JOURNAL

OF

BIBLICAL LITERATURE.

NINTH YEAR—1890—PART II.

HAS *ΠΟΙΕΙΝ* IN THE NEW TESTAMENT A SACRIFICIAL MEANING?*

BY PROF. T. K. ABBOTT.

THE opinion that ποιεῖν has a special sacrificial meaning has obtained in recent times a wide acceptance, on what seem to me entirely inadequate grounds. I propose to examine these grounds on strictly philological principles. The opinion is usually supported by the statement that in the LXX ποιεῖν has such a sense, sometimes it is said "constantly," or "ordinarily"; sometimes, "forty or fifty times." The statement is, as I shall show, erroneous. But even if it were correct, a different impression would doubtless be produced if the same alleged facts were put in the form that once in fifty times it has this sense; for ποιεῖν, it must be remembered, occurs in the LXX about two thousand five hundred times. The reader would then see that even in the LXX we should not be justified in assuming a sacrificial meaning of the verb as the most likely one, prior to an examination of the context.

The assertion that ποιεῖν has a sacrificial sense must mean that the word of itself, i.e. apart from considerations of the context, does at least suggest this sense. Now let us see first what is this usage of the verb in classical Greek. Here it includes, first, nearly all the senses of the English 'make,' 'cause,' etc.; secondly, many of those of

* Presented in May 1890.

the English 'do'; besides, thirdly, some additional senses, such as 'do to,' 'do with.' It is, in fact, the most general word for 'doing.' There are two or three of its uses which for the present purpose require to be particularly mentioned, because they are paralleled by the Hebrew עשה, and are found in the LXX:

1. 'To do to, or with,' ἀργύριον τώυτὸ τοῦτο ἐποίεε, "he did this same thing with the silver," Herod. iv. 166; ἃ ἐποίησε τῶν Ἀμφιπολιτῶν τοὺς παραδόντας, Demosth. *Olynth.* i. 5. So εὖ, κακῶς, κακά, ἀγαθά, καλὰ ποιεῖν τινα (*passim*).

2. 'To keep (a feast),' ἴσθμια ποιεῖν, Demosth.; ἑορτὴν ποιεῖν, a quite classical phrase.

3. 'To perform (sacred rites or sacrifices),' ἱρὰ ποιεῖν, Herod.; θυσίαν ποιεῖσθαι, Plato, *Sympos.* 174 c., also in Xenophon, *Cyrop.* vi. 2, 6. The verb is also used even without θυσίαν when followed by the name of a deity, τῇ Γῇ, etc., like the Latin *facere* in the sense of sacrifice; ἔθυσαν τῷ Διΐ ... ἔπειτα τῷ Ἡλίῳ ... ἔπειτα Γῇ σφάξαντες ὡς ἐξηγήσαντο οἱ μάγοι, ἐποίησαν, Xen. *Cyrop.* viii. 3, 24.

4. It is used as a substitute for a more special verb, to avoid repetition where the special verb has already occurred or has been indirectly implied. For example, in Herod. v. 97, "If he was unable to impose on Cleomenes alone, but did this [to] (τοῦτο ἐποίησε) thirty thousand of the Athenians." Similarly Xenoph., ταὐτὰ ἐποίησαν τοὺς ταῖς βώλοις βάλλοντας (i.e. struck them on the neck and back), *Cyrop.* ii. 3, 18.

This is a very common use of the English 'do,' especially where the action is not expressed by a single verb: thus, "If you correct this sheet and verify the references, I will do the other"; "When I have painted and varnished this panel, I will do that one."

The Hebrew verb which corresponds generally in its range of application with ποιεῖν, including the signification of 'do,' 'make,' 'cause,' etc., is עשה, which occurs about two thousand five hundred times. Hence, as was inevitable, the Greek translators almost always rendered it by ποιεῖν, i.e. in about ninety-two per cent of its occurrences, and very rarely did they use ποιεῖν to render any other word. It follows that in the LXX we find ποιεῖν used not only in its classical senses, but in others.

Thus it is used of 'trimming' (the beard), 2 Sam. xix. 24; for 'provide' (singing men), Eccl. ii. 8; 'provide for' (my own house),*

* [make a house for myself. — ED.]

Gen. xxx. 30; 'prepare' (horses and chariots), 2 Sam. xv. 1; 'produce' (fruit),[1] Isa. v. 2, 4; 'keep' (a feast), often, as Deut. xvi. 1, 2 Chron. xxx. 13, 21; 'dress, cook, prepare (food),'[2] with 'food,' Gen. xxvii. 4, 7, 9, etc., 2 Sam. xiii. 5, 7, 10; Ezek. iv. 15; with 'meal and oil,' 1 Kings xvii. 12, 13; with 'sheep,' 1 Sam. xxv. 18; with 'lamb,' 2 Sam xii. 4; 'calf,' Gen. xviii. 7, 8. It is 'do with,' or 'deal with' oxen and sheep, Exod. xxii. 30; a vineyard, Exod. xxiii. 11; an ass, Deut. xxii. 3; 'do for' (a hundred talents), 2 Chron. xxv. 9; 'do with or about,' Josh. vii. 9; 'offer' (sacrifice), of which presently.

