

A GRAMMAR OF
NEW TESTAMENT GREEK

BY
JAMES HOPE MOULTON

M.A., D.LIT., D.D., D.C.L.
D.THEOL. (BERLIN AND GRÖNINGEN)

VOL. IV
STYLE

BY
NIGEL TURNER
B.D., M.Th., Ph.D.

**A Grammar of
New Testament Greek
J. H. Moulton,
Volume I**

J. H. Moulton

T&T CLARK

**A GRAMMAR OF
NEW TESTAMENT GREEK**

This page intentionally left blank

A GRAMMAR OF
NEW TESTAMENT GREEK
J. H. MOULTON

VOLUME I

PROLEGOMENA

J. H. MOULTON

THIRD EDITION

T&T CLARK
EDINBURGH

T&T CLARK LTD
59 GEORGE STREET
EDINBURGH EH2 2LQ
SCOTLAND

First edition copyright © T&T Clark Ltd
Second edition copyright © T&T Clark Ltd
Third edition copyright © T&T Clark Ltd

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of T&T Clark Ltd.

Latest impression 1998

ISBN 0 567 01011 2

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Printed in Great Britain by Page Bros, Norwich
Bound by Bookcraft Ltd, Avon

**IN PIAM MEMORIAM
PATRIS
LABORVM HERES DEDICO**

This page intentionally left blank

PREFACE.

THE call for a second edition of this work within six or seven months of its first appearance gives me a welcome opportunity of making a good many corrections and additions, without altering in any way its general plan. Of the scope of these new features I shall have something to say later; at this point I have to explain the title-page, from which certain words have disappeared, not without great reluctance on my part. The statement in the first edition that the book was "based on W. F. Moulton's edition of G. B. Winer's Grammar," claimed for it connexion with a work which for thirty-five years had been in constant use among New Testament students in this country and elsewhere. I should hardly have yielded this statement for excision, had not the suggestion come from one whose motives for retaining it are only less strong than my own. Sir John Clark, whose kindness throughout the progress of this work it is a special pleasure to acknowledge on such an opportunity, advised me that misapprehension was frequently occurring with those whose knowledge of this book was limited to the title. Since the present volume is entirely new, and does not in any way follow the lines of its great predecessor, it seems better to confine the history of the undertaking to the Preface, and take sole responsibility. I have unhappily no means of divining what judgement either Winer or his editor would have passed on my doctrines; and it is therefore, perhaps, due to *Pietät* that I should drop what *Pietät* mainly prompted.

It is now forty years since my father, to whose memory this book is dedicated, was invited by Messrs T. & T. Clark to translate and edit G. B. Winer's epoch-making *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Sprachidioms*. The proposal originated with Bishop Ellicott, afterwards Chairman of the New Testa-

ment Revision Company, and the last survivor of a band of workers who, while the following pages were in the press, became united once more. Dr Ellicott had been in correspondence on biblical matters with the young Assistant Tutor at the Wesleyan Theological College, Richmond; and his estimate of his powers was shown first by the proposal as to Winer, and not long after by the Bishop's large use of my father's advice in selecting new members of the Revision Company. Mr Moulton took his place in the Jerusalem Chamber in 1870, the youngest member of the Company; and in the same year his edition of Winer appeared. My brother's Life of our father (Isbister, 1899) gives an account of its reception. It would not be seemly for me to enlarge on its merits, and it would be as superfluous as unbecoming. I will only allow myself the satisfaction of quoting a few words from one who may well be called the greatest New Testament scholar this country has seen for generations. In giving his Cambridge students a short list of reference books, Dr Hort said (*Romans and Ephesians*, p. 71):—

Winer's Grammar of the New Testament, as translated and enlarged by Dr Moulton, stands far above every other for this purpose. It does not need many minutes to learn the ready use of the admirable indices, of passages and of subjects: and when the book is consulted in this manner, its extremely useful contents become in most cases readily accessible. Dr Moulton's references to the notes of the best recent English commentaries are a helpful addition.

In 1875 Dr Moulton was transferred to Cambridge, charged by his Church with the heavy task of building up from the foundation a great Public School. What time a Head Master could spare to scholarship was for many years almost entirely pledged to the New Testament and Apocrypha Revision. Naturally it was not possible to do much to his Grammar when the second edition was called for in 1877. The third edition, five years later, was even less delayed for the incorporation of new matter; and the book stands now, in all essential points, just as it first came from its author's pen. Meanwhile the conviction was growing that the next

edition must be a new book. Winer's own last edition, though far from antiquated, was growing decidedly old; its jubilee is in fact celebrated by its English descendant of to-day. The very thoroughness of Winer's work had made useless for the modern student many a disquisition against grammatical heresies which no one would now wish to drag from the lumber-room. The literature to which Winer appealed was largely buried in inaccessible foreign periodicals. And as the reputation of his editor grew, men asked for a more compact, better arranged, more up-to-date volume, in which the ripest and most modern work should no longer be stowed away in compressed notes at the foot of the page. Had time and strength permitted, Dr Moulton would have consulted his most cherished wish by returning to the work of his youth and rewriting his Grammar as an independent book. But "wisest Fate said No." He chose his junior colleague, to whom he had given, at first as his pupil, and afterwards during years of University training and colleagueship in teaching, an insight into his methods and principles, and at least an eager enthusiasm for the subject to which he had devoted his own life. But not a page of the new book was written when, in February 1898, "God's finger touched him, and he slept."

Since heredity does not suffice to make a grammarian, and there are many roads by which a student of New Testament language may come to his task, I must add a word to explain in what special directions this book may perhaps contribute to the understanding of the inexhaustible subject with which it deals. Till four years ago, my own teaching work scarcely touched the Greek Testament, classics and comparative philology claiming the major part of my time. But I have not felt that this time was ill spent as a preparation for the teaching of the New Testament. The study of the Science of Language in general, and especially in the field of the languages which are nearest of kin to Greek, is well adapted to provide points of view from which new light may be shed on the words of Scripture. Theologians, adepts in criticism, experts in early Christian literature, bring to a task like this an equipment to which I can make no pretence. But there are other studies, never more active than now,

which may help the biblical student in unexpected ways. The life-history of the Greek language has been investigated with minutest care, not only in the age of its glory, but also throughout the centuries of its supposed senility and decay. Its syntax has been illuminated by the comparative method; and scholars have arisen who have been willing to desert the masterpieces of literature and trace the humble development of the Hellenistic vernacular down to its lineal descendant in the vulgar tongue of the present day. Biblical scholars cannot study everything, and there are some of them who have never heard of Brugmann and Thumb. It may be some service to introduce them to the side-lights which comparative philology can provide.

But I hope this book may bring to the exegete material yet more important for his purpose, which might not otherwise come his way. The immense stores of illustration which have been opened to us by the discoveries of Egyptian papyri, accessible to all on their lexical side in the brilliant *Bible Studies* of Deissmann, have not hitherto been systematically treated in their bearing on the grammar of New Testament Greek. The main purpose of these *Prolegomena* has accordingly been to provide a sketch of the language of the New Testament as it appears to those who have followed Deissmann into a new field of research. There are many matters of principle needing detailed discussion, and much new illustrative material from papyri and inscriptions, the presentation of which will, I hope, be found helpful and suggestive. In the present volume, therefore, I make no attempt at exhaustiveness, and often omit important subjects on which I have nothing new to say. By dint of much labour on the indices, I have tried to provide a partial remedy for the manifold inconveniences of form which the plan of these pages entails. My reviewers encourage me to hope that I have succeeded in one cherished ambition, that of writing a Grammar which can be read. The fascination of the Science of Language has possessed me ever since in boyhood I read Max Müller's incomparable *Lectures*; and I have made it my aim to communicate what I could of this fascination before going on to dry statistics and formulae. In the second volume I shall try to present as concisely as I can the systematic facts of Hellenistic acci-

dence and syntax, not in the form of an appendix to a grammar of classical Greek, but giving the later language the independent dignity which it deserves. Both Winer himself and the other older scholars, whom a reviewer thinks I have unduly neglected, will naturally bulk more largely than they can do in chapters mainly intended to describe the most modern work. But the mere citation of authorities, in a handbook designed for practical utility, must naturally be subordinated to the succinct presentation of results. There will, I hope, be small danger of my readers' overlooking my indebtedness to earlier workers, and least of all that to my primary teacher, whose labours it is my supreme object to preserve for the benefit of a new generation.

It remains to perform the pleasant duty of acknowledging varied help which has contributed a large proportion of anything that may be true or useful in this book. It would be endless were I to name teachers, colleagues, and friends in Cambridge, to whom through twenty years' residence I contracted debts of those manifold and intangible kinds which can only be summarised in the most inadequate way: no Cantab who has lived as long within that home of exact science and sincere research, will fail to understand what I fail to express. Next to the Cambridge influences are those which come from teachers and friends whom I have never seen, and especially those great German scholars whose labours, too little assisted by those of other countries, have established the Science of Language on the firm basis it occupies to-day. In fields where British scholarship is more on a level with that of Germany, especially those of biblical exegesis and of Greek classical lore, I have also done my best to learn what fellow-workers east of the Rhine contribute to the common stock. It is to a German professor, working upon the material of which our own Drs Grenfell and Hunt have provided so large a proportion, that I owe the impulse which has produced the chief novelty of my work. My appreciation of the memorable achievement of Dr Deissmann is expressed in the body of the book; and I must only add here my grateful acknowledgement of the many encouragements he has given me in my efforts to glean

after him in the field he has made his own. He has now crowned them with the all too generous appreciations of my work which he has contributed to the *Theologische Literaturzeitung* and the *Theologische Rundschau*. Another great name figures on most of the pages of this book. The services that Professor Blass has rendered to New Testament study are already almost equal to those he has rendered to classical scholarship. I have been frequently obliged to record a difference of opinion, though never without the inward voice whispering "*impar congressus Achilli.*" But the freshness of view which this great Hellenist brings to the subject makes him almost as helpful when he fails to convince as when he succeeds; and I have learned more and more from him, the more earnestly I have studied for myself. The name of another brilliant writer on New Testament Grammar, Professor Schmiedel, will figure more constantly in my second volume than my plan allows it to do in this.

The mention of the books which have been most frequently used, recalls the need of one or two explanations before closing this Preface. The text which is assumed throughout is naturally that of Westcott and Hort. The principles on which it is based, and the minute accuracy with which they are followed out, seem to allow no alternative to a grammatical worker, even if the B type of text were held to be only the result of second century revision. But in frequently quoting other readings, and especially those which belong to what Dr Kenyon conveniently calls the δ -text, I follow very readily the precedent of Blass. I need not say that Mr Geden's Concordance has been in continual use. I have not felt bound to enter much into questions of "higher criticism." In the case of the Synoptic Gospels, the assumption of the "two-source hypothesis" has suggested a number of grammatical points of interest. Grammar helps to rivet closer the links which bind together the writings of Luke, and those of Paul (though the Pastorals often need separate treatment); while the Johannine Gospel and Epistles similarly form a single grammatical entity. Whether the remaining Books add seven or nine to the tale of separate authors, does not concern us here; for the Apocalypse,

1 Peter and 2 Peter must be treated individually as much as Hebrews, whether the traditional authorship be accepted or rejected.

Last come the specific acknowledgements of most generous and welcome help received directly in the preparation of this volume. I count myself fortunate indeed in that three scholars of the first rank in different lines of study have read my proofs through, and helped me with invaluable encouragement and advice. It is only due to them that I should claim the sole responsibility for errors which I may have failed to escape, in spite of their watchfulness on my behalf. Two of them are old friends with whom I have taken counsel for many years. Dr G. G. Findlay has gone over my work with minute care, and 'has saved me from many a loose and ambiguous statement, besides giving me the fruit of his profound and accurate exegesis, which students of his works on St. Paul's Epistles know well. Dr Rendel Harris has brought me fresh lights from other points of view; and I have been particularly glad of criticism from a specialist in Syriac, who speaks with authority on matters which take a prominent place in my argument. The third name is that of Professor Albert Thumb, of Marburg. The kindness of this great scholar, in examining so carefully the work of one who is still *ἀγνοούμενος τῷ προσώπῳ*, cannot be adequately acknowledged here. Nearly every page of my book owes its debt either to his writings or to the criticisms and suggestions with which he has favoured me. At least twice he has called my attention to important articles in English which I had overlooked; and in my illustrations from Modern Greek I have felt myself able to venture often into fields which might have been full of pitfalls, had I not been secure in his expert guidance. Finally, in the necessary drudgery of index-making I have had welcome aid at home. By drawing up the index of Scripture quotations, my mother has done for me what she did for my father nearly forty years ago. My brother, the Rev. W. Fiddian Moulton, M.A., has spared time from a busy pastor's life to make me the Greek index. To all these who have helped me so freely, and to many others whose encouragement and counsel has been a constant stimulus—I would mention especially my Man-

chester colleagues, Dr R. W. Moss and Professor A. S. Peake—I tender my heartfelt thanks.

The new features of this edition are necessarily confined within narrow range. The Additional Notes are suggested by my own reading or by suggestions from various reviewers and correspondents, whose kindness I gratefully acknowledge. A new lecture by Professor Thumb, and reviews by such scholars as Dr Marcus Dods, Dr H. A. A. Kennedy, and Dr Souter, have naturally provided more material than I can at present use. My special thanks are due to Mr H. Scott, of Oxton, Birkenhead, who went over the index of texts and two or three complicated numerical computations in the body of the book, and sent me unsolicited some corrections and additions, for which the reader will add his gratitude to mine. As far as was possible, the numerous additions to the Indices have been worked in at their place; but some pages of Addenda have been necessary, which will not, I hope, seriously inconvenience the reader. The unbroken kindness of my reviewers makes it needless for me to reply to criticisms here. I am tempted to enlarge upon one or two remarks in the learned and helpful *Athenaeum* review, but will confine myself to a comment on the "awkward results" which the writer anticipates from the evidence of the papyri as set forth in my work. My *Prolegomena*, he says, "really prove that there can be no grammar of New Testament Greek, and that the grammar of the Greek in the New Testament is one and the same with the grammar of the 'common Greek' of the papyri." I agree with everything except the "awkwardness" of this result for me. To call this book a Grammar of the 'Common' Greek, and enlarge it by including phenomena which do not happen to be represented in the New Testament, would certainly be more scientific. But the practical advantages of confining attention to what concerns the grammatical interpretation of a Book of unique importance, written in a language which has absolutely no other literature worthy of the name, need hardly be laboured here, and this foreword is already long enough. I am as conscious as ever of the shortcomings of this book when placed in the succession of one which has so many associations of learning and industry, of caution and flawless accuracy. But I hope that its many deficiencies may

not prevent it from leading its readers nearer to the meaning of the great literature which it strives to interpret. The new tool is certain not to be all its maker fondly wished it to be; but from a vein so rich in treasure even the poorest instrument can hardly fail to bring out nuggets of pure gold.

J. H. M.

DIDSBURY COLLEGE, *Aug. 13, 1906.*

NOTE TO THE THIRD EDITION.

As it is not yet three years since this book first appeared, I am spared the necessity of introducing very drastic change. Several new collections of papyri have been published, and other fresh material, of which I should have liked to avail myself more fully. But the alterations and additions have been limited by my wish not to disturb the pagination. Within this limit, however, I have managed to bring in a large number of small changes—removing obscurities, correcting mistakes, or registering a change of opinion; while, by the use of blank spaces, or the cutting down of superfluities, I have added very many fresh references. For the convenience of readers who possess former editions, I add below¹ a note of the pages on which changes or additions occur, other than those that are quite trifling. No small proportion of my time has been given to the Indices. Experience has shown that I had planned the Greek Index on too small a scale. In the expansion of this Index, as also for the correction of many statistics in the body of the book, I have again to acknowledge with hearty thanks the generous help of Mr

¹ See pp. xii., xx.-xxiii., 4, 7, 8, 10, 13-17, 19, 21, 26, 27, 29, 36, 38, 40, 41, 43, 45-50, 52-56, 64, 65, 67-69, 76-81, 86, 87, 93, 95-99, 101, 105, 107, 110, 113-115, 117, 119-121, 123, 125, 129, 130, 134, 135, 144, 145, 150, 156, 159, 161-163, 167, 168, 174, 176-179, 181, 185, 187, 188, 191, 193-196, 198, 200, 204, 205, 214, 215, 223-225, 227-231, 234-237, 239-241, 243-249. Pp. 260-265 have many alterations, Index iii a few. Index ii and the Addenda are new.

H. Scott. To the kindness of many reviewers and correspondents I must make a general acknowledgement for the help they have given me. One debt of this kind, however, I could not omit to mention, due to a learned member of my own College, who is working in the same field. The *Accidence* of Mr H. St. J. Thackeray's Septuagint Grammar is now happily far advanced towards publication; and I have had the privilege of reading it in MS, to my own great profit. I only wish I could have succeeded in my endeavour to provide ere now for my kind critics an instalment of the systematic grammar to which this volume is intended to be an introduction. It is small comfort that Prof. Schmiedel is still in the middle of the sentence where he left off ten years ago. The irreparable loss that Prof. Blass's death inflicts on our studies makes me more than ever wishful that Dr Schmiedel and his new coadjutor may not keep us waiting long.

Some important fields which I might have entered have been pointed out by Prof. S. Dickey, in the *Princeton Theological Review* for Jan. 1908, p. 151. Happily, I need not be exhaustive in *Prolegomena*, though the temptation to rove further is very strong. There is only one topic on which I feel it essential to enlarge at present, touching as it does my central position, that the New Testament was written in the normal *Koinḗ* of the Empire, except for certain parts where over-literal translation from Semitic originals affected its quality. I must not here defend afresh the general thesis against attacks like that of Messrs Conybeare and Stock, delivered in advance in their excellent *Selections from the Septuagint*, p. 22 (1905), or Dr Nestle's review of my book in the *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift* for December 8, 1906. There are many points in this learned and suggestive review to which I hope to recur before long. But there is one new line essayed by some leading critics of Deissmannism—if I may coin a word on an obvious analogy—which claims a few words here. In the first additional note appended to my second edition (p. 242, below), I referred to the evidence for a large Aramaic-speaking Jewish population in Egypt, and anticipated the possibility that "Hebraists" might interpret our parallels from the papyri as Aramaisms of home growth.

As this argument had not yet been advanced, I did not offer an answer. But simultaneously Prof. Swete was bringing out his monumental Commentary on the Apocalypse; and I found on p. cxx that the veteran editor of the LXX was disposed to take this very line. The late Dr H. A. Redpath also wrote to me, referring to an article of his own in the *American Journal of Theology* for January 1903, pp. 10 f., which I should not have overlooked. With two such authorities to support this suggestion, I cannot of course leave the matter as it stands in the note referred to. Fuller discussion I must defer, but I may point out that our case does not rest on the papyri alone. Let it be granted, for the sake of argument, that we have no right to delete from the list of Hebraisms uses for which we can only quote Egyptian parallels, such as the use of *μετά* referred to on p. 246. There will still remain a multitude of uses in which we can support the papyri from vernacular inscriptions of different countries, without encountering any probability of Jewish influence. Take, for example, the case of instrumental *ἐν*, where the Hebrew בְּ has naturally been recognised by most scholars in the past. I have asserted (p. 12) that Ptolemaic exx. of *ἐν μαχαίρῃ* (Tb P 16 *al.*) rescue Paul's *ἐν ῥάβδῳ* from this category: before their discovery Dr Findlay (*EGT* on 1 Co 4²¹) cited Lucian, *Dial. Mort.* xxiii. 3. Now let us suppose that the Egyptian official who wrote Tb P 16 was unconsciously using an idiom of the Ghetto, and that Lucian's Syrian origin—*credat Iudæus!*—was peeping out in a reminiscence of the nursery. We shall still be able to cite examples of the reckless extension of *ἐν* in Hellenistic of other countries; and we shall find that the roots of this particular extension go down deep into classical *usus loquendi*: see the quotations in Kühner-Gerth i. 465, and especially note the Homeric *ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖσι* *ἰδέσθαι* (*Il.* i. 587 *al.*) and *ἐν πυρὶ καλεῖν* (*Il.* xxiv. 38), which are quite near enough to explain the development. That some Biblical uses of *ἐν* go beyond even the generous limits of Hellenistic usage, neither Deissmann nor I seek to deny (see p. 104). But evidence accumulates to forbid my allowing Semitism as a *vera causa* for the mass of Biblical instances of *ἐν* in senses which make the Atticist stare and gasp. And on the general question I confess myself uncon-

vinced that Egyptian Greek differs materially from that current in the Empire as a whole, or that the large Jewish population left their stamp on the language of Greeks or bilingual Egyptians in the Delta, any more than the perhaps equally large proportion of Jews in Manchester affects the speech of our Lancashire working men. There is another line of argument which I personally believe to be sound, but I do not press it here—the dogma of Thumb (see pp. 17 n. and 94 below), that a usage native in Modern Greek is *ipso facto* no Semitism. It has been pressed by Psichari in his valuable *Essai sur le grec de la Septante* (1908). But I have already overstepped the limits of a Preface, and will only express the earnest hope that the modest results of a laborious revision may make this book more helpful to the great company of Biblical students whom it is my ambition to serve.

J. H. M.

DIDSBURY COLLEGE, Nov. 6, 1908.

CONTENTS.



CHAP.	PAGE
I. GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS	1
II. HISTORY OF THE "COMMON" GREEK	22
III. NOTES ON THE ACCIDENCE	42
IV. SYNTAX: THE NOUN.	57
V. ADJECTIVES, PRONOUNS, PREPOSITIONS	77
VI. THE VERB: TENSES AND MODES OF ACTION	108
VII. THE VERB: VOICE	152
VIII. THE VERB: THE MOODS	164
IX. THE INFINITIVE AND PARTICIPLE	202
ADDITIONAL NOTES	233
ADDITIONAL NOTES TO THE SECOND EDITION	242
I. INDEX TO QUOTATIONS	250
II. INDEX OF GREEK WORDS AND FORMS	266
III. INDEX OF SUBJECTS	278
ADDENDA TO INDICES	290

This page intentionally left blank

ABBREVIATIONS.



ABBREVIATIONS for the names of Books of Scripture will explain themselves. In the OT and Apocrypha the names of the Books follow the English RV (except Ca for Song of Songs), as also do the numbers for chapter and verse: the LXX numbering, where it differs, is added within brackets.

Centuries are denoted iii/B.C., ii/A.D., etc., except when an exact date is given. Where the date may fall within wider limits, the notation is ii/i B.C., iv/v A.D., etc. Where papyri or inscriptions are not dated, it may generally be taken that no date is given by the editor.

The abbreviations for papyri and inscriptions are given in Index I (c) and (d), pp. 251 ff. below, with the full titles of the collections quoted.

The ordinary abbreviations for MSS, Versions, and patristic writers are used in textual notes.

Other abbreviations will, it is hoped, need no explanation: perhaps MGr for Modern Greek should be mentioned. It should be observed that references are to pages, unless otherwise stated: papyri and inscriptions are generally cited by number. In all these documents the usual notation is followed, and the original spelling preserved.

Abbott *JG* = *Johannine Grammar*, by E. A. Abbott. London 1906.

Abbott—see Index I (e) iii.

AJP = *American Journal of Philology*, ed. B. L. Gildersleeve, Baltimore 1880 ff.

Archiv—see Index I (c).

Audollent—see Index I (c).

BCH—see Index I (c).

Blass = *Grammar of NT Greek*, by F. Blass. Second English edition, tr. H. St J. Thackeray, London 1905. (This differs from ed.¹ only by the addition of pp. 306–333.) Sometimes the reference is to notes in Blass's *Acta Apostolorum* (Göttingen 1895): the context will make it clear.

Brugmann *Dist.* = *Die distributiven u. d. kollektiven Numeralia der idg. Sprachen*, by K. Brugmann. (*Abhandl. d. K. S. Ges. d. Wiss.*, xxv. v, Leipzig 1907.)

Burton *MT* = *New Testament Moods and Tenses*, by E. D. Burton. Second edition, Edinburgh 1894.

Buttmann = *Grammar of New Testament Greek*, by A. Buttmann. English edition by J. H. Thayer, Andover 1876.

- BZ* = Byzantinische Zeitschrift, ed. K. Krumbacher, Leipzig 1892 ff.
Cauer—see Index I (c).
CGT = Cambridge Greek Testament for Schools and Colleges.
CR = Classical Review (London 1887 ff.). Especially reference is made to the writer's collection of forms and syntactical examples from the papyri, in *CR* xv. 31-38 and 434-442 (Feb. and Dec. 1901), and xviii. 106-112 and 151-155 (March and April 1904—to be continued).
CQ = Classical Quarterly. London 1907 f.
Dalman Words = The Words of Jesus, by G. Dalman. English edition, tr. D. M. Kay, Edinburgh 1902.
Dalman Gramm. = Grammatik des jüdisch-palästinischen Aramäisch, by G. Dalman, Leipzig 1894.
DB = Dictionary of the Bible, edited by J. Hastings. 5 vols., Edinburgh 1898-1904.
Deissmann BS = Bible Studies, by G. A. Deissmann. English edition, including *Bibelstudien* and *Neue Bibelstudien*, tr. A. Grieve, Edinburgh 1901.
Deissmann In Christo = Die neutestamentliche Formel "in Christo Jesu," by G. A. Deissmann, Marburg 1892.
Delbrück Grundr. = Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen, by K. Brugmann and B. Delbrück: Dritter Band, Vergleichende Syntax, by Delbrück, Strassburg 1893-1900. (References to Brugmann's part, on phonology and morphology, are given to his own abridgement, *Kurze vergleichende Grammatik*, 1904, which has also an abridged Comparative Syntax.)
Dieterich Unters. = Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der griechischen Sprache, von der hellenistischen Zeit bis zum 10. Jahrh. n. Chr., by K. Dieterich, Leipzig 1898.
DLZ = Deutsche Literaturzeitung, Leipzig.
EB = Encyclopædia Biblica, edited by T. K. Cheyne and J. S. Black. 4 vols., London 1899-1903.
EGT = Expositor's Greek Testament, edited by W. Robertson Nicoll. 4 vols. (vol. iv. not yet published), London 1897-1903.
Exp B = Expositor's Bible, edited by W. R. Nicoll. 49 vols., London 1887-1898.
Expos = The Expositor, edited by W. R. Nicoll. Cited by series, volume, and page. London 1875 ff.
Exp T = The Expository Times, edited by J. Hastings. Edinburgh 1889 ff.
Gildersleeve Studies = Studies in Honor of Professor Gildersleeve, Baltimore.
Gildersleeve Synt. = Syntax of Classical Greek, by B. L. Gildersleeve and C. W. E. Miller. Part i, New York 1900.
Giles Manual ² = A Short Manual of Comparative Philology for classical students, by P. Giles. Second edition, London 1901.
Goodwin MT = Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb, by W. W. Goodwin. Third edition, London 1889.
Goodwin Greek Gram. = A Greek Grammar, by W. W. Goodwin. London 1894.
Grimm-Thayer = Grimm's Wilke's *Clavis Novi Testamenti*, translated and

- enlarged by J. H. Thayer, as "A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament." Edinburgh 1886.
- Hatzidakis=Einleitung in die neugriechische Grammatik, by G. N. Hatzidakis. Leipzig 1892.
- Hawkins *HS*=Horæ Synopticæ, by J. C. Hawkins. Oxford 1899.
- HR=A Concordance to the Septuagint, by E. Hatch and H. A. Redpath. Oxford 1897.
- IMA*—see Index I (c).
- Indog. Forsch.*=Indogermanische Forschungen, edited by K. Brugmann and W. Streitberg. Strassburg 1892 ff.
- Jannaris *HG*=A Historical Greek Grammar, by A. N. Jannaris. London 1897.
- JBL*=Journal of Biblical Literature. Boston 1881 ff.
- JHS*—see Index I (c).
- JTS*=Journal of Theological Studies. London 1900 ff.
- Jülicher *Introd.*=Introduction to the New Testament, by A. Jülicher. English edition, tr. by J. P. Ward, London 1904.
- Kalker=Quæstiones de elocutione Polybiana, by F. Kaelker. In *Leipziger Studien* III. ii., 1880.
- Kühner^s, or Kühner-Blass, Kühner-Gerth=Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache, by R. Kühner. Third edition, *Elementar- und Formenlehre*, by F. Blass. 2 vols., Hannover 1890-2. *Satzlehre*, by B. Gerth. 2 vols., 1898, 1904.
- Kuhring *Praep.*=De Praepositionum Graec. in chartis Aegyptiis usu, by W. Kuhring. Bonn 1906.
- KZ*=Kuhn's Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung. Berlin and Gütersloh 1852 ff.
- LS*=A Greek-English Lexicon, by H. G. Liddell and R. Scott. Eighth edition, Oxford 1901.
- Mayser=Grammatik der gr. Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit, by E. Mayser. Leipzig 1906.
- Meisterhans^s=Grammatik der attischen Inschriften, by K. Meisterhans. Third edition by E. Schwyzer (see p. 29 n.), Berlin 1900.
- MG*=Concordance to the Greek Testament, by W. F. Moulton and A. S. Geden. Edinburgh 1897.
- Milligan-Moulton=Commentary on the Gospel of St John, by W. Milligan and W. F. Moulton. Edinburgh 1898.
- Mithraslit.—see Index I (d).
- Monro *HG*=Homeric Grammar, by D. B. Monro. Second edition, Oxford 1891.
- Nachmanson=Laute und Formen der Magnetischen Inschriften, by E. Nachmanson, Uppsala 1903.
- Ramsay *Paul*=Paul the Traveller and Roman Citizen, by W. M. Ramsay. Third edition, London 1897.
- Ramsay *C. and B.*—see Index I (c).
- RE*^s=Herzog-Hauck *Realencyclopädie*. (In progress.) Leipzig.
- REGr*=Revue des Études grecques. Paris 1888 ff.
- Reinhold=De Græcitate Patrum, by H. Reinhold. Halle 1896.

