which afterwards sent men on pilgrimage, and led them to seek for relics to which they attributed wonderful power. The sacraments may be viewed with a like superstition. This is a weakness which Christ always appears to treat with much considerateness. The Word of Life came in such form that an apostle was able to speak of having handled it. Christ's word would have sufficed to have wrought His miracles, and sometimes did, but, out of consideration for human weakness, He generally 'laid His hands on them, and healed them.'

III. CHRIST'S POWER OPERATES THROUGH HUMAN TRUSTFULNESS.—Many in the crowd touched Christ, indeed pressed on Him, without being conscious of any healing influence. Peter rebuked his Lord for having asked, 'Who touched Me?' But Christ could distinguish the touch of faith from the pressing of the crowd. We touch Christ in the sacraments and ordinances of public worship, but do not necessarily draw healing influence from Him in so doing. The Pharisee, with his parade and long prayers, was like one of the crowd that pressed on Christ, while the shrinking publican was like the woman who touched the hem of His garment, and he 'went down to his house justified, rather than the other.'

The woman was made bold by her need and by the kindness of Jesus. There was trust in His sympathy and ability to heal her. The woman was active, while Christ was passive. He did not send out healing power, but was like a charged

thunder-cloud waiting for contact with the conducting substance. The woman's faith, expressed in her touch, formed the bridge across which the power immediately poured. When faith is weak in the recipient, Christ needs to exert energy to overcome resistance. It is from this cause that it is possible to say that faith made the woman whole, because her faith was the first and chief activity. Her faith enabled her to draw on the power which healed her.

IV. CHRIST'S POWER OPERATES THROUGH THE TRUSTFULNESS BE VERY IMPERFECT.—The woman's faith was neither bold nor pure. She would if possible steal health without acknowledgment, and she showed much superstition in the means by which this end was to be gained. In healing her, Christ drew from her that acknowledgment she was so reluctant to give, and cleared her faith from that alloy which dimmed it. Yet He gave her abundant healing. Many would, in services and ordinances, steal an unacknowledged blessing from Christ. They seek thus, with much superstition, to touch the hem of His garment. Blessing they do receive, since they come seeking it, but along with the blessing there ought to be open acknowledgment of the Healer, and a simpler faith. The blessing, however, is to faith; not necessarily to firm faith. A true faith, however weak, will form a bond linking our feebleness to divine power. If the faith be true, Christ will strengthen and purify it. Yet He desires open acknowledgment.

Contributions and Comments.

Church and Book.

A SONNET.

AN ancient church stands on the shelter'd knoll,
Up whose grave-mounded yew-enclosed ascent
Seven hundred years have seen the people bent
To pray as changing priesthoods held control.
The pile, to practised eye, tells like a scroll
How diverse modes of architecture lent
Successive parts: and Christians reverent
O'erlook the sections for the sacred whole.
The Bible's varied contents critics read
And know that style, like mason's mark, defines
The writer's era: no time-honour'd creed
Annuls the autographs between the lines.
Yet the one Book, composed of all, enshrines
What makes both sage and simple wise indeed.

Stobo.

J. R. CRUICKSHANK.

Emmaus.

IN the January number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, p. 159, Dr. Grosart, in answer to a correspondent regarding the site of Emmaus, refers only to Mrs. Finn's paper, *Palestine Quarterly*, 1883, pp. 53-64, in which she endeavours to make out that Emmaus was at Urtâs. Allow me to supplement that reference by others. In the *Palestine Quarterly*, papers maintaining other views will be found as follows:—*Palestine Quarterly*, 1876, p. 172; 1879, p. 105; 1881, pp. 46, 237, 274; 1884, p. 243 and p. 245. A paper in defence of Mrs. Finn's view will be found in *Palestine Quarterly*, 1885, p. 116; and note in reply, p. 156.

I have no theory to maintain, as I do not think

the evidence conclusive in favour of anyone of the other proposed identifications. I think it is conclusive against Urtâs. But in any case an inquirer should know where to find more than a one-sided statement.

