Apostles nevertheless conferred upon him, he can find it only here,—in the diminutive imperfectly moulded creature which has been arrested at the very lowest initial stage of humanity and is lying there before your eyes dead.<sup>1</sup>

The same intense consciousness of his own moral nothingness while in view of his having been called to be an Apostle, which in the present instance impels St. Paul to

The remark does not apply to such passages as Rom. i. 26, 27; 1 Cor. vii. 3, where the introduction of such references was a matter of grave necessity or solemn importance.

In how great a degree the Hebrew mind was familiar with the *ectroma* as a subject of thought, is evidenced already by the passages above cited from the Old Testament Scriptures. As a further illustration of this, I cannot forbear from referring to a rabbinical passage, in other respects very remarkable, which Dr. Biesenthal (*Tröstschreiben des Apostels Paulus an die Hebräer*, p. 104) quotes from "the oldest Jewish Haggada," tracing an analogy between Isaiah and the Messiah, as severally dealing with "God's children." The Messiah is apprized by God of "a week's suffering" appointed for Him: "if Thou art grieved thereat, I will henceforth drive them away into exile. The Messiah answered, Lord of the World, with heart's-joy and delight do I take upon me all these sufferings, so that not one single soul out of Israel shall perish. But not the living only shall in my days be succoured, but also the dead! yea, even those that long ago from the time of Adam have deceased! yea, even the untimely births, and those that were only in Thy will to be created but not yet have been created! yea, that is my will! that do I undertake!"

<sup>1</sup> This is no new conception of the sense of the passage. After writing as above, I found in Theodoret's comment on it a very similar sentence even: "Desiring to stigmatise himself as the meanest of all mankind, he passes by all those who after being fully formed in the womb have then according to the laws of nature been born, and describes himself under the image of the fetus of a miscarriage [*ἀμβλωθριδίῳ ἑαυτὸν ἀπεικάζει ἐμβρύῳ*] which has not been entered upon the roll of human creatures." Compare also Dr. John Lightfoot's note on the passage in his *Exercitations*.

have recourse to the image of an *ectroma*, prompts him on another occasion, when writing to the Ephesians (iii. 8) to coin the *comparative-superlative* adjective *ἐλαχιστότερος*—an unparalleled barbarism of grammatical inflexion, the extreme ruggedness of which is in our Authorised Version as well as in its Revised form smoothed very much out of sight by the rendering “less than the least.” This *ἐλαχιστότερος* bespeaks a writer struggling (we might say) with language in the endeavour to wring from it, if he can, an adequate representation of the idea before his mind: “To me, the man *leaster* than all saints, was this grace given, to preach unto the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ.”<sup>1</sup>

The surmise was broached by Wetstein, that *The Ectroma* was a nickname fastened upon the Apostle by his enemies, in consequence of a noticeable smallness characterizing, as many have supposed, his physical make. The effect upon the eye of an observer of such marked diminutiveness, supposing it to have existed, may be conceived to have been heightened by a certain painful disfigurement, which there is good reason to believe had in some way or other been produced by the malady, whatever it was, with which unquestionably he had long been afflicted.<sup>2</sup> The hypothesis, however, that it was from such a contemptuous jeer of adversaries that St. Paul borrowed this designation

<sup>1</sup> The *τῷ ἐλαχιστοτέρῳ* in the one passage closely corresponds to the *τῷ ἐκτρώματι* in the other, not only in the near resemblance of meaning in the two phrases employed, and in their relation to the context, but also in the use of the article: in both cases it is the article of strongly emphasized distinction, as in Luke xviii. 13, ὁ Θεὸς, δάσθητί μοι τῷ ἁμαρτωλῷ; Rev. iii. 17, σὺ εἶ ὁ ταλαίπωρος καὶ ἔλεινός, κ.τ.λ. This mode of explaining the force of the article is, I think, preferable to that of some commentators, which, assuming apparently that in the company of the Apostles there would of course be one *ectroma*, supposes St. Paul to mean that *that* one was himself.

