

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 Expository Times* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

couple Lass Sharon and Dan-jaan have sites suggested for them, namely, *Sarona* in Galilee [with ?? in Index, and without the identity being noted at all in the Map], and *Daniân* (with a query), E. of the Ladder of Tyre. In the Map it is left undecided whether Dan (Laish or Leshem) = *Baniâs* or *Tell el-Kâdî*, although in the Index it is identified (without query) with the latter. *Baniâs* is made = Baal-gad and Cæsarea Philippi. Sodom and Gomorrah are left unidentified; Zoar, in Index but not in Map, is given as = *Shaghur* (??). The problematic Bethabara (? = Beth-barah) is doubtfully identified with *Makt Abarah* on the Jordan, N.E. of Scythopolis. Emmaus of 1 Mac is = *Amwas* (?); of St. Luke = *Kulônich* (?). Megiddo is given without hesitation as *el-Lajjun*. The doubtful Rakkon and Me-jarkon of Jos 19⁴⁶ are identified (without query) with *Tell er-Rekkeit* and *Nahr el-Aujâ*. Is this not somewhat bold in view of the text of the passage? Pharpar is

hesitatingly made = *Nahr Awaj*. This appears to be the correct identification, in spite of the similarity of the name in the *Nahr Barbar*. *Râs en-Nakûrah* still holds its place as the 'Ladder of Tyre,' but Ewing's view (see art. 'Ladder of Tyre,' in *Dictionary of Bible*) is worthy of consideration, that the term included three distinct headlands.

There can be no doubt that this will be for long the map of Palestine. We expect to see it soon in all our church halls, and it will find its way into the knapsack of the traveller in Palestine, for whose convenience it is issued also in the more portable form of two separate sheets, cloth mounted, and folded to smaller size. It will also take its place as a very suitable companion to the *Dictionary of the Bible*, the ordinary case form being, as was pointed out last month, folded in the same size as the *Dictionary* and bound to match.

J. A. SELBIE.

Maryculter, Aberdeen.

Recent Research in the Language of the New Testament.

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

III.

THE book which, in our judgment, marks an epoch in determining the place of Biblical Greek in the history of the language is the *Einleitung in die Neugriechische Grammatik* of Professor G. N. Hatzidakis (Leipz., 1892). Up to the time of its appearance there was no work which really occupied the field. Mullach's *Grammatik der griechischen Vulgarsprache* (Berlin, 1856) had long been quoted as an authority. It included an introduction to Modern Greek as well as a grammar. Many of the facts presented were, of course, valuable, but the book was marred by the tendency to treat Modern Greek as identical with the ancient language, thus obscuring the modifications which accompany every historical process, and, beneath the common designation *Vulgarsprache*, concealing the vast differences existing even between the ancient colloquial language and the modern tongue spoken in Greece and the islands of the Ægean.

Professor Hatzidakis, trained in the great philological school of Delbrück and Brugmann, has set the scientific study of the later history of the language on a firm basis. He guards against erroneous generalities. He recognizes that undue emphasis must not be laid either on the written or the oral tradition, clearly understanding how manifold have been the influences shaping the development of the Greek speech. From this point of view he considers that the modern language may be traced back through its various stages to the later *κοινή*, taking the latter term in a wide sense as including not only the written but also the spoken Greek of the post-classical era. Of course this *κοινή* admits of more classical and more 'popular' varieties as we have already seen. We may point to the gulf between the language of the papyri and a writer like Plutarch. The whole subject, however, must be treated with great caution.

For even distinguished scholars are led to make hazardous assertions regarding it, as, *e.g.*, Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (*Verhandlungen* d. 32. Versammlung d. deutscher Philolog., 1877, p. 40), who goes the length of asserting that it was Ionians, the colonists of the East, who created the *κωνή*. This is to narrow down the whole historical vista. But further, Hatzidakis points out that the chief characteristics of Modern Greek originated at an early period. Many of these can be traced at one stage of their development in the writings of the N.T. This fact, in turn, reacts on our appreciation of the N.T. language, indeed makes a scientific appreciation possible. We know, *e.g.*, how rare the optative is in the N.T. writings. It is entirely foreign to Middle and Modern Greek. Or take the ending—*av* for *ασι(ν)* in the 3rd plur. perf. There are ten clear instances of this in the N.T. The formation arose on the analogy of the aorist active and passive. As time went on, this principle was widely extended until in Middle Greek even the 3rd plur. of the imperf. passive was affected by it, and we find forms like *ἐγράφοντα*.