Crieff.

ARCH. HENDERSON.

Who was Darius the Mede?

I READ with interest the account you give, in your December issue, of Mr. Pinches' paper before the Church Congress at Norwich. I have long been aware of Mr. Pinches' view on the subject of the identity of Darius the Mede with Gobryas, and had arrived at a similar position independently. I have not seen any full report of Mr. Pinches' paper, and so cannot tell whether he distinctly credits the *authors* of the Book of Daniel or of this portion of the book with the change from the one name to the other. I, for my part, feel inclined to think that the author of the change was one or other of the numerous scribes through whose hands it must have passed ere it came to us. We all know the case in Judges xviii. 30, where *Moses* has been changed into *Manasseh*. Another case is 2 Sam. xi. 21, where *Jerubbaal* becomes *Jerubbesheth*. In the case of the transition from Gobryas to Darius, the change is rendered easy from the striking resemblance of the initial letters in the early Aramaic and Hebrew scripts. That there was some uncertainty as to the name is shown by the fact that once in the Septuagint (ch. v. 31) it appears as 'Artaxerxes.' The fact that the Book of Daniel did not form part of the regular synagogal reading rendered the introduction of such changes as that from Gobryas to Darius possible. We have evidence of one change, at any-rate, of as great magnitude having taken place: in Dan. i. 3, 'Ashpenaz' of the Massoretic becomes, 'Abiesdri' in the Septuagint.

Safed, Palestine.

J. E. H. THOMSON.

The Galatians of St. Paul's Epistle.

DR. W. M. RAMSAY'S kindly Note in your issue of December last tempts me to write a word or two in explanation of my dissent from him on the question of the locality of St. Paul's Galatians. The critics of his South-Galatian hypothesis have at least enjoyed the satisfaction of provoking from

him a brilliant and resourceful defence; they have enabled him to readjust and develop and buttress his position in various directions.

1. Dr. Ramsay separates Galatians from Romans by three and a half years, and by the whole breadth of the eventful third missionary journey (*Church in the Roman Empire*,³ p. 101; *St. Paul the Traveller*, pp. 191, 286), making the former epistle much nearer in time and circumstances to the Thessalonian than to the Corinthian-Roman group of the letters. If Dr. Ramsay happens to glance at my little work on *The Epistles of Paul*, he will see that I hold decidedly to Lightfoot's arrangement of the second group, though I cannot follow him in placing Philippians at the head of the third. Lightfoot's argument in the latter case is neither so convincing nor so confident as in the former. In both instances, the deliberate judgment of that prince of New Testament scholars calls for careful examination upon its own ground. It is strange to read of 'Lightfoot's strange error.' Such study of the connexion of the apostle's writings and of the working of his mind as I have been able to make, has led to a firm belief that the order 1, 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Romans, made out by Lightfoot, is the true sequence. Objections of this nature, based on internal evidence, must of course give way to decisive external proof; but till such proof is forthcoming, they retain their force.

2. On the matter of St. Barnabas' relations to St. Paul and the South-Galatian Churches, I have said: 'Barnabas was the joint founder, with Paul, of the churches of South Galatia. But, in the epistle, Paul claims unshared and unqualified authority over his Galatians. He refers thrice to Barnabas by name (once in terms of condemnation, ii. 13), but appears quite unaware of any relationship between his old companion and the readers; he is in no way embarrassed by the fact that Barnabas, to whom the South-Galatian Churches owed allegiance equally with himself, had differed from him in regard to the grave question at issue in the epistle. Now St. Paul was particularly sensitive upon this point, and speaks elsewhere of those who "stretch themselves overmuch" and "build on another's foundation" (1 Cor. iv. 14-16; 2 Cor. x. 13-16; Rom. xv. 20) with a contempt, some measure of which would fall on himself, if he really ignored Barnabas' paternal rights and interest in the churches of the first missionary tour, and elbowed him out of the