<sup>2</sup> On St. Paul's personal appearance, see Conybeare and Howson, vol. i. ch. 7, near the end; and on the subject of his malady, see Canon Farrar's Excursus on St. Paul's *Thorn in the Flesh*, in his *Life of St. Paul*, vol. i. pp. 652 seq., and Mr. Waite's *Additional Note* in the *Speaker's Commentary on the New Testament*, vol. iii. p. 475.

of himself, rests on a very precarious foundation; inasmuch as the term in question would seem to be a too enormous hyperbole to apply to any one not actually an extraordinarily small dwarf. Most certainly it is of no real help to us at present. For even if this hypothesis be accepted, it still remains clear that the particular phase of extreme insignificance which the Apostle had in view in so designating himself had nothing whatever to do with bodily appearance, but appertained exclusively to his moral or spiritual personality.

In illustration of the Apostle's expression critics have cited Horace's words (*Sat.*, I. iii. 44-47),—

Strabonem  
Appellat Pætum pater; et Pullum, male parvus  
Si cui filius est, ut abortivus fuit olim  
Sisyphus;

this Sisyphus, according to an old Scholiast, being a pigmy of a man, formerly possessed by the Triumvir Antony, barely two feet high. Horace's application of the word *abortivus* does not, however, warrant the notion that this noun was ever in plain style used of other than a still birth. It is not so used even here. Rather, the fact that the dead creature cast forth in a miscarriage is commonly of extremely small dimensions is the very circumstance that furnishes the point of Horace's application of the phrase: it is applied to Sisyphus in sportive exaggeration. In fact, although a seven months child born alive is of course at its birth of smaller dimensions than it would have been if born after the full term of gestation, yet this does not hinder but that it may afterwards grow to be a man or woman of ordinary size. But I venture to question whether *abortivus* in Latin is ever to be found any more than *ἔκτρομα* in Greek, except with reference to a stillborn miscarriage. At the same time, Horace's use of the phrase may be admitted to be a fair illustration so far as this:



that both the satirist uses the noun *abortivus*, and the Apostle *ectroma*, with allusion to the extreme diminutiveness of an "untimely birth."

A good many critics have referred to a passage in Suetonius's *Octavius* (chap. 35), in which, according to one reading of the text, we are told that the public of Rome gave the nickname of *abortivi* to a large rabble of senators irregularly and corruptly created in the disorders which ensued upon Cæsar's assassination. But it is not improbable that instead of *abortivos* the true reading is *Orcinos*. Admitting, however, the other reading, any similarity which can be recognized in the use of the figure in the two cases must be regarded as a result of pure accident. It is an obvious remark, long ago made (see Estius's *Commentarius* and Poole's *Synopsis*), that it is altogether incredible that this morsel of Roman civic gossip, of three generations previous, had reached the remote sphere of social existence with which St. Paul's life was conversant.

If *abortivi* was the epithet applied to those senators, it must have been employed, not as in the case of Sisyphus just now adverted to, with reference to the notion of diminutiveness, but as implying that they were no more fit to be accounted senators than the dead little creature produced by a miscarriage is fit to be accounted a man. This, as I apprehend, would in part approximate to the Apostle's application of the term; but a very important distinction is to be noted between the two cases,—a distinction which in fact is fundamental.

The sobriquet, whether *Orcini* or *abortivi* fastened, in the case of these senators, upon their very persons as senators: in their persons the highest step of Roman nobility appeared debased, alike by the unworthy means through which it had been acquired and by their own coarseness of character and vulgarity of demeanour,—*deformi et incondita turba* is Suetonius's description of them; they

were as senators a monstrous brood of social non-entities. But in the case before us, though St. Paul immediately afterwards, with evident reference to his word *ectroma*, describes himself as "the least of the Apostles," it is evident that both that description of himself and this vilipending epithet *ectroma* were meant as applying, not at all to his official personality, but solely to his own individual personality antecedent to his call to be an Apostle and viewed in contrast with his being invested with that function. In himself (he means), in his own moral and spiritual personality apart from the Divine grace, he was a miserable *ectroma*. But, as to his apostolic character,—on the one hand, in respect to its origin, this was of the very sublimest; for his apostleship had been conferred on him by none other than God through Christ; and on the other hand, in respect to the manner in which this holy function had been sustained, "by the grace of God" his apostolate vied in spiritual achievement with that of any other Apostle whatever; for not one of them all had laboured so energetically as he had done.