A large portion of Hatzidakis' work is occupied with the phenomena of form and inflexion. This is the province in which the gradual modification of the language chiefly reveals itself. But there are also many important syntactical discussions. These are based on the general principle that the language tended, stage by stage, to simplify its grammar by the laying aside of certain elements and the generalizing of others. In the case of synonyms, *e.g.*, one gradually ousts its rival. The distinctions between pronouns, so characteristic of Attic purity, at length vanish, a phenomenon of which there are many instances in the N.T. (*e.g.* *αὐτός* and *οὗτος*, *τίς* and *ποῖος*, *τίς* and *πότερος*). Most instructive examples of the modifications in syntax are the substitution of *ἵνα* with subjunctive for the infinitive, and the interchange of the indicative and subjunctive moods, both these usages being largely prevalent in the N.T. The wide extension, also, of the sphere of the accusation is one of the notable developments which have to be reckoned with in many questions of exegesis.

We are not so well acquainted with the *Historical Greek Grammar* of Professor A. N. Jannaris (Macmillan, 1897), but it appears to be a valuable and scholarly work. It is specially rich in examples of the later forms and usages of the language which

is examined according to the various periods (J. distinguishes seven) of its development. The book must have involved an astonishing amount of careful research. Our chief objection is the author's readiness to correct the text with which he is dealing, sometimes with great boldness. An immense number of facts bearing upon the sounds and inflexions of the latter language are presented in Dieterich's *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte d. griech. Sprache* (Heft 1 of Krumbacher's *Byzantinisches Archiv*, Leipzig, 1898). These are derived largely from the papyri and inscriptions. He distinguishes between the Attic *κωνή*, the Egyptian, and that of Asia Minor, and arranges his results in interesting tables under these headings. We are inclined to think that often he lays too much stress on one or two isolated examples of forms, etc., from papyri or inscriptions, forgetting how much may be due to the ignorance or caprice of the scribe. It is hazardous to establish tests of usage on any save a broad basis. For the later stages of the language, it is scarcely needful to emphasize the importance of so well-known a book as the *Greek Dictionary of the Roman and Byzantine Periods* (146 B.C.—1100 A.D.) of E. A. Sophocles (3rd ed., Boston, 1888). Its evidence as to vocabulary is still of real value. It is self-evident by this time that a careful study of the phenomena of Modern Greek will constantly shed unexpected light on the forms, the syntax and the vocabulary of the N.T. There is now available a thoroughly scientific grammar, based on the latest results of philological research, in the *Handbuch der neugriech. Volkssprache* of Dr. A. Thumb (Strassburg, 1895), well known through his standard work on the 'Spiritus Asper.' The book contains a most interesting collection of selections in prose and poetry with a glossary.

We have already pointed out the importance of the *Inscriptions* in their relation to the language of the N.T. For they usually reflect the non-literary aspect of the written speech. At the same time, allowance must be made for a certain official phraseology which has become more or less stereotyped for epigraphic purposes. Good instances of this may be found in P. Viereck's *Sermo Græcus quo senatus populus que Romanus . . . usi sunt* (Göttingen, 1888). Accordingly, while no hard and fast lines can be laid down between the various regions, we may be sure that the inscriptions of Egypt, of Asia Minor, and of the islands of the