- RhM* = Rheinisches Museum. Bonn 1827 ff.
- Riddell = A Digest of Platonic Idioms, by J. Riddell (in his edition of the *Apology*, Oxford 1867).
- Rutherford *NP* = The New Phrynichus, by W. G. Rutherford, London 1881.
- Schanz *Beitr.* = Beiträge zur historischen Syntax der griechischen Sprache, edited by M. Schanz. Würtzburg 1882 ff.
- Schmid *Attic.* = Der Atticismus in seinen Hauptvertretern von Dionysius von Halikarnass bis auf den zweiten Philostratus, by W. Schmid. 4 vols. and Register, Stuttgart 1887-1897.
- Schmidt *Jos.* = De Flavii Josephi elocutione, by W. Schmidt, Leipzig 1893.
- Schulze *Gr. Lat.* = Graeca Latina, by W. Schulze, Göttingen 1901.
- Schwyzler *Perg.* = Grammatik der pergamenischen Inschriften, by E. Schweizer (see p. 29 n.), Berlin 1898.
- SH = The Epistle to the Romans, by W. Sanday and A. C. Headlam. Fifth edition, Edinburgh 1902.
- ThLZ* = Theologische Literaturzeitung, edited by A. Harnack and E. Schürer, Leipzig 1876 ff.
- Thumb *Hellen.* = Die griechische Sprache im Zeitalter des Hellenismus, by A. Thumb, Strassburg 1901.
- Thumb *Handb.* = Handbuch der neugriechischen Volkssprache, by A. Thumb, Strassburg 1895.
- TI = Novum Testamentum Graece, by C. Tischendorf. Editio octava critica maior. 2 vols., Leipzig 1869-72. Also vol. iii, by C. R. Gregory, containing Prolegomena, 1894.
- Viereck *SG*—see Index I (c).
- Viteau = Étude sur le grec du Nouveau Testament, by J. Viteau. Vol. i, Le Verbe: Syntaxe des Propositions, Paris 1893; vol. ii, Sujet, Complément et Atribut, 1896.
- Völker = Syntax der griechischen Papyri. I. Der Artikel, by F. Völker, Münster i. W. 1903.
- Votaw = The Use of the Infinitive in Biblical Greek, by C. W. Votaw. Chicago 1896.
- Wellh. = Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien, by J. Wellhausen. Berlin 1905.
- WH = The New Testament in the Original Greek, by B. F. Westcott and F. J. A. Hort. Vol. i, Text (also ed. minor); vol. ii, Introduction. Cambridge and London 1881; second edition of vol. ii, 1896.
- WH *App* = Appendix to WH, in vol. ii, containing Notes on Select Readings and on Orthography, etc.
- Witk. = Epistulae Privatae Graecae, ed. S. Witkowski. Leipzig 1906.
- WM = A Treatise on the Grammar of New Testament Greek, regarded as a sure basis for New Testament Exegesis, by G. B. Winer. Translated from the German, with large additions and full indices, by W. F. Moulton. Third edition, Edinburgh 1882.
- WS = G. B. Winer's Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Sprachidioms. Eighth edition, newly edited by P. W. Schmiedel, Göttingen 1894 ff. (In progress.)
- ZNTW = Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, edited by E. Preuschen. Giessen 1900 ff.

A GRAMMAR OF NEW TESTAMENT GREEK.

PROLEGOMENA.



CHAPTER I.

GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS.

New Lights. AS recently as 1895, in the opening chapter of a beginner's manual of New Testament Greek, the present writer defined the language as "*Hebraic Greek, colloquial Greek, and late Greek.*" In this definition the characteristic features of the dialect were expressed according to a formula which was not questioned then by any of the leading writers on the subject. It was entirely approved by Dr W. F. Moulton, who would undoubtedly at that time have followed these familiar lines, had he been able to achieve his long cherished purpose of rewriting his *English Winer* as an independent work. It is not without imperative reason that, in this first instalment of a work in which I hoped to be my father's collaborator, I have been compelled seriously to modify the position he took, in view of fresh evidence which came too late for him to examine. In the second edition of the manual referred to,¹ "*common Greek*" is substituted for the first element in the definition. The disappearance of that word "*Hebraic*" from its prominent place in our delineation of NT language marks a change in our conceptions of the subject nothing less than revolutionary. This is not a revolution in theory alone. It

¹ *Introduction to the Study of New Testament Greek, with a First Reader.* Second Edition, 1904 (C. H. Kelly—now R. Culley).

touches exegesis at innumerable points. It demands large modifications in our very latest grammars, and an overhauling of our best and most trusted commentaries. To write a new Grammar, so soon after the appearance of fresh light which transforms in very important respects our whole point of view, may seem a premature undertaking. But it must not be supposed that we are concerned with a revolutionary theory which needs time for readjusting our science to new conditions. The development of the Greek language, in the period which separates Plato and Demosthenes from our own days, has been patiently studied for a generation, and the main lines of a scientific history have been thoroughly established. What has happened to our own particular study is only the discovery of its unity with the larger science which has been maturing steadily all the time. "Biblical Greek" was long supposed to lie in a backwater: it has now been brought out into the full stream of progress. It follows that we have now fresh material for illustrating our subject, and a more certain methodology for the use of material which we had already at hand.

The isolated position of the Greek found in the LXX and the NT has been the problem dividing grammatical students of this literature for generations past. That the Greek Scriptures, and the small body of writings which in language go with them, were written in the *Koinḗ*, the "common" or "Hellenistic" Greek¹ that superseded the dialects of the classical period, was well enough known. But it was most obviously different from the literary *Koinḗ* of the period. It could not be adequately paralleled from Plutarch or Arrian, and the Jewish writers Philo and Josephus² were no more helpful than their "profane" contemporaries. Naturally the peculiarities of Biblical Greek came to be explained from its own conditions. The LXX was in "translation Greek," its syntax determined perpetually by that of the original Hebrew. Much the same was true of large parts of the NT, where

¹ I shall use the terms *Hellenistic*, *Hellenist*, and *Hellenism* throughout for the Greek of the later period, which had become coextensive with Western civilisation.

² See below, p. 233.

translation had taken place from an original Aramaic. But even where this was not the case, it was argued, the writers used Greek as foreigners, Aramaic thought underlying Greek expression. Moreover, they were so familiar with the LXX that its idiosyncrasies passed largely into their own style, which accordingly was charged with Semitisms from two distinct sources. Hence this "Judaic" or "Biblical" Greek, this "language of the Holy Ghost,"¹ found in the sacred writings and never profaned by common use. It was a phenomenon against which the science of language could raise no *a priori* objection. The Purist, who insisted on finding parallels in classical Greek literature for everything in the Greek NT, found his task impossible without straining language to the breaking-point. His antagonist the Hebraist went absurdly far in recognising Semitic influence where none was really operative. But when a grammarian of balanced judgement like G. B. Winer came to sum up the bygone controversy, he was found admitting enough Semitisms to make the Biblical Greek essentially an isolated language still.

It is just this isolation which the new Greek Papyri : evidence comes in to destroy.^a The Greek Deissmann. papyri of Egypt are in themselves nothing novel ; but their importance for the historical study of the language did not begin to be realised until, within the last decade or so, the explorers began to enrich us with an output of treasure which has been perpetually fruitful in surprises. The attention of the classical world has been busy with the lost treatise of Aristotle and the new poets Bacchylides and Herodas, while theologians everywhere have eagerly discussed new "Sayings of Jesus." But even these last must yield in importance to the spoil which has been gathered from the wills, official reports, private letters, petitions, accounts, and other trivial survivals from the rubbish-heaps of antiquity.^b They were studied by a young investigator of genius, at that time known only by one small treatise on the Pauline formula *ἐν Χριστῷ*, which to those who read it now shows abundantly the powers that were to achieve such

¹ So Cremer, *Biblico-Theological Lexicon of NT Greek*, p. iv (E.T.), following Rothe. (Cited by Thumb, *Hellenismus* 181.)

[^a ^b See p. 242

splendid pioneer work within three or four years. Deissmann's *Bibelstudien* appeared in 1895, his *Neue Bibelstudien*¹ in 1897. It is needless to describe how these lexical researches in the papyri and the later inscriptions proved that hundreds of words, hitherto assumed to be "Biblical,"—technical words, as it were, called into existence or minted afresh by the language of Jewish religion,—were in reality normal first-century spoken Greek, excluded from literature by the nice canons of Atticising taste. Professor Deissmann dealt but briefly with the grammatical features of this newly-discovered Greek; but no one charged with the duty of editing a Grammar of NT Greek could read his work without seeing that a systematic grammatical study in this field was the indispensable equipment for such a task. In that conviction the present writer set himself to the study of the collections which have poured with bewildering rapidity from the busy workshops of Oxford and Berlin, and others, only less conspicuous. The lexical gleanings after Deissmann which these researches have produced, almost entirely in documents published since his books were written, have enabled me to confirm his conclusions from independent investigation.² A large part of my grammatical material is collected in a series of papers in the *Classical Review* (see p. xxi.), to which I shall frequently have to make reference in the ensuing pages as supplying in detail the evidence for the results here to be described.

The new linguistic facts now in evidence

Vernacular show with startling clearness that we have
Greek. at last before us the language in which the apostles and evangelists wrote. The papyri exhibit in their writers a variety of literary education even wider than that observable in the NT, and we can match each sacred author with documents that in respect of Greek stand on about the same plane. The conclusion is that "Biblical" Greek, except where it is translation Greek, was simply the vernacular of daily life.³ Men who aspired to literary fame wrote in an

¹ See p. xxi. above.

² See *Expositor* for April 1901, Feb. and Dec. 1903; and new series in 1908.

³ Cf Wellhausen (*Einl.* 9): "In the Gospels, spoken Greek, and indeed Greek spoken among the lower classes, makes its entrance into literature."

artificial dialect, a would-be revival of the language of Athens in her prime, much as educated Greeks of the present day profess to do. The NT writers had little idea that they were writing literature. The Holy Ghost spoke absolutely in the language of the people, as we might surely have expected He would. The writings inspired of Him were those

Which he may read that binds the sheaf,
Or builds the house, or digs the grave,
And those wild eyes that watch the wave
In roarings round the coral reef.

The very grammar and dictionary cry out against men who would allow the Scriptures to appear in any other form than that "understood of the people."

A Universal Language. There is one very striking fact brought out by the study of papyri and inscriptions which preserve for us the Hellenistic vernacular.

It was a language without serious dialectic differences, except presumably in pronunciation. The history of this *lingua franca* must be traced in a later chapter. Here it suffices to point out that in the first centuries of our era Greek covered a far larger proportion of the civilised world than even English does to-day.¹ The well-known heroics of Juvenal (iii. 60 f.)—

Non possum ferre, Quirites,
Graecam Urbem—,

joined with the Greek "*Εἰς Ἐαυτόν*" of the Roman Emperor and the Greek *Epistle to the Romans*, serve as obvious evidence that a man need have known little Latin to live in Rome itself.¹ It was not Italy but Africa that first called for a Latin Bible.² That the Greek then current in almost every part of the Empire was virtually uniform is at first a startling fact, and to no one so startling as to a student of the science of language. Dialectic differentiation is the root principle of that science;³

¹ Cf A. S. Wilkins, *Roman Education* 19; SH lii ff.

² So at least most critics believe. Dr Sanday, however, prefers Antioch, which suits our point equally well. Rome is less likely. See Dr Kennedy in Hastings' *BD* iii. 54.

³ See, for instance, the writer's *Two Lectures on the Science of Language*, pp. 21-23. [^{*} See p. 242

and when we know how actively it works within the narrow limits of Great Britain, it seems strange that it should apparently be suspended in the vast area covered by Hellenistic Greek. We shall return to this difficulty later (pp. 19–39): for the present we must be content with the fact that any dialect variation that did exist is mostly beyond the range of our present knowledge to detect. Inscriptions, distributed over the whole area, and dated with precision enough to trace the slow development of the vernacular as it advanced towards Mediæval and Modern Greek, present us with a grammar which only lacks homogeneity according as their authors varied in culture. As we have seen, the papyri of Upper Egypt tally in their grammar with the language seen in the NT, as well as with inscriptions like those of Pergamum and Magnesia. No one can fail to see how immeasurably important these conditions were for the growth of Christianity. The historian marks the fact that the Gospel began its career of conquest at the one period in the world's annals when civilisation was concentrated under a single ruler. The grammarian adds that this was the only period when a single language was understood throughout the countries which counted for the history of that Empire. The historian and the grammarian must of course refrain from talking about "Providence." They would be suspected of "an apologetic bias" or "an edifying tone," and that is necessarily fatal to any reputation for scientific attainment. We will only remark that some old-fashioned people are disposed to see in these facts a *σημείον* in its way as instructive as the Gift of Tongues.

Bilingualism It is needless to observe that except in the Greek world, properly so called, Greek did not hold a monopoly. Egypt throughout the long period of the Greek papyri is very strongly bilingual, the mixture of Greek and native names in the same family, and the prevalence of double nomenclature, often making it difficult to tell the race of an individual.¹ A bilingual country

¹ It should be noted that in the papyri we have not to do only with Egyptians and Greeks. In Par P 48 (153 B.C.) there is a letter addressed to an Arab by two of his brothers. The editor, M. Brunet de Presle, remarks as follows on this:—"It is worth our while to notice the rapid diffusion of Greek,

is vividly presented to us in the narrative of Ac 14, where the apostles preach in Greek and are unable to understand the excited populace when they relapse into Lycaonian. What the local Greek was like, we may gauge from such specimens as the touching Christian epitaph published by Mr Cronin in *JHS*, 1902, p. 369 (see *Exp T* xiv. 430), and dated "little if at all later than iii/A.D." We need not develop the evidence for other countries: it is more to the point if we look at the conditions of a modern bilingual country, such as we have at home in the country of Wales. Any popular English politician or preacher, visiting a place in the heart of the Principality, could be sure of an audience, even if it were assumed that he would speak in English. If he did, they would understand him. But should he unexpectedly address them in Welsh, we may be very sure they would be "the more quiet"; and a speaker anxious to conciliate a hostile meeting would gain a great initial advantage if he could surprise them with the sound of their native tongue.¹ Now this is exactly what happened when Paul addressed the Jerusalem mob from the stairs of Antonia. They took for granted he would speak in Greek, and yet they made "a great silence" when he faced them with the gesture which indicated a wish to address them. Schürer nods, for once, when he calls in Paul's Aramaic speech as a witness of the people's ignorance of Greek.² It does not prove even the "inadequate" knowledge which he gives as the alternative possibility for the lower classes, if by "inadequate know-

after Alexander's conquest, among a mass of people who in all other respects jealously preserved their national characteristics under foreign masters. The papyri show us Egyptians, Persians, Jews, and here Arabs, who do not appear to belong to the upper classes, using the Greek language. We must not be too exacting towards them in the matter of style. Nevertheless the letter which follows is almost irreproachable in syntax and orthography, which does not always happen even with men of Greek birth." If these remarks, published in 1865, had been followed up as they deserved, Deissmann would have come too late. It is strange how little attention was aroused by the great collections of papyri at Paris and London, until the recent flood of discovery set in.

¹ These words were written before I had read Dr T. K. Abbott's able, but not always conclusive, article in his volume of *Essays*. On p. 164 he gives an incident from bilingual Ireland exactly parallel with that imagined above. Prof. T. H. Williams tells me he has often heard Welsh teachers illustrating the narrative of Ac 21⁴⁰ 22² in the same way: cf also A. S. Wilkins, *CR* ii. 142 f. (On Lystra, see p. 233.)

² *Jewish People*, II. i. 48 (= II. 63).

ledge" is implied that the crowd would have been unable to follow a Greek speech. They thought and spoke among themselves, like the Welsh, exclusively in their native tongue; but we may well doubt if there were many of them who could not understand the world-language, or even speak in it when necessary.¹ We have in fact a state of things essentially the same as in Lystra. But the imperfect knowledge of Greek which may be assumed for the masses in Jerusalem and Lystra is decidedly less probable for Galilee and Peræa. Hellenist Jews, ignorant of Aramaic, would be found there as in Jerusalem; and the proportion of foreigners would be much larger. That Jesus Himself and the Apostles regularly used Aramaic is beyond question, but that Greek was also at command is almost equally certain. There is not the slightest presumption against the use of Greek in writings purporting to emanate from the circle of the first believers.² They would write as men who had used the language from boyhood, not as foreigners painfully expressing themselves in an imperfectly known idiom. Their Greek would differ in quality according to their education, like that of the private letters among the Egyptian papyri. But it does not appear that any of them used Greek as we may sometimes find cultured foreigners using English, obviously translating out of their own language as they go along. Even the Greek of the Apocalypse itself³ does not seem to owe any

¹ The evidence for the use of Greek in Palestine is very fully stated by Zahn in his *Eint. in das NT*, ch. ii. Cf also Jülicher in *EB* ii. 2007 ff. Mahaffy (*Hellenism*, 130 f.) overdoes it when he says, "Though we may believe that in Galilee and among his intimates our Lord spoke Aramaic, and though we know that some of his last words upon the cross were in that language, yet his public teaching, his discussions with the Pharisees, his talk with Pontius Pilate, were certainly carried on in Greek." Dr Nestle misunderstands me when he supposes me to endorse in any way Prof. Mahaffy's exaggeration here. It would be hard to persuade modern scholars that Christ's *public teaching* was mainly in Greek; and I should not dream of questioning His daily use of Aramaic. My own view is that which is authoritatively expressed in the remarks of Profs. Driver and Sanday (*DB* iv. 583a) as to our Lord's occasional use of Greek. Cf Ramsay, *Pauline Studies* 254; Nicklin, *CR* xx. 465; Mahaffy, *Silver Age* 250; Mayor, *St James* xlii.

² Dr T. K. Abbott (*Essays* 170) points out that Justin Martyr, brought up near Sichem early in ii/A.D., depends entirely on the LXX—a circumstance which is ignored by Mgr Barnes in his attempt to make a different use of Justin (*JTS* vi. 369). (See further below, p. 233.)

³ On Prof. Swete's criticism here see my Preface, p. xvii.

Apocalypse. of its blunders to "Hebraism." The author's uncertain use of cases is obvious to the most casual reader. In any other writer we might be tempted to spend time over τὰς λυχνίας in 1²⁰, where τῶν λυχνιῶν is clearly needed: for him it is enough to say that the neighbouring οὗς may have produced the aberration. We find him perpetually indifferent to concord. But the less educated papyri give us plentiful parallels from a field where Semitism cannot be suspected.¹ After all, we do not suspect Shakspeare of foreign upbringing because he says "between you and I."² Neither he nor his unconscious imitators in modern times would say "between I and you," any more than the author of the Apocalypse would have said ἀπὸ ὁ μάρτυς ὁ πιστός (1⁵): it is only that his grammatical sense is satisfied when the governing word has affected the case of one object.³ We shall find that other peculiarities of the writer's Greek are on the same footing. Apart from places where he may be definitely translating a Semitic document, there is no reason to believe that his grammar would have been materially different had he been a native of Oxyrhynchus, assuming the extent of Greek education the same.⁴ Close to

¹ See my exx. of nom. in apposition to noun in another case, and of gender neglected, in *CR* xviii. 151. Cf also below, p. 60. (Ἄπὸ ὁ ὦν, 1⁴, is of course an intentional *tour de force*.) Note the same thing in the δ-text of 2 Th 1⁸, Ἰησοῦ . . . διδοῦς (D*FG and some Latin authorities).

² *Merchant of Venice*, III. ii. (end—Antonio's letter).

³ There are parallels to this in correct English. "Drive far away the disastrous Kêres, they who destroy" (Harrison, *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*, p. 168) would not be mended by substituting *them*.

⁴ The grammatical peculiarities of the book are conveniently summarised in a few lines by Julicher, *Introd. to NT*, p. 273: for a full account see the introduction to Bousset's Commentary, in the Meyer series. It may be well to observe, à propos of the curious Greek of Rev, that grammar here must play a part in literary criticism. It will not do to appeal to grammar to prove that the author is a Jew: as far as that goes, he might just as well have been a farmer of the Fayûm. Thought and material must exclusively determine that question. But as that point is hardly doubtful, we pass on to a more important inference from the imperfect Greek culture of this book. If its date was 95 A.D., the author cannot have written the fourth Gospel only a short time after. Either, therefore, we must take the earlier date for Rev, which would allow the Apostle to improve his Greek by constant use in a city like Ephesus where his Aramaic would be useless; or we must suppose that someone (say, the author of Jn 21²⁴) mended his grammar for him throughout the Gospel

the other end of the scale comes the learned Rabbi of Tarsus.

Paul, Luke, "A Hebrew, the son of Hebrews," he calls himself (Phil 3⁵), and Zahn is no doubt right in inferring that he always claimed Aramaic as his mother tongue. But he had probably used Greek from childhood with entire freedom, and during the main part of his life may have had few opportunities of using Aramaic at all. It is highly precarious to argue with Zahn from "*Abba, Father*" (Rom 8¹⁵, Gal 4⁶), that Aramaic was the language of Paul's prayers. The peculiar sacredness of association belonging to the first word of the Lord's Prayer in its original tongue supplies a far more probable account of its liturgical use among Gentile Christians.¹ Finally, we have the Gentile Luke² and the *auctor ad Hebraeos*, both of whom may well have known no Aramaic at all: to the former we must return presently. Between these extremes the NT writers lie; and of them all we may assert with some confidence that, where translation is not involved, we shall find hardly any Greek expression used which would sound strangely to speakers of the *Κοινή* in Gentile lands.

To what extent then should we expect to find the style of Jewish Greek writers coloured by the influence of Aramaic or Hebrew? Here our Welsh analogy helps us. Captain Fluellen is marked in Shakspeare not only by his Welsh pronunciation of English, but also by his fondness for the phrase "look you." Now "look you" is English: I am told it is common in the Dales, and if we could dissociate it from Shakspeare's Welshman we should probably not be struck by it as a bizarre expression. But why does Fluellen use it so often? Because

Genuine Semitisms.

Otherwise, we must join the *Χωρίστως*. Dr Bartlet (in *Exp T* for Feb. 1905, p. 206) puts Rev under Vespasian and assigns it to the author of Jn: he thinks that Prof. Ramsay's account (*Seven Churches*, p. 89) does not leave sufficient time for the development of Greek style. We can now quote for the earlier date the weightiest of all English authorities: see Hort's posthumous *Commentary* (with Sanday's half consent in the Preface).

¹ Cf Bp Chase, in *Texts and Studies*, i. iii. 23. This is not very different from the devout Roman Catholic's "saying *Paternoster*"; but Paul will not allow even one word of prayer in a foreign tongue without adding an instant translation. Note that *Pader* is the Welsh name for the Lord's Prayer. (See p. 283.)

² Cf Dalman, *Words*, 40 f.

it translates two or three Welsh phrases of nearly identical meaning, which would be very much on his tongue when talking with his own countrymen. For the same reason the modern Welshman overdoes the word "indeed." In exactly the same way the good Attic interjection *ἰδοῦ* is used by some NT writers, with a frequency quite un-Attic, simply because they were accustomed to the constant use of an equivalent interjection in their own tongue.¹ Probably this is the furthest extent to which Semitisms went in the ordinary Greek speech or writing of men whose native language was Semitic. It brought into prominence locutions, correct enough as Greek, but which would have remained in comparatively rare use but for the accident of their answering to Hebrew or Aramaic phrases. Occasionally, moreover, a word with some special metaphorical meaning might be translated into the literally corresponding Greek and used with the same connotation, as when the verb *גָּלַה*, in the ethical sense, was represented not by the exactly answering *ἀναστρέφειν*, but by *περιπατεῖν*.² But these cases are very few, and may be transferred any day to the other category, illustrated above in the case of *ἰδοῦ*, by the discovery of new papyrus texts. It must not be forgotten

¹ Note that James uses *ἰδοῦ* 6 times in his short Epistle, Paul only 9 times (including one quotation) in all his writings. In Ac 1-12 it appears 16 times, in 13-28 only 7: its rarity in the Gentile atmosphere is characteristic. It is instructive to note the figures for narrative as against speeches and OT quotations. Mt has 33 in narrative, 4 in quotations, 24 in speeches; Mk 0/1/6; Lk 16/1/40; Ac (1-12) 4/0/12, Ac (13-28) 1/0/6; Jn 0/1/3. Add that Heb has 4 OT quotations and no other occurrence, and Rev has no less than 26 occurrences. It is obvious that it was natural to Hebrews in speech, and to some of them (not Mk or Jn) in narrative. Luke in the Palestinian atmosphere (Lk, Ac 1-12) employs it freely, whether reproducing his sources or bringing in a trait of local character like Shakspeare with Fluellen. Hort (*Ecclesia*, p. 179) says *ἰδοῦ* is "a phrase which when writing in his own person and sometimes even in speeches [Luke] reserves for sudden and as it were providential interpositions." He does not appear to include the Gospel, to which the remark is evidently inapplicable, and this fact somewhat weakens its application to Ac 1-12. But with this reservation we may accept the independent testimony of Hort's instinct to our conclusion that Luke when writing without external influences upon him would use *ἰδοῦ* as a Greek would use it. The same is true of Paul. Let me quote in conclusion a curiously close parallel, unfortunately late (iv/v A.D.) to Lk 13¹⁶: BU 948 (a letter) *γινώσκειν ἐθέλω ὅτι εἶπεν ὁ πραγματευτῆς ὅτι ἡ μήτηρ σου ἀσθενί, εἰδοῦ, δέκα τρίς μῆνες.* (See p. 70.) It weakens the case for Aramaism (Wellh. 29).

² Deissmann, *BS* 194. *Πορεύομαι* is thus used in 1 Pet 4⁸ *al.* Cf *στοιχεῖν*.

that the instrumental *ἐν* in *ἐν μάχαιρῃ* (Lk 22⁴⁹) and *ἐν ῥάβδῳ* (1 Co 4²¹) was only rescued from the class of "Hebraisms" by the publication of the *Tebtunis Papyri* (1902), which presented us with half-a-dozen Ptolemaic citations for it.¹

A very important distinction must be drawn at this point between Semitisms concerning vocabulary and those which affect syntax. The former have occupied us mainly so far, and they are the principal subject of Deissmann's work. *Grammatical* Semitisms are a much more serious matter. We might indeed range under this head all sins against native Greek style and idiom, such as most NT books will show. Co-ordination of clauses with the simple *καί*,² instead of the use of participles or subordinate clauses, is a good example. It is quite true that a Hebrew would find this style come natural to him, and that an Egyptian might be more likely, in equal absence of Greek culture, to pile up a series of genitive absolutes. But in itself the phenomenon proves nothing more than would a string of "ands" in an English rustic's story—elementary culture, and not the hampering presence of a foreign idiom that is being perpetually translated into its most literal equivalent. A Semitism which definitely contravenes Greek syntax is what we have to watch for. We have seen that *ἀπὸ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ὁ μάρτυς ὁ πιστός* does not come into this category. But Rev 2¹³ *ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Ἀντίπας ὁ μάρτυς . . . ὃς ἀπεκτάνθη* would be a glaring example, for it is impossible to conceive of *Ἀντίπας* as an indeclinable. The Hebraist might be supposed to argue that the nom. is unchanged because it would be unchanged (*stat. abs.*) in Hebrew. But no one would seriously imagine the text sound: it matters little whether we mend it with Lachmann's conjecture *Ἀντίπα* or with that of the later copyists, who repeat *αἷς* after *ἡμέραις* and drop *ὃς*. The typical case of *ἐγένετο ἦλθε* will be discussed below;

¹ *Expos.* vi. vii. 112; cf *CR* xviii. 153, and Preface, p. xvii. above.

² Cf Hawkins *HS* 120 f., on the frequency of *καί* in Mk. Thumb observes that *καί* in place of hypotaxis is found in MGr—and in Aristotle (*Hellenismus* 129): here even Viteau gives way. So *ἦρθε καιρὸς κ' ἀρρώστησεν* (Abbott 70). The simple parataxis of Mk 15²⁶, Jn 4³⁶ 11⁵⁵, is illustrated by the uneducated document Par P 18, *ἔτι δύο ἡμέρας ἔχομεν φθάσομεν εἰς Πηλούσι*.

and in the course of our enquiry we shall dispose of others, like *ἡς τὸ θυγάτριον αὐτῆς* (Mk 7²⁵), which we now find occurring in Greek that is beyond suspicion of Semitic influences.

There remain Semitisms due to translation, from the Hebrew of the OT, or from Aramaic "sources" underlying parts of the Synoptists and Acts. The former case covers

Translation Greek. all the usages which have been supposed to arise from over-literal rendering in the

LXX, the constant reading of which by Hellenist Jews has unconsciously affected their Greek. In the LXX we may have abnormal Greek produced by the effort of Greek-speaking men to translate the already obsolete and imperfectly understood Hebrew: when the Hebrew puzzled them, they would often take refuge in a barbarous literalness.¹ It is not antecedently probable that such "translation Greek" would influence free Greek except by supplying phrases for conscious or unconscious quotation: these phrases would not become models to be followed by men who wrote the language as their own. How far such foreign idioms may get into a language, we may see by examining our own. We have a few foreign phrases which have been literally translated into English, and have maintained their place without consciousness of their origin: "that goes without saying," or "this gives furiously to think," will serve as examples. Many more are retained as conscious quotations, with no effort to assimilate them to English idiom. "To return to our muttons" illustrates one kind of these barbarisms; but there are Biblical phrases taken over in a similar way without sacrificing their unidiomatic form. We must notice, however, that such phrases are sterile: we have only to imagine another verb put for *saying* in our version of *Cela va sans dire* to see how it has failed to take root in our syntax.

Hebraism in Luke. The general discussion of this important subject may be clinched with an enquiry into the diction of Luke, whose varieties of style in the different parts of his work form a particularly interesting

¹ My illustration here from Aquila (Gen 1¹) was unfortunate: of Swete's *Introd.* 458 f. Better ones may be seen in Mr Thackeray's "Jer β" (see *JTS* ix. 94). He gives me *ἐσθλειν τὴν τράπεζαν* in 2 K 19²⁸ *al*—also in the Greek additions to Esther (C²⁸). Was this from some Greek original of Vergil's *consumens mensas*, or was it a "Biblical" phrase perpetuated in the Biblical style?

and important problem.¹ I restrict myself to grammatical Hebraisms mainly, but it will be useful to recall Dalman's list (*Words* 20 ff.) to see how far Luke is concerned in it. He gives as pure Aramaisms (*a*) the superfluous ἀφείς or καταλιπών and ἤρξατο, as more Aramaic than Hebrew the use of εἶναι with participle as a narrative tense. Either Aramaic or Hebrew will account for (*b*) the superfluous ἐλθών,² καθίσας, ἐστώς, and ἀναστάς or ἐγερθείς. Pure Hebraisms are (*c*) the periphrases with πρόσωπον, the use of ἐν τῷ with infinitive,³ the types ἀκοῇ ἀκούσετε and βλέποντες βλέψετε (see below, pp. 75 f.), and the formulæ καὶ ἐγένετο, ἐλάλησεν λαλῶν and ἀποκριθείς εἶπεν.⁴ In class (*a*), we find Luke unconcerned with the first case. The third we must return to (see pp. 225 ff.): suffice to say now that it has its

¹ In assuming the unity of the two books *ad Theophilum*, I was quite content to shield myself behind Blass; but Harnack has now stepped in with decisive effect. The following pages will supply not a few grammatical points to supplement Harnack's stylistic evidence in *Luke the Physician*.

² A fair vernacular parallel in *Syll.*² 807 (ii/A. D.) καὶ ἐσώθη καὶ ἐλθὼν δημοσίᾳ ἠὲ χαρίστησεν ἐμπροσθεν τοῦ δήμου.

³ See Kalker 252, and below, p. 215. Add Par P 63 (ii/B. C.) τίς γὰρ οὕτως ἐστὶν ἀνάληγος (?) ἢ ἀλιτρος ἐν τῷ λογίζεσθαι καὶ πράγματος διαφορὰν εὑρεῖν, ὅς οὐδ' αὐτὸ τοῦτο δυνήσεται συννοεῖν; "so utterly wanting in reason" (Mahaffy). It is of course the *frequency* of this locution that is due to Semitic thought: of what is said of *ιδού*, above, p. 11. But see p. 249.