partnership, as he must have done on the South-Galatian hypothesis' (*The Epistles of Paul*,³ pp. 291, 292). I say nothing about 'the policy pursued in Iconium,' etc.: Paul was admittedly, as Dr. Ramsay says, the leading spirit of the missionary band. But Barnabas was not a cypher. It was a *joint* enterprise on which they were engaged. Barnabas was at this time Paul's colleague upon an equal footing, if not, in public estimate, his official superior (Acts xiii. 1, 2, xiv. 12), as he was his senior in age and, in a sense, his patron (Acts ix. 27, xi. 25, 26). In view of St. Paul's known character and delicate sentiments towards his fellow-workers, I cannot understand his assumption of sole jurisdiction over the 'Galatians' and his oblivion of Barnabas' part in their conversion, if they were the Galatians of the southern cities where Barnabas and he laboured as fellow-missionaries. Their subsequent disagreement would have made the apostle all the more scrupulous to do full justice to his old comrade in arms.

3. The questions of grammar involved have been by this time pretty nearly thrashed out. Dr. Ramsay's final notes on these matters (found in his delightful and richly instructive work just to hand)¹ I have read with special interest, but find myself still sceptical of the soundness of his pleas. Allowing that the local terms in Acts xvi. 6 and xviii. 23 are both adjectives, the probability remains that they are employed in a parallel and not a heterogeneous sense, and that the popular (ethnic) use of 'Phrygian' determines that of 'Galatian' likewise. Dr. Ramsay has proved that 'Galatia' had at this period a wider imperial meaning; he has not proved that it lost its proper local and racial significance, or that St. Luke was tied to the former signification. Acts xxvii. 5 and 1 Thess. i. 8 are apt examples for the coupling under a single Greek article of two local words denoting a continuous area in its different parts. The instance of 'the Ituræan and Trachonitic region,' in Luke iii. 1, is dubious; it appears to tell rather against than in favour of the coincidence of the two place-names here. That διήλθον . . . κωλυθέντες = διήλθον καὶ ἐκωλύθησαν appears very unlikely in a careful author; to admit such a lapse would destroy one's confidence in St. Luke's grammar. In each of the parallels adduced, the aorist participle conditions, in some way or other, the verb to which it is

attached, and should not be baldly resolved into a co-ordinate finite verb.

4. On other points I have nothing to add to what was said in the postscript to *The Epistles of Paul*,³ and in the *Critical Review* for October 1893, except to admit that Dr. Ramsay's testimony throws great doubt upon the existence of Christianity in St. Paul's time in the *centre and east* of Galatia proper. I would, therefore, follow the retreat of Drs. Chase and Zöckler from Lightfoot's extreme position, and concentrate the defence of the old North-Galatian hypothesis upon the *western* region of North Galatia surrounding Pessinus and immediately contiguous to Phrygia. From this centre, however, 'the word of the Lord' would begin to 'sound out' through northern Asia Minor; and the apostle in writing Rom. xv. 19—after he had traversed this region a second time, and, apparently, from the opposite (eastern) side (Acts xviii. 23)—would feel that he had virtually occupied the whole peninsula for Christ. Bithynia and Pontus were in touch with North-West Galatia, and it is significant that Pontus and Galatia are associated in 1 Peter i. 1. Perhaps St. Paul fell ill and was compelled to halt here (Gal. iv. 13), during the second missionary tour, *on his way to Ancyra*, which was the metropolis of the great province of Galatia, and the spot for which we should have expected him to make when he found his progress to 'Asia' barred at Antioch (Acts xvi. 6).

GEORGE G. FINDLAY.

Headingley College.

The Kingdom of Heaven.