These, indeed, would be more properly called different applications than distinct meanings. However, it is to be observed that this extension of range does not make the verb more definite, but less so. It becomes even more necessary than before to look to the connection. Monsignor Patterson's statement, which has been largely followed, is that "*ποιεῖν* when joined with a noun signifying anything capable of being offered to God constantly has this [sacrificial] meaning." Let us now examine the passages by which this signification is supposed to be established.

In the first place we have those in which the connection is *ποιεῖν τὸ πάσχα*. Now it is capable of distinct proof that this means "keep the feast of the passover," not "offer, or sacrifice the passover." First, *πάσχα*, although it sometimes is used for the lamb, is frequently (and indeed more properly) the feast. Thus we have "the morrow of the passover," Num. xxxiii. 3, Josh. v. 11 [codd.]; "in the fourteenth day ye shall have the passover, a feast of seven days," Ezek. xlv. 21; "such a passover was not kept. *οὐκ ἐγενήθη τὸ πάσχα τοῦτο*," 2 Kings xxiii. 22, and 23 *ἐγενήθη τὸ πάσχα*.

The usage of the New Testament confirms this. There *πάσχα* generally means the feast. A few instances will suffice: *μετὰ δύο ἡμέρας τὸ πάσχα γίνεται*, Matt. xxvi. 2; *ἦν τὸ πάσχα καὶ τὰ ἄζυμα μετὰ δύο ἡμέρας*, Mark xiv. 1; *ἤγγιζε ἡ ἑορτὴ τῶν ἀζύμων ἡ λεγομένη πάσχα*, Luke xxii. 1; *ἐγγὺς ἦν τὸ πάσχα*, John ii. 13, vi. 4, xi. 55; *ἐν τῷ πάσχα ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ*, ii. 23; *πρὸ τοῦ πάσχα*, xi. 55; *ἀπολύσω ἐν τῷ πάσχα*, xviii. 39; *μετὰ τὸ πάσχα*, Acts xii. 4. Secondly, *ποιεῖν* is regularly used of 'keeping' a feast. This, as we have seen, was a classical usage; it is also found in the LXX. *ποιεῖν ἑορτήν* occurs Exod. xxiii. 16, xxxiv. 22, and in at least a dozen other places; sometimes *ποιεῖν τὴν ἑορτὴν*

[1] Classical.

[2] Classical; cf. Xen. *Cyrop.* IV. 5, 1; VIII. 5, 5; *Lac.* VI. 4.

τῶν ἀζύμων, as Ezra vi. 22; *ποιεῖν σάββατον* also occurs Exod. xxxi. 16 and 1 Sam. xvii. 18 [codd.].

Add that the passover is seldom said to be sacrificed, and never to be offered,[3] and we have sufficient reason to conclude that *ποιεῖν τὸ πάσχα* "to perform, or do the passover," means "to keep the feast of the passover." But any possible doubt is excluded by the use of the phrase where it can mean nothing else. Thus Exod. xii. 48, where the stranger sojourning with an Israelite is said *ποιεῖν τὸ πάσχα*; also 2 Chron. xxxv. 17, 18, 19, "The children of Israel that were present kept the passover and the feast of unleavened bread (*ἐποίησαν τὸ φασὲκ καὶ τὴν ἑορτήν*). And there was no passover like to that 'kept' (*ἐγένετο*) in Israel from the days of Samuel the prophet, neither did all the kings of Israel keep such a passover as Josiah kept (*οὐκ ἐποίησαν τὸ φασὲκ ὃ ἐποίησεν Ἰωσίας, καὶ οἱ ἱερεῖς . . . τῷ ὀκτωκαιδεκάτῳ ἔτει τῆς βασιλείας Ἰωσίου ἐποιήθη τὸ φασὲκ τοῦτο*)." Here it is clear that *φασέκ* is the feast, and *ποιεῖν τὸ φασέκ* = "to keep the feast." So in 2 Chron. xxx. *ποιῆσαι τὸ φασέκ* in verse 2 and verse 5 is obviously the same as *ποιῆσαι τὴν ἑορτὴν τῶν ἀζύμων* in verses 13 and 21. Here again we may make use of the New Testament. Our Lord speaks of *ποιεῖν τὸ πάσχα* in a private room, where the paschal lamb certainly could not be sacrificed or offered. Accordingly *ποιεῖν τὸ πάσχα* in Matt. xxvi. 18 is represented by *φαγεῖν τὸ πάσχα* in Mark xiv. 14 and Luke xxii. 11. There is nothing to set against this; for this signification is applicable wherever the phrase occurs. There is not a shadow of a reason for supposing that *ποιεῖν τὸ πάσχα* can mean 'offer the passover,' although it is true that the ceremonial killing was a part of the keeping.