⁴ See Wellh. 16. To class (*c*) I may append a note on *eis* ἀπάντησιν, which in Mt 27²³ (δ -text) and 1 Th 4¹⁷ takes a genitive. This is of course a very literal translation of נִקְרָא, which is given by HR as its original in 29 places, as against 16 with dative. (Variants συναν., ὑπαντ., and others are often occurring: I count all places where one of the primary authorities has *eis* ἀπ. with gen. or dat. representing "ἔ." In addition there are a few places where the phrase answers to a different original; also 1 ex. with gen. and 3 with dat. from the Apocrypha.) Luke (Ac 28¹⁶) uses it with dat., and in Mt 25⁶ it appears absolutely, as once in LXX (1 Sa 13¹⁵). Now this last may be directly paralleled in a Ptolemaic papyrus which certainly has no Semitism—Tb P 43 (ii/B. C.) παρεγενήθημεν *eis* ἀπάντησιν (a newly arriving magistrate). In BU 362 (215 A. D.) πρὸς [ἀ]πάντη[σιν] τοῦ ἡγεμόνος has the very gen. We want. One of Strack's Ptolemaic inscriptions (*Archiv* iii. 129) has ἰν' εἰδῆι ἢ ἐσχηκεν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἢ πόλις εὐχάριστον ἀπάντησιν. It seems that the special idea of the word was the official welcome of a newly arrived dignitary—an idea singularly in place in the NT exx. The case after it is entirely consistent with Greek idiom, the gen. as in our "to *his* inauguration," the dat. as the case governed by the verb. If in the LXX the use has been extended, it is only because it seemed so literal a translation of the Hebrew. Note that in 1 Th *l.c.* the authorities of the δ -text read the dat., which is I suspect better Greek. (What has been said applies also to *eis* ὑπάντησιν αὐτῷ, as in Mt 8²⁴, Jn 12¹³: the two words seem synonymous). See also p. 242.

roots in classical Greek, and is at most only a more liberal use of what is correct enough, if less common. But ἤρξατο raises an interesting question. In Lk 3^s we find *καὶ μὴ ἀρξήσθε λέγειν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς*. Dalman (p. 27) shows that in narrative "the Palestinian-Jewish literature uses the meaningless 'he began,'" a conventional locution which was evidently parallel with our Middle-English auxiliary *gan*. It is very common in the Synoptists, and occurs twice as often in Luke as in Matthew. Dalman thinks that if this Aramaic אָרַח with participle had become practically meaningless, we might well find the same use in direct speech, though no example happens to be known. Now in the otherwise verbally identical verse Mt 3^o we find *δóξετε* for *ἀρξήσθε*, "do not presume to say," which is thoroughly idiomatic Greek, and manifestly a deliberate improvement of an original preserved more exactly by Luke.¹ It seems to follow that this original was a Greek translation of the Aramaic *logia*-document, used in common by both Evangelists, but with greater freedom by the first. If Luke was ignorant of Aramaic,² he would be led by his keen desire for accuracy to incorporate with a minimum of change translations he was able to secure, even when they were executed by men whose Greek was not very idiomatic. This conclusion, which is in harmony with our general impressions of his methods of using his sources, seems to me much more probable than to suppose that it was he who misread Aramaic words in the manner illustrated by Nestle on Lk 11⁴¹. (*Exp T* xv. 528): we may just as well accuse the (oral or written) translation he employed.

Passing on to Dalman's (b) class, in which Luke is concerned equally with the other Synoptists, we may observe that only a very free translation would drop these pleonasms. In a sense they are "meaningless," just as the first verb is in "He *went* and did it all the same," or "He *got up* and went out," or (purposely to take a parallel from the vernacular) "So he

¹ But see E. Norden, *Antike Kunstprosa* ii. 487. Harnack (*Sayings*, p. 2) cites my view without approving it. I cannot resist the conviction that Harnack greatly overpresses his doctrine of Luke's stylistic alterations of Q.

² Luke "probably did not understand Aramaic," says Jülicher, *Introd.* 359. So Dalman, *Words* 38-41. Harnack (*Luke*, pp. 102 f.) observes that in ch. 1 and 2 Luke either himself translated from Aramaic sources or very freely adapted oral materials to literary form. He prefers the second alternative.

ups and says." But however little additional information they may add—and for us at least the "stand praying" is not a superfluous touch—they add a distinct *nuance* to the whole phrase, which Luke was not likely to sacrifice when he met it in his translation or heard it from the *αὐτόπται* whose story he was jotting down. The same may be said of the pleonastic phrases which begin and end Dalman's list of "pure Hebraisms." In this class (c) therefore there remains only the construction with *καὶ ἐγένετο*, answering to the narrative *וַיְהִי*, which is (strangely enough) almost peculiar to Luke in the NT. There are three constructions:—(a) *ἐγένετο ἦλθε*, (b) *ἐγένετο καὶ ἦλθε*, (c) *ἐγένετο (αὐτὸν) ἐλθεῖν*.¹ The occurrences of these respectively are for Lk 22/11/5, for Ac 0/0/17.² It may be added that the construction occurs almost always with a time clause (generally with *ἐν*): in Lk there is only one exception, 16²². The phrase was clearly therefore temporal originally, like our "It was in the days of . . . that . . ." (This is (c), but we could use the paratactic (a) form, or even (b), without transgressing our idiom.) Driver (*Tenses*, § 78) describes the *וַיְהִי* construction as occurring when there is inserted "a clause specifying the circumstances under which an action takes place,"—a description which will suit the Lucan usage everywhere, except sometimes in the (c) class (as 16²²), the only one of the three which has no Hebrew parallel. We must infer that the LXX translators used this locution as a just tolerable Greek which literally represented the original;³ and that Lk (and to a minute extent Mt and Mk) deliberately recalled the Greek OT by using the phrase. The (a) form is used elsewhere in the NT twice in Mk and five times in Mt, only in the phrase *ἐγένετο ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν κτλ.* Mt 9¹⁰ has (b) and Mk 2²³ has (c). There are (a) forms with *ἔσται* Ac 2^{17.21} 3²³, Rom 9²⁶ (all OT citations); and (c) forms with *γίνεται* Mk 2¹⁵,

¹ Once (Ac 10²⁵), *ἐγένετο τοῦ εἰσελθεῖν τὸν Πέτρον*.

² Blass cites Ac 4⁵ D for (a), and finds (b) in 5⁷. Certainly the latter sentence may be thus construed (see below, p. 70); nor is it a fatal objection that the construction is otherwise isolated in Ac. See p. 233.

³ W. F. Moulton (WM 760 n.) gives LXX exx. for the (a) and (b) forms: the only approach to the (c) form is 2 Mac 3¹⁵, *ἦν . . . ὀρώντα . . . τιτρώσκεσθαι*. Here Mr Thackeray thinks *ἦν = εἶδε*, "it was impossible not to . . ."

ἐὰν γένηται Mt 18¹³, and *ὅπως μὴ γένηται* Ac 20¹⁶. Now in what sense is any of this to be called "Hebraism"? It is obvious that (b) is a literal translation of the Hebrew, while it is at least grammatical as Greek, however unidiomatic. Its retention to a limited extent in Lk (with a single doubtful case in Ac), and absence elsewhere in NT (except for Mt 9¹⁰, which is affected by the author's love for *καὶ ἰδοὺ*), are best interpreted as meaning that in free Greek it was rather an experiment, other constructions being preferred even by a writer who set himself to copy the LXX style. At first sight (a) would seem worse Greek still, but we must note that it is apparently known in MGr:¹ cf Pallis's version of Mt 11¹, *καὶ συνέβηκε, σὰν τέλιωσε . . . , ἔφυγε . . .*, etc. We cannot suppose that this is an invasion of Biblical Greek, any more than our own idiomatic "It happened I was at home that day." What then of (c), which is characteristic of Luke, and adopted by him in Ac as an exclusive substitute for the other two? It starts from Greek vernacular, beyond doubt. The normal Greek *συνέβη* still takes what represents the *acc. et inf.*: *συνέβη ὅτι ἦρθε* is idiomatic in modern Athenian speech, against *ἔτυχε νὰ ἔλθῃ* which, I am told, is commoner in the country districts. But *ἐὰν γένηται* with *inf.* was good contemporary vernacular: see AP 135, BM 970, and *Pap. Catt.* (in *Archiv* iii. 60)—all ii/A.D. So was *γίνεται* (as Mk 2¹⁵): cf Par P 49 (ii/B.C.) *γίνεται γὰρ ἐντραπήναι*. From this to *ἐγένετο* is but a step, which Luke alone of NT writers seems to have taken:² the isolated *ex.* in Mk 2²³ is perhaps a primitive assimilation to Lk 6¹.³

¹ Of Thumb, *Hellenismus* 123: "What appears Hebraism or Aramaism in the Bible must count as Greek if it shows itself as a natural development in the MGr vernacular." Mr Thackeray well compares *asyndeta* like *καλῶς ποιήσεις γράψεις* in the papyri.

² An interesting suggestion is made by Prof. B. W. Bacon in *Expos.*, April 1905, p. 174 n., who thinks that the "Semitism" may be taken over from the "Gospel according to the Hebrews." The secondary character of this Gospel, as judged from the extant fragments, has been sufficiently proved by Dr Adeney (*Hibbert Journal*, iii. pp. 139 ff.); but this does not prevent our positing an earlier and purer form as one of Luke's sources. Bacon's quotation for this is after the (a) form: "*Factum est autem, cum ascendisset . . . , descendit . . .*" (No. 4 in Preuschen's collection, *Antilegomena*, p. 4). The (a) form occurs in frag. 2 of the "Ebionite Gospel" (Preuschen, p. 9).

³ *Παραπορεύεσθαι* (ΣΑΛΔ αὐ) may be a relic of Mk's original text.

Conclusions as
to Semitism.

By this time we have perhaps dealt sufficiently with the principles involved, and may leave details of alleged Semitisms to their proper places in the grammar. We have seen that the problem is only complicated in the Lucan writings: elsewhere we have either pure vernacular or vernacular tempered with "translation Greek." In Luke, the only NT writer except the author of Heb to show any conscious attention to Greek ideas of style, we find (1) rough Greek translations from Aramaic left mainly as they reached him, perhaps because their very roughness seemed too characteristic to be refined away; and (2) a very limited imitation of the LXX idiom, as specially appropriate while the story moves in the Jewish world. The conscious adaptation of his own style to that of sacred writings long current among his readers reminds us of the rule which restricted our nineteenth century Biblical Revisers to the English of the Elizabethan age.

On the whole question, Thumb (p. 122) quotes with approval Deissmann's dictum that "Semitisms which are in common use belong mostly to the technical language of religion," like that of our sermons and Sunday magazines. Such Semitisms "alter the scientific description of the language as little as did a few Latinisms, or other booty from the victorious march of Greek over the world around the Mediterranean."¹ In summing up thus the issue of the long strife over NT Hebraisms, we fully apprehend the danger of going too far. Semitic thought, whose native literary dress was necessarily foreign to the Hellenic genius, was bound to fall sometimes into un-Hellenic language as well as style. Moreover, if Deissmann has brought us a long way, we must not forget the complementary researches of Dalman, which have opened up a new world of possibilities in the scientific reconstruction of Aramaic originals, and have warned us of the importance of distinguishing very carefully between Semitisms from two widely different sources. What we can assert with assurance is that the papyri have finally destroyed the figment of a NT Greek which in any material respect differed from that spoken by ordinary

¹ Art. *Hellenistisches Griechisch*, in *RE*⁸ vii. p. 638.

people in daily life throughout the Roman world. If the natural objection is raised that there must have been dialectic variation where people of very different races, scattered over an immense area, were learning the world language, and that "Jewish-Greek" is thus made an *a priori* certainty, we can meet the difficulty with a tolerably complete modern parallel. Our own language is to-day spoken over a far vaster area; and we have only to ask to what extent dialect difference affects the modern *Weltsprache*. We find that pronunciation and vocabulary exhaust between them nearly all the phenomena we could catalogue. Englishman, Welshman, Hindu, Colonial, granted a tolerable primary education, can interchange familiar letters without betraying except in trifles the dialect of their daily speech.^a This fact should help us to realise how few local peculiarities can be expected to show themselves at such an interval in a language known to us solely from writing. We may add that a highly educated speaker of standard English, recognisable by his intonation as hailing from London, Edinburgh, or New York, can no longer thus be recognised when his words are written down. The comparison will help us to realise the impression made by the traveller Paul.

[^a See p. 243.

**A special NT
diction?**

There is one general consideration which must detain us a little at the close of this introductory chapter. Those who have studied some recent work upon Hellenistic Greek, such as Blass's brilliant *Grammar of NT Greek*, will probably be led to feel that modern methods result in a considerable levelling of distinctions, grammatical and lexical, on which the exegesis of the past has laid great stress. It seems necessary therefore at the outset to put in a plea for caution, lest an exaggerated view should be taken of the extent to which our new lights alter our conceptions of the NT language and its interpretation. We have been showing that the NT writers used the language of their time. But that does not mean that they had not in a very real sense a language of their own. Specific examples in which we feel bound to assert this for them will come up from time to time in our inquiry. In the light of the papyri and of MGr we are compelled to give up some grammatical scruples which figure largely in

great commentators like Westcott, and colour many passages of the RV. But it does not follow that we must promptly obliterate every grammatical distinction that proves to have been unfamiliar to the daily conversation of the first century Egyptian farmer. We are in no danger now of reviving Hatch's idea that phrases which could translate the same Hebrew must be equivalent to one another. The papyri have slain this very Euclid-like axiom, but they must not enslave us to others as dangerous. The NT must still be studied largely by light drawn from itself. Books written on the same subject and within the same circle must always gather some amount of identical style or idiom, a kind of technical terminology, which may often preserve a usage of earlier language, obsolescent because not needed in more slovenly colloquial speech of the same time. The various conservatisms of our own religious dialect, even on the lips of uneducated people, may serve as a parallel up to a certain point. The comparative correctness and dignity of speech to which an unlettered man will rise in prayer, is a very familiar phenomenon, lending strong support to the expectation that even ἀγράμματοι would instinctively rise above their usual level of exactness in expression, when dealing with such high themes as those which fill the NT. We are justified by these considerations in examining each NT writer's language first by itself, and then in connexion with that of his fellow-contributors to the sacred volume; and we may allow ourselves to retain the original force of distinctions which were dying or dead in every-day parlance, when there is a sufficient body of internal evidence. Of course we shall not be tempted to use this argument when the whole of our evidence denies a particular survival to Hellenistic vernacular: in such a case we could only find the locution as a definite literary revival, rarely possible in Luke and the writer to the Hebrews, and just conceivable in Paul.

**Note on
Latinisms.**

It seems hardly worth while to discuss in a general way the supposition that Latin has influenced the Κοινή of the NT. In the borrowing of Latin words of course we can see activity enough, and there are even phrases literally translated, like λαβεῖν τὸ ἱκανόν Ac 17⁹; ποιεῖν τὸ ἰ. Mk 15¹⁶ (as early as

Polybius); *μετὰ πολλὰς ταύτας ἡμέρας* Ac 1⁵, etc. But grammar we must regard as another matter, in spite of such collections as Buttman's (see his Index, *s.v.* *Latinisms*) or Thayer's (Hastings' *DB* iii. 40). It will suffice to refer to Prof. Thumb's judgement (*Hellenismus* 152 ff.). Romans writing Greek might be expected to have difficulties for example with the article¹—as I have noticed in the English efforts of Japanese boys at school in this country; but even of this there seems to be no very decisive proof. And though the bulk of the NT comes to us from authors with Roman names, no one will care to assert that Latin was the native language of Paul² or Luke or Mark. Apart from lexical matters, we may be content with a general negative. "Of any effective *grammatical* influence [of Latin] upon Greek there can be no question: at any rate I know nothing which could be instanced to this effect with any probability." So says Dr Thumb, and the justification of his decision in each alleged example may be safely left till the cases arise. It should of course be noted that Prof. Blass (p. 4) is rather more disposed to admit Latinisms in syntax. Greek and Latin were so constantly in contact throughout the history of the *Koinḗ*, that the question of Latinisms in Greek or Graecisms in Latin must often turn largely on general impressions of the genius of each language.³

¹ Foreigners sometimes did find the article a stumbling block: witness the long inscription of Antiochus I of Commagene, *OGIS* 383 (i/b.c.)—see Dittenberger's notes on p. 596 (vol. i.). We may here quote the lamented epigraphist's note, on *Syll.*² 930 (p. 785), that a translator from Latin might fall into a confusion between *ris* and *is*. In a linguist who can render *quo minus* by *ὅ ελασσον* (l. 57), we take such a mistake as a matter of course; yet we shall see (p. 93) that its occurrence is very far from convicting a document of Latinising.

² This does not involve denying that Paul could speak Latin; see p. 233.

³ How inextricably bound together were the fortunes of Greek and Latin in the centuries following our era, is well shown in W. Schulze's pamphlet, *Graeca Latina*. He does not, I think, prove any real action of Latin on Greek early enough to affect the NT, except for some mere trifles. Brugmann (*Dist.* p. 9), discussing the idiom *δύο δύο* (see below, p. 97), speaks of the theory of Semitism and Thumb's denial of it, and proceeds: "The truth lies between the two, as it does in many similar cases—I am thinking among others of Graecisms in Latin, and of Latinisms and Gallicisms in German. A locution already in existence in Greek popular language, side by side with other forms (*ἀνὰ δύο*, *κατὰ δύο*), received new strength and wider circulation through the similar Hebrew expression as it became known." I welcome such a confirmation of my thesis from the acknowledged master of our craft.

CHAPTER II.

HISTORY OF THE "COMMON" GREEK.

A New Study. WE proceed to examine the nature and history of the vernacular Greek itself. This is a study which has almost come into existence in the present generation. Classical scholars have studied the Hellenistic literature for the sake of its matter: its language was seldom considered worth noticing, except to chronicle contemptuously its deviations from "good Greek." In so suffering, perhaps the authors only received the treatment they deserved; for to write Attic was the object of them all, pursued doubtless with varying degrees of zeal, but in all cases removing them far from the language they used in daily life. The pure study of the vernacular was hardly possible, for the Biblical Greek was interpreted on lines of its own, and the papyri were mostly reposing in their Egyptian tombs, the collections that were published receiving but little attention. (Cf above, p. 7 n.) Equally unknown was the scientific study of modern Greek. To this day, even great philologists like Hatzidakis decry as a mere patois, utterly unfit for literary use, the living language upon whose history they have spent their lives. The translation of the Gospels into the Greek which descends directly from their original idiom, is treated as sacrilege by the devotees of a "literary" dialect which, in point of fact, no one ever spoke! It is left to foreigners to recognise the value of Pallis's version for students who seek to understand NT Greek in the light of the continuous development of the language from the age of Alexander to our own time. See p. 243.

The Sources. As has been hinted in the preceding paragraph, the materials for our present-day study of NT Greek are threefold:—(1) the prose literature

of the post-classical period, from Polybius down, and including the LXX; (2) the *Κοινή* inscriptions, and the Egyptian non-literary papyri; (3) modern vernacular Greek, with especial reference to its dialectic variations, so far as these are at present registered. Before we discuss the part which each of these must play in our investigations, it will be necessary to ask what was the *Κοινή* and how it arose. We should premise that we use the name here as a convenient term for the spoken dialect of the period under review, using "literary *Κοινή*" and similar terms when the dialect of Polybius, Josephus, and the rest, is referred to. Whether this is the ancient use of the name we need not stay to examine: the curious will find a paper on the subject by Prof. Jannaris in *CR* xvii. 93 ff., which may perhaps prove that he and we have misused the ancient grammarians' phraseology. *Ὁὐ φροντὶς Ἰπποκλειδῆ.*

[* See p. 243.

**Greek and its
Dialects.**

The history, geography, and ethnology of Hellas are jointly responsible for the remarkable phenomena which even the literature of the classical period presents. The very school-boy in his first two or three years at Greek has to realise that "Greek" is anything but a unity. He has not thumbed the *Anabasis* long before the merciful pedagogue takes him on to Homer, and his painfully acquired irregular verbs demand a great extension of their limits. When he develops into a Tripos candidate, he knows well that Homer, Pindar, Sappho, Herodotus and Aristotle are all of them in their several ways defiant of the Attic grammar to which his own composition must conform. And if his studies ultimately invade the dialect inscriptions,¹ he finds in Elis and Heraclea, Lacedaemon and Thebes, Crete² and Cyprus, forms of Greek for which his literature has almost entirely failed to prepare him. Yet the Theban who said *Ἰττω Ζεὺς* and the Athenian with his *ἰστω Ζεὺς* lived in towns exactly as far apart as Liverpool and Manchester! The bewildering variety of dialects within that little country arises partly from racial

¹ An extremely convenient little selection of dialect inscriptions is now available in the Teubner series:—*Inscriptiones Graecae ad illustrandas Dialectos selectae*, by Felix Solmsen. The book has less than 100 pp., but its contents might be relied on to perplex very tolerable scholars!

² See p. 233.

differences. Upon the indigenous population, represented best (it would seem) by the Athenians of history, swept first from Northern Europe¹ the hordes of Homer's Achæans, and then, in post-Homeric days, the Dorian invaders. Dialectic conditions were as inevitably complex as they became in our own country a thousand years ago, when successive waves of Germanic invaders, of different tribes and dialects, had settled in the several parts of an island in which a Keltic population still maintained itself to greater or less extent. Had the Norman Conquest come before the Saxon, which determined the language of the country, the parallel would have been singularly complete. The conditions which in England were largely supplied by distance, were supplied in Greece by the mountain barriers which so effectively cut off each little State from regular communication with its neighbours—an effect and a cause at once of the passion for autonomy which made of Hellas a heptarchy of heptarchies.

Survival of the Fittest. Meanwhile, a steady process was going on which determined finally the character of literary Greek. Sparta might win the hegemony of Greece at Aegospotami, and Thebes wrest it from her at Leuktra. But Sparta could not produce a man of letters,—Alkman (who was not a Spartan!) will serve as the exception that proves the rule; and Pindar, the lonely "Theban eagle," knew better than to try poetic flights in Bœotian. The intellectual supremacy of Athens was beyond challenge long before the political unification of Greece was accomplished; and Attic was firmly established as the only possible dialect for prose composition. The post-classical writers wrote Attic according to their lights, tempered generally with a plentiful admixture of grammatical and lexical elements drawn from the vernacular for which they had too hearty a contempt even to give it a name. Strenuous efforts were made by precisians to improve the Attic quality of this artificial literary dialect; and we still possess the works of Atticists who cry out

¹ I am assuming as proved the thesis of Prof. Ridgeway's *Early Age of Greece*, which seems to me a key that will unlock many problems of Greek history, religion, and language. Of course *adhuc sub iudice lis est*, and with Prof. Thumb on the other side I should be sorry to dogmatise.

against the "bad Greek" and "solecisms" of their contemporaries, thus incidentally providing us with information concerning a Greek which interests us more than the artificial Attic they prized so highly. All their scrupulousness did not however prevent their deviating from Attic in matters more important than vocabulary. The optative in Lucian is perpetually misused, and no Atticist successfully attempts to reproduce the ancient use of *οὐ* and *μή* with the participle. Those writers who are less particular in their purism write in a literary *Κοινή* which admits without difficulty many features of various origin, while generally recalling Attic. No doubt the influence of Thucydides encouraged this freedom. The true Attic, as spoken by educated people in Athens, was hardly used in literature before iv/B.C.;¹ while the Ionic dialect had largely influenced the somewhat artificial idiom which the older writers at Athens used. It was not strange therefore that the standard for most of the post-classical writers should go back, for instance, to the *πράσσω* of Thucydides rather than the *πράττω* of Plato and Demosthenes.

Such, then, was the "Common Greek" Literary *Κοινή*. of literature, from which we have still to derive our illustrations for the NT to a very large extent. Any lexicon will show how important for our purpose is the vocabulary of the *Κοινή* writers, from Polybius down. And even the most rigid Atticists found themselves unable to avoid words and usages which Plato would not have recognised. But side by side with this was a fondness for obsolete words with literary associations. Take *ναῦς*, for example, which is freely found in Aelian, Josephus, and other *Κοινή* writers. It does not appear in the indices of eight volumes of Grenfell and Hunt's papyri—except where literary fragments come in,—nor in those to vol. iii of the Berlin collection and the small volume from Chicago. (I am naming all the collections that I happen to have by me.²) We turn to the NT and find it once, and that is

¹ Schwyzer, *Die Weltsprachen des Altertums*, p. 15 n., cites as the earliest extant prose monument of genuine Attic in literature, the pseudo-Xenophon's *De republica Atheniensis*, which dates from before 413 B.C.

² In 1905.

in Luke's shipwreck narrative, in a phrase which Blass (*Philology* 186) suspects to be a reminiscence of Homer. In style and syntax the literary Common Greek diverges more widely from the colloquial. The bearing of all this on the subject of our study will come out frequently in the course of our investigations. Here it will suffice to refer to Blass, p. 5, for an interesting summary of phenomena which are practically restricted to the author of Heb, and to parts of Luke and Paul, where sundry lexical and grammatical elements from the literary dialect invade the colloquial style which is elsewhere universal in the NT.¹

The writers who figure in Dr W. Schmid's well-known book, *Der Atticismus*, were not the last to found a literary language on the artificial resuscitation of the ancient Attic. Essentially the same thing is being tried in our time. "The purists of to-day," says Thumb (*Hellenismus* 180), "are like the old Atticists to a hair." Their "mummy-language," as Krumbacher calls it, will not stand the test of use in poetry; but in prose literature, in newspapers, and in Biblical translation, it has the dominion, which is vindicated by Athenian undergraduates with bloodshed if need be.² We have nothing to do with this curious phenomenon, except to warn students that before citing MGr in illustration of the NT, they must make sure whether their source is *καθαρεύουσα* or *ὀμιλουμένη*, book Greek or spoken Greek. The former may of course have borrowed from ancient or modern sources—for it is a medley far more mixed than we should get by compounding together Cynewulf and Kipling—the particular feature for which it is cited. But it obviously cannot stand in any line of historical development, and it is just as valuable as Volapük to

¹ For literary elements in NT writers, see especially E. Norden, *Antike Kunstprosa* ii. 482 ff. In the paragraph above referred to, Blass suggests that in Ac 20²⁹ Luke *misused* the literary word *ἀφίξις*. If so, he hardly sinned alone: of the citations in Grimm-Thayer, which are at least ambiguous, and add Jos. *Ant.* ii. 18 *fin.* *μη προδηλώσαντες τῷ πατρὶ τὴν ἐκεῖσε ἀφίξιν*, where *departure* seems certain. See our note *sub voce* in *Expositor* VII. vi. 376. The meaning "my home-coming" is hardly likely.

² See Krumbacher's vigorous polemic, *Das Problem d. neuogr. Schriftsprache*, summarised by the present writer in *Exp T* xiv. 550 ff. Hatzidakis replies with equal energy in *REGr*, 1903, pp. 210 ff., and further in an *Ἀπάντησις* (1905).

the student of linguistic evolution. The popular patois, on the other hand, is a living language, and we shall soon see that it takes a very important part in the discussions on which we are entering.

We pass on then to the spoken dialect of the first century Hellenists, its history and its peculiarities. Our sources are, in order of importance, (1) non-literary papyri, (2) inscriptions, (3) modern vernacular Greek. The literary sources are almost confined to the Biblical Greek. A few general words may be said on these sources, before we examine the origin of the Greek which they embody.

(1) Papyri. The papyri have one very obvious disadvantage, in that, with the not very important exception of Herculaneum,¹ their provenance is limited to one country, Egypt. We shall see, however, that the disadvantage does not practically count. They date from 311 B.C. to vii/A.D. The monuments of the earliest period are fairly abundant, and they give us specimens of the spoken *Kowή* from a time when the dialect was still a novelty. The papyri, to be sure, are not to be treated as a unity. Those which alone concern us come from the tombs and waste paper heaps of Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt; and their style has the same degree of unity as we should see in the contents of the sacks of waste paper sent to an English paper-mill from a solicitor's office, a farm, a school, a shop, a manse, and a house in Downing Street. Each contribution has to be considered separately. Wills, law-reports, contracts, census-returns, marriage-settlements, receipts and official orders largely ran along stereotyped lines; and, as formulæ tend to be permanent, we have a degree of conservatism in the language which is not seen in documents free from these trammels. Petitions contain this element in greater or less extent, but naturally show more freedom in the recitation of the particular grievances for which redress is claimed. Private letters are our most valuable sources; and they are all the better for the immense differences that betray

¹ On these see the monumental work of W. Crönert, *Memoria Graeca Herculaneensis* (Teubner, 1903); also E. L. Hicks in *CR* i. 186.

themselves in the education of their writers. The well-worn epistolary formulæ show variety mostly in their spelling; and their value for the student lies primarily in their remarkable resemblances to the conventional phraseology which even the NT letter-writers were content to use.¹ That part of the letter which is free from formulæ is perhaps most instructive when its grammar is weakest, for it shows which way the language was tending. Few papyri are more suggestive than the letter of the lower-school-boy to his father, OP 119 (ii/iii A.D.). It would have surprised Theon *père*, when he applied the well-merited cane, to learn that seventeen centuries afterwards there might be scholars who would count his boy's audacious missive greater treasure than a new fragment of Sappho! But this is by the way. It must not be inferred from our laudation of the ungrammatical papyri that the NT writers are at all comparable to these scribes in lack of education. The indifference to concord, which we noted in Rev, is almost isolated in this connexion. But the illiterates show us by their exaggerations the tendencies which the better schooled writers keep in restraint. With writings from farmers and from emperors, and every class between, we can form a kind of "grammatometer" by which to estimate how the language stands in the development of any particular use we may wish to investigate.

(2) **Inscriptions.** Inscriptions come second to papyri, in this connexion, mainly because their very material shows that they were meant to last. Their Greek may not be of the purest; but we see it, such as it is, in its best clothes, while that of the papyri is in corduroys. The special value of the Common Greek inscriptions lies in their corroborating the papyri, for they practically show that there was but little dialectic difference between the Greek of Egypt and that of Asia Minor, Italy, and Syria. There would probably be varieties of pronunciation, and we have evidence that districts differed in their preferences among sundry equivalent locutions; but a speaker of Greek would be understood without the slightest difficulty wherever he went throughout the immense area

¹ On this point see Deissmann, *BS* 21 ff.; J. R. Harris, in *Expos.* v. viii. 161 ff.; G. G. Findlay, *Thess. (CGT)*, lxi.; Robinson, *Eph.* 275-284.

over which the Greek world-speech reigned. With the *caveat* already implied, that inscription-Greek may contain literary elements which are absent from an unstudied private letter, we may use without misgiving the immense and ever-growing collections of later Greek epigraphy. How much may be made of them is well seen in the *Preisschrift* of Dr E. Schwyzer,¹ *Grammatik der Pergamenischen Inschriften*, an invaluable guide to the accidence of the *Koinḗ*. (It has been followed up by E. Nachmanson in his *Laute und Formen der Magnetischen Inschriften* (1903), which does the same work, section by section, for the *corpus* from Magnesia.) Next to the papyrus collections, there is no tool the student of the NT *Koinḗ* will find so useful as a book of late inscriptions, such as Dittenberger's *Orientalis Graeci Inscriptiones selectae*, or the larger part of his *Sylloge* (ed.²).