I. IT is well known that the New Testament phrase ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν is peculiar to the Hebrew-Greek Gospel of Matthew, and corresponds to ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ² and similar phrases in the other Gospels. I notice that in Grimm-Thayer's *Lexicon* under βασιλεία (p. 97) the Rabbinic equivalent is given as מְלִכְוֹתָא דֵּי הָאֱלֹהִים, i.e. 'The rule of God, the theocracy viewed universally, not the Messianic kingdom.' This is a mistake. Delitzsch, in his valuable articles, 'Critical Observations on my Hebrew New Testament,' which appeared in various numbers of the *Expositor* for 1889, following Schürer, has shown (Article II.) that the post-biblical Jewish equivalent for the kingdom

¹ *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*, pp. 211, 212.

² ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ occurs also in Matt. 12²⁸ 19²⁴ 21³¹⁻⁴³; ἡ βασιλεία alone sometimes, e.g., 6³³.

of God is מְלִכּוּת שָׁמַיִם (without the article). מְלִכּוּת שָׁמַיִם never occurs. שָׁמַיִם, in fact, is one of the well-known (Rabbinic) substitutes for the name of God, and is practically a proper name. Cf. the common (post-biblical) phrases. קִבֵּל מְלִכּוּת שָׁמַיִם *reception of the kingdom of heaven*; or קִבֵּל עוֹל מְלִכּוּת שָׁמַיִם *taking up the yoke of the kingdom of heaven*.

On the other hand, Delitzsch justifies his own rendering (in his Hebrew New Testament) of ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν by מְלִכּוּת הַשָּׁמַיִם (*with the article*) on the ground that it is 'by no means identical with מְלִכּוּת שָׁמַיִם of the synagogue.' 'Heaven (heavens)' here is, in fact, not a proper name, but implies that the kingdom is 'of heavenly origin, of heavenly nature and universal extent, comprehending as well the heavenly as the earthly world, and some way transforming the earth into heaven as the fulfilment of the prayer, "Thy will be done on earth as in heaven."' "

It is noticeable that ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν never interchanges with ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, and in this connexion it is curious to observe that the plural οὐρανοί¹ is, outside the phrase ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν, chiefly if not exclusively confined (in the first Gospel) to the expression ὁ πατήρ ὑμῶν (ἡμῶν) ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς (cf. 5^{16. 45 69} [contrast Luke 11²] 7^{11. 21} 10³² 16¹⁷ 18¹⁹).² The exceptions to this rule are 3^{16. 17} 5¹² 16¹⁹ (contrast 18¹⁸), 18¹⁰ (v. 1. ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ), 19²¹ 24³⁶, and the quotations from the Old Testament in 24^{29. 31}, where οὐρανός and οὐρανοί (apparently) interchange indiscriminately. Now, it is certainly striking that in the Hebrew-Greek Gospel the Hebraism οὐρανοί is mainly confined to two expressions, one of which has for its counterpart (of which it is presumably a translation) שְׁבִישִׁמַיִם (אֲבִיךָ) אֲבִינוּ (cf., e.g., Pirke Abhoth v. 30: 'R. Jehudah ben Thema said, Be bold as a leopard, and swift as an eagle, and fleet as a hart, and strong as a lion, to do the will of thy Father which is in heaven (שְׁבִישִׁמַיִם) אֲבִיךָ').³

By parity of reasoning, it would seem that the

¹ This use of the plural, it is hardly necessary to explain, is a Hebraism (see, e.g., THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, vol. ii. p. 84).

² The only other instance of the use of this phrase that I can discover outside the first Gospel is Mark 11^{25. 26}. A variation on it, ὁ πατήρ ὑμῶν (μου) ὁ οὐράνιος, occurs Matt. 5⁴⁸ 6¹⁴ 15¹³ 18³⁵ 23⁹. Contrast ὁ πατήρ ὁ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, Luke 11¹³.

³ On the whole subject of the Jewish parallels to the Lord's Prayer, see Dr. Taylor's *Sayings of the Jewish Fathers*, Excursus v. p. 138.

other expression, ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν, has for its counterpart the post-biblical מְלִכּוּת שָׁמַיִם⁴ (of which it, too, is presumably a translation).