Another class of cases consists of those in which the object of *ποιεῖν* is a word which itself means sacrifice. As the verb is used of 'doing' anything, it is natural that when the thing done is sacrifice this verb should still be used, although not itself having any sacrificial force. Thus we have *ποιεῖν θυσίαν, ὁλοκαύτωμα, κάρπωμα*. These are, indeed, notable examples of "things capable of being offered."

These and the like are simply instances of the adoption of an indefinite verb where the definition is supplied by the objects, a usage not peculiar to Hebrew or Greek. In English we use 'do' thus with many different objects, even with 'sacrifice.' The circumstance that the thing done is sacrifice gives no reason to attribute to the verb

[3] Offering a gift at the Passover is mentioned Num. ix. 7, 13, *προσενέγκαι τὸ δῶρον*.

ποιεῖν a specific sacrificial meaning. That it may be convenient to translate it 'offer' is nothing to the point.

A similar remark applies to the phrase ποιεῖν ἐπὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου, which may be illustrated by the English phrase 'do in the oven,' and the like. All that these instances prove is, that a word meaning 'make' or 'do' may be joined with a word meaning 'offering' or 'sacrifice,' and the two words will mean 'make an offering' or 'do sacrifice,' — not a very important proposition, except for those who write Greek exercises. Is it supposed that we must always say 'offer an offering,' 'sacrifice a sacrifice,' or substitute a synonymous verb? Even in English we can speak of 'doing sacrifice,' 'bringing an offering,' without its being supposed that 'do' or 'bring' have put on any special meaning.

The last class of passages consists of those in which ποιεῖν is used in the familiar way to avoid the repetition of a specific word or complex description contained in the preceding context. These are the only passages which give any plausibility to the suggestion that the verb means 'offer'; but it is, after all, only a superficial plausibility.

For example, in Lev. iv. detailed directions are given as to what is to be done with the bullock for a sin-offering; directions occupying several verses. These are partially repeated with respect to the sin-offering for the congregation, and in verse 20 occurs the more concise direction "he shall do with the bullock as he did with the bullock for a sin-offering, so shall he do with this," καὶ ποιήσει τὸν μόσχον ὃν τρόπον ἐποίησε τὸν μόσχον τὸν τῆς ἁμαρτίας οὕτω ποιηθήσεται. This is rightly translated "he shall do with the bullock, etc."; indeed, colloquial English would admit 'do the bullock.' In Exod. xxix. 39, τὸν ἀμνὸν τὸν ἕνα ποιήσεις τὸ πρωί κ.τ.λ., the sort of ποιεῖν is understood from the preceding verse, ποιήσεις ἐπὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου, and there is merely an ellipsis of these three words, an ellipsis precisely parallel to that which is so familiar with the English verb 'do.' Psalm lxv. 15 (E.V. lxvi. 15) is similar: ὁλοκαυτώματα ... ἀνοίσω σοι μετὰ θυμιάματος ... ποιήσω σοι βόας μετὰ χιμάρων. The poetical parallelism makes the brevity of expression less harsh. Possibly the expression ποιεῖν μόσχον for 'do to' may seem strange to some readers, but it is precisely parallel to the usage quoted above from classical writers as well as from the LXX, and to the colloquial English use of 'do.'

In 1 Kings xviii. 23, 25 we have another instance of ποιεῖν used to

replace the description of a complex action. "Let them choose one bullock for themselves, and cut it in pieces and lay it on the wood, and put no fire under; and I will dress (*ποιήσω*) the other bullock, and lay it on the wood, and put no fire under"; "choose you one bullock for yourselves, and dress it first (*ποιήσατε πρῶτοι*)." "And they took the bullock, and they dressed it (*ἐποίησαν*)." I do not include these verses amongst those which give even a superficial plausibility to the meaning 'offer,' for offering is not even part of the action specified. This is simply the preparing for the sacrifice, the killing and cutting in pieces, as well as in 25, 26 the laying on wood. This may well be included even in verse 23, although specially added in consequence of the important stipulation to put no fire under.

There are other passages in which *ποιεῖν*, although used in connection with sacrifice, yet clearly excludes the sense 'offer.'