This is a point on which it is necessary to be quite clear. St. Paul's thought is infinitely remote from any notion of either irregularity, or incompleteness, or inferiority in any respect whatever, attaching to his *apostleship*. All that he has anywhere written respecting his status and work as an Apostle makes it evident that any such depreciation, either of his call to be an Apostle or of his behaviour in the execution of his trust, was wholly abhorrent from his consciousness and his habits of feeling; the admission of such a thought would in fact have seemed to him nothing less than *prevarication*,—a false betrayal of the high commission which he held, and a treason against the might of spiritual agency which was evermore operating through him and with him.

The more complete exposition of the grounds of that

intense sense of his own nothingness which the Apostle has embodied in this word *ectroma* as now interpreted, as well as of the impulses which just here prompted him to its utterance,—points which I venture to think will be found to furnish an interesting and not unimportant illustration of the Apostle's character,—I must reserve for an ensuing Number. For the present, I can only claim space for an additional note, in which to introduce, for the satisfaction of such of my readers as may care to see them, a few facts and observations appertaining more specifically to the region of verbal criticism, than would interest the general reader.

E. HUXTABLE.

ADDITIONAL NOTE.

IT may be more satisfactory to my readers to see some of the passages referred to in their original form.

(1) Num. xii. 12. LXX. *μη γένηται* (*Alex. γένοιτο*) *ὡσεὶ ἴσον θανάτῳ, ὡσεὶ ἔκτρομα ἐκπορευόμενον ἐκ μήτρας μητρὸς, καὶ κατεσθίει τὸ ἥμισυ τῶν σαρκῶν αὐτῆς.*

*Vulg.* Ne fiat hæc quasi mortua, et ut abortivum quod projicitur de vulva matris suæ; ecce jam medium carnis ejus devoratum est a lepra.

*Heb.* אֶל־נָא תְהִי כַמֵּת אֲשֶׁר בְּצֵאתוֹ מִרְחֹם אִמּוֹ וַיֵּאָבֵל חֲצִי בְשָׂרוֹ.

*A.V.* "Let her not be as one dead, of whom the flesh is half consumed when he cometh out of his mother's womb."

(2) Job iii. 16. LXX. *ἢ ὥσπερ ἔκτρομα ἐκπορευόμενον ἐκ μήτρας μητρὸς, ἢ ὥσπερ νήπιος οὗ οὐκ εἶδον φῶς.*

*Vulg.* Aut sicut abortivum absconditum non subsisterem, vel qui concepti non viderunt lucem.

*Heb.* : אִנּוּ כְנֶפֶל טָמֵן לֹא אֶהְיֶה בְעֵלְאִים לֹא־רָאוּ אֹר.

*A.V.* "Or as an hidden, untimely birth I had not been; as infants which never saw light."

I am at a loss to understand what led the LXX. to put *ἐκπορευόμενον ἐκ μήτρας μητρὸς* (as in Num. xii. 12) in the place occupied in the Hebrew by the words *טָמֵן לֹא־אֶהְיֶה*. The participle *טָמֵן*, apparently, either means "put out of sight as soon as born," or else points to the condition of the *ectroma* as both unknown and itself

sealed up in unconsciousness, according to the description given in Eccles. vi. 4, 5.

(3) Eccles. vi. 3. LXX. *εἶπα, Ἀγαθὸν ὑπὲρ αὐτὸν τὸ ἔκτρομα.*

*Vulg.* De hoc ego pronuncio quod melior illo sit abortivus.

*Heb.* : אֶמְרֵתִי טוֹב מִמְנוּי הַנֶּפֶל.