(3) Modern
Greek.

Finally we have MGr to bring in.² The discovery that the vernacular of to-day goes back historically to the *Koinḗ* was made in 1834 by Heilmaier, in a book on the origin of the "Romaic." This discovery once established, it became clear that we could work back from MGr to reconstruct the otherwise imperfectly known oral Greek of the Hellenistic age.³ It is however only in the last generation that the importance of this method has been adequately recognised. We had not indeed till recently acquired trustworthy materials. Mullach's grammar, upon which the editor of Winer had to depend for one of the most fruitful innovations of his work,⁴ started from wrong premisses as to the relation between the old language and the new.⁵ We have now, in such books

¹ He was Schweizer in 1898, when this book was published, but has changed since, to our confusion. He has edited Meisterhans' *Grammatik der attischen Inschriften*³, and written the interesting lecture on *Die Weltsprache* named above.

² I must enter here a caveat as to the use of G. F. Abbott's charming little volume, *Songs of Modern Greece*, as a source for scientific purposes. Prof. Psichari and Dr Bouse show me that I have trusted it too much.

³ I cite from Kretschmer, *Die Entstehung der Koinḗ*, p. 4.

⁴ Cf WM index s.v. "Greek (modern)," p. 824.

⁵ Cf Krumbacher in *KZ* xxvii. 488. Krumbacher uses the epithet "diletante" about Mullach, *ib.* p. 497, but rather (I fancy) for his theories than his facts. After all, Mullach came too early to be blameworthy for his unscientific position.

as Thumb's *Handbuch der neugriechischen Volkssprache* and Hatzidakis's *Einleitung in die neugriechische Grammatik*, the means of checking not a few statements about MGr which were really based on the artificial Greek of the schools. The perpetual references to the NT in the latter work will indicate forcibly how many of the developments of modern vernacular had their roots in that of two thousand years ago. The gulf between the ancient and the modern is bridged by the material collected and arranged by Jannaris in his *Historical Greek Grammar*. The study of a Gospel in the vernacular version of Pallis¹ will at first produce the impression that the gulf is very wide indeed; but the strong points of contact will become very evident in time. Hatzidakis indeed even goes so far as to assert that "the language generally spoken to-day in the towns differs less from the common language of Polybius than this last differs from the language of Homer."²

**The Birth of
the Κοινή.**

We are now ready to enquire how this Common Greek of the NT rose out of the classical language. Some features of its development are undoubted, and may be noted first. The impulse which produced it lay, beyond question, in the work of Alexander the Great. The unification of Hellas was a necessary first step in the accomplishment of his dream of Hellenising the world which he had marked out for conquest. To achieve unity of speech throughout the little country which his father's diplomatic and military triumphs had virtually conquered for him, was a task too serious for Alexander himself to face. But unconsciously he effected this, as a by-product of his colossal achievement; and the next generation found that not only had a common language emerged from the chaos of Hellenic dialects, but a new and

¹ *Ἡ Νέα Διαθήκη, μεταφρασμένη ἀπὸ τὸν Ἄλεξ. Πάλλη* (Liverpool, 1902). (Pallis has now translated the *Iliad*, and even some of Kant—with striking success, in Thumb's opinion, *DLZ*, 1905, pp. 2084-6.) Unfortunately the B.F.B.S. version contains so much of the artificial Greek that it is beyond the comprehension of the common people: the bitter prejudice of the educated classes at present has closed the door even to this, much more to Pallis's version.

² *REGr*, 1903, p. 220. (See a further note below, pp. 238f.)

nearly homogeneous world-speech had been created, in which Persian and Egyptian might do business together, and Roman proconsuls issue their commands to the subjects of a mightier empire than Alexander's own. His army was in itself a powerful agent in the levelling process which ultimately destroyed nearly all the Greek dialects. The *Anabasis* of the Ten Thousand Greeks, seventy years before, had doubtless produced results of the same kind on a small scale. Clearchus the Lacedaemonian, Menon the Thessalian, Socrates the Arcadian, Proxenus the Bœotian, and the rest, would find it difficult to preserve their native brogue very long free from the solvent influences of perpetual association during their march; and when Cheirisophus of Sparta and Xenophon of Athens had safely brought the host home, it is not strange that the historian himself had suffered in the purity of his Attic, which has some peculiarities distinctly foreshadowing the *Κοινή*.¹ The assimilating process would go much further in the camp of Alexander, where, during prolonged campaigns, men from all parts of Greece were tent-fellows and messmates, with no choice but to accommodate their mode of speech in its more individual characteristics to the average Greek which was gradually being evolved among their comrades. In this process naturally those features which were peculiar to a single dialect would have the smallest chance of surviving, and those which most successfully combined the characteristics of many dialects would be surest of a place in the resultant "common speech." The army by itself only furnished a nucleus for the new growth. As Hellenism swept victoriously into Asia, and established itself on all the shores of the eastern Mediterranean, the mixture of nationalities in the new-rising communities demanded a common language as the medium of intercourse,

¹ Cf Rutherford, *NP* 160-174. The same may be said of the language of the lower classes in Athens herself in v/b.c., consisting as they did of immigrants from all parts. So [Xenophon] *Constitution of Athens* 11. 3:—"The Greeks have an individual dialect, and manner of life and fashion of their own; but the Athenians have what is compounded from all the Greeks and barbarians." The vase-inscriptions abundantly evidence this. (Kretschmer, *Entstehung d. Κοινή*, p. 34.) The importance of Xenophon as a forerunner of Hellenism is well brought out by Mahaffy, *Progress of Hellenism in Alexander's Empire*, Lecture i.

and the Greek of the victorious armies of Alexander was ready for the purpose. In the country districts of the motherland, the old dialects lived on for generations; but by this time Greece herself was only one factor in the great Hellenising movement to which the world was to owe so much. Besides, the dialects which strikingly differed from the new *Κοινή* were spoken by races that mostly lay outside the movement. History gives an almost pathetic interest to an inscription like that from Larissa (Michel 41—end of iii/B.C.), where the citizens record a rescript from King Philip v, and their own consequent resolutions:—

Ταγεύοντων Ἀναγκίπποι Πετθαλείοι κ.τ.λ., Φιλίπποι τοῦ βασιλείου ἐπιστολὰν ἀπυστέλλαντος πὸς τὸς ταγὸς καὶ τὰν πόλιν τὰν ὑπογεγραμμένας

Βασιλεὺς Φίλιππος Λαρισαίων τοῖς ταγοῖς καὶ τῇ πόλει χαίρειν (and so on in normal *Κοινή*).

Decay of the Dialects.

The old and the new survived thus side by side into the imperial age; but Christianity had only a brief opportunity of speaking in the old dialects of Greece. In one corner of Hellas alone did the dialect live on. To-day scholars recognise a single modern idiom, the Zaconian, which does not directly descend from the *Κοινή*. As we might expect, this is nothing but the ancient Laconian, whose broad *ā* holds its ground still in the speech of a race impervious to literature and proudly conservative of a language that was always abnormal to an extreme. Apart from this the dialects died out entirely.^a They contributed their share to the resultant Common Greek; but it is an assured result of MGr philology that there are no elements of speech whatever now existing, due to the ancient dialects, which did not find their way into the stream of development through the channel of the vernacular *Κοινή* of more than two thousand years ago.

[^a See p. 243.

Relative Contributions to the Resultant.

So far we may go without difference of opinion. The only serious dispute arises when we ask what were the relative magnitudes of the contributions of the several dialects to the new resultant speech. That the literary *Κοινή* was predominantly Attic has been already stated, and is of course beyond doubt. But was Attic more than one

among many elements assimilated in the new vernacular? It has always been taken for granted that the intellectual queen of Greece was the predominant partner in the business of establishing a new dialect based on a combination of the old ones. This conclusion has recently been challenged by Dr Paul Kretschmer, a brilliant comparative philologist, previously distinguished for his studies on the language of the Greek vase-inscriptions and on the dialects of the Greeks' nearest neighbours.¹ In his tractate entitled *Die Entstehung der Koiné*, published in the Transactions of the Vienna Academy for 1900, he undertook to show that the oral *Koiné* contained elements from Bœotian, Ionic, and even North-west Greek, to a larger extent than from Attic. His argument affects pronunciation mainly. That Bœotian monophthongising of the diphthongs, Doric softening of β , δ and γ , and Ionic de-aspiration of words beginning with *h*, affected the spoken language more than any Attic influence of this nature, might perhaps be allowed. But when we turn to features which had to be represented in writing, as contrasted with mere variant pronunciations of the same written word, the case becomes less striking. Bœotian may have supplied 3 plur. forms in *-σαν* for imperfect and optative, but these do not appear to any considerable extent outside the LXX: the NT exx. are precarious, and they are surprisingly rare in the papyri.² North-west Greek has the accusative plural in *-es*, found freely in papyri and (for the word *τέσσαρες*) in MSS of the NT; also the middle conjugation of *εἶμι*, and the confusion of forms from *-άω* and *-έω* verbs. Doric contributes some guttural forms from verbs in *-ζω*, and a few lexical items. Ionic supplies a fair number of isolated forms, and may be responsible for many *-ω* or *-ῶ* flexions from *-μι* verbs, and some uncontracted noun-forms like *ὄστρέων* or *χουσέω*. But the one peculiarly Attic feature of the *Koiné* which Kretschmer does allow, its treatment of original *ā*, in contrast with Ionic phonology on one side and that of the remaining dialects on the other, is so far-reaching in its effects

¹ *Die griech. Vasenschriften*, 1894; *Einleitung in die Geschichte der griech. Sprache*, 1896.

² See *CR* xv. 86, and the addenda in xviii. 110.

that we cannot but give it more weight than to any other feature. And while the accident of Attic has bequeathed to the vernacular much matter which it shared with other dialects, one may question whether the accident of any single dialect would present anything like the same similarity to that of the *Koivḗ* as the Attic does. We can hardly resist the conclusion of the experts that Kretschmer has failed to prove his point. At the same time we may allow that the influence of the other dialects on *pronunciation* has been commonly underestimated. Kretschmer necessarily recognises that Attic supplied the orthography of the *Koivḗ*, except for those uneducated persons to whom we owe so much for their instructive mis-spellings. Consequently, he says, when the Hellenist wrote *χαίπει* and pronounced it *chéri*, his language was really Bœotian and not Attic.¹ It is obvious that the question does not seriously concern us, since we are dealing with a language which, despite its vernacular character, comes to us in a written and therefore largely Atticised form.² For our purpose we may assume that we have before us a Greek which includes important contributions from various dialects, but with Attic as the basis, although the exclusive peculiarities of Attic make but a small show in it. We shall see later on (pp. 213ff.) that syntax tells a clearer story in at least one matter of importance, the articular infinitive.

At this point it should be observed that **Pronunciation and MS Tradition.** pronunciation is not to be passed over as a matter of no practical importance by the modern student of Hellenistic. The undeniable fact that phonetic spelling—which during the reign of the old dialects was a blessing common to all—was entirely abandoned by educated people generations before the Christian era, has some very obvious results for both grammar and textual criticism. That *ai* and *e*, *ei* (*η*) and *i*, *oi* and *υ* were identities for the scribes of our MSS, is certain.³ The scribe made his choice according to the grammar and the sense,

¹ Against this emphasising of Bœotian, see Thumb, *Hellenismus* 228.

² On the date of the levelling of quantity, so notable a feature in MGr, see Hatzidakis in *Αθηνα* for 1901 (xiii. 247). He decides that it began outside Greece, and established itself very gradually. It must have been complete, or nearly so, before the scribes of κ and β wrote. [See p. 243.]

just as we choose between *kings*, *king's*, and *kings'*, or between *bow* and *bough*. He wrote *σύ* nominative and *σοί* dative: *λύσασθαι* infinitive and *λύσασθε* imperative: *φιλείς*, *εἶδομεν* indicative, and *φιλής*, *ἴδωμεν* subjunctive; *βούλει* verb, but *βουλῆ* noun—here of course there was the accentual difference, if he wrote to dictation. There was nothing however to prevent him from writing *ἐξέφνης*, *ἐφνίδιος*, *ἀφειρημένος*, etc., if his antiquarian knowledge failed; while there were times when his choice between (for example) infinitive and imperative, as in Lk 19¹³, was determined only by his own or perhaps a traditional exegesis. It will be seen therefore that we cannot regard our best MSS as decisive on such questions, except as far as we may see reason to trust their general accuracy in grammatical tradition. WH may be justified in printing *ἵνα . . . ἐπισκιάσει* in Ac 5¹⁵, after B and some cursives; but the passage is wholly useless for any argument as to the use of *ἵνα* with a future. Or let us take the constructions of *οὐ μὴ* as exhibited for WH text in the concordance (MG). There are 71 occurrences with aor. subj., and 2 more in which the *-σω* might theoretically be future. Against these we find 8 cases of the future, and 15 in which the parsing depends on our choice between *ει* and *η*. It is evident that editors cannot hope to decide here what was the autograph spelling. Even supposing they had the autograph before them, it would be no evidence as to the author's grammar if he dictated the text. To this we may add that by the time *κ* and *β* were written *ο* and *ω* were no longer distinct in pronunciation, which transfers two more cases to the list of the indeterminates. It is not therefore simply the overwhelming manuscript authority which decides us for *ἔχωμεν* in Rom 5¹. Without the help of the versions and patristic citations, it would be difficult to prove that the orthography of the MSS is really based on a very ancient traditional interpretation. It is indeed quite possible that the Apostle's own pronunciation did not distinguish *ο* and *ω* sufficiently to give Tertius a clear lead, without his making inquiry.¹ In all these matters we may fairly recognise a

¹ *ο* and *ω* were confused in various quarters before this date: of Schwyzer, *Pergam.* 95; Nachmanson, *Magnet.* 64; Thumb, *Hellenismus* 143. We have

case nearly parallel with the editor's choice between such alternatives as *τίνες* and *τινές* in Heb 3¹⁶, where the tradition varies. The modern expositor feels himself entirely at liberty to decide according to his view of the context. On our choice in Rom, *l.c.*, see below, (p. 110).

Before we leave dialectology, it may be well to make a few more remarks on the nature of the contributions which we have noted. Some surprise may be felt at the importance of the elements alleged to have been brought into the language by the "North-west Greek,"¹ which lies altogether outside the literary limits. The group embraces as its main constituents the dialects of Epirus, Aetolia, Locris and Phokis, and Achaia, and is known to us only from inscriptions, amongst which those of Delphi are conspicuous. It is the very last we should have expected to influence the resultant language, but it is soon observed that its part (on Kretschmer's theory) has been very marked. The characteristic Achaian accus. plur. in *-ες* successfully established itself in the common Greek, as its presence in the vernacular of to-day sufficiently shows. Its prominence in the papyri² indicates that it was making a good fight, which in the case of *τέσσαρες* had already become a fairly assured victory. In the NT *τέσσαρες* never occurs without some excellent authority for *τέσσαρες*:³ of WH *App*² 157.⁴ Moreover we find that A, in Rev 1¹⁶, has *ἀστέρες*—with omission of *ἔχων*, it is true, but this may well be an effort to mend the grammar. It is of course impossible to build on this example; but taking into account the obvious fact that the author of Rev was still decidedly *ἀγράμματος* in Greek, and remembering the similar phenomena of the papyri, we might expect his autograph to exhibit accusatives in *-ες*, and in other instances beside *τέσσαρες*. The middle conjugation of *εἰμί* is given by

confusion of this very word in BU 607 (ii/A.D.). See p. 244, and the copious early papyrus evidence in Mayser, pp. 98 f., 139.

¹ Brugmann, *Gr. Gramm.*² 17.

[² See pp. 243 f.

³ See *CR* xv. 34, 435, xviii. 109 (where by a curious mistake I cited Dr Thumb for, instead of against, Kretschmer's argument on this point).

⁴ Jn 11¹⁷ * Δ; Ac 27²⁰ and Rev 9¹⁴ *; Rev 4⁴ * A (WHmg), 7¹ A *bis* P *semel*. Mr Thackeray says *τέσσαρες* acc. is constant in the B text of the Octateuch.

Kretschmer as a NW Greek feature; but the Delphian ἦται and ἔωνται are balanced by Messenian ἦνται and Lesbian ἔσσο, which looks as if some middle forms had existed in the earliest Greek. But the confusion of the -άω and -έω verbs, which is frequent in the papyri¹ and NT, and is complete in MGr, may well have come from the NW Greek, though encouraged by Ionic. We cannot attempt here to discuss the question between Thumb and Kretschmer; but an *a priori* argument might be found for the latter in the well-known fact that between iii/ and i/B.C. the political importance of Aetolia and Achaia produced an Achaian-Dorian Κοινή, which yielded to the wider Κοινή about a hundred years before Paul began to write: it seems antecedently probable that this dialect would leave some traces on that which superseded it. Possibly the extension of the 3rd plur. -σαν, and even the perfect -αν, may be due to the same source:² the former is also Boeotian. The peculiarities just mentioned have in common their *sporadic* acceptance in the Hellenistic of i/A.D., which is just what we should expect where a dialect like this contended for survival with one that had already spread over a very large area. The elements we have tentatively set down to the NW Greek secured their ultimate victory through their practical convenience. The fusion of -άω and -έω verbs amalgamated two grammatical categories which served no useful purpose by their distinctness. The acous. in -es reduced the number of case-forms to be remembered, at the cost of a confusion which English bears without difficulty, and even Attic bore in πόλεις, βασιλείς, πλείους, etc.; while the other novelties both reduced the tale of equivalent suffixes and (in the case of -σαν) provided a useful means of distinction between 1st sing. and 3rd plur.

and of Ionic.

We come to securer ground when we estimate the part taken by Ionic in the formation of the Κοινή, for here Thumb and Kretschmer are at one. The former shows that we cannot safely trace any feature of Common Greek to the influence of some

¹ See *CR* xv. 36, 435, xviii. 110. Thumb suggests that the common aor. in -σα started the process of fusion.

² The -σαν suffix is found in Delphian (Valaori, *Delph. Dial.* 60) rather prominently, both in indic. and opt. The case for -αν (*ibid.*) is weaker.

particular dialect, unless it appears in that dialect as a distinct new type, and not a mere survival. The nouns in *-ās -ādos* and *-ōūs -ōūdos* are by this principle recognised as a clear debt of MGr to Ionic elements in the *Κοινή*. Like the other elements which came from a single ancient dialect, they had to struggle for existence. We find them in the Egyptian Greek; but in the NT *-ās* makes gen. *-ā*, as often even in Asia Minor, where naturally *-ādos* was at home.¹ Kretschmer gives as Ionic factors in the *Κοινή* the forms *κῖθών* (= *χιτών*) and the like,² psilosis (which the Ionians shared with their Aeolic neighbours), the uncontracted noun and verb forms already alluded to, and the invasion of the *-μι* verbs by thematic forms (contract or ordinary).³ He explains the declension *σπείρα σπείρης* (normal in the *Κοινή* from i/B.C.) as due not to Ionism, but to the analogy of *γλώσσα γλώσσης*. To his argument on this point we might add the consideration that the declension *-ῶ -ῶης* is both earlier and more stable than *-ῦα -ῦης*, a difference which I would connect with the fact that the combination *ιη* continued to be barred in Attic at a time when *ρη* (from *ρῦα*) was no longer objected to (contrast *ἰγιᾶ* and *κόρη*):⁴ if Ionic forms had been simply taken over, *εἰδυῖης* would have come in as early as *σπείρης*.

But such discussion may be left to the philological journals. What concerns the NT student is the question of dialectic varieties within the *Κοινή* itself rather than in its previous history. Are we to expect persistence of Ionic features in Asia Minor; and will the Greek of Egypt, Syria,

Did dialectic differences persist?

¹ But *-ādos* is rare both at Pergamum and at Magnesia: Schwyzer 139 f., Nachmanson 120.

² *Κῖθών*, *κῖθρα* and *ἐνθαῦτα* occur not seldom in papyri; and it is rather curious that they are practically absent from NT MSS. I can only find in *Τι χειθῶνας* D* (Mt 10¹⁰) and *κιτῶνας* B* (Mk 14⁶⁸—"ut alibi κ," says the editor). *Κῖθρα* occurs in Clem. Rom. 17 fin. (see Lightfoot); also three times in the LXX, according to great uncials (Thackeray). *Βάθρακος*, which is found in MGr (as Abbott 56) I cannot trace, nor *πάθρη*. Cf Hatzidakis 160 f.

³ The perfect *ἔωκα* from *ἔημι* (NT *ἀφέωνται*) is noted as Ionic rather than Doric by Thumb, *ThLZ* xxviii. 421 n. Since this was a prehistoric form (cf Gothic *saisō* from *saiā*, "sow"), we cannot determine the question certainly. But note that the imperative *ἀφεώσθω* occurs in an Arcadian inscription (Michel 585¹⁶—iii/fb.c.). Its survival in Hellenistic is the more easily understood, if it really existed in two or three dialects of the classical period. [° See p. 244.

Macedonia, and Italy differ to an extent which we can detect after two thousand years? Speaking generally, we may reply in the negative. Dialectic differences there must have been in a language spoken over so large an area. But they need not theoretically be greater than those between British and American English, to refer again to the helpful parallel we examined above (p. 19). We saw there that in the modern *Weltsprache* the educated colloquial closely approximates everywhere when written down, differing locally to some extent, but in vocabulary and orthography rather than in grammar. The uneducated vernacular differs more, but its differences still show least in the grammar. The study of the papyri and the *Koinḗ* inscriptions of Asia Minor discloses essentially the same phenomena in Hellenistic. There are few points of grammar in which the NT language differs from that which we see in other specimens of Common Greek vernacular, from whatever province derived. We have already mentioned instances in which what may have been quite possible Hellenistic is heavily overworked because it happens to coincide with a Semitic idiom. Apart from these, we have a few small matters in which the NT differs from the usage of the papyri. The weakening of *οὐ μή* is the most important of these, for certainly the papyri lend no countenance whatever to any theory that *οὐ μή* was a normal unemphatic negative in Hellenistic. We shall return to this at a later stage (see pp. 187 ff.); but meanwhile we may note that in the NT *οὐ μή* seems nearly always connected with "translation Greek"—the places where no Semitic original can be suspected show it only in the very emphatic sense which is common to classical and Hellenistic use. Among smaller points are the NT construction of *ἔνοχος* with gen. of penalty, and the prevailing use of *ἀπεκρίθην* for *ἀπεκρίνάμην*: in both of these the papyri wholly or mainly agree with the classical usage; but that in the latter case the NT has good Hellenistic warrant, is shown by Phrynichus (see Rutherford, *NP* 186 ff.), by the witness of Polybius, and by the MGr *ἀποκρίθηκα*.

Thumb's Verdict. The whole question of dialectic differences within the spoken *Koinḗ* is judicially summed up by our greatest living authority, Dr Albert

Thumb, in chap. v. of his book on *Greek in the Hellenistic Age*, already often quoted.¹ He thinks that such differences must have existed largely, in Asia Minor especially; but that writings like the Greek Bible, intended for general circulation, employed a *Durchschnittsprache* which avoided local peculiarities, though intended for single localities. (The letters of Paul are no exception to this rule, for he could not be familiar with the peculiarities of Galatian or Achaian, still less of Roman, *Κοινή*.) To the question whether our authorities are right in speaking of a special Alexandrian Greek, Thumb practically returns a negative. For nearly all the purposes of our own special study, Hellenistic Greek may be regarded as a unity, hardly varying except with the education of the writer, his tendency to use or ignore specialities of literary language, and the degree of his dependence upon foreign originals which might be either freely or slavishly rendered into the current Greek.

It is however to be noted that the minute dialectic differences which can be detected in NT Greek are sometimes significant to the literary critic. In an article in *ThLZ*, 1903, p. 421, Thumb calls attention to the prominence of *ἐμός* in Jn, as against *μου* elsewhere.² He tells us that *ἐμός* and its like survive in modern Pontic-Cappadocian Greek, while the gen. of the personal pronoun has replaced it in other parts of the Greek-speaking area. This circumstance contributes something to the evidence that the Fourth Gospel came from Asia Minor. We might add that on the same showing Luke should come from Macedonia, or some other country outside Asia Minor, for he hardly uses *ἐμός*; while Rev, in which out of the four possessive pronouns *ἐμός* alone occurs, and that but once, seems to be from the pen of a recent immigrant. *Valeat quantum!* In the same paper Thumb shows that the infinitive still survives in Pontic,

¹ Cf Blass 4 n. ; and Thumb's paper in *Neue Jahrb.* for 1906.

² *Ἐμός* occurs 41 times in Jn, once each in 3 Jn and Rev, and 34 times in the rest of the NT. It must be admitted that the other possessives do not tell the same story: the three together appear 12 times in Jn (Ev and Epp), 12 in Lk, and 21 in the rest of NT. Blass (p. 168) notes how *ἐμῶν* in Paul (in the position of the attribute) ousts the emphatic *ἐμέτερος*. (For that position of *ἡ σοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ*, Mithraelit. p. 17 and note.)

while in Greece proper it yields entirely to the periphrasis. The syntactical conditions under which the infinitive is found in Pontic answer very well to those which appear in the NT: in such uses Western Greek tended to enlarge the sphere of *ἴνα*. This test, applied to Jn, rather neutralises that from *ἐμός*: see below, p. 205, 211. Probably the careful study of local MGr patois will reveal more of these minutiae. Another field for research is presented by the orthographical peculiarities of the NT uncials, which, in comparison with the papyri and inscriptions, will help to fix the *provenance* of the MSS, and thus supply criteria for that localising of textual types which is an indispensable step towards the ultimate goal of criticism.¹

¹ One or two hints in this direction are given by Thumb, *Hellenismus* 179. Cf Prof. Lake's Leiden inaugural (Oxford, 1904). See also p. 244.

ADDITIONAL NOTE.—A few new points may be added on the subjects of this chapter. First comes the important fact—noted by Thumb in his *Hellenismus*, p. 9, and again in reviewing Mayser (*Archiv* iv. 487)—that the pre-Byzantine history of the *Κοινή* divides about the date A.D. The NT falls accordingly in the early years of a new period, which does not, however, differ from its predecessor in anything that ordinary observers would notice. The fact needs bearing in mind, nevertheless, when we are comparing the Greek of the LXX and the NT.

There are difficulties as to the relations of *η*, *η̄*, and *ει*, which have some importance in view of the matters noted on p. 35. In Attic *η* and *ει* were fused at an early date; whereas *η̄* remained distinct, being the *open e*, while in the diphthong it had become *close*. Ionic inscriptions show the same fusion. In papyri *η̄*, like *φ* and *γ*, sheds its *ι* just as *η* (*ω* and *ᾱ*) can add it, regardless of grammar; so that *η̄* and *η* are equivalent, and they remain distinct from *ει* (= *ι*) till a late period. It is difficult to correlate these facts; but it must be remembered that the papyri only represent Egypt, which was not necessarily at one with all other Greek-speaking countries as to the quality of *η̄*. There is also the probability that the *η̄* which alternates with *η* is often hystero-genous—*βουλεῑ* was replaced by a newly formed *βουλῆ̄* because of the *η̄* that runs through the rest of the singular flexion. (I owe many suggestions here to a letter from Prof. Thumb, March 1908.) See further Mayser 126 ff.

On the question of the contributions of the old dialects to the *Κοινή*, research seems progressively emphasising the preponderance of Attic. There are phenomena which are plausibly treated as Doric in origin; but Thumb reasonably points to Mayser's evidence, showing that these did not emerge till the later period of the *Κοινή*, as a serious difficulty in such an account of their history. On the other hand, he rightly criticises Mayser's tendency to minimise the Ionic influence: he believes that dialectic elements, and especially Ionisms, found their way into the spoken Attic of the lower classes, which spread itself largely through the operation of trade. "The first people to speak a *Κοινή* were Ionians, who used the speech of their Athenian lords. . . . Outside the Athenian empire, the Macedonians were the first to take up the new language, and joined their subject Greeks, especially Ionians, in spreading it through the world." The old dialects worked still in producing local differentiations in the *Κοινή* itself.

CHAPTER III.

NOTES ON THE ACCIDENCE.

The Uncials and the Papyri. BEFORE we begin to examine the conditions of Hellenistic syntax, we must devote a short chapter to the accidence. To treat the forms in any detail would be obviously out of place in these *Prolegomena*. The humble but necessary work of gathering into small compass the accidence of the NT writers I have done in my little *Introduction* (see above, p. 1 n.); and it will have to be done again more minutely in the second part of this *Grammar*. In the present chapter we shall try to prepare ourselves for answering a preliminary question of great importance, viz., what was the position occupied by the NT writers between the literary and illiterate Greek of their time. For this purpose the forms give us a more easily applied test than the syntax. But before we can use them we must make sure that we have them substantially as they stood in the autographs. May not such MSS as κ and B—and D still more—have conformed their orthography to the popular style, just as those of the “Syrian” revision conformed it in some respects to the literary standards? We cannot give a universal answer to this question, for we have seen already that an artificial orthography left the door open for not a few uncertainties. But there are some suggestive signs that the great uncials, in this respect as in others, are not far away from the autographs. A very instructive phenomenon is the curious substitution of $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\alpha}\nu$ for $\acute{\alpha}\nu$ after $\delta\varsigma$, $\delta\pi\omicron\upsilon$, etc., which WH have faithfully reproduced in numberless places from the MSS. This was so little recognised as a genuine feature of vernacular Greek, that the editors of the volumes of papyri began by gravely subscribing “l. $\acute{\alpha}\nu$ ” wherever the abnormal $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\alpha}\nu$ showed itself. They

were soon compelled to save themselves the trouble. Deissmann, *BS* 204, gave a considerable list from the papyri, which abundantly proved the genuineness of this $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\alpha}\nu$; and four years later (1901) the material had grown so much that it was possible to determine the time-limits of the peculiarity with fair certainty. If my count is right,¹ the proportion of $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\alpha}\nu$ to $\acute{\alpha}\nu$ is 13 : 29 in papyri dated B.C. The proportion was soon reversed, the figures being 25 : 7 for i/A.D., 76 : 9 for ii/, 9 : 3 for iii/, 4 : 8 for iv/. This $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\alpha}\nu$ occurs last in a vi/ papyrus. It will be seen that the above construction was specially common in i/ and ii/, when $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\alpha}\nu$ greatly predominated, and that the fashion had almost died away before the great uncials were written. It seems that in this small point the uncials faithfully reproduce originals written under conditions long obsolete.² This particular example affords us a very fair test; but we may reinforce it with a variety of cases where the MSS accurately reproduce the spelling of i/A.D. We will follow the order of the material in *WH App*² 148 ff. ("Notes on Orthography"): it is unnecessary to give detailed references for the papyrus evidence, which will be found fully stated in the papers from *CR*, already cited. We must bear in mind throughout Hort's caution (p. 148) that "all our MSS have to a greater or less extent suffered from the

¹ *CR* xv. 82, xv. 434: for the exx. B.C. I have added figures from papyri read up to 1905. See further on p. 234; and compare Mr Thackeray's independent statistics in *JTS* ix. 95, which give the same result.