Lev. ii. 7, "If thy oblation be a meat-offering of the frying-pan it shall be made of fine flour with oil," *σεμίδαλις ἐν ἐλαίῳ ποιηθήσεται, καὶ προσοίσει τὴν θυσίαν ἣν ἂν ποιήσῃ ἐκ τούτων τῷ κυρίῳ καὶ προσοίσει πρὸς τὸν ἱερέα*, followed in verse 9 by the offering on the altar. Lev. ii. 11, *πᾶσαν θυσίαν ἣν ἂν προσφέρητε κυρίῳ οὐ ποιήσετε ζυμωτόν*. Num. xv. 8, 11, 12, 13, *ἐὰν ποιῆτε ἀπὸ τῶν βοῶν εἰς ὁλοκαύτωσιν ἢ εἰς θυσίαν μεγαλῦναι εὐχήν, ... οὕτω ποιήσεις τῷ μόσχῳ τῷ ἑνί ... κατὰ τὸν ἀριθμὸν ὧν ἐὰν ποιήσητε οὕτως ποιήσετε τῷ ἑνί ... πᾶς ὁ αὐτόχθων ποιήσει οὕτως*. Also in Ezek. xlv. 22, 23; xlvi. 12, etc., where the prince is said to 'prepare' the offerings. Thus in xlv. 17 it is said to be the prince's part to 'give' the offerings (*διὰ τοῦ ἀφηγουμένου ἔσται*), and then he is said *ποιεῖν* the several offerings. The prince, however, was not to perform the office of the priest. Some Jewish expositors, indeed, supposed the 'prince' here to mean the high-priest. In that case *ποιεῖν* might be taken as = 'offer,' but this meaning must be determined solely by the fact that the doer was the priest, and that the whole discourse was about sacrifice.

Perhaps we may add to this Lev. vi. 21, 22. In 21 *ποιεῖν* is certainly 'make,' *ἐπὶ τηγάνου ἐν ἐλαίῳ ποιηθήσεται*. In the following verse the Hebrew word certainly means 'offer,' but the last clause of the verse is rendered so differently by the LXX that it seems as if they did not so understand the word. Instead of "it shall be wholly burnt to the Lord," it has *ἅπαν ἐπιτελεσθήσεται*. This would agree with the view that *ποιεῖν* in the beginning of the verse was taken in the same sense as in verse 21. But it must be observed that the subject of the

verb is ὁ ἱερεὺς ὁ χριστός. It is this subject and the following context that determine the meaning of the verb in the Hebrew. No inference, then, can be drawn from the use of ποιεῖν here to its use where no such elements of determination exist. Indeed, apart from any particular context, the whole book of Leviticus is sacrificial, as is the above quoted section of Ezekiel. If we met the word 'operate' in a treatise on surgery we should interpret it of surgical operations; if in a book on the stock exchange, of stock-dealing operations. The word 'work' would have one meaning as used by students, another as used by ladies, and again another in the mouth of an artist.

Instead of saying that ποιεῖν joined with one of the objects capable of being offered means 'offer,' it would be more correct to say that it may be used of an object capable of being 'made,' 'offered,' 'cooked for food,' 'prepared,' 'done [something] to,' etc, instead of any more definite verb, provided that the definition is supplied by the object or by the preceding context. And it is important, further, to note that in every case of the signification 'offer' not only is the connection sacrificial, but the object is a thing familiarly offered.

But before we reckon even this limited application to offering as belonging to the Hellenistic idiom we must consult the Hebrew. For it is possible that the translators, instead of selecting ποιεῖν as the most suitable word in the particular connection, adopted it simply because it was the literal and usual equivalent of the Hebrew word. How can this be decided? Obviously by examining whether ποιεῖν is used to render Hebrew words which properly signify 'offer,' or occurs in connection with 'offering' only where the original has עשה. If it really had to a Hellenistic writer the special sense 'offer' it would doubtless be used to render the special Hebrew words. It is not. It never renders הקריב, which is rendered by προσφέρω, etc., eighty times;[4] and it but once represents the hiphil of עלה, which also is rendered by προσφέρω, ἀναφέρω, etc., about eighty times. In this one instance, moreover (Job xlii. 8), the object is κάρπωμα. This is absolutely decisive. Actually a stronger case could be made for a sacrificial meaning of the English 'do,' which is used four times with sacrifice where neither עשה nor ποιεῖν is found in the original, viz. Exod. v. 17; viii. 8; 2 Kings x. 19; Acts xiv. 13.

[4] An unknown translator renders *hiṣrîḥ* once by ποιεῖν, Num. xxviii. 27, where the LXX has προσάξετε. There, also, the object is a word for sacrifice, ὁλοκαύτωμα.

It deserves to be noted further, that in the two places where עשה is used without an object in the sense 'offer' the LXX understand it differently. One is Hosea ii. 8, *ἀργυρᾶ καὶ χρυσᾶ ἐποίησε τῇ Βάαλ* (R.V. "used for Baal," marg. "made into the image of Baal"); the other is 2 Kings xvii. 32, *ἐποίησαν ἑαυτοῖς ἐν οἴκῳ τῶν ὑψηλῶν.*

But if *ποιεῖν* had no special sacrificial meaning in the idiom used by the LXX translators, is it not possible that the frequent use of the word in connection with sacrifice may have given it a sacrificial meaning in the minds of the writers of the New Testament, who were familiar with that version? It is indeed often assumed, and not least in reference to the present question, that the LXX usage exercises a predominant influence over that of the New Testament. The assumption is by no means borne out by facts.