A.V. "I say *that* an untimely birth is better than he."

The Hebrew word *nephel* which *ectroma* represents in this last passage occurs again in Psalm lviii. 8 : נֶפֶל אִשָּׁת בְּלִחוּי שִׁמְשֵׁי, where the A.V. has "like the untimely birth of a woman, *that* they may not see the sun," and Jerome, "quasi abortivum mulieris, quod non vidit solem." But here the LXX. give *ἔπρεσεν πῦρ καὶ οὐκ εἶδον τὸν ἥλιον*, and the Vulgate, "supercecidit ignis, et non viderunt solem;" as if the Hebrew were נֶפֶל אִשָּׁת. There seems, however, no reason to doubt but that the Masoretic reading is the true one; and this being so, the passage confirms the sense assigned to *nephel*, and therefore to *ectroma*, its Greek representative.

Another confirmatory particular, brought to my notice by the Rev. T. L. Kingsbury, to whose learning and kindness I owe in this inquiry a variety of valuable references, is drawn from Isaiah xiv. 19. The Authorised Version has there the clause, "but thou art cast out of thy grave *like an abominable branch*"; these last words following the Masoretic text בְּנִצֵּר נְהָעָב. But the LXX. gives for בְּנִצֵּר, ὡς νεκρός, while we learn from the fragments of Origen's Hexapla, edited by the Rev. F. Field (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1868, Tom. ii., Fasc. ii.) that Aquila rendered it ὡς ἰχώρ (*i.e.*, as explained by Jerome, quoted by Mr. Field, *tabes et pædor*); Symmachus, ὡς ἔκτρομα; and Theodotion, ὡς βλαστός. These last three translators did their work in the second century of our era. These renderings of the LXX. and Symmachus seem at first sight to point to the conjecture, that in their Hebrew text the word was כַּנְפֵל. But Theodotion's ὡς βλαστός shews that he read כַּנְצֵר, as also Origen and Jerome appear to have done; and since נִצֵּר is used in Isaiah xi. 1 and Daniel xi. 7 in a figurative sense to denote an offspring, like the Latin *soboles*, it is conceivable that both the LXX. and Symmachus understood the term here likewise as a poetical figure for "offspring," and that finding it qualified by "loathed," they further particularized its meaning by supposing it to refer to an *ectroma*. Perhaps Aquila's ἰχώρ refers to the *tabes et pædor* thrown out as refuse along with it. This interpretation would give to the otherwise mysterious phrase "loathed branch"

a sense very suitable to the context, by exhibiting the proud monarch of Babylon as put on a level with an object utterly insignificant and disgusting. But whatever may be thought of this, so much is clear: Symmachus's rendering taken side by side with that of the LXX. points to the like conception of *ectroma* as has been before arrived at.

Philo uses the term in the same sense in his *Leg. Alleg.*, Tom. i., p. 59 (cited by Wetstein), as follows: οὐ πέφυκε γόνιμον οὐδὲν τελεσφορῶν ἢ τοῦ φαύλου ψυχῆ· ἃ δ' ἂν καὶ δοκῇ προφέρειν, ἀμβλωθρίδια εἰρίσκειται καὶ ἐκτρώματα καὶ ἐσθίοντα τὸ ἥμισυ τῶν σαρκῶν αὐτῆς. For the difference between ἀμβλωθρίδια and ἐκτρώματα (perhaps not always observed), see Eustathius, cited below.

So Hesychius: Ἐκτρωμα· παιδίον νεκρὸν ἄωρον· ἐκβολὴ γυναικός. Theophylact, *in hunc loc.*: ἐκτρωμα λέγεται κυρίως τὸ ἀτελεσφόρητον ἔμβρυον ὃ ἀποβάλλεται ἢ γυνή. Eustathius, in *Hom.*, p. 1239 (cited by Wetstein): περὶ ὧν φασὶν οἱ παλαιοὶ οὕτω· ἀμβλῶσαι τὸ φθεῖραι βρέφος ἐν γαστρὶ, καὶ ἀμβλωθρίδιον τὸ τοιοῦτον· ἐκτῶσαι δὲ καὶ ἔκτρωμα τὸ μῆπω τετυπωμένον. Polychromius, in his *Catena*, in cap. iii. 16: *Jobi*, p. 128 (cited by Suicer): ἔκτρωμά ἐστι, τὸ μηδέπω διαμορφωθὲν τελείως ἐν τῇ γαστρὶ.