In rendering back into Hebrew, ought we not, then, to follow the usage of the language and translate by מְלִכּוּת שָׁמַיִם? No doubt the Christian expression is charged with a fuller and far profounder meaning than the synagogic; but in this respect it does not differ from other terms, derived from extraneous sources, that have been taken up into Christian phraseology and, as it were, spiritualised (e.g. the λόγος of St. John).

Parenthetically, it may here be remarked that, according to Schürer, מְלִכּוּת שָׁמַיִם does not, as a rule, occur with the meaning 'kingdom of heaven' (concrete), but with the abstract sense, 'the kingdom, the government of heaven,' i.e. the rule of God. Very curiously, the same connotation has on, I believe, quite independent grounds been recently claimed for the New Testament βασιλεία. In an article in the *Contemporary Review* for October 1894 (which was noticed in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for the following month), Dr. A. N. Jannaris argues with much force that βασιλεία is, in the usage of the New Testament, an abstract noun with the meaning of 'lordship' or 'dominion.' If this may be accepted, nothing could well seem clearer than that the ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν of the first Gospel is (in form, at least) an exact equivalent of the מְלִכּוּת שָׁמַיִם current in contemporary Jewish literature.⁵

II. The question arises, Do any cases occur in the New Testament of 'heaven' used as an equivalent of 'God'? Delitzsch (*op. cit.*) quotes one passage which he says is unique. This is Luke 15²¹: Πάτερ ἡμαρτον εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ ἐνώπιόν σου. *Father, I have sinned against heaven, and in Thy sight.* The right Hebrew rendering here is (as Delitzsch points out) לְשָׁמַיִם וּלְפָנֶיךָ (שְׁבִישִׁמַיִם) *without the article*. But there is, so it seems to the present writer, at least one other passage where this meaning is highly probable, namely, Matt. 21²⁵ (parallel Luke 20⁴): τὸ βάπτισμα τὸ Ἰωάννου πόθεν ἦν; ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ἢ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων; *The baptism of John, whence was it? from heaven or from men?* Surely here the antithesis requires that 'heaven' should be understood in its

⁴ In Aramaic (מְלִכּוּתָא דְּשָׁמַיָא) the distinction would not be maintained.

⁵ *History of Jewish People in the Time of Christ*, div. ii. vol. ii. p. 171, note 58, Eng. trans.

metonymic sense.¹ It is interesting to note² that the earliest known case for the use of 'heaven' in this remarkable sense occurs in Daniel 4²³ (E.V. 26), the latter part of which verse runs:³ *Thy kindgom (shall be) secure to thee from the time when thou shalt recognise that the heavens rule* (דִּי שְׁלֹטִין שָׁמַיָּא). How is the metonymic sense to be explained? Fischer (*ap.* Buxtorf) answers: 'Quia *coelum* proprie dicitur habitaculum ejus (sc. Dei).' This may be illustrated by a passage in the first Gospel (23²²), where the literal and metonymic senses seem to be combined. The verse runs: And he that sweareth by heaven (ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ) sweareth by the throne of God, and by Him that sitteth thereon. (Cf. Matt. 5³⁵ and James 5¹².)

At the same time it must not be forgotten that even in the metonymic sense of the term there was an implied contrast to earth. 'The consciousness of its contrast to earth or the world (says Dr. Edersheim⁴) was distinctly expressed in Rabbinic writings.' (He cites as a synonym of מַלְכוּת שָׁמַיָּא, מַלְכוּתא דְּרִיקְעָא, 'kingdom of the firmament,' Ber. 58a, Shebhu. 35b.)

G. H. Box.

Walton-on-the-Naze.

Sennacherib's Murder.