In the first place, many of the ideas in reference to which we should most of all expect the Septuagint vocabulary to influence that of the New Testament are differently expressed. "To confess" is in the LXX *ἐξαγορεύω* or (once) *ἐξηγοῦμαι*, neither of which occurs in the N. T. *ἐξομολογοῦμαι* often in the N. T. = 'confess,' has in the LXX only the meaning 'praise.' 'Forgiveness' of sins is in the LXX *ἱλασμός*, but in the N. T. *ἄφεσις*. The latter word never has this sense in the LXX, although the verb occurs in the sense 'forgive.'

'To divorce' is in the LXX *ἐξαποστέλλειν*, but in the N. T., even where the reference is to the O. T., it is *ἀπολύειν*. 'Persecute' is in the LXX usually *καταδιώκειν*, but in the N. T. *διώκειν*. The former word occurs once in the N. T., but means 'follow' (Mark i. 36). 'To condemn (judicially)' is in the N. T. *κατακρίνω*, which occurs in LXX once only (Esther ii. 1.).

Again, words common to both Testaments have frequently entirely different meanings, and this is true even of semi-technical terms. Thus *κοινός*, which in the N. T. has the technical sense 'common or unclean,' is found in the canonical books of the O. T. only twice, and then with the meaning 'in common.' The verb *κοινόω* is not in the LXX. *Ἀγάπη* has not in the LXX the meaning given to it in the N. T.; on the contrary, it is used of sexual love in 2 Sam. xiii. 15 and in Canticles. *Ὑπομονή* in the LXX means 'expectation,' not 'steadfastness.' In the LXX *ἀνίημι* and *λύω* are both used in the sense 'forgive,' which they never have in the N. T. *ὁμολογία* in the LXX means 'free-will offering' or 'vow.' The verb *ὁμολογέω* also means 'swear,' 'vow,' 'admit'; in the Apocrypha it occurs = 'con-

fess.' Κρίμα in the sense 'justice,' 'ordinance,' is common in the LXX, but never occurs in this sense in the N. T.

These examples might be multiplied if it were worth the trouble. But it will, perhaps, be more useful to take a section of the Epistle to the Hebrews, the writer of which is sometimes said to be impregnated with the language of the LXX. His familiarity with it is indeed shown by his abundant use of it in the way of quotations interwoven with his text; all the more striking is it to find how independent his own vocabulary is. The section I have taken (pretty much at haphazard) is chap. v. 11 to vi. 20 (twenty-four verses). Here we find the following words which do not occur in the canonical Septuagint at all: δυσερμήνευτος (the verb ἑρμηνεύω occurs once, but = 'translate'); στοιχεῖα (but in Wisdom); γυμνάζω (in Macc., but = 'harass'); διδαχή (only in the title of Psalm lix.); δωρεά (in Wisdom and received text of Daniel); ἀμετάθετος; μιμητής (the verb occurs in Wisdom); μεσιτεύω; ἄγκυρα; βέβαιος (Wisdom); μεταλαμβάνω (only in Apocrypha). Of course I do not reckon ἀνασταυρόω.

Of words used in a different sense[5] we may enumerate: αἰσθητήρια ('the walls of my heart'); ἕξις ('body'); στερεός; καταβάλλω ('cast down'); ἐπίθεσις ('deceit,' etc.); διάκρισις ('separation' [of the clouds] Job xxxvii. 16); ἀδόκιμος (only with ἄργυρον); νωθρός (found in Prov. xxii. 29 only, but twice in Ecclus.); μακροθυμέω (once only, but = 'not soon angry,' Prov. xix. 11), so μακροθυμία; πρόδρομος (LXX = 'first-fruits'); ἐπιδείκνυμι; ἐνδείκνυμι; βεβαίωσις; παραδειγματίζω.

This is a considerable gleaning for so short a passage, and that from a writer who is supposed to be peculiarly imbued with the language of the LXX. The coincidences with the book of Wisdom deserve notice; had this been one of the books from which the writer so freely quotes, these would doubtless be thought to bear out the hypothesis of his dependence on the vocabulary of the LXX; as it is, they only indicate that the two writers used the same form of Greek.

It follows I think, clearly, that the existence of a particular usage in the LXX gives of itself no ground for expecting to find the same in the New Testament, even if it be not a Hebraism, and *a fortiori* if it is. How does the case stand with the verb in question, ποιεῖν? It occurs nearly six hundred times in the N. T., but never in any of the peculiar senses which the LXX imitated from the Hebrew עשה.

[5] The Septuagint meaning is given in brackets.