² The case of $\acute{\alpha}\nu$, $\acute{\iota}\acute{\nu}$, is separate. In the NT this is confined apparently to Jn, where it occurs six times. In the papyri it is decidedly a symptom of illiteracy. With this agrees what Meisterhans³ 255 f. says: "Only six times is $\acute{\alpha}\nu$ found from v/ to iii/B.C. The form $\acute{\alpha}\nu$ is entirely foreign to the Attic inscriptions, though it is often found in the Ionicising literary prose of v/ (Thucydides: cf the Tragedians)." Since $\acute{\alpha}\nu$ is the modern form, we may perhaps regard it as a dialectic variant which ultimately ousted the Attic $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\alpha}\nu$. It is not clear to what dialect it is to be assigned. Against Meisterhans' suggestion of Ionic stands the opinion of H. W. Smyth (*Ionic Dialect*, p. 609) that its occasional appearances in Ionic are due to Atticising! Certainly $\acute{\eta}\nu$ is the normal Ionic form, but $\acute{\alpha}\nu$ may have been Ionic as well, though rarer. (So Dr P. Giles.) Nachmanson (p. 68) gives $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\alpha}\nu$ as the only form from Magnesia. Some peculiar local distribution is needed to explain why $\acute{\alpha}\nu$ ($\acute{\iota}\acute{\nu}$) is absent from the incorrectly written Rev, and reserved for the correct Jn. Both $\acute{\alpha}\nu$ and $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\alpha}\nu$ are found promiscuously in the Herculaneum rolls (*Crönert* 180).

effacement of unclassical forms of words." Note also his statement that the "Western" MSS show the reverse tendency. "The orthography of common life, which to a certain extent was used by all the writers of the NT, though in unequal degrees, would naturally be introduced more freely in texts affected by an instinct of popular adaptation." He would be a bold man who should claim that even Hort has said the last word on the problem of the δ -text; and with our new knowledge of the essentially popular character of NT Greek as a whole, we shall naturally pay special attention to documents which desert the classical spelling for that which we find prevailing in those papyri that were written by men of education approximately parallel with that of the apostolic writers.

Orthography. We begin with the "unusual aspirated forms" (p. 150), $\acute{\epsilon}\phi'$ $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\pi\acute{\iota}\delta\iota$ etc., $\kappa\alpha\theta'$ $\acute{\iota}\delta\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu$, $\acute{\alpha}\phi\acute{\iota}\delta\epsilon$ etc., and $\acute{\omicron}\chi$ $\acute{\omicron}\lambda\acute{\gamma}\omicron\varsigma$.^a For all these there is a large body of evidence from papyri and inscriptions. There are a good many other words affected thus, the commonest of which, $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\omicron\varsigma$, shows no trace of the aspiration in NT uncials. Sins of commission as well as omission seem to be inevitable when initial h has become as weak as in later Greek or in modern English. Hence in a period when de-aspiration was the prevailing tendency, analogy produced some cases of reaction,— $\kappa\alpha\theta'$ $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\omicron\varsigma$ due to $\kappa\alpha\theta'$ $\acute{\eta}\mu\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha\nu$, $\acute{\alpha}\phi\acute{\iota}\delta\epsilon$ to $\acute{\alpha}\phi\omicron\rho\acute{\alpha}\nu$, etc.;¹ and the two types struggled for survival. MGr $\acute{\epsilon}\phi\acute{\epsilon}\tau\omicron$ shows that the aspirated form did not always yield. The uncertainty of the MS spelling thus naturally follows from the history of the aspirate. It is here impossible to determine the spelling of the autographs, but the wisdom of following the great uncials becomes clearer as we go on. The reverse phenomenon, *psilosis*, exx. of which figure on p. 151, is part of the general tendency which started from the Ionic and Aeolic of Asia Minor and became universal, as MGr shows. The mention of $\tau\alpha\mu\acute{\epsilon}\iota\omicron\nu$ (p. 152—add $\pi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ from

¹ The curious coincidence that many, but by no means all, of these words once began with F , led to the fancy (repeated by Hort) that the lost consonant had to do with the aspiration. I need not stay to explain why this cannot be accepted. The explanation by analogy within the *Koiné* is that favoured by Thumb. (See additional note, p. 234.) [^a See p. 244.

p. 177) brings up a Hellenistic sound-law, universal after A.D., viz. the coalescence of two successive *i* sounds; the inf. *διασεῖν* for *-σειεῖν* (LPg—i/B.C.) will serve as a good example—cf *ἀνασι* in Lk 23⁵ κ.¹ *Ταμείον*, *πεῖν* and *ὑγεία* are overwhelmingly attested by the papyri of the Roman age, where we seldom find the reversion seen in Mt 20²². In *ἀλειεῖς* (Mk 1¹⁷ αλ) we have dissimilation instead of contraction. Under the head of Elision (p. 153), it may be worth while to mention that the neglect of this even in a verse citation, as in the MSS at 1 Co 15³³, is in accord with an exceedingly common practice in inscriptions. The presence or absence of movable *ν* (pp. 153 f.) cannot be reduced to any visible rule: the evanescence of the nasal in pronunciation makes this natural. Cf p. 49 below. Among the spellings recorded on pp. 155 f. we note *σφυρίς*, *γένημα* (vegetable product), and *-χύννω*² as well attested in the papyri; while the wavering of usage between *ρρ* and *ρσ* is traceable down through Hellenistic to MGr.³ The case of the spelling *ἀραβίων* ("only Western") is instructive. Deissmann (*BS* 183) gives but one ex. of the *ρρ* form, and nine of the single consonant, from three documents. His natural questioning of Hort's orthography is curiously discounted by the papyri published up to 1905, which make the totals 11 for the "Western" and 15 for *ρρ*.⁴ The word will serve as a reminder that only the unanimity of the papyri can make us really sure of our autographs' spelling: cf Deissmann, *BS* 181. The wavering of inscriptional testimony as to *Ζμύρνα* (*ib.* 185) makes it impossible to be decisive; but the coincidence of Smyrnæan coins makes it seem difficult to reject the witness of κ, on suspicion of "Western" taint. In words with *σσ* the papyri show the Attic *ττ* in about the same small proportion as the NT uncials, and with much the same absence of intelligible principle. *᾽Ορνιξ* (Lk 13³⁴ κD, also banned as "Western") has some papyrus warrant, and survives in the MGr (Cappadocian) *ὀρνίχ*: cf Thumb, *Hellen.* 90. It started in Doric Greek. Coming to the note on *τέσσαρες* and *τεσσα-*

¹ Buresch *RhM* xlv. 213 n. Correct *Ti* *in loc.* So *ἀποκλείν*, OP 265 (i/A.D.).

² So MGr (Cyprus), says Thumb in *ThLZ* xxviii. 423.

³ Thumb *l.c.* 422. On this and the *σσ*, *ττ*, see now Wackernagel's *Hellenistica* (1907).

⁴ *CR* xv. 83, since supplemented.

ράκοντα (p. 157), we meet our first dissonance between NT uncials and papyri. The *ε* forms are in the latter relatively few, and distinctly illiterate, in the first centuries A.D. Indeed the evidence for *τέσσερα* or *τέσσερας* is virtually *nil* before the Byzantine age,¹ and there does not seem to be the smallest probability that the Apostles wrote anything but the Attic form. For *τεσσεράκοντα* the case is a little better, but it is hopelessly outnumbered by the *-αρ-* form in documents antedating the NT uncials; the modern *σεράντα*, side by side with *σαράντα*, shows that the strife continued. No doubt before iv/A.D. *τέσσερες -α* (not *τεσσέρων*) had begun to establish themselves in the place they hold to-day. *Ἐραυνάω* is certain from i/A.D. onward;² and Mayser (pp. 42, 56) gives a ii/B.C. papyrus parallel for *ἐγγαρεύω* (≠ *bis*, B *semel*). Spellings like *κρίμα* (p. 158) are supported by a great multiplication in *Κοινή* documents of *-μα* nouns with shortened penultimate. Cf Moeris (p. 28), *ἀνάθημα Ἀττικῶς, ἀνάθεμα Ἑλληνικῶς*; and note *ἀφεύρεμα bis* in Par P 62 (ii/B.C.). Even *σύστημα* is found (not **σύσταμα*), Gen 1¹⁰, which shows how late and mechanical this process was. The convenient differentiation of meaning between *ἀνάθημα* and *ἀνάθεμα*³ preserved the former intact, though ≠ADX are quotable for the levelling in its one NT occurrence. The complete establishment of *εἰ μὴν* after iii/B.C. is an interesting confirmation of the best uncials. Despite Hort (p. 158), we must make the difference between *εἰ μὴν* and *ἦ μὴν* "strictly orthographical" after all, if the alternative is to suppose any connexion with *εἰ, ἰφ*. Numerous early citations make this last assumption impossible.⁴ On *ει* and *ι* (p. 153) the papyri are

¹ *Τέσσερες* acc. is another matter: see above, p. 36.

² But *ἐραυνα* in the Ptolemaic PP iii. 65 *bis*, Par P 60², and Tb P 38, *αἰ*. So also MGr. *Ἐραυνα* was limited in range. See Buresch, *RhM* xlvii. 213 f.; but note also Thumb, *Hellen.* 176 f., who disposes of the notion that it was an Alexandrinism. Kretschmer, *DLZ*, 1901, p. 1049, brings parallels from Thera (*αυ-* in compounds of *εῦ*). See papyrus citations in *CR* xv. 34, xviii. 107.

³ Deissmann has shown that *ἀνάθεμα, curse*, is not an innovation of "Biblical Greek" (*ZNTW* ii. 342).

⁴ The syntax is decisive in the Messenian "Mysteries" inscription (91 B.C., *Syll.* 653, Michel 694): *ὀρκιζόντω τὸν γυναικονόμον: εἰ μὴν ἔξειν ἐπιμέλειαν, κτλ.* (The same inscription has *εἶρεν* for *εἶρα*, as in Mk 4²⁶: this is also Ionic.) Add *Syll.* 578 (iii/B.C.), and note. PP iii. 56 (before 260 B.C.) has *ἦ*, but I have 11 papyrus exx. of *εἰ* from ii/B.C. to i/A.D.

entirely indecisive: *ει* even for *ι* is an everyday occurrence. At any rate they give no encouragement to our introducing *γεινομαι* and *γεινώσκω*, as WH would like to do: to judge from mere impressions, *γίνομαι* is at least as common as *γείνομαι*. This matter of the notorious equivalence of *ει* and *ι* is adduced by Thumb (reviewing Blass², *ThLZ*, 1903, 421) as a specimen of philological facts which are not always present to the minds of theological text-critics: he cites Brooke and M'Lean (*JTS*, 1902, 601 ff.), who seriously treat *ἴδεν*, *ἴδον*, as various readings deserving a place in the LXX text. Ti did the same in *Rev*, where even WH (see *App*² 169) marked *ἴδον*, etc., as alternative. In this matter no reader of the papyri would care to set much store by some of the minutiae which WH so conscientiously gather from the great uncials. It would probably be safer in general to spell according to tradition; for even WH admit that their paramount witness, B, "has little authority on behalf of *ει* as against *ι*." Finally might be mentioned a notable matter of pronunciation to which Hort does not refer. The less educated papyrus writers very frequently use *ā* for *av*, before consonants, from ii/B.C. onwards.¹ Its frequent appearance in Attic inscriptions after 74 B.C. is noted by Meisterhans⁸ 154. In Lk 2¹ (*Ἀγούστου*) this pronunciation shows itself, according to *NC*Δ*; but we do not seem to find *ἀτός*, *ἐατόν*, etc., in the MSS, as we should have expected.² An excellent suggestion is made by Dr J. B. Mayor (*Expos.* vi. x. 289)—following up one of Hort's—that *ἀκαταπάστους* in 2 Pet 2¹⁴ AB may be thus explained: he compares *ἀχμηρῶ* 1¹⁹ A. In arguing his case, he fails to see that the dropping of a *v* (or rather *F*) between *vowels* is altogether another thing; but his remaining exx. (to which add those cited from papyri in *CR* xv. 33, 434, xviii. 107) are enough to prove his point. Laurent remarks (*BCH*, 1903, p. 356) that this phenomenon was common in the latter half of i/B.C. We need not assume its existence in the NT autographs.

¹ The same tendency appeared in late vulgar Latin, and perpetuated itself in Romance: see Lindsay, *Latin Language* 41 f. See early exx. in Mayer 114.

² In MGr (see Thumb, *Handbuch*, p. 59) we find *αἰτός* (pronounced *astós*) side by side with *ἀτός* (obsolete except in Pontus), whence the short form *τός*, etc. There was therefore a grammatical difference in the *Κοινή* itself.

Inflexion:— We pass on to the noun flexion (p. 163).
Nouns. Nouns in *-ῶ* and participles in *-ῶν* in the papyri regularly form genitive and dative in *-ῆς -ῆ*, except that *-ῶν*, *-ῶν* are still found in the Ptolemaic period. Here again the oldest uncials alone (in NT, but very rarely in LXX) generally support the unmistakable verdict of the contemporary documents of the *Κοινή*. We saw reason (above, p. 38) to regard this as the analogical assimilation of *-ῶ* nouns (and—somewhat later and less markedly—*-ῶν* participles) to the other *-ᾶ* flexions of the first declension, rather than as an Ionic survival. We may add that as *μάχαιρα* produced *μαχαίρης* on the model of *δόξα δόξης*, so, by a reverse analogy process, the gen. *Νύμφης* as a proper name produced what may be read as *Νύμφᾶ Νύμφᾶν* in nom. and acc.: the best reading of Col 4¹⁵ (*αὐτῆς* B) may thus stand, without postulating a Doric *Νύμφᾶν*, the improbability of which decides Lightfoot for the alternative.¹ The heteroclitic proper names, which fluctuate between 1st and 3rd decl., are paralleled by Egyptian place-names in papyri. Critics, like Clemen, whose keen scent has differentiated documents by the evidence of *Λύστραν* and *Λύστροις* in Ac 14^{6,8} (see Knowing, *EGT in loc.*),² might be invited to track down the “redactor” who presumably perpetrated either *Κερκεσούχη* or *Κερκεσούχων* in GH 46 (ii/A.D.). Ramsay (*Paul* 129) shows that *Μύρα* had acc. *-αν* and gen. *-ων*. Uncritical people may perhaps feel encouraged thus to believe that Mt 2¹ and Mt 2³, despite the heteroclitism, are from the same hand.^a The variations between 1st and 2nd decl. in words like *ἐκατόνταρχος (-ῆς)* are found *passim* in papyri: for conscientious labour wasted thereon see Schmiedel’s amusing note in his *Preface* to WS. In contracted nouns and adjectives we have abundant parallels for forms like *ὀστέων, χρυσέων*, and for *χρυσᾶν* (formed by analogy of *ἀργυρᾶν*). The good attestation of the type *νοός νοῖ*, after the analogy of *βούς, βού*, may be observed in passing. The fact that we do not find short forms of nouns in *-ιος -ιον* (e.g. *κύρις, παιδίν*)^b is a

¹ See the writer’s paper in *Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc.* Oct. 1893, p. 12, where the archaic vocative in *-ᾶ* is suggested as the connecting link. Cf *Δούδα* as a proper name (Dieterich, *Unters.* 172), and *Ειρήνα* in a Christian inscr. (Ramsay, *C. & B.* ii. 497 n.).
² Cf Harnack, *Apostelg.* 86 n. [^a^b See p. 244.]

noteworthy test of the educational standard of the writers, for the papyri show them even as early as iii/B.C., and always in company with other indications of comparative illiteracy. These forms, the origin of which seems to me as perplexed as ever, despite the various efforts of such scholars as Thumb, Hatzidakis, and Brugmann to unravel it, ultimately won a monopoly, as MGr shows everywhere. We must not omit mention of the "Mixed Declension," which arose from analogies in the *-ā-* and *-o-* nouns, and spread rapidly because of its convenience, especially for foreign names. The stem ends in a long vowel or diphthong, which receives *-ς* for nom. and *-ν* for acc., remaining unchanged in voc., gen. and dat. sing. *Ἰησοῦς* is the most conspicuous of many NT exx. It plays a large part in MGr.¹ Passing lightly over the exact correspondence between uncials and papyri in the accusatives of *κλείς* and *χάρις* (p. 164), we may pause on *χεῖραν* in Jn 20²⁶ N*AB. The great frequency of this formation in uneducated papyri, which adequately foreshadows its victory in MGr,² naturally produced sporadic examples in our MSS, but it is not at all likely that the autographs showed it (unless possibly in Rev). Gregory (in Ti, vol. iii. 118 f.) registers forms like *ἀσφαλῆν* and *ποδήρην*, which also have papyrus parallels, but could be explained more easily from the analogy of 1st decl. nouns. *Μερίζων* acc. (Jn 5³⁶ ABEGMΔ) is a good example of the irrational addition of *ν*, which seems to have been added after long vowels almost as freely as the equally unpronounced *ι*.³ One further noun calls for comment, viz., *Ἐλαιῶνος* in Ac 1¹² (p. 165). The noun *ἐλαιών* = *olivetum* occurs at least thirty times in papyri between i/ and iii/A.D., which prompts surprise at Blass's continued scepticism. *Ἐλικών* (*salicetum*) is an ancient example of the turning of a similar word into a proper name.⁴

¹ See CR xviii. 109, Kühner-Blass § 136.

² It seems most probable that the modern levelling of 1st and 3rd decl. started with this accusative. See Thumb, *Handbuch* 28, 35; also p. 18 for the pronunciation of *-ν* final. The formation occurs often in LXX.

³ Thus *ἔλωι* is acc. sing., while *ἦν* (= *ῆν*) is sometimes subjunctive. For exx. see CR xviii. 108. So *ὅσα ἐὰν ἦν* in Gen 6¹⁷ E. See p. 168.

⁴ See Deissmann, *BS* 208 ff., and the addenda in *Expos.* vi. vii. 111, viii. 429; also below, pp. 69 and 235. See also p. 244, on *συγγενεῖσι* (*App.*³ 165).

Indeclinable Adjectives. Two curious indeclinables meet us periodically among the adjectives. *Πλήρης* should be read in Mk 4²³ (C*, Hort) and Ac 6⁶ (⊂AC*DEHP *al.*), and is probably to be recognised in Jn 1¹⁴ (-ρη D). Cf 2 Jn 8 (L), Mk 8¹⁹ (AFGM *al.*), Ac 6³ (AEHP *al.*) 19²³ (AEL 13). Thus in almost every NT occurrence of an oblique case of this word we meet with the indeclinable form in good uncials. The papyrus citations for this begin with LPc (ii/B.C.), which suits its appearance in the LXX. We cannot well credit educated writers, such as Luke, with this vulgar form; but I readily concede to Deissmann (*Licht v. Osten* 85 f.) that it is possible in Jn. (Here B. Weiss and others would make the adj. depend in sense upon *αὐτοῦ*, but *δόξαν* seems more appropriate, from the whole trend of the sentence: it is the "glory" or "self-revelation" of the Word that is "full of grace and truth.") One might fairly doubt whether expositors would have thought of making *καὶ ἐθεασάμεθα . . . πατρός* a parenthesis, had it not been for the supposed necessity of construing *πλήρης* as a nominative. We restore the popular form also in Mk.¹ The other indeclinables in question are *πλείω* and the other forms in -ω from the old comparative base in -γος. Crönert (in *Philologus* lxi. 161 ff.) has shown how frequently in papyri and even in literature these forms are used, like *πλήρης* and *ἡμισυ*, without modification for case. In Mt 26⁵³ we have a good example preserved in ⊂BD, the later MSS duly mending the grammar with *πλείους*. Is it possible that the false reading in Jn 10²⁹ started from an original *μείζω* of this kind?

Many more noun forms might be cited in which the MSS prove to have retained the genuine Hellenistic, as evidenced by the papyri; but these typical examples will serve.

See the full evidence in Crönert *Mem.* 179: add CR xv. 35, 435, xviii. 109; also C. H. Turner in *JTS* i. 120 ff. and 561 f.; Radermacher in *RhM* lvii. 151; Reinhold 53. Deissmann, *New Light* 44 f., deals briefly with Jn *l.c.* Winer, p. 705, compares the "grammatically independent" *πλήρης* clause with the nom. seen in Phil 3¹⁹, Mk 12⁴⁰. W. F. Moulton makes no remark there, but in the note on Jn 1¹⁴ (Milligan-Moulton *in loc.*) he accepts the construction found in the RV, or permits his colleague to do so. At that date the case for the indeclinable *πλήρης* was before him only in the LXX (as Job 21³⁰ ⊂BAC). See Blass 81 n.: Mr B. R. Ottley adds a probable ex. in Is 63² B.

Verbs naturally supply yet more abundant material, but we need not cite it fully here. Pursuing the order of WH *App*²

Verbs :— we pause a moment on the dropped augments, etc., in pp. 168 f., which are well illustrated in papyri. This phenomenon goes back to Herodotus, and

Augments. may well be a contribution of Ionic to the Common Greek. Diphthongs are naturally the first to show the tendency: it is not likely, for example, that Drs Grenfell and Hunt would now, as in the *editio princeps* of the Oxyrhynchus Logia (1897, p. 7), call *οικοδομημένη* a "more serious error" than *αι* for *ε* or *ει* for *ι*. The double augment of *ἀπεκατεστάθη* in papyri and NT may be noted as a suggestive trifle under this head of augments before we pass

Person-endings. on. Very satisfactory confirmation of our uncial tradition is supplied by the person-endings. The functionally useless difference of ending between the strong and the weak aorist began to disappear in our period. The strong aorist act. or mid. is only found in some thirty *-ω* verbs (and their compounds) in the NT; and while the great frequency of their occurrence protected the root-form, the overwhelming predominance of the sigmatic aorist tended to drive off the field its rival's person-endings. The limits of this usage in the NT text are entirely in accord with the better-written papyri. Thus we find little encouragement for *γενάμενος*,¹ for which any number of papyrus citations may be made. But when we notice *γενα* [. . .] in BU 1033 (ii/A.D.) corrected to *γενο* . . . by a second hand,² we see that education still rebelled against this development, which had begun with the Attic *εἶπας* centuries before. The tendency, in fairly cultured speech, mainly concerned the act., and the indic. middle. For the details see the careful note in WS p. 111. Whether the same intrusion should

¹ So Lk 22⁴⁴ κ, Lk 24²⁹ B, and Mk 6²⁶ and 15⁴² Δ: there is no further uncial support, if Ti is reliable, throughout Mt, Mk, and Lk, in a total of 40 occurrences. The ptc. does not occur in Jn. I have not looked further.

² *Εὐράμενος* in Heb 9¹² (all uncials except D₂) is perhaps due to the frequency of 1st aor. in *-ρα*. The ptc. itself appears in an inscr. of the Roman age, *IMA* iii. 1119. P. Buttmann cites *γενάμενος* from Archimedes (iii/B.C.), though Wilamowitz-Möllendorf in his extracts from the *Psammmites* (*Lesebuch* 243 ff.) edits *γενόμενος* seven times. But in a Doric author the question concerns us little. MGr shows that *γενάμενος* came to stay.

be allowed in the imperf., e.g. εἶχαν Mk 8⁷, is doubtful, in view of the scanty warrant from the papyri. It is for the same reason more than doubtful whether we can accept παρελάβοσαν 2 Th 3⁸ κ*AD*: I have only 4 imperf. and 2 aor. exx. from Ptolemaic times, and the forms ἐλαμβάνεσαν and ἀφίλεσαν (BM 18, 41, 161 B.C.—cited by WM 91 n.⁵) show that the innovation had not attained great fixity before i/A.D. The ocular confusion suggested by Hort in 2 Th *l.c.* would be furthered by the later currency of this convenient ending. What we find it hard to allow in a writer of Paul's culture is a little easier in Jn (15^{22, 24} κBL etc.); and ἐδολιοῦσαν Rom 3¹³ (LXX) might have been written by Paul himself, apart from quotation—we can hardly cite any other 3 pl. imperf. from -όω verbs. As early as ii/B.C. we find ἡξιοῦσαν in *Magn.* 47: see Nachmanson's parallels, pp. 148 f. The -ες of 2 sg. perf., read by WH in Rev 2^{3, 5} 11¹⁷, and in 1st aor. Rev 2⁴, may perhaps be allowed in Rev as a mark of imperfect Greek: it has no warrant from educated writing outside.¹ The 3 pl. perf. in -αν is well attested in Ac 16³⁶ and Ro 16⁷ κAB, Lk 9³⁶ BLX, Col 2¹ κ*ABCD*P, as well as in Jn, Jas and Rev, where it raises less difficulty. It certainly makes a fair show in the papyri, from 164 B.C. down (see Mayser 323), but not in documents which would encourage us to receive it for Luke or even Paul. As the only difference between perf. and 1 aor.-endings, the -ασι was foredoomed to yield to the assimilating tendency; but possible occurrences of -αν are relatively few, and the witness of the papyri indecisive, and it is safer, except in Rev, to suppose it a vulgarism due to the occasional lapse of an early scribe.² If it were really Alexandrian, as Sextus Empiricus says, we could understand its comparative frequency in the papyri; but Thumb decisively rejects this (*Hellenismus* 170), on the ground of its frequent appearance elsewhere.³ The termina-

¹ Even B shows it, in Ac 21²². Note also ἀπεκάλυψες Mt 11²⁵ D.

² Γέγοναν formed the starting-point of a valuable paper by K. Buresch in *RhM*, 1891, pp. 193 ff., which should not be missed by the student of Hellenistic, though it needs some modification in the light of newer knowledge. Thus he accepts the Alexandrian *provenance* of this and the -οσαν type.

³ At Delphi, for example, with imperf. and aor. -οσαν (see p. 37).

tion *-ασι* invades what is formally, though not in meaning, a present, in the case of *ἤκασι*, which is a genuine vernacular form (cf *ἤκαμεν* in Par P 48 (ii/B.C.)). WH (*App*² 176) reject it as "Western" in Mk 8³, regarding it as a paraphrase of *εἰσίν* (BLΔ); but it must be observed that the Lewis Syriac is now to be added to *αADN*, with the Latin and other versions, which support it. It is after all a form which we might expect in Mk, and equally expect to find removed by revisers, whether Alexandrian or Syrian. By way of completing the person-endings, we may observe that the pluperf. act. has exclusively the later *-ειν* form, with *-ει-* even in 3 pl.;¹ and that the 3 pl. imper. in *-τωσαν* and *-σθωσαν* are unchallenged.

Taking up the contract verbs, we note how the confusions between *-άω* and *-έω* forms (p. 173) are supported by our external evidence, and by MGr. Our first serious revolt from WH concerns the infinitive in *-οῖν* (and by analogy *-ᾶν*). The evidence for it is "small, but of good quality" (p. 173—cf *Introd.* § 410): it is in fact confined to B*D in Mt 13³², B* in Mk 4³², *κ** in 1 Pet 2¹⁵, BD* in Heb 7⁵ (where see Ti), and a lectionary in Lk 9³¹. This evidence may pass if our object is merely to reproduce the spelling of the age of B; but absolutely no corroboration seems discoverable, earlier than the date of B itself, except an inscription cited in Hatzidakis (p. 193),² and two papyri, BM iii. p. 136 *bis* (18 A.D.), and PFi 24 (ii/A.D.). Blass (p. 48) does not regard the form as established for the NT. We can quote against it from i-iv/A.D. plentiful *exx.* of *-οῦν* in papyri. (That *-οῦν* and *-ᾶν* (not *ᾶν*) are the correct Attic forms, may be seen from Meisterhans³ 175 f., which Hort's hesitation as to *-ᾶν* prompts me to quote: for the reason of the apparent irregularity see Brugmann, *Gr. Gramm.*³ 61, or WS 42.) Next may be named, for *-άω* verbs, the 2nd sing. pres. mid. in *-ᾶσαι* (*καυχᾶσαι*, *ὀδυνᾶσαι*), which has been formed afresh in the *Κοινή* with the help of the *-σαι* that answers to 3rd

¹ There are isolated exceptions in the papyri.

² So WS 116 n. Two other inscriptions are cited by Hatzidakis, but without dates. Vitelli (on PFi *l.c.*) refers to Crönert 220 n., who corrects Schmiedel's philology: the form is of course a simple product of analogy—*λύει : λύειν : δηλοῖ : δηλοῖν*.

sing. *-ται* in the perfect.¹ It is well paralleled by the early fut. *χαριεῖσαι* in GH 14 c (iii/B.C.), for which *χαρίεσαι* appears in OP 292 (i/A.D.). *Φάγεσαι* and *πίεσαι*, which naturally went together, give us the only *exx.* outside *-άω* verbs, to which the quotations in G. Meyer *Gr. Gram.*³ 549 suggest that the innovation was mainly confined. The later extensions may be noted in Hatzidakis 188. Note the converse change in *δύνη*. Unfortunately we do not seem to have *exx.* of the subj. of *-όω* verbs, to help the parsing of *ἴνα ζηλοῦτε* and the like (p. 167). Blass (Kühner³ i. 2. 587, and *Gr.* 48) accepts Hort's view that the subj. of these verbs became identical with the indic., just as it always was in the *-άω* verbs. (See W. F. Moulton's note, WM 363. Ex 1¹⁶ *δταν μαιούσθε . . . και ᾧσι*, there cited, is a very good example.) But Blass rightly, I think, rejects the supposition that *εὐδοῶται* (1 Co 16²) can be anything but a pres. subj. To read *εὐδοῶται*, as perf. indic., is possible, though the editors do not seem by their printing to have favoured that alternative. That it is a perf. subj. is extremely unlikely. The parallels on which Hort (p. 179) relies—set forth with important additions in Blass's Kühner i. 2. 100 f.—do nothing to make it likely that the *Κοινή* had any perf. subj. apart from the ordinary periphrastic form.² It is hard, moreover, to see why the pres. subj. is not satisfactory here: see Dr Findlay's note *in loc.* (*EGT* vol. ii.). Finally we note the disappearance of the *-ήω* verbs from the *Κοινή*, with the exception of *ζήω* and *χρήμαι*³ (as we ought to call them); also the sporadic appearance of the uncontracted *έδέετο* Lk 8³⁸ (B and a few others *-εἶτο*, which looks like a correction). It is supported by Esth 14³ A, BU 926 (ii/A.D.) and the Mithras Liturgy (p. 12): it is probably, as Blass suggests, a mere analogy-product from *δέομαι* conjugated

¹ To suppose this (or *φάγεσαι*, similarly formed from *φάγεται*) a genuine survival of the pre-Greek *-esai*, is characteristic of the antediluvian philology which still frequently does duty for science in this country. Krumbacher, *KZ* xxvii. 497, scoffs at E. Curtius for talking of an "uralte" *-σαι*.