THE biblical account is precise enough (2 Kings xix. 36, 37). But it presents many puzzles to anyone who wishes to compare contemporary Assyrian documents. The names Nisroch, Adrammelech, and Sharezer are all difficult. As far as I know, the only sons of Sennacherib mentioned in the Inscriptions are Aššur-nadin-šum and Esarhaddon. The former was made king of Babylon, but after six years' reign was carried away captive to Elam. Esarhaddon succeeded his father. The Babylonian Chronicle (Royal Asiatic Society, vol. xix. N.S. p. 655) gives this short account:—'On the 20th of Tebet, Sennacherib, king of Assyria, his son in a revolt killed him . . . years Sennacherib had wielded the sovereignty of Assyria. From the

¹ On referring (since writing the above) to the 1885 and last editions of his Hebrew New Testament, I discover that Delitzsch finally recognised the metonymic sense of 'heaven' in these passages, the מִן הַשָּׁמַיִם of the earlier editions having been altered to מִשָּׁמַיִם in the last.

² The fact is pointed out by Delitzsch (*op. cit.*), cf. also Bevan, *ad loc.*

³ I cite Professor Bevan's translation.

⁴ *Jesus the Messiah*, i. 267.

20th of Tebet to the 2nd of Adar the revolt in Assyria went on. On the 18th of Sivan (*i.e.* in the next year), Esarhaddon, his son, sat on the throne in Assyria.' This record was written in the twentieth year of Darius Hystaspes, B.C. 500, say. The agreement is scanty. It looks as if one son slew Sennacherib and not two. Some have thought it implied that Esarhaddon himself was the murderer. If, as is generally stated, Esarhaddon was the avenger of his father's death, one would expect him to be proud enough of the fact to say so. We know that he had been made regent in Babylon at the end of his father's reign. We know that on his broken cylinder translated in Budge's *History of Esarhaddon*, he represents himself as defeating an army at Hanirabbat, on the Armenian frontier. But I cannot see at all why that army is supposed to consist of any but Armenians, who naturally seized the opportunity to throw off the Assyrian yoke. Immediately after we find Esarhaddon engaged in putting down a similar rebellion in Babylon. To call it a battle against his brother passes fair deduction from the account given. At the most, this battle and its geographical position is consistent with the biblical account; but the inscription is singularly lacking in detailed confirmation. Of course the commencement of the inscription being lost, we can assert what we like as to its probable contents; but what purpose will that serve?

Esarhaddon has left other inscriptions. That on the 'so-called Black Stone' in column 2 contains a significant sentence. In return for his good deeds, Marduk the gracious 'has selected him from the group of his elder brothers.' There seems to be no doubt about the 'elder,' though Dr. Winckler (in Schrader's *Keilschriftliche Bibliothek*, Bd. ii. p. 123) does not translate it. I fancy he took the phrase to mean kings in general who had preceded Esarhaddon. This passage, at least, seems to confirm Esarhaddon's being preferred before the brothers who had right of birth to the throne, but one cannot press it too much. On the cylinders denoted as A and C, I can find no reference to his father's murder, nor his brother's hostility. Another inscription of his is partly published in *Keilschriftliche Bibliothek* concerning the erection of an Istar-temple at Erech. Nowhere in that can I find any reference to these points. Esarhaddon's silence about the horrors of his accession is total. The addresses to Esarhaddon of the various oracles

do evince that at some time in his life, most probably in the interval after his father's death before his accession, he was in great straits. In these prophecies of his success, the goddess Ištar of Arbela calls the Ukkai his enemies; promises he shall cross the river in safety, and repeatedly tells him not to fear, he shall prosper and come to old age and the usual good things Assyrian kings wished for. But she does not bid him avenge his father, nor say a word about his enemies being those of his own household. Professor Strong has published some other oracles addressed to Esarhaddon, which mention as his enemies the Gamirrai and the land of Ellipi; but these probably refer to a later period of his reign. Dr. Knudtzon in his *Gebete an den Sonnengott* has published a crowd of documents asking advice at the shrine of Šamaš. In none of them can I see a hint of these events.