Even the obvious and simple phrase *ποιεῖν θυσίαν* never occurs; *ποιεῖν δικαιοσύνην* only in St. John (Epist.); *ποιεῖν κρίμα*, frequent in the LXX in the sense 'do justice,' is also foreign to the N. T., the usage of which, in fact, hardly differs from the classical, except as the more familiar use might be expected to differ from the literary; *ποιεῖν κάρπον*, as already observed, is classical, and occurs in Aristotle.

The phrase, however, with which we have to do is *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε*. To understand this to mean 'offer' would be to go far beyond any usage of *ποιεῖν* in the LXX. It need hardly be remarked that it is never safe to argue from the meaning which a word has only in a special connection to its meaning in another connection quite different. It is more than unsafe when such a special meaning is introduced into a connection in which a different meaning is familiar. Now, since *ποιεῖν* means 'do' in the widest sense, it is natural that *τοῦτο ποιεῖν* should be as familiar to a Greek as 'do this' is to an English speaking person. And so in fact we find it was. The phrase occurs frequently in classical Greek, and always = 'do this.' It also occurs frequently in the LXX, and always in this sense. Lastly it frequently occurs in the N. T. (about twenty times), and everywhere in the same sense. No writer or speaker wishing to be intelligible would use *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε* for 'offer this,' nor could any hearer so understand the words. On the other hand, 'do this' could not be expressed in any other way.

The general conclusion so far is,

1. That in the LXX *ποιεῖν* = 'offer' only where the object of the verb, or at least the preceding context, defines the 'doing' as sacrificial.

2. That so far as this usage of the LXX goes beyond that of classical writers it is not a Hellenistic idiom, but a Hebraism, due to literalness of translation, which there is no reason to suppose would pass into the New Testament.

3. That the limitations of this usage, even in the LXX, are such as to exclude such a combination as *τοῦτο ποιεῖν*.

Hence whatever be the meaning of the words *εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν*, *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε* cannot possibly mean anything but 'do this.'

It is, however, asserted that *ἀνάμνησις* is a specially sacrificial word, and that so decidedly that it must determine the meaning of *ποιεῖν* to be 'offer.' The assertion is in fact entirely without foundation. It has, indeed, been said that *ἀνάμνησις* occurs frequently in the LXX, and

always in connection with sacrifice. By some inscrutable mistake the frequency has been made out by an enumeration of passages in which the word is not found at all. In fact, in the text of the LXX (i.e. apart from Psalm-titles) it occurs just twice, and twice only, viz. Lev. xxiv. 7 and Num. x. 10. These require to be considered separately. The latter passage runs thus in the Revised Version: "Also in the day of your gladness, and in your set feasts, and in the beginnings of your months, ye shall blow with your trumpets over your burnt-offerings, and over the sacrifices of your peace-offerings; and they shall be to you for a memorial before your God." This rendering certainly seems to represent the sacrifices as a memorial. Even if it were so, this would not help prove that *ἀνάμνησις* had a sacrificial meaning. As well might we consider that because a scholarship in college is said to be *in memoriam*, therefore 'memoriam' means scholarship. But, first, the Hebrew word, זִכָּרוֹן, does not mean a memorial sacrifice. Secondly the Greek version has the singular *ἔσται*: *σαλπιεῖτε ταῖς σάλπιγξιν ἐπὶ τοῖς ὁλοκαυτώμασι καὶ ἐπὶ ταῖς θυσίαις τῶν σωτηρίων ὑμῶν· καὶ ἔσται ὑμῖν ἀνάμνησις ἔναντι τοῦ Θεοῦ ὑμῶν.* The subject of *ἔσται* here cannot be the sacrifices *τὰ ὁλοκαυτώματα καὶ αἱ θυσίαι*, but must be the action of blowing with the trumpets. Not only is this necessarily the sense of the Greek, but it is probably the meaning of the original also, for it agrees well with the preceding context, "When ye go to war in your land against the adversary that oppresseth you, then ye shall sound an alarm with the trumpets; and ye shall be remembered before the Lord your God, and ye shall be saved from your enemies." It is clear that the blowing did not constitute the sacrifices a memorial, as our version seems to imply; but in both verses the blowing is regarded as a sort of reminder to the Almighty to bring his people to his mind.

The other passage is Lev. xxiv. 7, of the shewbread: "Thou shalt put pure frankincense upon each row, that it may be to the bread for a memorial, even an offering made by fire unto the Lord." The Greek is, *καὶ ἐπιθήσετε ἐπὶ τὸ θέμα λίβανον καθαρὸν καὶ ἄλα καὶ ἔσονται εἰς ἄρτους εἰς ἀνάμνησιν προκείμενα τῷ Κυρίῳ.* Here the Hebrew word rendered by *ἀνάμνησις* is אַזְכָּרָה. Now, everywhere else this word is rendered uniformly *μνημόσυνον*. Why did the LXX depart from this rendering here? Not without reason; but to understand this we must call to mind what the אזכרה was. It was that portion of a meal offering which was consumed by fire, thus sanctifying the

whole as an offering.[6] Hence it was called the אזכרה, or 'memorial' thereof. It was in fact a 'reminder,' something that brought to remembrance; viz. it brought the offering and the offerer to remembrance before God. It is important to notice that no offering is called by this name merely as an offering, but as in relation to a whole of which it is a part; and further, that the English word 'memorial' tends to mislead, for the name has no reference to 'memory' of a thing past or absent.