² To argue this would demand a very technical discussion. It is enough to say that the Attic *κεκῶμαι* and *μεμῶμαι* are not derivative verbs, and that the three derivative verbs which can be quoted, from Doric, Cretan and Ionic respectively, supply slender justification for the supposed *Κοινή* parallel.

³ *Χρᾶσθαι* was the Hellenistic infin., but there is no example of it in NT.

like *λύομαι*,¹ and owes nothing to Ionic. It affords no warrant for suspecting uncontracted forms elsewhere: *κατέχευεν* Mk 14³ is an aor., as in Attic.

The verbs in *-μι* continued in Hellenistic to suffer from the process of gradual extinction which began even in Homeric Greek, and in MGr has eliminated every form outside the verb "be." The papyri agree with the NT

uncials in showing forms like *δύνομαι* and *Verbs in -μι.* *-έδετο* (as well as *-έδοτο*), and various flexions after contract verb types. New verbs like *ιστάνω*² are formed, and new tenses like *ἔστακα* (transitive). The most important novelty apart from these is the aor. subj. *δοῖ* and *γνοῖ*,³ as to which W. F. Moulton's view (WM 360 n.) is finally established by good attestation from papyri. The pres. subj. *διδοῖ*, after the *-όω* verbs, set the analogy at work. That in much later documents such forms may be opt. need not trouble us. The form *δῶη* is more difficult. Schwyzer (p. 191) quotes Moeris for *ποιῶη* in Common Greek, and calls in the analogy of *τιμῶη*: the further step to *δῶη* (also attested by Moeris) was eased by the fact that *δοίη* drew towards *δίη*, and would consequently become monosyllabic: see p. 45. *Δῶη* (subj.) seems a syntactical necessity in Eph 1¹⁷ (B *δῶ*), 2 Tim 2²⁵ (cf later uncials in Eph 3¹⁶ and Jn 15¹⁶): this form, well known in Homer, survives in Boeotian and Delphian inscriptions, as Michel 1411 (ii/B.C., Delphi), 1409 (*δο*).⁴ It is quite intelligible that NW Greek (cf above, p. 36 f.) should have thus contributed to the *Κοινή* an item which (like other contributions from a single quarter, e.g. *τέσσαρες* acc.) kept only a precarious existence by the side of other forms. We return to this later (pp. 193 f.). From *οἶδα* we have in papyri, as in NT, ordinary perfect indic. flexion,⁵ and pluperf. for *ἤδειν*, with occasional literary revival of the older irregular forms. Finally, in the conjugation of *εἰμί*, the middle forms

¹ See below, p. 234.

² The form *-στάνω* in κ and D (p. 175) is interesting in that it exactly anticipates the MGr. So NP 53 (iii/A.D.), in Wilcken's reading; *Syll.* 737⁷⁶ (ii/A.D.)

³ So in 2nd person also, *ἀποδοῖς* Lk 12⁶⁹ D (as papyri).

⁴ See G. Meyer³ 656. Witkowski, p. xxii, reads *ἀποδοῖη* (subj.) in Par P 58.

⁵ Probably Ionic: so Herodotus, and even our texts of Homer (*Od.* i. 337).

are well established (*ἤμην, ἤμεθα*—see above, p. 37), as to a still further extent in MGr. Even the MGr present *εἶμαι* is found already in a Phrygian inscription *ap. Ramsay C. and B. ii. 565* (early iv/A.D.). G. Meyer (⁸ 569) regarded *ἔσται* as the 3rd sing. of this, transferred to future meaning. Note that the old 1st sing. *ἦν* reappears in D at Ac 20¹⁸: elsewhere *ἤμην* stands alone. The rarer *ἦτω* alternates with *ἔστω*, in papyri and late inscriptions, as in NT.

Miscellaneous. It is needless to add any details as to noteworthy forms among the "principal parts" of verbs. Papyrus parallels may be cited for *ἠνοίγην*, for the double formation of *ἀρπάζω* and *βαστάζω* (*ἠρπάγην* and *ἠρπάσθην, ἐβάστασα* and *ἐβάσταξα*¹), for the alternative perf. of *τυγχάνω* (see Ti on Heb 8⁶), for the 1 aor. of *ἄγω*, etc. Note especially the intrusion of the *μ* from the present of *λαμβάνω* into various parts of the verb, and into derivative nouns (p. 149). This is normal in the papyri after the Ptolemaic period, in which there is still some lingering of the older forms. The same phenomenon occurred partially in Ionic; but the Ionic fut. *λάμψομαι*, by taking over the *ᾶ* as well as the nasal of the present, shows that it was an independent development in the *Κοινή*. This will serve as a final example to show that the late uncials and cursives, in restoring classical forms which the best MSS set aside, were deserting the Greek of the NT period in the interests of an artificial grammar.

¹ So P 1 38 (? rightly) in Rev 2²; cf *δυσβάστακτος* Lk 11⁴⁶. It is MGr.

ADDITIONAL NOTES.—Superficially parallel with *τέσσερα*, etc. is the curious variant *ἐκαθερίσθη*, which in Mk 1^{41c} immediately follows *καθαρίσθητι*. WH (*App.*² 157) note that this occurs only in augmented or reduplicated tense-forms: so also in LXX (Thackeray). Clearly the *ε* came in as a second augment, following what looked like *κατά*. For the itacism of *αι* and *ε* (WH *ib.*), cf Mayser 107, who shows that the change of *αι* was illiterate, and quite rare in Ptolemaic times. Later it became normal, till *αι* and *ε* were only distinguished orthographically. Mr Thackeray sends me statistics as to *οὐθείς*, supplementing the tables of Mayser (pp. 180 ff.). The phenomenon seems to be of Attic origin, appearing early in iv/b.c. Thence it spread to the *Κοινή*, where in ii/b.c. it greatly predominated. But in i/A.D. *οὐθείς* was markedly recovering, and before iii/A.D. it had driven out *οὐθεῖς*. The survival of *οὐθείς* in NT uncials is therefore significant. The compound *ἐξουθενεῖν*, born perhaps in ii/b.c., is found in the more literary LXX writers, and in Luke and Paul: the later LXX books show *ἐξουθενοῦν* coined when *οὐθείς* was reasserting itself. The 3 pl. opt. in *-σαν* may be noted in D (Ac 17^{27 bis}). The agreement of D with the LXX in a formation markedly absent from the NT is curious; but it must not (says Dr Thumb) be used to support any theory of Egyptian origin for the MS.

CHAPTER IV.

SYNTAX: THE NOUN.

WE address ourselves to the syntax, beginning with that of the Noun. There are grammatical categories here that scarcely ask for more than bare mention.

Number:— On the subject of *Number* there is one obvious thing to say—the dual has gone. Many Greek dialects, Ionic conspicuously, had discarded this hoary luxury long before the Common Greek was born;

The Dual. and no theory of the relation of the *Koinḗ* to
Neuter Plurals. the dialects would allow Attic to force on the resultant speech a set of forms so useless as these. The dual may well have arisen in prehistoric days when men could not count beyond two; and it is evidently suffering from senile decay in the very earliest monuments we possess of Indo-Germanic language. It had somewhat revived in Attic—witness the inscriptions, and folk-songs like the “Harmodius”; but it never invaded Hellenistic, not even when a Hebrew dual might have been exactly rendered by its aid. We shall see when we come to the adjectives that the disappearance of the distinction between duality and plurality had wider results than the mere banishment of the dual number from declensions and conjugations. The significant new flexion of *δύο* should be noted here: there is a pluralised dative *δυσί*, but in other respects *δύο* is indeclinable. *Ἄμφω* has disappeared in favour of the normally declined *ἀμφοτέρως*. Apart from this matter the only noteworthy point under Number is the marked weakening of the old principle that neuter plurals (in their origin identical with collectives in -α¹) took a singular verb. In the NT we have a large

¹ See Giles, *Manual*², 264 ff. I might add here that Dr Giles thinks the dual may have been originally a specialised form of the plural, used (as in Homer always) to describe natural or artificial *pairs*. That this is its earliest

extension of what in classical Greek was a comparatively rare licence, the plural verb being allowed when the individual items in the subject are separately in view, while the singular treats the subject as a collective unity.¹ The liberty of using the plural freely makes the use of the singular distinctly more significant than it could be in classical Greek.

It may be added that the converse "Pindaric" phenomenon, known as the *σχῆμα Πινδαρικόν*, is found in the NT: see Mk 4⁴¹, Mt 5¹⁸ 6¹⁹, 1 Co 15⁵⁰, Rev 9¹². It is really only a special case of anacoluthon, no more peculiar to Pindar than to Shakspeare. An interesting communication by Prof. Skeat to the Cambridge Philological Society (*Proceedings*, lxvii. p. 2) describes a rule in English, from Alfred downwards, that "when a verb occurs in the 3rd person in an introductory manner . . ., it is often used in the singular number, though the subject may be in the plural." Thus "what *cares* these roacers for the name of king?"—"and now *abideth* faith, hope, [love], these three,"—etc.; the last being as true to English idiom as to its original Greek. That the construction is also possible with order inverted, is shown by another citation, "For thy three thousand ducats here *is* six." (See also p. 234.)

An idiomatic use of the plural appears in passages like Mt 2²⁰ *τεθνήκασιν*, Lk 12²⁰ *αἰτοῦσιν*, where there is such a suppression of the subject in bringing emphasis on the action, that we get the effect of a passive, or of French *on*, German *man*. Our "they say" is like it. Lightfoot compares the "rhetorical plural" in Euripides *IT* 1359, *κλέπτοντες ἐκ γῆς ξόανα καὶ θυηπόλους* (*i.e.* Iphigenia). Add Livy ix. 1, "*auctores belli* [one man] *dedidimus*." Winer gives other parallels, but rightly refuses to put Mt 9⁸ 27⁴⁴, 1 Co 15²⁹ 16³ into this category. If Heb 10¹ has not a primitive error (as Hort suspected), the plural subject of *προσφέρουσιν*

extant use is certain, but its origin may very well have been as suggested above. There are savages still who cannot count beyond two: see Tylor, *Primitive Culture*, i. 242 f. The Indo-Germans had numerals up to 100 before their separation; but the superfluous dual, I suggest, had been already utilised for a new purpose.

¹ This is conspicuous in D (Wellh. 12).

and *δύνανται* might fairly be described in this way; for the priests are certainly not prominent in the writer's thought, and a passive construction would have given the meaning exactly. So Westcott (for *προσφ.*) who quotes Jn 15⁶ 20², Rev 12⁶, Mt 7¹⁶, Mk 10¹⁸, Lk 17²³. See also p. 163, n.²

Gender:— On *Gender* likewise there is not much to say. There are sundry differences in the

gender of particular words; but even MGr is nearly as much under the domination of this outworn excrescence on language as was its classical ancestor. That English should still be almost the only European language to discard gender, indicating only distinction of sex, is exceedingly strange. As in the case of Number, we have to refer to ordinary grammars for some uses of gender which NT Greek shares with the classical. One or two cases of slavish translation should be mentioned. In Rom 11⁴ the LXX τῷ Βάαλ is cited as τῇ B., which occurs however three times in LXX, and in *Ascensio Isaiæ* 12. Prof. F. C. Burkitt (*CR* xiv. 458), in commenting on this last passage, accepts the explanation that the gender is determined by the *Q'rt* נשָׂבָא, translated *αἰσχύνη*. In Mk 12¹¹ and Mt 21⁴² we have the LXX αὐτή = ἡστί: the translators may perhaps have interpreted their own Greek by recalling

Breach of Concord. κεφαλὴν γυνίλας. Breach of concord in Gender has been already alluded to in a note on the Greek of Rev (p. 9).^a The very difficult εἴ τις σπλάγγνα καὶ οἰκτιρμοί of Phil 2¹ comes in here, involving as it does both number and gender. We might quote in illustration Par P 15 (ii/B.C.) ἐπὶ τι μίαν τῶν . . . οἰκιῶν, and BU 326 (ii/A.D.) εἰ δέ τι περισσὰ γράμματα . . . καταλίπω.^b But Blass's εἴ τι, read throughout, is a great improvement: *si quid valet* is the sense required, as Lightfoot practically shows by his translation. H. A. A. Kennedy (*EGT in loc.*) makes independently the same suggestion. Note that the Codex Amiatinus (and others) read *si quid viscera*. [^a See p. 244.

A significant remark may be quoted from the great Byzantinist, K. Krumbacher, à propos of these breaches of concord. In his *Problem d. neuogr. Schriftsprache* (p. 50) he observes: "If one finds in Greek literature, between the early Byzantine age and the present day, mistakes like *λειπῶν μὴ συγχωρούντων, φυλαὶ καταλαμβάντες, πάντων τῶν γυναικῶν,*

etc., it shows that we have to do with a half-dead form, in which mistakes slip in as soon as grammatical vigilance nods." When we remember that the MGr present participle, *e.g.* *δένοντας*, is as indeclinable as our own equivalent "binding," we can see some reason for the frequency of non-agreement in this part of the verb. What became common in the early Byzantine literature would naturally be incipient in the vernacular of imperfectly educated persons centuries before, like the author of Rev.¹ A few nouns wavering in gender may be named. *Αιμός* is masculine in Par P 22 (ii/B.C.) and feminine in 26, which is written by the same hand; further parallels need not be sought for the inconsistency between Lk 4²⁵ and Ac 11²⁸, Lk 15¹⁴. The apparently purposeless variation between *ἡ θεός* and *ἡ θεά* in Ac 19 is explained by inscriptions.² Some masculine *-ος* nouns like *ἔλεος*, *ἦχος*, *πλούτος*, passed into the neuter declension in Hellenistic, and remain there in MGr: see Hatzidakis, pp. 356 ff.

Case:— We are free now to examine the phenomena of *Case*. To estimate the position of Hellenistic cases along the line of development, we may sum up briefly what may be seen at the two ends of this line. MGr has only the three cases we ourselves possess—nominative, accusative, and genitive. (The survival of a few vocative forms, in which MGr and Hellenistic are on practically the same footing, does not affect this point, for the vocative is not really a case.) At the very dawn of Greek language history, as we know it, there is only one more, the dative, though we can detect a few moribund traces of instrumental, locative, and ablative. For all practical purposes, we may say that Greek lost in pre-

¹ Of Reinhold 57 f., and p. 234 below. We may cite typical breaches of concord from the papyri. Firstly, case:—KP 37 (ii/A. D.) "Ἦρων ἔγραψα ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ μὴ εἰδὼς γρ(άμματα):—this is quite true as it stands, but Heron meant *εἰδὼτος*! So BU 31 (*εἰδὼς*!). BU 1002 (i/B.C.) Ἀντιφίλου Ἑλληνη . . . ἱκάρχη. *Leit.* 149 (ii/A.D.) τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ . . . ὁ διάτοχος (= διαδ.). OP 527 (ii-iii/A.D.) περὶ Σερήνου τοῦ γραφέως ὁ συνεργαζόμενος.^a Then gender:—BU 997 (ii/B.C.) τὴν ὑπάρχον αὐτῷ οἰκίαν. *Ib.* 577 (iii/A.D.) ἐκ τῆς μετῆλλαχότος γυναίκαν. *Ib.* 1013 (i/A.D.) ἡ ὁμολογῶν. *Ib.* 1036 (ii/A.D.) στολήν λενοῦν. LPu (ii/B.C.) τὴν τῶν θεῶν ἀνασον ἀκούσαντα. AP 113 (ii/A.D.) ὁ τετελευτηκῶς αὐτῆς μήτηρ.

² Cf Blass on 19²⁷: "Usitate dicitur ἡ θεός (ut v.²⁷); verum etiam inscriptio Ephesia . . . τῇ μεγίστῃ θεῇ Ἐφεσία Ἀρτέμιδι, cum alibi . . . ἡ θεός eadem dicitur. . . . Itaque formulam sollemnem ἡ μεγάλη θεά Ἄ. mira diligentia L. conservavit."^b

^{a b} See p. 244.

historic times three out of the primitive seven cases (or eight, if we include the vocative), viz., the *from* case (ablative), the *with* case (instrumental¹), and the *at* or *in* case (locative), all of which survived in Sanskrit, and appreciably in Latin, though obscured in the latter by the formal syncretism of ablative, instrumental, and (except in singular of *-ā-* and *-o-* nouns) locative. In other words, the purely local cases, in which the meaning could be brought out by a place-adverb (for this purpose called a preposition), sacrificed their distinct forms and usages.² Greek is accordingly marked,

**Encroachment
of Prepositions.**

like English, by the very free use of prepositions. This characteristic is most obviously intensified in Hellenistic, where we are perpetually finding prepositional phrases used to express relations which in classical Greek would have been adequately given by a case alone. It is needless to illustrate this fact, except with one typical example which will fitly introduce the next point to be discussed. We have already (pp. 11 f.) referred to the instrumental *ἐν*, formerly regarded as a translation of the familiar Hebrew *בְּ*, but now well established as vernacular Greek of Ptolemaic and later times. The examples adduced all happen to be from the category "armed with"; but it seems fair to argue that an instrumental sense for *ἐν* is generally available if the context strongly pleads for it, without regarding this restriction or assuming Hebraism.³ Nor is the intrusion of *ἐν* exclusively a feature of "Biblical" Greek, in the places where the prep. seems to be superfluous. Thus in Gal 5¹ the simple dative appears with *ἐνέχομαι*: Par P 63 (ii/B.C.—a royal letter) gives us *τοὺς ἐνεσχημένους*

¹ The instrumental proper all but coincided with the dative in form throughout the *sing.* of the 1st and 2nd decl., so that the still surviving dative of instrument may in these declensions be regarded as the ancient case: the *comitative* "with," however, was always expressed by a preposition, except in the idiom *αὐτοῖς ἀνδράσι*, and the "military dative."

² Note that the *to* case also disappeared, the "terminal accusative" seen in *ire Romam*. The surviving Greek cases thus represent purely grammatical relations, those of subject, object, possession, remoter object, and instrument.

³ I should not wish to exclude the possibility that this *ἐν*, although correct vernacular Greek, came to be used rather excessively by translators from Hebrew, or by men whose mother tongue was Aramaic. The use would be explained on the same lines as that of *ἰδοῦ* on p. 11.

ἐν τισιν ἀγνοήμασιν. In Par P 22 (ii/B.C.) we have τῷ λιμῷ διαλυθῆναι, while the contemporary 28 has διαλυόμεναι ἐν τῷ λιμῷ. What gave birth to this extension of the uses of ἐν? It seems certainly to imply a growing lack of clearness in the simple dative, resulting in an unwillingness to trust it to express the required meaning without further definition. We may see in the multiplied use of prepositions an incipient symptom of that simplification of cases which culminates in the abbreviated case system of to-day.

The NT student may easily overlook the fact that the dative has already entered the way that leads to extinction. I take a page at random from Mk in WH, and count 21 datives against 23 genitives and 25 accusatives. A random page from the Teubner Herodotus gives me only 10, against 23 and 29 respectively; one from Plato 11, against 12 and 25. Such figures could obviously prove nothing conclusive until they were continued over a large area, but they may be taken as evidence that the dative is not dead

yet. Taking the NT as a whole, the dative with prepositions falls behind the accusative and genitive in the proportion 15 to 19 and 17 respectively. This makes the dative considerably more prominent than in classical and post-classical historians.¹ The preponderance is, however, due solely to ἐν, the commonest of all the prepositions, outnumbering εἰς by about three to two: were both these omitted, the dative would come down to 2½ in the above proportion, while the accusative would still be 10. And although ἐν has greatly enlarged its sphere of influence² in the NT as compared with literary Κοινή, we

¹ Helbing, in Schanz's *Beiträge*, No. 16 (1904), p. 11, gives a table for the respective frequency of dat., gen., and accus. with prepositions, which works out for Herodotus, Thucydides, and Xenophon, taken together, at 1:1·2:3; for twelve post-classical historians, from Polybius to Zosimus, at 1:1·5:2·4.

² This is well seen by comparing the statistics of Helbing, pp. 8f. He gives the figures for the three favourite prepositions of the historians. 'Εν is one of the three in every author except Polybius, Diodorus, and Josephus; εἰς falls out of the list in Eusebius only. The total occurrences of εἰς in the three classical historians amount to 6,531, those of ἐν to 6,031; while in the twelve Hellenistic writers εἰς comes to 31,651, and ἐν to only 17,130. Contrast the NT, where εἰς is preferred to ἐν only in Mk and Heb, and the total occurrences amount to 1,743 and 2,698 respectively. See the list in p. 98 below: note there also the

find very clear examples of *εἰς* encroaching on its domain. There are many NT passages where a real distinction between *εἰς* and *ἐν* is impossible to draw without excessive subtlety, for which all the motive is gone when we find in MGr *στέ* with accusative (= *εἰς τόν*) the substitute for the now obsolete dative; while the language in its intermediate stages steadily tends towards this ultimate goal.¹ By the side of this we may put the disappearance of *ὑπό* with the dative, the accusative serving to express both motion and rest: in the classical historians the dative is nearly as frequent as the accusative, and some of their successors, notably Appian and Herodian, made it greatly outnumber its rival—see Helbing, *op. cit.*, p. 22. Similarly *πρός* with dative stands in NT in the ratio of less than .01 to *πρός* with accusative: in the three classical historians it averages nearly .12; in the later twelve, .01 again. *Ἐπί* and *παρά* are the only prepositions in which the use with three cases is really alive; and even *ἐπί* rather illustrates our tendency than contradicts it—see p. 107.

We pass on to other symptoms of senescence in the dative. In the papyri there are some clear examples of an accusative expressing point of time instead of duration (see *CR* xviii. 152); and in Ac 20¹⁶ and Jn 4⁵², Rev 3⁸ we may recognise the same thing.² Of course the dative of "time when" was still very much more common. There were not wanting, indeed, instances where a classical use of the accusative, such as that of specification (Goodwin *Greek Gram.* § 1058), has yielded to a dative of reference (instrumental).³ We have examples of its survival in Jn 6¹⁰ *al* (WM 288 f.); but, as in the papyri, the dative is very much commoner. The evidence of the decay of the dative was examined with great minuteness by F. Krebs in his three pamphlets, *Zur Rection der Casus in der späteren historischen Gräcität* (1887–1890). He deals only

marked drop in the total for *ἐπί*, which in the twelve writers of literary *Koivῆ* comes not far behind *ἐν* (14,093).

¹ See below, p. 234.

² Thus OP 477 (ii/A.D.) τὸ πέμπτον ἔτος, "in the fifth year"—a recurrent formula. Add Gen 43¹⁶ (Dieterich, *Unters.* 151). With *ἔσαν*, however, the use began in classical times: see Blass 94. See also p. 245.

³ Cf *CR* xv. 438, xviii. 153, and the useful *Program* by Compagnon, *De Sermone Gr. Volg. Pisidias Phrygiaeque meridionalis*, pp. 20 f. [^a See p. 245.

with the literary *Κοινή*; but we may profitably take up his points in order and show from the NT how these tendencies of the artificial dialect are really derived from the vernacular. Krebs starts with verbs which are beginning to take the accusative, having been confined to the dative in the earlier language. The distinction in meaning between transitive verbs and verbs whose complement was properly instrumental (as with *χρᾶσθαι*—which itself takes an abnormal accus. in 1 Co 7³¹),^a or the dative of person interested, inevitably faded away with time, and the grammatical distinction became accordingly a useless survival. Of Krebs' exx., *πολεμεῖν* takes accus. also in vernacular, *ἐνεδρεύειν* and *εὐδοκεῖν* in the NT; but *ξενίζεσθαι*, *ἀπαντᾶν* and *ὑπαντᾶν* retain the dative there.¹ The movement was accompanied with various symptoms of reaction. *Προσκυνεῖν* in the NT takes the dative about twice as often as the accusative.² The phrase *παραβάλλεσθαι τῇ ψυχῇ* (Polybius) is matched in respect of its innovating dative by *παραβολεύεσθαι* in Phil 2³⁰. We will dismiss the decay of the dative with the remark that the more illiterate papyri and inscriptions decidedly show it before the NT had acquired any antiquity. The schoolboy of OP 119, referred to already (p. 28), uses *σέ* for *σοί* after *γράφω*; while later samples (see *CR* as above) include such monstrosities as *τίνι λόγου, σὺν τῶν υἱῶν, χαρίζετε ἐμοῦ*.^{3b} Dittenberger would actually recognise the same thing in *OGIS 17 Ἀθηναῖ Σωτεῖρα Νίκη καὶ βασιλέως Πτολεμαίου*. But at the beginning of iii/B.C. this confusion is surely unthinkable, and there is a curious asyndeton left: should the *καί* be transposed?⁴ Even OP 811 (A.D. 1), *εὐχαριστῶν Ἐρμίππου*, seems much too early to be intentional. We may follow Krebs further as he shows the encroachments of the accusative upon the genitive, and upon the field of verbs which were formerly intransitive. It will be seen that the

¹ Also, we may add, *πειθαρχεῖν*, which takes a gen. (like *ἀκούω*) in Tb P 104 (i/B.C.), OP 265 (i/A.D.), and the "Gadatas" inscr. (Michel 32). For the dat., as in NT, cf *Μαγν.* 114, etc. *Εὐδοκεῖν* c. acc. is only in a quotation (Mt 12¹⁹).

² Contrast the inscriptions: see *CR* xv. 436. But note Par P 51 (ii/B.C.) *ἵνα προσκυνήσῃς αὐτόν*. ³ See other exx. in Dieterich, *Unters.* 150.

⁴ D.'s further ex., No. 87 (iii/B.C.) *ὑπὲρ βασιλέως . . . καὶ βασιλείσης . . . καὶ Πτολεμαίου τῷ υἱῷ* seems merely a mason's carelessness. See his note on No. 364 (18 B.C.), and exx. in his Index, p. 238. [^ab See p. 245.

NT does not tally in details with the literary *Κοινή*, though it independently shows the same tendencies at work. In

his second part Krebs turns to the genitive. **Accusative gains from genitive,** The first verb in which we are interested is

the late compound *ἀπελπίζειν*, which generally takes acc. instead of the natural gen. This it seems to do in Lk 6³⁵, if we read *μηδένα* with *κ* etc. and the Lewis Syriac:¹ so Ti WHmg RVmg. *Κρατεῖν* (Krebs ii. 14) takes the gen. only 8 times in NT, out of 46 occurrences, but *διαφέρειν* ("surpass") has gen. always. *Ἐντρέπεσθαι* (p. 15) takes only the acc.,² and so does *κληρονομεῖν*. *Δράσσομαι* (p. 17) has the acc. in the only place where it occurs (1 Co 3¹⁹, altered from LXX). *Ἐπιθυμῶ* may be added to this list, if we may follow BD *al.* in Mt 5²⁸. Add likewise the sporadic exx. of acc. with verbs of filling (Rev 17³ *αἵ*.; see Blass 102): Thumb observes (*ThLZ* xxviii. 422) that the usage lives on in MGr.³ There follows a category

of intransitive verbs which in Hellenistic have begun to take a direct object in the acc. Of these we recognise as NT examples *ἐνεργεῖν* (six times), *συνεργεῖν* (in Rom 8²⁸ AB and Origen), *πλεονεκτεῖν* (four times, and once in passive), and *χορηγεῖν*.

The third part of Krebs' work deals with compound verbs and their cases. Here **and from dat. and gen. after compounds.** *προσφωνεῖν* c. acc. may claim Lk 6¹³, but it has the dat. four times; *ὑποτρέχειν* has acc.

in its only occurrence; *ἐπέρχεσθαι* has only dat. or prepositional phrase; *καταβαρεῖν* occurs once, c. acc.; *καταλαλεῖν* takes gen. in NT, but is once passive, as is *καταπονεῖν* in its two occurrences; while *κατισχύειν* shows no sign of the acc. construction.

It would of course be easy to supplement from the NT grammar these illustrations of a general tendency, but exhaustive discussion is not needed here. We must proceed to note a few special characteristics of the individual cases as they appear in NT Greek, in uses deviating from earlier

¹ *Μηδέν*, if not to be read *μηδέν'*, is an internal accus., *nihil desperantes*.

² A passage from Dionysius (Krebs 16), *ὄσπε θεῖον φοβηθέντα. χόλον ὄσπε ἄνθρωπίνην ἐντραπέντες νέμεσιν*, bears a curiously close resemblance to Lk 18⁶

³ See further, p. 235.

language. Before doing so, however, we must make some general observations, by way of applying to noun syntax the principles noted above, p. 20. We should not assume, from the evidence just presented as to variation of case with verbs, that the old distinctions of case-meaning have vanished, or that we may treat as mere equivalents those constructions which are found in common with the same word. The very fact that in Jn 4²³ *προσκυνεῖν* is found with dat. and then with acc. is enough to prove the existence of a difference, subtle no doubt but real, between the two, unless the writer is guilty of a most improbable slovenliness. The fact that the maintenance of an old and well-known distinction between the acc. and the gen. with *ἀκούω* saves the author of Ac 9⁷ and 22⁹ from a patent self-contradiction, should by itself be enough to make us recognise it for Luke, and for other writers until it is proved wrong. So with the subtle and suggestive variation in Heb 6⁴⁴ from gen. to acc. with *γεύεσθαι*.^{1a} Further, the argument that because *εἰς* often denotes rest *in* or *at*, and sometimes represents that motion *towards* (as distinguished from motion *to*) which may perhaps have been the primitive differentia of the dat., therefore it is immaterial whether *εἰς* or *ἐν* or the simple dat. be used with any particular word, would be entirely unwarrantable. It depends upon the character of the word itself. If its content be limited, it may well happen that hardly any appreciable difference is made by placing it in one or another of certain nearly equivalent relations to a noun. But if it is a word of large content and extensive use, we naturally expect to find these alternative expressions made use of to define the different ideas connected with the word they qualify, so as to set up a series of phrases having a perfectly distinct meaning. In such a case we should expect to see the original force of these expressions, obsolete in contexts where there was no-

¹ To illustrate with a lexical example, we need not think that the evidence which proves *ἑρωτᾶν* in the vernacular no longer restricted to the meaning *question* (cf *Expos.* VI. viii. 431), compromises the antithesis between the verbs in Jn 16²³, rightly given by RVmg. Our English *ask* is the complete equivalent of the Hellenistic *ἑρωτᾶν*; and if we translated *ἀιτήσῃτε* by some other word, say *beg* or *petition*, we should naturally take *ask* to mean *question* there. See Westcott or Milligan-Moulton *in loc.*, or Loisy, *Le Quatrième Évangile*, p. 789.