Now to crown all this silence, with a *reductio ad absurdum* of the argument *e silentio*, comes a phrase from the lately published Sendschirli Stele of Esarhaddon. There, as naturally as possible, quite at the end of his reign, Esarhaddon calls himself 'mutir gimil abi alidišu.' I believe that can only be rendered, 'The avenger of the father that begot him.' The silence is broken, as one had hoped. Esarhaddon, at least, disclaims the murder of his father, claims to have avenged him.

I have written this in the hope of stirring others to a more careful examination of what Esarhaddon did write. These epithets usually recur, and other inscriptions are known. Perhaps some one may yet point out a more striking confirmation. At least one cloud is pierced by one ray of light.

Queens' College, Cambridge.

C. H. W. JOHNS.

The Use of *νῦν* and *νυνί* in the New Testament.

It is well known that, in classical Greek, *νῦν* is used to convey (1) the mere sense of *time*, being equivalent to *nunc*, *now*, *at this present hour*. But it is not so well known as it ought to be that it is used also (2) as a particle of *transition*, denoting the sequence of one thing upon, or from another, and equivalent to *then*, *therefore*, *now then*, *as it is*, *as the case now stands*; e.g. *μὴ νῦν μοι νεμεσήσετε*, do not *then* be wroth with me (*II. xv. 115*); *νῦν δὲ ὑμεῖς στρεβλώσαντες*, etc., *Dem. de Cor. 271, 20*,

where, manifestly, the meaning is 'as the case turned out.'

These two distinct senses of *νῦν*, which we may call the *temporal*, and the *logical—argumentative—or ethical*, are both largely exemplified in the New Testament. Of the latter use, indeed, we find a considerable expansion here, for the Attic form *νυνί* has come to be employed in the same way, whereas in classical Greek it referred only to *time*.

The object of this brief note is to call attention to the importance of giving all due effect to this *logical* force of *νῦν* and *νυνί* as just described. I believe that it is not too much to say that it has been very frequently disregarded by New Testament exegetes—invariably leading to the point and sense of many a passage being entirely lost.

Passages that seem to come oftenest under the range of the remark just made are: Luke xix. 42; Acts iii. 17, vii. 34, x. 5, xii. 11, xx. 22, 25, xxii. 16; Rom. v. 9, 11, vii. 6; 1 Cor. v. 11, vii. 14, xiii. 13, xiv. 6; 1 Thess. iii. 8; 2 Thess. ii. 6; Heb. xi. 16.

I need not occupy space in doing, with respect to *all* these passages, what every one of your readers can do for himself. To make the point I contend for clear, however, I may be allowed to discuss a few of them by way of illustration.

Take the first on the list, Luke xix. 42: 'If thou hadst known, even thou, at least in this thy day, the things which belong unto thy peace! but now they are hid from thine eyes' (A.V.), 'If thou hadst known in this day, even thou, the things which belong unto peace! but now they are hid from thine eyes' (R.V.). Do the words (the same in both versions), 'but now they are hid,' convey to the ordinary English reader the exact sense of what St. Luke reports our Lord to have really said, namely, *νῦν δὲ ἐκρύβη?* What precisely is it that is taught here? Most people will be satisfied with Dean Plumptre's answer: 'The Greek tense implies, by a distinction hard to express in English, in conjunction with the adverb "now," that the concealment of the things that made for the peace of Jerusalem was a thing completed in the past.' But if that is really the meaning, is there *no* way of rendering the Greek so as to show the English reader that it is? The case is not hopeless. Here *νῦν* is not so much an adverb of *mere time*, as a *logical particle* with the force of *as the event has proved*. Why not so inform the ordinary reader by rendering the clause thus: *but, as now appears, they were hid*, etc.?

'They were hid, *i.e.* the present state of things proves the divine decree by which they were destined to be hidden from thee' (Farrar). Our translation brings out all this—perhaps at the cost of a little neatness and elegance of diction, but truth and accuracy are even more important still.