Now, in the case of the shewbread no part of the cakes was burned, but the frankincense which was placed on them (probably on trays, not on the bread itself) was burned, and served as an אזכרה to the bread. The LXX misses this by reading לֶחֶם without the article. Instead of *τῷ ἄρτῳ* or *τοῖς ἄρτοις* they render *εἰς ἄρτους*. Having done this, they necessarily missed the sense of אזכרה, and this at once explains their departure from the usual rendering *μνημόσυνον*. The Greek words *ἔσονται εἰς ἄρτους εἰς ἀνάμνησιν* cannot mean "shall serve to the bread as an *ἀν.*," but must mean "shall serve as bread for *ἀνάμνησις*," i.e. the bread itself was *εἰς ἀνάμνησιν*. The translators knew well enough what an אזכרה was, and knew that the cakes which were not burned could not be that. This is made still clearer by the fact that אֲשֶׁר at the end of the verse is not rendered by the usual *κάρπωμα*, but by *προκείμενα*; or, perhaps it is more correct to say that they omit אֲשֶׁר, and insert *προκείμενα* to complete the sense. This word is used of the table of shewbread in Num. iv. 7, and in Exod. xxxix. 36 of the shewbread, *τοὺς ἄρτους τοὺς προκειμένους*. This places beyond all doubt the explanation above given. The passage then is so far from proving that *ἀνάμνησις* was used as equivalent for אזכרה in its ordinary sense, that it goes to prove the contrary: *ἀνάμνησις* is here used just because אזכרה is not taken in its sacrificial sense; if indeed the translator read the Hebrew word so.[7]

Before discussing the Psalm-titles I will refer to the usage of the Hexaplar translators and of the writers of the Apocryphal books, which is as important as that of the LXX as evidence of the meaning of the Greek word. Now, Symmachus has *ἀνάμνησις* in Ps. vii. 5; an unnamed translator (perhaps Symmachus) has it in Ps. cxxxv. 13;

[6] See Lev. ii. 2, 9, 16.

[7] I leave it undecided whether the LXX may not have read the Hebrew word a little differently.

and in the Book of Wisdom, xvi. 6, it is found in the connection *εἰς ἀνάμνησιν ἐντολῆς νόμου σου.*

It would be too little to say that *ἀνάμνησις* has been proved not to be sacrificial; in fact, there is not a shadow of reason for the contrary assertion.

I now come to the two Psalm-titles in which *ἀνάμνησις* occurs, and in which the Hebrew is לְהַזְכִּיר. Some recent commentators have adopted the view that this means "at the offering of the אַזְכָּרָה," or "of incense"; basing the interpretation on Isai. lxvi. 3, where, however, the verb is followed by the word 'incense.' I am not, however, going to discuss the correctness of this view; I am content for argument's sake to admit that it is correct.

Admitting this, however, this use of לְהַזְכִּיר is at best rare, and the literal meaning of the word is that which it has elsewhere, viz. 'to bring to remembrance.'[8] The Greek *εἰς ἀνάμνησιν*, then, corresponds with the literal sense of the Hebrew, and this being so, surely no philologist would think himself justified in seeking farther or inferring an otherwise unexampled meaning of the Greek to correspond with the rare meaning of the Hebrew. Nothing short of verbal inspiration of the Greek could justify such an inference. Preposterous as such an argument would be in any case, in that of the Psalm-titles it is utterly irrational. A few examples will make this clear.

To the Precentor is	*εἰς τὸ τέλος.*
On Shoshannim (to the tune 'Lilies,')	*ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀλλοιωθησομένων.*
On "Lily of the Testimony,"	*ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀλλοιωθησομένων ἔτι.*
To a Gittite march or tune,	*ὑπὲρ τῶν ληνῶν.*
On 'Alamoth (virgin voices),	*ὑπὲρ τῶν κρυφίων.*
To the accompaniment of flutes,	*ὑπὲρ τῆς κληρονομούσης.*
On stringed instruments,	*ἐν ὕμνοις.*

Is it not obvious that in rendering the titles the translator was absolutely at sea, and in obscure cases went by guesswork? In Ps. liii. he even gave up in despair, and wrote *μαελέθ*. There is, I think, not one title not of obvious meaning which he renders correctly according to modern views. He is invariably either strictly literal or utterly wrong. Will any one seriously contend that we are to assign a perfectly novel meaning to a Greek word on the assumption that in one case this translator's rendering, while apparently literal, was

[8] לְהַזְכִּיר is rendered *τοῦ ἀναμνῆσαι* more than once; מַזְכִּיר is *ὁ ἀναμιμνήσκων.*

really profoundly and subtilely correct, when nearly every one else went astray?