We have in Ignatius's letter to the Romans (ch. 9) the passage: Ἐγὼ δὲ αἰσχύνομαι ἐξ αὐτῶν (sc. the members of the Church in Syria) λέγεσθαι οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀξίως εἶμι, ὧν ἔσχατος αὐτῶν, καὶ ἔκτρωμα ἀλλ' ἠλέημαί τις εἶναι, ἐὰν Θεοῦ ἐπιτύχω. But the passage presents a mere imitation of St. Paul's words, and gives no help for determining the meaning of the noun.

The meaning of the verb ἐκτιρώσκω and its derivatives may be supposed to have its root in the notion of *hurt, damage*, which seems inherent in τιρώσκω (see Liddell & Scott *in verb.*), this notion of *hurt* having, perhaps, in the specific sense in which ἐκτιρώσκω is used, reference, at least primarily, to some *hurt* to the matrix of the parent occasioning or accompanying the issuing *from* it of the fetus, as *e.g.* in *Herod.* iii. 32; but possibly also with a secondary reference to damage done to the embryo.

Such an interpretation of the primary meaning of the verb may help to explain its use in two passages referring to one and the same subject, communicated to me by Mr. Kingsbury. Diodorus Siculus (iii. 63) writes: (Semelem) τελευτῆσαι καὶ τὸ βρέφος (Dionysus) ἐκτῶσαι (αἴ. *broke away*) πρὸ τοῦ καθήκοντος χρόνου; and Philostratus (*Icones*, i. 14), ὁ δὲ Διόνυσος τῆς μὲν μητρὸς ἐκτῶσ-

κει (*sic.*, not ἐκτιρώσκει). The birth of this very vivacious god, occurring under conditions altogether extraordinary, furnishes the one exceptional case of a living product of ἔκτρωσις which has come to my knowledge. The application of the verb ἐκτιρώσκω in this instance is further anomalous in its departure in other respects from its regular sense; for this, according to Liddell & Scott, is either to *miscarry* or to *cause miscarriage*.

Elsewhere, the verb ἐκτιρώσκω and its derivatives appear used solely, if I mistake not, in respect to cases of miscarriage, in which the process of reproduction is frustrated.

In respect to ἀμβλίσκω, ἄμβλωμα, ἐξάμβλωμα, which the grammarian Thomas Magister insisted upon as alone the correct words to use in place of ἐκτιρώσκω and its derivatives, the notion of *dulness, sluggishness, want of thoroughgoing efficiency*, viewed as attaching to the parent, may perhaps account for their having this specific sense; though here again the notion may be conceived of as passing on to the frustrated product.

Further illustration of the lexical question is furnished by Triller's note on the passage just now referred to in Thomas Magister, and in the following passages, likewise communicated to me by the same friend:—Aristotle, *Hist. Anim.*, vii. 8, 3; *ib.*, *De Generatione Anim.*, lib. iv. p. 291; Hippocrates, *de Aere, Aquis, et Locis*, p. 343; *ib.*, *Lib. de Sterilitate*, p. 641; *ib.*, *Lib. de Mulierum Morbis*, *passim*.

---

## FIDELITY AND BIAS IN VERSIONS OF THE BIBLE.

“The expressions are as direct as strong, and a true believer will neither attempt to divert or dilute their strength”—COLERIDGE.

THE words of sacred books become necessarily more precious from their very familiarity. When the Authorised Version was published in A.D. 1611, one of the first Hebrew scholars of that age, Dr. Hugh Broughton, said that he would rather be torn to pieces by wild horses than impose such a version on the poor Churches of England. It was