Ægean will afford valuable contributions to the understanding of the Greek Bible. Professor W. M. Ramsay's most suggestive papers in this Journal on the *Greek of the Early Church and the Pagan Ritual* show what a fruitful field lies open to research. The range of publications is very wide, and is being extended from year to year. Without specifying the two great collections, the *Corpus Inscr. Græcarum*, and the *Corp. Inscr. Atticarum*, probably those of chief importance for our subject are Letronne's *Recueil des inscriptions grecques et latines de l'Égypte* (Paris, 1842-48), Le Bas-Waddington, *Voyage archéologique en Grèce et en Asie Mineure* (Paris, 1843-44), *Inschriften von Pergamon*, ed. M. Fränkel, i.-ii., (Berlin, 1890-95), *Inscriptiones Græcæ insularum maris Ægæi*, i., ed. Hiller von Gaertringen (Berlin, 1895), and the *Sammlung d. griech. Dialekt-Inschriften*, ed. Collitz and Bechtel. Convenient selections are those of P. Cauer, *Delectus Inscriptionum Græcarum* (Leipz., 1883), and W. Dittenberger, *Sylloge Inscriptionum Græcarum* (Leipz., 1883). The language of the inscriptions has been the subject of some useful dissertations, of which the *Grammatik d. attischen Inschriften* by K. Meisterhans (2nd ed., Berlin, 1888) is a good example. Many of the forms quoted, more especially those of the Imperial Age, have their direct parallels in the N.T., as, e.g., aorists like ἔρχα and εὐράμην. In syntax, there are notable instances of such phenomena as the substitution of the preposition εἰς for ἐν, the exclamation ἰδοῦ with the nominative, proper names in the nominative with the phrase ὀνομά ἐστιν, all having parallels in the N.T., while the first is of great importance for its exegesis. The preposition σύν is found to extend its sphere and to take the place of μετά, while μετά with nouns forms a large number of adverbial phrases. περί and ὑπέρ are often used interchangeably. There are also some curious examples of incongruous gender, such as τύποι . . . ἃ ἀνέθηκε, which offer a parallel to the barbarisms of the Apocalypse. This small selection suggests how usefully the *Grammatik* of Meisterhans may be employed to illustrate the language of the N.T. A work belonging to the same category is Schweizer's *Grammatik der Pergamenischen Inschriften* (Berlin, 1898), and of real importance is Kretschmer's *Die griech. Vaseninschriften* (Güterslohe, 1894), which bears on the old Attic colloquial language.

We have already hinted that the diction of the inscriptions might probably be expected to reveal

a closer affinity with the Greek of the N.T. than that of the later writers who are usually classed under the familiar heading of the κοινή. But great care is required in drawing rigid distinctions. For the whole range of the later language, notwithstanding marked differences of literary effort and culture among the various writers, discloses a wide similarity both in vocabulary and grammar common to all. As a connecting link between departments of which we have spoken separately we may mention W. Jerusalem's study, *Die Inschrift von Sestos und Polybius* (Wiener Studien, i. 1, p. 32 ff.). In this inscription of an old Thracian town, assigned approximately to 120 B.C., he traces coincidences with Polybius in the case of compound words which have lost their original force, compounds of which prepositions form an element no longer felt, prepositional phrases, words which have exchanged their general meaning for a special side of it, common words employed in a peculiar sense, uncommon words and constructions, and some official forms of speech. These give a very instructive view of certain characteristics, more especially the weakening of compounds and the anomalous use of prepositions, facts which have to be taken into account in N.T. exegesis. The extraordinary increase of compound forms is one of the most notable peculiarities of the later language. As careless talkers have a tendency to use exaggerated expressions in dealing with common things owing to their lack of sensitiveness to the true force of words, so, as the finer feeling for the expressiveness of the Greek speech gradually disappeared, the attempt was made to atone for this loss by the accumulation of various parts of speech in one word, more especially by the creation of new verbs in which prepositions formed a prominent element. Specially frequent was the use of κατά in such verbs, its compounds generally governing the accusative. Indeed, the accusative gradually encroaches upon the sphere of both dative and genitive after verbs, and there arises a widespread habit of giving intransitive verbs a transitive force. Many interesting examples of these later usages, which have a more or less direct bearing upon the interpretation of passages in the N.T., are given by Dr. F. Krebs in his dissertation, *Zur Rection der Casus in der späteren historischen Gräcität*, 3 parts (Munich, 1887-90), although, at times, he seems to go beyond the evidence.