It may be worth while to add that in Ps. lxx. Aquila substitutes *τοῦ ἀναμιμνήσκειν* obviously in order to represent more closely the grammatical form of the Hebrew, but showing that he had no idea of the supposed sense of *ἀνάμνησις*.

The case is analogous to that of deciding between two suggested causes of a given effect in natural philosophy. Here we take for each cause its antecedent probability, and multiply this by the chance that if it existed it would produce the effect; and a comparison of the results gives the relative probability of the two causes. Now here we have on one side the probability that the translator took חוכרי in its literal sense, a very high probability indeed when estimated from the other titles, multiplied by the probability that in that case he would render the word *ἀνάμνησις*, which is also pretty high, as *ἀναμιμνήσκειν* is frequently used for this verb. On the other side we have to place the probability that he would discern the subtile and elsewhere unknown sense of חוכרי, a minute chance, indeed evanescent, multiplied by the chance that he would think *ἀνάμνησις* a suitable word to express this meaning, a chance too small to be measured, seeing the word is never found in this sense. If the passage in Isaiah referred to supports the suggestion as to the meaning of the Hebrew word, it certainly does not support this view of the Greek word, which is not used there, for the rendering is *ὁ διδοὺς λίβανον εἰς μνημόσυνον*.

In the N. T. *ἀνάμνησις* occurs Heb. x. 3, "In those sacrifices there is a remembrance made of sins year by year." But the circumstance that a sacrifice calls sins to mind does not go to prove that whatever calls a thing to mind is a sacrifice.

We are now in a position to estimate the value of the assertion that in the LXX *ποιεῖν* when joined with an object capable of being offered has frequently or constantly the meaning 'offer'; and, secondly, that therefore this may be assumed to be its meaning in the N. T. when so joined.

First, we have seen that it has this meaning only under these conditions: first, that the object be not only capable of being offered, but in fact habitually spoken of as offered; and, secondly, that the connection be unmistakably sacrificial.

Secondly, the usage of the LXX does not determine that of the

N. T., and there is nothing to show that even this limited usage would be admitted in the dialect of the N. T. writers.

Thirdly, τοῦτο ποιεῖτε or τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ποιεῖτε in the sense 'offer this' or 'offer this cup,' has no analogy in the LXX, and may be pronounced impossible.

Fourthly, εἰς ἀνάμνησιν nowhere and never had any sacrificial signification at all.

To assume then that in the N. T. ποιεῖν means 'offer' when neither of the above conditions is fulfilled is philologically unjustifiable.

I may add that I do not know any theory of the Eucharist which would make it correct to speak of it as an אזכרה. Possibly some writers may have been misled by the associations of the English word 'memorial.' But from what was said above it is plain that the אזכרה had nothing to do with 'memorial' in the sense of remembrance of a past event; it was a present calling to mind of the worshipper before God.

The preceding reasoning is to my mind so entirely conclusive that I am unwilling to add considerations of another kind. Nevertheless there is one such consideration which seems to me worthy of notice; but I wish it to be regarded quite independently of what precedes.

When τοῦτο or 'this' is used of an action, whether shown or not, it usually is general; that is, it means an action 'such as this': 'this gesture,' 'this movement,' etc. But if the word is defined by an actual object shown and presented, then it means this actual object only. Hence, if it were possible to understand τοῦτο as τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον it would mean this actual cup, not a cup thus consecrated. No doubt after the institution became established the case would be different, and 'this cup' would mean 'the cup of this ceremony.'

This may be illustrated as follows. Suppose the sovereign to present a sword to a successful warrior, saying, "Wear this sword for my sake," 'this' would mean this individual sword. But if an order of knighthood were thus instituted a subsequent knight might speak of 'this sword' meaning a sword thus appropriated. It is thus that St. Paul speaks of 'this cup,' 'this bread,' not defining by showing or presenting the object, but by reference to the institution spoken of. Such usage, however, is obviously quite different from that in the passage in question, connected with the first institution. There 'this' must mean 'this actual cup,' and the words would therefore refer only to a present action. This would of course be inconsistent with

ὁσακις ἂν πίνητε, not to speak of other obvious objections; objections, too, which will at once suggest themselves even to the understanding ποιεῖτε of a present offering at all of 'this my blood,' or 'this my body,' which if τοῦτο means 'this object' it must certainly include.

It would seem as if those who adopt this interpretation unconsciously combine two interpretations of τοῦτο ποιεῖτε: 1, offer this cup; 2, repeat this action.

Trin. Coll., Dublin, 1890.