I take next Acts iii. 17: 'And now, brethren, I wot that through ignorance ye did it.' Here 'And now . . . I wot' is not the best possible rendering of *καὶ νῦν οἶδα*. It is certainly misleading, and calculated to make one fancy that what St. Peter is speaking of is the *present* state of his knowledge as contrasted with his knowledge at some *former time*. The fact is, however, that *νῦν* has, in this place, no time reference at all. As in Acts vii. 34, x. 5, xx. 25, xxii. 16; 2 Thess ii. 6, it is a particle of *transition* towards a fresh consideration—a logical term thrown in to call attention to what is to be done next. So Professor Blass,¹ who explains *καὶ νῦν* as 'quod attinet ad ea quæ nunc facienda sunt,' namely, 'repent ye' and 'turn again' (ver. 19). As is nearly always the case, it is impossible by one single word adequately to translate an expression like this. But, with much deference, I suggest the following: *And, to pass to the point, brethren, I wot that in ignorance ye did it.* That is, I pass from my severe charge against you as having denied and murdered the Holy One, and I call you to your next duty—'Repent, . . . turn again.'

Another passage that calls for examination is Rom. vii. 6: 'But now we are delivered from the law' (A.V.); 'But now we have been discharged from the law' (R.V.). Both these renderings of *νυνὶ δὲ καταργηθήμεν* miss the point. It is clear from the context that *νυνὶ* here, as frequently with St. Paul, has a logical or argumentative force, denoting *things being so*, or, as Lightfoot explains the position, '*under this new dispensation.*' One wonders whether it was error as to the force of *νυνὶ* that led the Authorized Version and Revised Version translators into another error still, namely, that of missing the precise force of the *Aorist*, which, manifestly, is that the release in question took place *at the moment of accepting Christ in baptism*. I humbly contend for the rendering—*But, as things are, we were loosed from the law, having died to that wherein we were holden.*

Perhaps the examination of only one other text

¹ *Acta Apostolorum* (Göttingen, 1895), p. 68.

will be sufficient to establish the view for which contend. Take 1 Cor. v. 11: 'But now I have written unto you not to keep company' (A.V.) 'But now I write unto you not to keep company' (R.V.). *Neither* version renders correctly *νῦν δὲ ἔγραψα*. And for this reason. The context clearly shows that the contrast suggested is not between two *periods* (present and past), but between two *constructions as regards Paul's letter*.—between a wrong meaning put upon it by the Corinthians and the meaning it was really intended to convey. As Meyer puts it, 'Paul's design is simply to define more precisely the purport of the phrase in his former letter, *μὴ συναναμίγνυσθαι πόρνους*.' . . . 'Were a contrast drawn between the present and the former letter, the present *γράφε* would have been more natural and more distinct than the Epistolary Aorist. . . . Nay, to obviate the misunderstanding, it would have been a thing of necessity' (Meyer's *Romans*, *in loc.*). Accordingly, ought not the rendering to be something like this: *But, as rightly understood, I wrote to you not to keep company, etc.*, which is equivalent to saying, *What, correctly speaking, I wrote to you was—?* The 1881 Revisers seem to have been convinced that there was something to be said for a translation like the one just given, for (by what majority one would like to know) they have put in the margin the alternative reading, 'as it is, I wrote.' But with all respect let it be said that it might have been better had a less timid policy prevailed, and had 'as it is, I wrote' been placed in the text, for experience of Authorized Version marginal readings *has* proved, and experience of Revised Version marginal readings will *continue* to prove, that they have little or no influence on the popular mind. It ought not to be forgotten that though *νῦν* is a very small word, yet questions by no means small frequently depend upon it. For example, a wrong view of it has led more than one expositor to take a wrong view of *ἔγραψα*, not only in ver. 11 but in ver. 9. Altogether, much confusion has often resulted, in the midst of which it cannot be seen nearly so well as it ought to be that in each case the reference is to some *lost letter* to the Corinthians, and not to the *present* Epistle.

Dunning.

P. THOMSON.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kinneff, Bervie, N.B.