It is impossible even to name the recent works of importance which deal with the language of the writers of the *κοινή*. We content ourselves with referring to two studies which appear to us particularly valuable. The first is *Quæstiones de Elocutione Polybiana*, by F. Kaelker (*Leipziger Studien zur classischen Philologie*, iii. 2, pp. 219-302, 1880). This is a careful examination of Polybius' use of words, his formation of sentences, and a variety of separate grammatical points such as the use of *αὐτῶν* for *ἑμῶν* (*ὑμῶν*) *αὐτῶν*, *αὐτός* = *μόνος*, *τό* with neuter adjective = noun, prepositions with nouns instead of the simple cases, etc. One important fact Kaelker brings out with great clearness, namely, that the desire to avoid *hiatus* largely influences Polybius (and Diodorus Siculus) in the selection of words. Thus, e.g., he seems to make little distinction between *περί* and *ὑπέρ*, except that *περί*, as a rule, occurs after vowels, *ὑπέρ* after consonants. Kaelker gives many instances of the prevalence of this principle in style. To recognize it as a factor in the composition of later Greek would be to get rid of some refinements of exegesis in the N.T.

The second study we will name is the *Observationes Criticæ de Flavii Josephi elocutione*, by W. Schmidt, published in Fleckeisen's *Jahrb. für classische Philol.*, supplement 20, 1894, pp. 345-550. We might expect, in the case of Josephus, a writer of Jewish birth, to find an unusual number of parallels to the N.T. (and LXX). But an interesting fact comes to light. After writing his *Jewish War* in Aramaic, he translated it into Greek with the assistance of some learned friends. Its language, therefore, is of a more polished type than that of the *Antiquities*. But neither in the one case nor the other are there distinct traces of the influence of a Semitic habit of mind. Rather do the abnormal constructions of Josephus most commonly resemble those of writers such as Polybius, Diodorus, Plutarch, Dionysius Halicarn., and Appian. In short, he is, like his fellow-countryman Philo, one of the typical writers of the *κοινή*. Schmidt's examination of syntactical points, including the article, pronouns, the dual, and especially the cases, is very valuable. The avoidance of *hiatus* is an important matter with Josephus also. Schmidt keeps this and other favourite usages of his author in view when deciding questions of text. The whole discussion

is suggestive in revealing the gradual relaxation of strict grammatical laws which characterizes the epoch of the *κοινή*, an epoch which admits many influences from the colloquial language while still preserving a certain flavour of literary dignity.

We have left to the last one of the most important books in this department of illustration for the N.T. language from the later Greek writers. This is W. Schmid's *Der Atticismus in seinen Hauptvertretern von Dionysius von Halikarnass bis auf den zweiten Philostratus*, 4 vols. and index (Stuttgart, 1887-97).

Schmid discusses with extraordinary thoroughness and elaboration the language of such writers as Dio Chrysostom, Lucian, Aristides, Ælian, and the second Philostratus, reviewing, at the same time, the general linguistic and stylistic principles of the age to which they belong. His theme is *Atticism*, the efforts made by the above-named writers, who are all embraced in the period between Augustus and Alexander Severus (c. 30 B.C.-240 A.D.), to raise the level of Greek prose by a deliberate return to the refinements of ancient Attic. The growth of this artificial and æsthetic movement is patiently traced until we see how the literary language, ever increasing in pedantry, is finally separated from the popular speech by a wide cleft, and becomes entirely the property of a special circle. A large portion of the book is mainly for reference, consisting as it does of elaborate tables of words illustrating the usage of the various authors. We have proved by careful testing the remarkable usefulness of these tables for the study of the N.T. diction. They are packed with important linguistic facts gathered from all quarters. The splendid index which forms vol. 5 makes reference easy and convenient. To turn up, e.g., the word *λοιπόν* (we take the instance at random) and examine the references will supply a collection of hints invaluable for the determination of several important N.T. passages. In a work of such large compass some inaccuracies are bound to occur. We have come upon one or two bearing on N.T. matters. But the book, as a whole, is indispensable to the study of the later language. Its concluding section gives a survey of the mutual relationships of the various elements in this Atticizing diction, and clearly shows that its chief ingredient is the post-Attic literary *κοινή*, which, as we have seen, is much farther removed from the