^a See p. 245.

thing to quicken it, brought out vividly where the need of a distinction stimulated it into new life. A critical example is afforded by the construction of *πιστεύω*, as to which Blass

(p. 110) declares that (beside the prepositional construction of *πιστεύω*, with the meaning "believe in") it takes the dat. "*passim* even in the sense 'to believe in,' as in Ac 5¹⁴ 18⁸."¹ Again, p. 123, "*πιστεύειν εἰς* alternates with *πιστ. ἐν* (Mk 1¹⁵) and *πιστ. ἐπί*, in addition to which the correct classical *πιστ. τινί* appears." Let us examine this. In classical Greek, as LS observe, "the two notions [*believe* and *believe in*] run into each other." To be unable to distinguish ideas so vitally different in the scheme of Christianity would certainly have been a serious matter for the NT writers. Blass allows that with the preposition the meaning is *believe in*. Is this meaning ever found with the simple dat., or is *πιστεύειν τινί* appropriated entirely for the other idea? The answer must, it would seem, come from examination of the NT passages, rather than from outside. There are about forty occurrences of *πιστεύειν* with dat., apart from those where the verb means *entrust*. It will be admitted that in the great majority of these passages the meaning is *believe*. There remain a few passages where the alternative is arguable, such as Jn 5²⁴.²⁸ (in which the *λόγος* just preceding shows that *believe* is more appropriate), 8³¹ (where the variation from the previous *π. εἰς* cannot be merely accidental), Ac 5¹⁴ (where the dat. may be construed with *προσετίθεντο*, as in RV), 16³⁴ and 18⁸ (where *accepting the truth of God's word* satisfies the connexion). (See p. 235.) It might be said that the influence of the LXX tends to weaken the normal distinction in the phrase *π. τῷ θεῷ*. But it is very clear that the LXX is not responsible for the NT use of *πιστεύειν*. The only prepositional phrase used in the LXX is that with *ἐν*, which is itself very rare, and this occurs in only one NT passage,³ Mk 1¹⁵, where there can be little doubt that Deissmann is right³ in translating "believe in (the sphere of)" the

¹ The second passage is dropped in ², but not in the English edition.

² Eph 1¹³ is only an apparent exception, for the second *ἐν* ᾧ is assimilated to the first, and its sense is determined by *ἐσφραγίσθητε*. (II. *ἐπί σε* in Wis 12³.)

³ *In Christo* 48 f Cf Gal 3²¹ (B) *ἐν νόμῳ*.

[² See p. 245.

Gospel": he compares 1 Th 3², Rom 1⁹, 2 Co 8¹⁸ 10¹⁴, etc. The construction *πιστ. ἐπί*, which outside John is commoner than *εἰς*, is found in Is 28¹⁶, where B omits *ἐπί*, and conformity to the NT application of the passage may well have occasioned its insertion in *NAQ*. It would seem therefore as if the substitution of *εἰς* or *ἐπί* for the simple dative may have obtained currency mainly in Christian circles, where the importance of the difference between mere belief (בְּרִמְיָהוּ) and personal trust (אֱמוּנָה) was keenly realised. The prepositional construction was suggested no doubt by its being a more literal translation of the Hebrew phrase with אֶל. But in itself it was entirely on the lines of development of the Greek language, as we have seen. There was, moreover, a fitness in it for the use for which it was specialised. To repose one's trust upon God or Christ was well expressed by *πιστεύειν ἐπί*, the dative suggesting more of the state, and the accusative more of the initial act of faith; while *εἰς* recalls at once the bringing of the soul into that mystical union which Paul loved to express by *ἐν Χριστῷ*. But as between *ἐπί* and *εἰς*, we may freely admit that it is not safe to refine too much: the difference may amount to little more than that between our own *believe on* and *believe in*.¹ The really important matter is the recognition of a clear distinction between *believe on* or *in* and *believe* with the dative simply.²

¹ For a closely allied equivalence, cf that of *ἐν* and *ἐπι τῷ ὀνόματι*, as demonstrated by Heitmüller, *Im Namen Jesu* (1903), i. ch. i.

² We may give a table of the constructions of *πιστεύω*, when not absolute, and not=*entrust*. As elsewhere, it depends on WH text, ignoring passages in [[]].

	c. <i>εἰς</i>	c. <i>ἐπί</i>		c. <i>ἐν</i>	c. dat.	Total.
		dat.	acc.			
Mt	1	—	1	—	4	6
Mk	—	—	—	1	1	2
Lk and Ac . . .	3	1	4	—	9	17
Jn and 1 Jn. . .	37	—	—	—	18	55
Paul	3	4	2	—	6	15
Jas	—	—	—	—	1	1
1 Pet.	1	1	—	—	—	2
Total	45	6	7	1	39	98

1 Jn 4¹⁶ is omitted, as *ἐγνώκαμεν* determines the construction; also Ac 5¹⁴ and Eph 1¹³, for reasons given above. See Thumb, *Neue Jahrb.* 1906, p. 253.

We have still to gather some noteworthy **Special uses of the Cases:**—points in the use of the cases, particularly the Nominative, on which nothing has been said hitherto. The case has a certain tendency to be residuary legatee of case-relations not obviously appropriated by other cases. We have its use as the name-case, unaltered by the construction of the sentence, in Rev 9¹¹: the fact that this has classical parallels (see Blass 85) is perhaps only accidental, for we have already seen that ungrammatical nominatives are prevalent in Rev (see p. 9), and the general NT usage is certainly assimilation (Mt 1²¹, Mk 3¹⁶, Ac 27¹). The classical parallels may serve for a writer such as Luke, if we are to write *ἐλαιών* in Lk 19²⁹ 21³⁷. In WH and the RV it is *ἐλαιών*, gen. pl., and so Blass. We noted above (p. 49) the conclusive evidence which compels us to accept the noun *ἐλαιών*, *olivetum*, as a word current in the *Κοινή*. WH (*App*² 165) regard the presence of *Ἐλαιῶνος* in Ac 1¹² as corroborating the argument drawn from the unambiguous *τὸ ὄρος τῶν ἐλαιῶν*. Tertullian's *in Elaeonem secedebat*, the prevalence of *olivetum* in the Latin versions, and the new fact (unknown to WH) that *ἐλαιών* is a word abundantly occurring in the vernacular, may together perhaps incline us rather to the other view, with Deissmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, and Weiss (cf W. F. Moulton's note in WM 227). Certainly, if we were forced to emend on conjecture, to substitute *Ἐλαιῶνα* in Lk *ll. cc.*—in one of which places the initial *ἀ* following makes it especially easy—would cause much less disturbance than to force Blass's *ἐλαιῶν* upon Acts and Josephus. (See further on p. 235.)

The nominative which stands at the head of a clause without construction is a familiar phenomenon hardly needing to be illustrated: it is one of the easiest of anacolutha, and as much at home in English as in Greek. The special case in which the participle is concerned will engage our attention later (p. 225). Typical *exx.* are Lk 21⁶, Ac 7⁴⁰, Mt 5⁴⁰ D (*ὁ θέλων . . . ἀφες αὐτῷ*—a plausible reading, as *τῷ θέλοντι* is an easy correction), 1 Jn 2²⁴, Rev 2²⁶, etc. Note Mt 17¹⁴ and Mk 1³⁴ in D.

The parenthetic nominative in expressions of time is well

seen in Mt 15³², Mk 8³, also Lk 9²³. In popular Attic the construction goes as far back as v/B.C.¹ Viteau (*Sujet* 41) cites

Parenthetic Nominative. Eccles 2¹⁶ (note emendation in A and κ^c .^a) and Jos 1¹¹. On the latter Nestle notes (*Exp T* xvi. 429) that B ($\epsilon\tau\iota$ ἡμέραι τρεῖς καὶ δια-

βαίνετε) gives the rationale.^a Deissmann adds from the *Acta Pauli et Theclae* (in OP i. p. 9) ἡμέραι γὰρ ἤδη τρεῖς καὶ νύκτες τρεῖς Θέκλα οὐκ ἐγγήγερται.² We must leave it an open question whether Ac 5⁷ (see p. 16) belongs to this category: it means an isolated return to the construction of ἐγένετο which Luke used in his Gospel, but then abandoned. This may not however be quite decisive. The use of parenthetic nominatives appears in the papyri most abundantly in descriptions with οὐλή or γείτονες. Thus "εἰκόνας"² will run, "to A., long-faced, straight-nosed, a scar on his right wrist"; and a piece of land or a house is inventoried with "belonging to A., its neighbours on the south the open street, on the west the house of B."—all nominatives without construction. We compare such examples as Jn 1⁶.

Articular Nominative in address.

There is a very marked increase in the use of the articular nominative in address. Nearly sixty examples of it are found in the NT. There seems no sufficient reason for assigning any influence to the coincident Hebrew use, for classical Greek shows the idiom well established. The rough and peremptory tone which characterises most of the other examples seems to have disappeared. Contrast the Aristophanic ὁ παῖς ἀκολούθει, "you there! the lad, I mean" (Blass), with the tender ἡ παῖς ἔγειρε² in Lk 8⁵⁴: we may still recognise a survival of the *decisiveness* of the older use. *Descriptiveness*, however, is rather the note of the articular nom. of address in the NT: so in Lk 12³², Jn 19³, where we may represent the *nuance* by "Fear not, you little flock!" "Hail, you 'King'!" In the latter passage we can easily feel the inappropriateness of the βασιλεῦ found in κ , which would admit the royal right, as in Ac 26⁷. Its appearance

¹ Meisterhans² 203. See CR xvii. 197, where Crönert reads in BM ii. 299 (no. 417—iv/A.D.) ἐπειδὴ ἀσχολῶ ἐλθὶν πρὸς σὲν αὐτὲ (= -αι) ἡμέρε, "his diebus"—a violent example if true. Of p. 11 n.¹ *ad fin.* [^a See p. 245.

² See p. 235.

in Mk 15¹⁸ is merely a note of the writer's imperfect sensibility to the more delicate shades of Greek idiom.

Vocative. Note that Lk, and perhaps Mt (κAL), correct Mk here. The *anarthrous* nom. should

probably be regarded as a mere substitute for the vocative, which begins from the earliest times to be supplanted by the nominative. In MGr the forms in -ε are practically the only separate vocatives surviving. Hellenistic has little more, retaining some in -α and -εῦ, with the isolated γύναι, πάτερ, and θύγατερ; but the nom. is beginning to assert itself even here, for πατήρ^{1a} and θυγάτηρ are well attested (see the evidence in Blass 86 n.). The vocative itself need not detain us, the presence or absence of ὦ being the only feature calling for comment. In the Lucan writings only is the interjection used in the classical manner without emphasis. Elsewhere it is mostly used as we use O, except that this is with us appropriate in prayer, from which it is markedly absent in the NT, though not entirely in the translation Greek of the OT. The progressive omission of ὦ is not wholly easy to explain, for the classical examples (see Gerth's Kühner³ § 357. 4) show that the simple voc. has normally a touch of dignity or reserve. A specially good ex. occurs in Plato *Crito* 52A, ταύταις δὴ φάμεν καὶ σέ, Σώκρατες, ταῖς αἰτίαις ἐνέξεσθαι, where "the effect of omitting ὦ is to increase the impressiveness, since ὦ Σώκρατες is the regular mode of address: in English we obtain the same effect by exactly the opposite means" (Adam). NT use has thus approximated to our own, and may well have travelled upon the same path without any outside interference, such as A. Buttmann would find in Latinism.²

Common to nominative and accusative is the use of εἰς with acc. to replace a predicate, in such phrases as εἶναι εἰς and ἐγείρειν εἰς (Ac 8²³ 13²²). This cannot fairly be described

¹ There seems no adequate reason to write πᾶτερ, as WH (*App*² 165).

² J. A. Scott, in *AJP* xxvi. 32-43, has a careful study of the classical use of ὦ. He shows that ὦ "with the vocative was familiar, and was not freely used until the familiar language of comedy, dialectic, and the law courts became the language of literature, when the vocative rarely appears without the interjection." The Attic *sermo vulgaris* in this case did not determine the usage of the Hellenistic vernacular. [° See p. 245.

as a Hebraism, for the vernacular shows a similar extension of the old use of εἰς expressing destination: so for example KP 46 (ii/A.D.), ἔσχον παρ' ὑμῶν εἰς δά(νειον) σπέρματα, a recurrent formula. It is obvious that "I received it *as* a loan" and "*for* a loan" do not differ except in grammar. The fact that this εἰς is mainly found in translation falls into line with other phenomena already discussed—the overdoing of a correct locution in passages based on a Semitic original, simply because it has the advantage of being a literal rendering.

Genitive. We may pass over the accusative, as

little remains to be said of it except on points of detail. As to the genitive, readers of Winer will perhaps hardly need reminding now-a-days that to call the case "unquestionably the *whence-case*" is an utterly obsolete procedure. The Greek genitive is syncretic (cf p. 61); and the ablative, the only case which answers to Winer's "case of *proceeding from* or *out of*," is responsible for a part of the uses of the genitive in which it was merged. Most of the ordinary divisions of the case we find still in extensive use. The *objective* gen. is very prominent, and exegesis has often to discuss the application of this or the subjective label to a particular phrase. It is as well to remember that in Greek this question is entirely one of exegesis, not of grammar. There is no approximation to the development by which we have restricted the inflexional genitive in our language almost entirely to the subjective use. The *partitive* gen. is largely replaced by the abl. with ἀπό or ἐκ,^a but is still used freely, sometimes in peculiar phrases. In Mt 28¹ (RV) we have ὀψέ with this gen., "late on the sabbath:" cf Tb P 230 (ii/B.C.) ὀψίτερον τῆς ἄρας, and Par P 35, 37 (ii/B.C.) ὀψέ τῆς ἄρας, and Philostratus (*ap.* Blass² 312) ὀψέ τῶν Τρωικῶν, "at a late stage in the Trojan war." This last writer however has also ὀψέ τούτων, "*after* these things," and Blass now (*l.c.*) adopts this meaning in Mt, giving other quotations. This use of ὀψέ = *after* involves an *ablative* gen., "late *from*." There remains the *vespere sabbati* of the Latt. and the Lewis Syr., favoured by Weiss, Wright, etc. Since ὀψέ could be used practically as an indeclinable noun (see Mk 11¹¹ *al*), this seems a natural development, but the question is not easy to

^aSee p. 245.

decide.¹ How freely the partitive gen. was used in the *Κοινή* may be seen in passages like Ac 21¹⁰, where it is subject of a sentence. See WM 253 for classical parallels: add *OGIS* 56⁵⁹ *ὁ προφήτης ἢ τῶν . . . ἱερέων . . . οἴσει*. How unnecessary it was there for Dittenberger to insert *τις*, may be seen from the standing phrase *ὁ δέινα τῶν φίλων*, "X., one of the Privy Council" (as Par P 15 (ii/B.C.), etc.).

The papyri show us abundantly the Genitive of Time and Place. genitive of *time* and *place*, like *νότου* "on the south," *ἔτους β* "in the 2nd year." It comes most naturally from the simplest of all genitives, that of possession, "belonging to"; but the abl. is possible, as we find the place idea expressed in Rev 21¹³ by *ἀπὸ νότου*. "Time or place *within which*"—cf *τοῦ ἔντος μηνός* "within the current month," FP 124 (ii/A.D.)—is the normal differentia of this genitive, which has thus perhaps its closest affinity with the partitive. For *time*, this genitive is common in NT, as in phrases like *νυκτός, χειμῶνος, ὄρθρου βαθέως, τοῦ λοιποῦ*. For *place*, we have mostly stereotyped words and phrases like *ποιίας* Lk 5¹⁹, and ancient words like *αὐτοῦ, ποῦ*. It is strange that the commentators and grammarians have so much neglected the difficult gen. in Ac 19²⁶. Dr Knowling merely declines Hackett's suggestion that *Ἐφέσου* and *πάσης τῆς Ἀσίας* depend on *ὄχλον*, for which however we might quote a good parallel in Sophocles *OT* 236 (see Jebb). The gloss *ἕως* (D), "within," may possibly express the meaning; but the vernacular supplies no parallel, except the stereotyped phrases for points of the compass, nor was it ever normal in classical Greek after the Epic period: see the exx., nearly all poetical, in Kühner-Gerth i. 384 f. On the whole, one feels disposed to make *ὄχλον* responsible after all.

The question of Hebraism is raised again by the genitive of *definition*. Some of the "long series of phrases" coming

¹ See below, p. 101, for a construction which may be parallel. There is a note in Dalman's *Gram. d. jüd.-pal. Aram.* p. 197, in which Lightfoot's קָרַב (Hor. Hebr. 500) is tentatively approved as the original of *ὄψέ*. The phrase "means always the time immediately after the close of the Sabbath." In Mt 28¹, accordingly, "at most a late hour of the night would be designated: the term is impossible for dawn. A reckoning of the Sabbath from sunrise to sunrise (Weiss *in loc.*) is unheard of."

under this head "obviously take their origin from Hebrew," says Blass (p. 98). The poetical examples collected in

**Genitive of
Definition.**

Jebb's note on Sophocles, *Antig.* 114 (or more fully in Kühner-Gerth, i. 264), include some which are quite as remarkable as the "Hebraisms" quotable from the NT. Thus *καρδία πονηρὰ ἀπιστίας* (Heb 3¹²) will pair off well with *τόσουδε τόλμης πρόσωπον* (Soph. *OT* 533). That many of these phrases really are literal translations from the Hebrew need not be questioned; and if an existing usage was available for the purpose, we can understand its being overstrained. Our only concern is with passages where no Semitic original is admissible. In these it seems fair to assume that the poetical phraseology of the Attic period had come down into the market-place, as happened also, for example, in *ἀπείραστος κακῶν* Jas 1¹³, *ἀκαταπάστους* (p. 47) *ἀμαρτίας* 2 Pet 2¹⁴, which have plentiful illustration from papyri.¹

**Genitive
Absolute.**

The rapid extension of the *genitive absolute* is a very obvious feature of Hellenistic Greek—so obvious, indeed, that we are not tempted to dwell on it here. In the papyri it may often be seen forming a string of statements, without a finite verb for several lines. We also find there a use frequently seen in the NT—*e.g.*, in Mt 1¹³ 8¹ 9¹⁸, Mk 13¹, Lk 12³⁶, Ac 22¹⁷, *etc.*—the gen. abs. referring to a noun or pronoun already in the sentence, without any effort to assimilate the cases.² Rarely in NT, but frequently in papyri, we find a participle standing by itself in gen. abs. without a noun or pronoun in agreement: thus Mt 17¹⁴, Ac 21³¹. A violent use occurs in Heb 8⁹ (LXX) *ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐπιλαβομένου μου*: so Blass, but the construction was probably suggested immediately by the original Hebrew. Westcott compares Barn 2²⁸ *ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐντε-λαμένου σου αὐτῷ*. The old accus. abs., belonging to impersonal verbs, has vanished except in the word *τυχόν* "perhaps" (1 Co 16⁹): Blass points out how Luke avoids it in Ac 23³⁰, where classical Greek would demand *μηνυθέν c. acc. et inf.* The papyri show *ἐξόντος passim* for the classical *ἐξόν, it being allowed.*

¹ See p. 235.

² Cf *exx.* from Polybius in Kälker 281; and below, p. 236.

One example of a noteworthy pure dative, the *dativus incommodi*, may be briefly referred to. In Rev 2⁵. 16 ἔρχομαί σοι is used rather markedly in place of ἔ. πρὸς σε: a reason

for the peculiar phraseology is offered in *JTS* iii. 516. It should however be added now that the very phrase occurs in a recently published papyrus, BU 1041 (ii/A.D.), an illiterate document, with context less clear than we should like. See p. 245.

Dative of Disadvantage. Side by side with the common *locative* dative of time (point of time), we have an *instrumental* dative of extension of time, which is not always easy to distinguish from

it. Thus in Lk 8²⁹ πολλοῖς χρόνοις is "oftentimes" (loc.) in RV text, "of a long time" (instr.) in mg. The latter, which is clearly found in χρόνῳ ἰκανῶ Lk 8²⁷, and χρόνοις αἰωνίου Rom 16²⁵, is supported by the recurring formula in private letters, ἐρρῶσθαί σε εἵχομαι πολλοῖς χρόνοις.¹ The field of accusative and instrumental is contiguous also in the "dative of reference": γένει in Mk 7²⁶, Ac 4³⁶ al, as in BU 887 (ii/A.D.) γένει Φρυγίαν. Jn 6¹⁰ affords one of the few NT exx. of the acc. in similar construction. TP 1 (ii/B.C.) προβεβηκότας ἤδη τοῖς ἔτεσιν (class.), compared with Lk 17¹⁸ 2⁸⁶, shows how the ubiquitous ἐν came in with datives that did not need it: here we may presume an Aramaic background. A difficult dative in Rev 8⁴, ταῖς προσευχαῖς (RV text "with the prayers," and so Milligan and Holtzmann), is probably to be taken as the sociative instrumental: cf BU 69 (ii/A.D.) ἄς καὶ ἀποδώσω σοι τῷ ἔνγιστα δοθησομένῳ ὀψωνίῳ, "with (i.e. at the time of) my next wages." Cf Abbott *Joh. Gr.* 519.

"Hebraic" Dative. Finally, we may speak of one more dative use, that of which ἀκοῇ ἀκούσετε, Mt 13¹⁴, will serve as a type. In giving a list of these phrases, Blass (p. 119) remarks that "the usage is an imitation of the Hebrew infinite absolute like תָּוַעַן תָּוַעַן, and is consequently found already in the LXX"; also that "the analogous classical phrases such as γάμφ γαμείν ('in true

¹ W. Schulze (*Gr. Lat.* 14) would make Latin responsible for the first start of this extension. But it must be allowed that the classical phrase τῷ χρόνῳ, "by lapse of time," was capable of giving the impulse. For the antiquity of this instrumental, see Delbrück, *Grundr.* § 109. Cf *CR* xv. 438, xviii. 153.

wedlock'), *φυγῆ φεύγειν* ('to flee with all speed') are only accidentally similar to these." I should state this rather differently. It may be allowed that this construction, and that with the participle (*βλέποντες βλέπετε*) are examples of "translation Greek." But in what sense are they *imitations* of the Hebrew? It seems to me that such a description implies something much nearer and more literal, such as *ἀκούειν ἀκούσατε*.¹ Is it then mere accident that we find the Hebrew locution represented by Greek which recalls respectively the *γάμω γαμῆν* and *φυγῆ φεύγειν* quoted by Blass, and the well-known Aeschylean

*οἱ πρῶτα μὲν βλέποντες ἔβλεπον μάτην,
κλύοντες οὐκ ἤκουον* (*P. V.* 447 f.),²

or the *φεύγων ἐκφεύγει* of Herodotus? The Greek translator, endeavouring to be as literal as he could, nevertheless took care to use Greek that was possible, however unidiomatic—a description well suiting the kind of language used in every age by translators who have gained the conscientious accuracy, but not the sure-footed freedom, of the mature scholar.

¹ As we actually find in Jos 17¹³ *ἐξολεθρευσαὶ δὲ αὐτοὺς οὐκ ἐξωλέθρευσαν*. A emends *ὀλεθρευσαὶ*. (I owe this to Votaw, p. 56.)

² The idea of these words became proverbial: cf [Demosthenes] 797, *ὥστε, τὸ τῆς παροιμίας, δρῶντας μὴ δρᾶν καὶ ἀκούοντας μὴ ἀκούειν*. Of course the resemblance to Mt *l.c.* is more superficial than real, for Aeschylus means "though they saw, they saw in vain." But there is enough nearness to suggest the NT form as possible Greek. An exact parallel is quoted by Winer from Lucian (*Dial. Marin.* iv. 3) *ἰδὼν εἶδον*: the participle has vanished in the Teubner text, whether with or without MS authority I cannot stop to examine. It should be made penal to introduce emendations into classical texts without a footnote! [° See p. 245.]

ADDITIONAL NOTES.—The predicative *els* occurs in M. Aurelius vi. 42—see Wilamowitz, *Leseb.* ii. 198. Marcus at any rate will not be suspected of Semitism! A similar use of *έν* is quotable from Hb P 42 (iii/B.C.) *δώσωμεν έν δφειλήματι* "as a debt." The freedom with which the dative was used in the days of its obsolescence may be further illustrated with vernacular *exx.* For the *dat.* *ethicus* cf *ἔρρωσέ μοι*, Tb P 315, 314 (both ii/A.D.). *Dat. commodi*, BM iii. p. 1 (iii/B.C.) compel him *ἐκχωρήσαι μοι τῶν ἐμῶν μερῶν*. The instrumental of time-duration is common. So Polyb. xxxii. 12 *πολλοῖς χρόνοις*. *Syll.* 734 (ii/A.D.) *πολλοῖς ἔτεσι (τὸν δεῖνα)* = "long live X!" Str P 22 (iii/A.D.) *ἡ γυνὴ έν τῇ νομῇ γέγονεν πολλῷ χρόνῳ*. *OGIS* 710 (ii/A.D.) *χρόνῳ [διαφθαρέν] ἀνὴρθωσεν* (classical). Note the remarkable instr. in *Ep. Dioign.* 7, *ῶ τοὺς οὐρανοὺς ἐκτίσεν*: see Gildersleeve *in loc.* Instr. also is PFi 2 (iii/A.D.), we appoint X. in charge of the gaol *κινδύνῳ ἡμῶν κτλ.* Locative uses are presumable in BM iii. p. 105 (i/A.D.) *ἐὰν ἀφυστερῆ καύμασι* "is deficient *in* fuel." OP 742 (2 B.C., Witk. 94) *ἵνα τῇ ἀναβάσει αὐτὰς ἀξωμεν* (1st aor.), "at our return." In the same papyrus is a curious instrumental: *παράδος . . . ἀριθμῶι αὐτὰς*, "carefully counted" (Wiloken).

CHAPTER V.

ADJECTIVES, PRONOUNS, PREPOSITIONS.

Adjectives:— THERE is not much to be said under the
“Duality,” head of Adjectives, except on the important
“Duality” question raised by the phenomena
of comparison. The question touches the use of dual
pronouns of the *ἑρεπος* class, as well as the relation between
comparative and superlative. The abolition of a dis-
tinction between duality and plurality is almost inevitable
sooner or later in language history. English affords us
instructive parallels. The simplicity and convenience of our
suffixes *-er* and *-est* have helped to preserve in common speech
the old degrees of comparison. But how often does the man
in the street say “the better of the two”? One would not
like to say offhand how far in this matter modern litera-
ture is impeccable on Lindley Murray rules; but in conver-
sation the most correct of us may at times be caught
tripping, and even when the comparative is used we are most
of us conscious of a kind of pedantic accuracy. That “the
best of the two” is the English of the future is a fairly safe
assertion. *Whether*, adjectivally, is as archaic as *πότερος*:¹
when we translate *τίνα ἀπὸ τῶν δύο* (Mt 27²¹) by the
archaism “whether of the twain,” we are only advertising
the fact that the original was normal speech and our trans-
lation artificial. We have not yet arrived at “either of the
three,” but people say “either A. or B. or C.” without a
qualm. Of course the first step was taken ages ago in the
extinction of the dual, the survival of which in Germanic

¹ In twelve papyrus collections there is *one* occurrence of *πότερος* in the indices, and that is nearly illegible and (to me, at least) quite unintelligible (AP 135, ii/A.D.). It is replaced by *τις* already in the LXX.

is evidenced, centuries after the NT, by Wulfila's Gothic. Other modern languages tell the same tale. In the NT the obsolescence of the superlative, except in the *relative* sense, is most marked. It is mere chance that only **in Comparison**, one example of the *-τατος* superlative has survived,¹ for there are scores of them in the papyri. Of the genuine superlative sense, however, the examples there are very rare; practically we may say that in the vernacular documents the superlative forms are used to express the sense of our "very." The confusion of comparative and superlative is well seen in some illiterate papyri, where phrases like τὸ μέγιστον καὶ γνησιώτερον occur. One or two typical examples of irregular comparatives may be cited—the references will be found, with other examples, in *CR* xv. 439 and xviii. 154. Specially instructive is the papyrus of the astronomer Eudoxus, written in ii/B.C. There we have καθ' ὃν ὁ ἥλιος φερόμενος τὴν μὲν ἡμέραν βραχυτέραν ποιεῖ τὴν δὲ νύκτα μακροτέραν. The context demands a superlative, and Blass no doubt rightly assumes that the author (iv/B.C.) wrote βραχυτάτην and μακροτάτην. In that case the scribe's alteration is very significant. He has in the same way altered μεγίστη to μειζόνει in another place, and he writes ἐν ἑκατέρῳ τῶν ζωιδίων for "in each of the (twelve) signs." In Tb P 33 (ii/B.C.) we have ἐν μειζονί αξιώματι, an relative.² It is in fact clear that μέγιστος is practically obsolete in Hellenistic: its appearance in 2 Pet is as significant as its absence from the rest of the NT. The Revisers' scrupulous margin in 1 Co 13¹⁸ and Mt 18¹ may be safely dispensed with, on the new evidence. Κρείττων and χείρων are always strictly comparative in NT, but they have no superlatives:² κράτιστος is only a title. Βελτίων² (in adv.) occurs once, in 2 Tim 1¹⁸, but does not appear in any of Grenfell and Hunt's papyri, except in an official Ptolemaic document:³ βέλτιστος (not in NT) has a somewhat better claim (*ter* in ii/B.C.). Ἀμείνων and ἄριστος (not NT) appear occasionally. Note especially OP 716 (ii/A.D.) τὴν ἀμείνονα

¹ Ac 26⁹, in true superlative sense; this speech is much affected by literary style.

² See p. 236 below.

³ Tb P 27⁹⁰ (113 B.C.).

ἀρῆσειν διδόντι, "to the *highest* bidder." Yet *ἄριστος* is found in OP 292 (i/A.D.), a vernacular document, but the sole witness among the papyri named. *Ἐλάσσων* is common, but *ἐλάχιστος* (a true superl. in 1 Co 15⁹, as in Tb P 24 (ii/B.C.)—an official document, but in very bad Greek) has not wholly disappeared. *Πλείων* and *πλείστος* are common, but the latter is generally elative in the papyri—note however Tb P 105 (ii/B.C.) *τὴν ἐσομένην πλείστην τιμὴν*, and other exx. which may support 1 Co 14²⁷. Mt 11²⁰ may show the elative—"those very numerous mighty works"; but the other rendering is as good. In Jn 1¹⁵ *πρῶτός μου*, and 15¹⁸ *πρῶτον ἡμῶν*, we have the superlative ousting the comparative. Winer quotes Aelian (WM 306), and we can add *σοῦ πρῶτός εἰμι* from LPw (ii/iii A.D.—magic).⁶ There seems no longer adequate reason to question that *πρότερος* has here been superseded; for the great rarity of the comparative form in the papyri reinforces the natural inference from Jn *U.c.* In the Grenfell-Hunt volumes it only occurs 9 times, in 7 documents. The mere use of *πρῶτος* in Ac 1¹, it must be allowed, proves very little as to the author's intention to write a third treatise. Ramsay himself (*Paul*, p. 28) admits that the absence of *πρότερος* from the Lucan writings precludes certainty for the hypothesis. See further p. 236. [⁶See p. 245.