colloquial language than is the Greek of the N.T. It is much to be desired that some scholar of Dr. Schmid's eminence would discuss the colloquial language of the Imperial Age in its affinities with, and difference from, the more artificial diction of literature. This would be a vast gain towards a balanced estimate of the Greek of the sacred

writings. Its contribution to accurate exegesis could scarcely be over-estimated.¹

¹ There has just appeared a book of extraordinary value, *Die griechische sprache im Zeitalter des Hellenismus*, by Dr. A. Thumb (Strassburg: Trübner, 1901). This work, while giving an admirable summary of the results reached in the investigation of the *κωφή*, is itself one of the most important contributions ever made to the subject.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF HEBREWS.

HEBREWS XI. 13.

'These all died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them and greeted them from afar, and having confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth' (R.V.).

EXPOSITION.

'These all died in faith.'—Or according to faith. The reference is to Abraham and Sarah and their immediate descendants, not to Noah and those farther back. The statement seems not to be the negative one, that they all died without having received the promises, still only in the region of faith, not in that of enjoyment; but the positive one, that their death, like their life, was according to faith, the emphasis falling on *died*,—all their life through, even up to death, was according to faith.—DAVIDSON.

'Not having received the promises.'—The clause does not simply state a fact . . . but gives this fact as the explanation of the assertion that the patriarchs 'died in faith': 'They died in faith inasmuch as they had not received the outward fulness of the promises—the possession of Canaan, the growth of the nation, universal blessing through their race—but had realized them while they were yet unseen and future.'—WESTCOTT.

THE not having received, so far from militating against, was a condition of the dying in faith. The promise *fulfilled* is no longer (in this sense) an object of *faith*.—VAUGHAN.

'The promises.'—The things promised (as in Lk 24⁴⁹, Ac 1⁴. 2³³).—VAUGHAN.

'Having seen them and greeted them from afar, and having confessed.'—The three thoughts rise in a natural succession. They saw the promises in their actual fulfilment; they welcomed the vision with joy though it was far off: they confessed what must be the true end of God's counsel.—WESTCOTT.

'Strangers and pilgrims on the earth.'—As 'strangers' they acknowledged that they were in a foreign land: as 'sojourners' that they had no permanent possession, no rights of citizenship. At the same time they kept their trust in God. Their natural fatherland had lost its hold upon them. They waited for a 'city' of God's preparing.—WESTCOTT.

METHODS OF TREATMENT.

I.

The Christian's Life a Pilgrimage.

By the Very Rev. R. W. Church, M.A., D.C.L.

Such was the life of the old saints. They lived in the world like travellers. In the land which was specially promised to them, they dwelt in tents like wayfarers or soldiers passing through a country. For they had not yet reached home, the 'city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God.' Other men might build houses and pass their lives in them, Abraham was a wanderer. True, it says, 'if they had been mindful of that country from whence they came out, they might have had opportunity to have returned,' but 'they desired a better country.' And so they went from tent to tent, and from well to well, from one stage of the journey to the next till the end was reached.

Our life does not look like that of pilgrims. We are accustomed to a settled home, and it is difficult to imagine changes in our surroundings. Yet this settled appearance of things is only due to our own want of the power of foreseeing what must come to pass. Whether we feel it or not, we too are strangers and pilgrims; like the old patriarchs we have no 'continuing city.' Whether like them we 'seek one to come' or not, like them we are passing through things temporal to things eternal.

It is important to feel this. It was the great proof of the faith of the old saints that they felt it. But it is difficult to feel it. For God has given us all duties in life, and how can we do them heartily unless we feel settled and at home