**and in
Pronouns.**

The case is not quite so strong for the pronouns. There are plenty of places where *ἕτερος*, *ἐκάτερος*, *ὀπίτερος*, etc., are used of more than two, and *ἄλλος* of two only; but also places where the pronouns are used carefully according to classical precedent. It seems a fair assumption that these words held much the same relative position as was described just now for our own comparative and superlative in phrases like "the better (best) of two." Educated men would know the distinction and observe it, unless off their guard. In these cases we must let the context decide, paying due attention to the degree of grammatical precision usually attained by each several author. It is remarkable that in this respect we find Luke by no means particular. In Lk 8⁶⁻⁸ he actually substitutes *ἕτερος* for the correct *ἄλλος* which appears in his presumed source, Mk 4⁵⁻⁸ (cf Mt 13⁵⁻⁸); and in Lk 6²⁹ he does not alter *τὴν ἄλλην* (*συναγόνα*!) which appears also in Mt 5³⁹, but is corrected

in Clem. Hom. 15^s. This will clearly need remembering when we examine other "dual" words in Luke.¹ See pp. 245 f.

A difficulty under this head is raised by ἄμφότεροι = all? Ac 19¹⁶. The probability that ἀμφότεροι was used for πάντες in BM 336 (ii/A.D.), and two clear examples of it in NP 67 and 69 (iv/A.D.),² with the undeniable Byzantine use, form a strong temptation where the relief would be so great.³ I cannot but think that Ramsay is quite right in saying (*Paul*, p. 272), "The seven sons in v.¹⁴ change in an unintelligible way to two in v.¹⁶ (except in the Bezan text)." Luke must have been a very slovenly writer if he really meant this, and the Bezan reading of v.¹⁴ does not help us to understand how the more difficult "neutral text" arose if it really was secondary. On the other hand, Luke is one of the last NT writers whom we should expect to fall into a colloquialism of which early examples are so rare: that he shares the loose use of ἕτερος, etc., current in his time, does nothing to mitigate this improbability. If we are to defend these verses from Ramsay's criticisms—and in a purely grammatical discussion we cannot deal with them except on this side—must we not assume that the original text of v.¹⁴ is lost?⁴ If this contained a fuller statement, the abruptness of τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ πονηρὸν in v.¹⁴, and of our ἀμφοτέρων, might be removed without compromising the characteristic ἐπίτά: we might also have a clearer term to describe Sceva's office. The alternative is to suppose the verses an interpolation from a less educated source, which has been imperfectly adapted to Luke's style.⁴

We pass on to the Article, on which there is not very much to say, since in all essentials its use is in agreement

¹ Note in the Messenian *Syll.* 653⁹¹ (91 B.C.) τὸν μὲν ἕνα . . . τὸν δ' ἄλλον, of two. The aberrant ἕτερον . . . ἄλλον in Lk 7^{19c}. B is most simply explained by supposing that the scribe has found a place for two variants. If we press the reading, the messengers are represented as softening the message, no longer "another kind of Messiah," but "another of the same kind": cf Gal 1^{9c}. The meaning "different" naturally developed out of "the other class (of two)," and it survived when the normal use of ἕτερος had faded out. See also p. 246.

² BU 1057 (13 B.C.) must, I think, be otherwise explained.

³ See notes in *Expos.* vi. viii. 426 and *CR* xv. 440.

⁴ The Sahidic and some later versions took ἀμφοτέρων as "all." Were this better supported, we should find another ex. in Ac 23⁹. Dr Nestle thinks me unduly timid as to adopting this interpretation. [See p. 246.]

with Attic. It might indeed be asserted that the NT is in this respect remarkably "correct" when compared with the papyri. It shows no trace of the use of the article as a relative, which is found in classical Greek outside Attic, in papyri from the first,¹ and to some extent in MGr. The papyri likewise exhibit some examples of the article as demonstrative, apart from connexion with *μέν* or *δέ*,¹ whereas the NT has no ex. beyond the poetical quotation in Ac 17²⁸. Further, we have nothing answering to the vernacular idiom by which the article may be omitted between preposition and infinitive. In family or business accounts among the papyri we find with significant frequency an item of so much *εἰς πείν*, with the dative of the persons for whom this thoughtful provision is made. There are three passages in Herodotus where *ἀντί* behaves thus: see vi. 32, *ἀντί εἶναι*, with Strachan's note, and Goodwin, *MT* § 803 (see further below, p. 216). In these three points we may possibly recognise Ionic influence showing itself in a limited part of the vernacular; it is at least noteworthy that Herodotus will supply parallels for them all. The Ionic elements in the *Κοινή* were briefly alluded to above (pp. 37 f.), where other evidence was noted for the sporadic character of these infusions, and their tendency to enlarge their borders in the later development of the Common Greek.

Hebraisms? We are not much troubled with Hebraism under the article.² Blass (p. 151) regards as "thoroughly Hebraic" such phrases as *πρὸ προσώπου Κυρίου, ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς ἡμῶν, ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ὀργῆς*; but *κατ' οἶκον αὐτῶν* "is a regular phrase and perhaps not a Hebraism." Where Semitic originals lie behind our Greek, the dictum is unobjectionable; but the mere admission that *κατ' οἶκον αὐτῶν* is Greek shows how slightly these phrases diverge from the spirit of the translator's language. Phrases like *τοὺς ἐν οἴκῳ, διὰ χειρὸς ἐξ οἴκου*. etc., are recurrent in the papyri, and the extension, such as it is, lies in the addition of a dependent genitive.³ The principle of "correlation" (on which see the note in WM,

¹ See Völker 5 f.; also *CR* xviii. 155. ² See p. 236. ³ See pp. 99 f.

p. 175) here supports the strong tendency to drop the article after a preposition. This is seen working in the papyri: cf Völker, *Der Artikel* pp. 15–17. Without laying

**Anarthrous
Prepositional
Phrases.**

down a law that the noun is naturally anarthrous when attached to a preposition, we may certainly say that the usage is so predominant that no refinements of interpretation are justifiable. Obviously *ἐν οἴκῳ* (Mk 2¹) is not “in a house,” nor *ἐν ἀγορᾷ* (Lk 7³²) “in a market-place,” nor *ἐν ἀγυῖᾳ*, in the current papyrus formula, “in a street.” We say “down town,” “on ‘Change,” “in bed,” “from start to finish.”¹ If we substitute “in my bed,” “from the beginning to the end,” we are, it seems, more pictorial; we point, as it were, to the objects in question. There is nothing *indefinite* about the anarthrous noun there; but for some reason the qualitative aspect of a noun, rather than the deictic, is appropriate to a prepositional phrase, unless we have special reason to point to it the finger of emphatic particularisation. To this Dr Findlay adds the consideration that the phrases in question are familiar ones, in which triteness has reduced their distinctiveness, and promoted a tendency to abbreviate. It would seem that English here is on the same lines as Greek, which, however, makes the anarthrous use with prepositions much more predominant than it is with us. Pursuing further

**Anarthrous
“Headings.”**

the classes of words in which we insert *the* in translation, we have the anarthrous use “in sentences having the nature of headings” (Hort, *1 Peter*, p. 15*b*). Hort assigns to this cause the dropped articles before *θεοῦ*, *πνεύματος* and *αἵματος* in 1 Pet 1²; Winer cites the opening words of Mt, Mk, and Rev. The lists of words which specially affect the dropped

**Qualitative
Force in
Anarthrous
Nouns.**

article will, of course, need careful examination for the individual cases. Thus, when Winer includes *πατήρ* in his list, and quotes Jn 1¹⁴ and Heb 12⁷, we must feel that in both passages the qualitative force is very apparent—

¹ According to Ramsay (*Paul*, p. 195), *παρὰ ποταμῶν*, Ac 16¹³, shows familiarity with the locality. To accept this involves giving up *ἐνομιζόμεν προσευχῆς εἶναι*, a step not to be lightly taken. (See further, p. 286.)

"what son is there whom his father, *as a father*, does not chasten?" (On the former passage see RV margin, and the note in WM 151.) For exegesis, there are few of the finer points of Greek which need more constant attention than this omission of the article when the writer would lay stress on the quality or character of the object. Even the RV misses this badly sometimes, as in Jn 6⁶⁸.¹

Proper Names. Scholarship has not yet solved completely the problem of the article with proper names. An illuminating little paper by Gildersleeve may be referred to (*AJP* xi. 483-7), in which he summarises some elaborate researches by K. Schmidt, and adds notes of his own. He shows that this use, which was equivalent to pointing at a man, was originally popular, and practically affects only prose style. The usage of different writers varies greatly; and the familiar law that the article is used of a person already named (anaphoric use), or well known already, is not uniformly observed. Deissmann has attempted to define the papyrus usage in the Berlin *Philol. Wochenschrift*, 1902, p. 1467. He shows how the writers still follow the classical use in the repetition with article of a proper name which on its first introduction was anarthrous. When a man's father's or mother's name is appended in the genitive, it normally has the article. There are very many cases where irregularities occur for which we have no explanation. See also Völker p. 9, who notes the curious fact that the names of slaves and animals receive the article when mentioned the first time, where personalities that counted are named without the article. The innumerable papyrus parallels to *Σαῦλος ὁ καὶ Παῦλος* (Ac 13⁹) may just be alluded to before we pass from this subject: see Deissmann *BS* 313 ff., and Ramsay, *CR* xix. 429.

Position of Article. The position of the article is naturally much affected by the colloquial character of NT language. In written style the ambiguous position of *εἰς τὸν θάνατον*, Rom 6⁴, would have been cleared up by prefixing *τοῦ*, if the meaning was (as seems

¹ The marginal reading stood in the text in the First Revision. It is one among very many places where a conservative minority damaged the work by the operation of the two-thirds rule.

probable) "by this baptism into his death." In most cases, there is no doubt as to whether the prepositional phrase belongs to the neighbouring noun. A very curious misplacement of the article occurs in the $\acute{\omicron}$ ὄχλος πολὺς¹ of Jn 12⁹. As Sir R. C. Jebb notes on Sophocles, *OT* 1199 f., the noun and adjective may be fused into a composite idea; but Jebb's exx. (like 1 Pet 1¹⁸ and the cases cited in W. F. Moulton's note, *WM* 166) illustrate only the addition of a *second* adjective after the group article-adjective-noun (cf *OP* 99—i/A.D.—τῆς ὑπαρχούσης αὐτῷ μητρικῆς οἰκίας τριστέγου).² We cannot discuss here the problem of Tit 2¹⁸, for we must, as grammarians, leave the matter open: see *WM* 162, 156 n. But we might cite, for what they are worth, the papyri BU 366, 367, 368, 371, 395 (all vii/A.D.), which attest the translation "our great God and Saviour" as current among Greek-speaking Christians. The formula runs ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου καὶ δεσπότου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν, καὶ τῆς δεσποίνης ἡμῶν τῆς ἁγίας θεοτόκου, κτλ. A curious echo is found in the Ptolemaic formula applied to the deified kings: thus GH 15 (ii/B.C.), τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ εὐεργέτου καὶ σωτῆρος [ἐπιφανοῦς] εὐχαρίστου. The phrase here is, of course, applied to one person. One is not surprised to find that P. Wendland, at the end of his suggestive paper on Σωτήρ in *ZNTW* v. 335 ff., treats the rival rendering in Tit *l.c.* summarily as "an exegetical mistake," like the severance of τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν and σωτῆρος 'I. X. in 2 Pet 1¹. Familiarity with the everlasting apotheosis that flaunts itself in the papyri and inscriptions of Ptolemaic and Imperial times, lends strong support to Wendland's contention that Christians, from the latter part of i/A.D. onward, deliberately annexed for their Divine Master the phraseology that was impiously arrogated to themselves by some of the worst of men.

<p>Personal Pronouns:— "Semitic Redundance."</p>	<p>From the Article we turn to the Personal Pronouns. A very short excursion here brings us up against another evidence of "the dependence of [NT] language on</p>
---	--

¹ If it is merely careless Greek, one may compare Par P 60² (ii/B.C. ?) ἀπὸ τῶν πλερωμάτων ἀρχαίων. (On the whole subject, see further p. 236.)

² See note in *CR* xviii. 154a.

Semitic speech," in the "extraordinary frequency of the oblique cases of the personal pronouns used without emphasis" (Blass 164). Dependence on Semitic would surely need to be very strongly evidenced in other ways before we could readily accept such an account of elements affecting the whole fabric of everyday speech. Now a redundance of personal pronouns is just what we should expect in the colloquial style, to judge from what we hear in our own vernacular. (Cf Thumb, *Hellen.* 108 f.). A reader of the petitions and private letters in a collection of papyri would not notice any particular difference in this respect from the Greek of the NT. For example, in Par P 51 (ii/B.C.) we see an eminently redundant pronoun in ἀνύγω (= ἀνοίγω) τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς μου. A specially good case is OP 299 (i/A.D.) Δάμπωνι μυοθηρευτῇ ἔδωκα αὐτῷ . . . δραχμὰς ἡ: the syntax is exactly that of Rev 2⁷, etc. Kälker (*Quæst.* 274) quotes διὸ καὶ πάλιν ἐπερρώσθησαν διὰ ταῦτα from Polybius, with other redundances of the kind. Such a line as this from a Klepht ballad (Abbott 42),

καὶ στρίβει τὸ μουστάκι του, κλώθει καὶ τὰ μαλλία του
 ("and he twirls his moustache and dresses his hair") illustrates the survival of the old vernacular usage in MGr. In words like κεφαλῆ, where the context generally makes the ownership obvious, NT Greek often follows classical Greek and is content with the article. But such a passage as Mt 6¹⁷, ἀλειψαί σου τὴν κεφαλὴν, where the middle voice alone would suffice (cf p. 236), shows that the language already is learning to prefer the fuller form. The strength of this tendency enhances the probability that in Jn 8³⁸ τοῦ πατρὸς ἰς "the Father" and not "your father": see Milligan-Moulton.

It is perhaps rather too readily taken for granted that the personal pronouns must always be emphatic when they appear in the nominative case. H. L. Ebeling (*Gildersleeve Studies*, p. 240) points out that there is no necessary emphasis in the Platonic ἦν δ' ἐγώ, ἔφην ἐγώ, ὡς σὺ φῆς, etc.; and Gildersleeve himself observes (*Synt.* § 69): "The emphasis of the 1st and 2nd persons is not to be insisted on too much in poetry or in familiar prose. Notice the frequency of ἐγώδα, ἐγώμαι." Are we obliged then to see a special

stress in the pronoun whenever it denotes the Master, like the Pythagorean *αὐτὸς ἔφα?* We may perhaps better describe it as fairly represented to the eye by the capital in "He," to the ear by the slower pronunciation which reverence likes to give when the pronoun refers to Christ. Generally the pronoun is unmistakably emphatic in nom., from Mt 1²¹ onwards; but occasionally the force of the emphasis is not obvious—cf Lk 19². The question suggests itself whether we are compelled to explain the difficult *σὺ εἶπας* and the like (Mt 26⁶⁴ 27¹¹, Mk 15², Lk 22⁷⁰ 23³, Jn 18³⁷) by putting a stress on the pronoun. Can we drop this and translate, "You have said it," *i.e.* "That is right"? It is pointed out however by Thayer (*JBL* xiii. 40–49) that the *πλήν* in Mt 26⁶⁴ is not satisfied by making the phrase a mere equivalent of "Yes"—to mention only one of the passages where difficulties arise. We seem thrown back on Thayer's rendering "You say it," "the word is yours."

There remains here the difficult question 'Ἡμεῖς for 'Εγώ? of the use of *ἡμεῖς* for *ἐγώ*. The grammarian's part in this problem is happily a small one, and need detain us only briefly. K. Dick, in his elaborate study of the question,¹ gives a few apposite examples from late Greek literature and from papyrus letters, which prove beyond all possible doubt that *I* and *we* chased each other throughout these documents without rhyme or reason. We may supplement his exx. with a few more references taken at random. See for example Tb P 58 (ii/B.C.), and AP 130 (i/A.D.—a most illiterate document): add Tb P 26 (ii/B.C.) *ὄντι μοι ἐν Πτολεμαίδει . . . προσέπεσεν ἡμῖν*, *JHS* xix. 92 (ii/A.D.) *χαῖρέ μοι, μήτηρ γλυκυτάτη, καὶ φροντίζετε ἡμῶν ὅσα ἐν νεκροῖς*, and BU 449 (ii/iii A.D.) *ἀκούσας ὅτι νωθρεύη ἀγωνιοῦμεν*. For the grammar of the last ex. cf Par P 43 (ii/B.C., = Witk. p. 54 f.) *ἔρρωμαι δὲ καὶ τοί, EP* 13 (222 B.C.) *τί ἂν ποιοῦντες χαρίζοίμην*, *al.* Dick succeeds in showing—so Deissmann thinks—that every theory suggested for regularising Paul's use of these pronouns breaks down entirely. It would seem that the question must be passed on from the grammarian to

¹ *Der schriftstellerische Plural bei Paulus* (1900), pp. 18 ff. See also Deissmann's summary of this book, *Theol. Rundschau* v. 65.

the exegete; for our grammatical material gives us not the slightest evidence of any distinction between the two numbers in ordinary writing. It is futile to argue from Latin to Greek, or we might expect help from Prof. Conway's careful study of *nos* in Cicero's Letters;¹ but the tone of superiority, in various forms, which the *nos* carries, has no parallel in Greek.

**Reflexive
Pronoun.**

The reflexive pronouns have developed some unclassical uses, notably that in the plural they are all fused into the forms originally appropriated to the third person. The presence or absence of this confusion in the singular is a nice test of the degree of culture in a writer of Common Greek. In the papyri there are examples of it, mostly in very illiterate documents,² while for the plural the use is general, beginning to appear even in classical times.³ This answers to what we find in the NT, where some seventy cases of the plural occur without a single genuine example of the singular;⁴ late scribes, reflecting the developments of their own time, have introduced it into Jn 18³⁴ and Rom 13⁹ (Gal 5¹⁴). As in the papyri, *ἑαυτούς* sometimes stands for *ἀλλήλους*,^a and sometimes is itself replaced by the personal pronoun. In translations from Semitic originals we may find, instead of *ἑαυτόν*, a periphrasis with *ψυχή*;⁵ thus Lk 9²⁵, compared with its presumed original Mk 8³⁶. But this principle will have to be most carefully restricted to definitely translated passages; and even there it would be truer to say that *ἑαυτόν* has been levelled up to *τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ*, than that *ψυχή* has been emptied of meaning.⁶

**"Exhausted"
ἑαυτοῦ and
ἰδιος.**

In one class of phrases *ἑαυτοῦ* is used without emphasis, in a way that brings up the discussion of its fellow *ἰδιος*.^b In sepulchral inscriptions we find a son describing his

¹ *Transactions of Cambridge Philological Society*, v. i., 1899.

² See *CR* xv. 441, xviii. 154, Mayser 304. It is rather perplexing to find it in literature: e.g. Lucian, *Dial. Marin.* iv. 3; Polybius xxxii. 10; Marcus vii. 18; Aristeas 215.

³ Polybius always uses *αὐτῶν* (Kälker, *Quaestiones*, p. 277).

⁴ In 1 Co 10²⁸ *ἑαυτοῦ* = "one's."

⁵ See J. A. Robinson, *Study of the Gospels*, p. 114.

⁶ On the shorter forms *αὐτοῦ*, etc. see Mayser 305 ff.

[^a ^b See p. 246.

father as *ὁ πατήρ, ὁ ἴδιος πατήρ, or ὁ ἑαυτοῦ πατήρ*, and the difference between the three is not very easily discernible. In a number of these inscriptions contained in vol. iii. of the *IMA* I count 21 exx. with *ἴδιος*, 10 with *ἑαυτοῦ*, and 16 with neither. The papyrus formula used in all legal documents where a woman is the principal, viz. *μετὰ κυρίου τοῦ ἑαυτῆς ἀνδρός* (*ἀδελφοῦ*, etc.), gives a parallel for this rather faded use of the reflexive. It starts the more serious question whether *ἴδιος* is to be supposed similarly weakened in Hellenistic. This is often affirmed, and is vouched for by no less an authority than Deissmann (*BS* 123 f.). He calls special attention to such passages in the *LXX* as Job 24¹² (*οἶκον ἰδίων*), Prov 27¹⁵ (*τοῦ ἰδίου οἴκου*), 9¹² (*τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ ἀμπελώνος . . . τοῦ ἰδίου γεωργίου*), 22⁷ (*ἰδίοις δεσπόταις*), in which the pronoun has nothing whatever answering to it in the original. He reminds us that the "exhausted *ἴδιος*" occurs in writers of the literary *Κοινή*, and that in Josephus even *οἰκειός* comes to share this weakening: a few Attic inscriptions from i/b.c. (Meisterhans⁹ 235) show *ἴδιος* with the like attenuated content. Our inference must be that in Ac 24²⁴ Luke is not ironically suggesting the poverty of Felix's title, and that in Mt 22⁵ there is no stress on the disloyal guest's busying himself with his own farm instead of someone else's. (Cf p. 237 below.) Perhaps, however, this doctrine of the exhausted *ἴδιος* is in some danger of being worked too hard. In *CR* xv. 440 f. are put down all the occurrences of *ἴδιος* in BU vols. i. and ii., which contain nearly 700 documents of various antiquity. It is certainly remarkable that in all these passages there is not one which goes to swell Deissmann's list. Not even in the Byzantine papyri have we a single case where *ἴδιος* is not exactly represented by the English *own*. In a papyrus as early as the Ptolemaic period we find the possessive pronoun added—*ὄντα ἡμῶν ἰδίων*, which is just like "our own." (Cf 2 Pet 3¹⁶, Tit 1¹², Ac 2⁸.) This use became normal in the Byzantine age, in which *ἴδιος* still had force enough to make such phrases as *ιδίαν καὶ νομίμην γυναῖκα*. Now, in the face of the literary examples, we cannot venture to deny *in toto* the weakening of *ἴδιος*, still less the practical equivalence of *ἴδιος* and *ἑαυτοῦ*, which

is evident from the sepulchral inscriptions above cited, as well as from such passages as Prov 9¹² and 1 Co 7². But the strong signs of life in the word throughout the papyri have to be allowed for.

In correlating these perplexing phenomena, we may bring in the following considerations:—(1) The fact that Josephus similarly weakens *οικείος* seems to show that the question turns on thought rather than on words. (2) It is possible, as our own language shows, for a word to be simultaneously in possession of a full and an attenuated meaning.¹ People who say "It's an awful nuisance," will without any sense of incongruity say "How awful!" when they read of some great catastrophe in the newspaper. No doubt the habitual light use of such words does tend in time to attenuate their content, but even this rule is not universal. "To annoy" is in Hellenistic *σκύλλειν*,² and in modern French *gêner*. There was a time when the Greek in thus speaking compared his trouble to the pains of flaying alive, when the Frenchman recalled the thought of *Gehenna*; but the original full sense was unknown to the unlearned speaker of a later day. Sometimes, however, the full sense lives on, and even succeeds in ousting the lighter sense, as in our word *vast*, the adverb of which is now rarely heard as a mere synonym of *very*. (3) The use of the English *own* will help us somewhat. "Let each man be fully assured in his own mind" (Rom 14⁵) has the double advantage of being the English of our daily speech and of representing literally the original *ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ νοῦ*. What function has the adjective there? It is not, as normally, an emphatic assertion of property: I am in no danger of being assured in someone else's mind. It is simply a method of laying stress on the personal pronoun: *ἐν τῷ νοῦ* and "in his mind" alike transfer the stress to the noun.³ This fact at once shows the equivalence of *ἴδιος* and *ἑαυτοῦ* in certain locutions. Now, when we look at the examples of "exhausted *ἴδιος*," we find that they very largely are attached to words that imply some sort of *belonging*. Husband and wife account for seven examples in the NT, and other relation-

¹ Cf p. 237 below.

² See *Expos.* VI. iii. 273 f.

[³ See p. 246.

ships, including that of master and slave, for a good many more. A large number come under the category of the mind, thoughts and passions, and parts of the body. House, estate, riding-animal, country or language, and similar very intimate possessions receive the epithet. If occasionally this sense of property is expressed where we should not express it, this need not compromise the assertion that ἴδιος itself was always as strong as our English word *own*. There are a host of places in the NT, as in the papyri, where its emphasis is undeniable; e.g. Mt 9¹, Lk 6⁴¹, Jn 1⁴¹ (note its position) 5¹⁸ etc., Ac 1²⁵, 1 Co 3⁸, Gal 6⁵, Heb 7²⁷, and many others equally decisive. One feels therefore quite justified in adopting the argument of Westcott, Milligan-Moulton, etc., that the emphatic position of τὸν ἴδιον in Jn 1⁴¹ was meant as a hint that the unnamed companion of Andrew, presumably John, fetched *his* brother. What to do in such cases as Ac 24²⁴ and Mt 22⁵, is not easy to say. The Revisers insert *own* in the latter place; and it is fair to argue that the word suggests the strength of the counter-attraction, which is more fully expressed in the companion parable, Lk 14¹⁸. The case of Drusilla is less easy. It is hardly enough to plead that ἴδιος is customarily attached to the relationship; for (with the Revisers) we instinctively feel that *own* is appropriate in 1 Pet 3¹ and similar passages, but inappropriate here. It is the only NT passage where there is any real difficulty; and since B stands almost alone in reading ἰδίᾳ, the temptation for once to prefer \aleph is very strong. The error may have arisen simply from the commonness of the combination ἡ ἰδία γυνή, which was here transferred to a context in which it was not at home.

Before leaving ἴδιος something should be said about the use of ὁ ἴδιος without a noun expressed. This occurs in Jn 1¹¹ 13¹, Ac 4²³ 24²³. In the papyri we find the singular used thus as a term of endearment to near relations: e.g. ὁ δεῖνα τῷ ἰδίῳ χαίρω. In *Expos.* vi. iii. 277 I ventured to cite this as a possible encouragement to those (including B. Weiss) who would translate Ac 20²³ "the blood of one who was his own." Mt 27²⁴, according to the text of \aleph L and the later authorities, will supply a parallel for the grammatical

ambiguity: there as here we have to decide whether the second genitive is an adjective qualifying the first or a noun dependent on it. The MGr use of *ὁ ἴδιος*, as substitute for the old *ὁ αὐτός*, has nothing foreshadowing it in the NT; but in the papyrus of Eudoxus (ii/B.C.) we find a passage where *τῆι ἰδίαι* is followed by *τῆι αὐτῆι* in the same sense, so that it seems inevitable to trace, with Blass, an anticipation of MGr here. Perhaps the use was locally restricted.

Αὐτός ὁ and
ὁ αὐτός.

There is an apparent weakening of *αὐτός ὁ* in Hellenistic, which tends to blunt the distinction between this and *ἐκεῖνος ὁ*. Dean Robinson (*Gospels*, p. 106) translates Lk 10²¹ "in that hour" (Mt 11²⁵ *ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ*), and so Lk 12¹² (Mk 13¹¹ *ἐκείνη*), and 10⁷. It is difficult to be satisfied with "John himself" in Mt 3⁴; and in Luke particularly we feel that the pronoun means little more than "that." Outside Luke, and the one passage of Mt, *αὐτός ὁ* has manifestly its full classical force. From the papyri we may quote OP 745 (i/A.D.) *αὐτὸν τὸν Ἀντᾶν*, "the said A.": note also GH 26 (ii/B.C.) *ὁ αὐτὸς Ὡρος*, "the same Horus," *i.e.* "the aforesaid," and so in BU 1052 (i/B.C.). We find the former use in MGr, *e.g.* *αὐτὸ τὸ κρίμα*, "this sin" (Abbott 184), etc. We have already seen (p. 86) that the emphatic *αὐτός* standing alone can replace classical *ἐκεῖνος*. (See now Wellh. 26 f.)

Relatives:—
Use of *ὅστις*.

Turning to the Relatives, we note the limiting of *ὅστις*, a conspicuous trait of the vernacular, where the nominative (with the neuter accusative) covers very nearly all the occurrences of the pronoun. The phrase *ἕως οὗτου* is the only exception in NT Greek. The obsolescence of the distinction between *ὅς* and *ὅστις* is asserted by Blass for Luke, but not for Paul. A type like Lk 2⁴ *εἰς πόλιν Δαυεὶδ ἣτις καλεῖται Βηθλεέμ*, may be exactly paralleled from Herodotus (see Blass 173) and from papyri: so in an invitation formula *αὔριον ἣτις ἐστὶν ἱε̄*, "to-morrow, which is the 15th"—cf Mt 27⁶². Hort, on 1 Pet 2¹¹ (*Comm.* p. 133), allows that "there are some places in the NT in which *ὅστις* cannot be distinguished from *ὅς*." "In most places, however, of the NT," he proceeds, "*ὅστις* apparently retains its strict classical force, either generic,

'which, as other like things,' or essential, 'which by its very nature.'" A large number of the exceptions, especially in Lucan writings, seem to be by no means cases of *equivalence* between ὅς and ὅστις, whether agreeing or disagreeing with classical use. Some of them would have been expressed with ὅσπερ in Attic: thus in Ac 11²³ we seem to expect ἥπερ ἐγένετο. Others throw a subtle stress on the relative, which can be brought out by various paraphrases, as in Lk 1²⁰, "which for all that." Or ὅστις represents what in English would be expressed by a demonstrative and a conjunction, as in Lk 10⁴², "and it shall not be taken away." In Mt we find ὅστις used four times at the beginning of a parable, where, though the principal figure is formally described as an individual, he is really a *type*, and ὅστις is therefore appropriate. We may refer to Blass 173, for examples of ὅς used for ὅστις, with indefinite reference. The large number of places in which ὅστις is obviously right, according to classical use, may fairly stand as proof that the distinction is not yet dead. We must not stay to trace the distinction further here, but may venture on the assertion that the two relatives are never absolutely convertible, however blurred may be the outlines of the classical distinction in Luke, and possibly in sporadic passages outside his writings. Kälker (*Quæst.* 245 f.) asserts that Polybius uses ὅστις for ὅς before words beginning with a vowel, for no more serious reason than the avoidance of hiatus; and it is curious that among twenty-three more or less unclassical examples in the Lucan books fourteen do happen to achieve this result. We chronicle this fact as in duty bound, but without suggesting any inclination to regard it as a key to our problem. If Kälker is right for Polybius—and there certainly seems weight in his remark that *this* substitution occurs just where the forms of ὅς end in a vowel—we may have to admit that the distinction during the Κοινή period had worn rather thin. It would be like the distinction between our relatives *who* and *that*, which in a considerable proportion of sentences are sufficiently convertible to be selected mostly according to our sense of rhythm or euphony: this, however, does not imply that the distinction is even blurred, much less lost.

The *attraction* of the Relative—which, of course, does

not involve *ὅστις*—is a construction at least as popular in late classical Greek. It appears abundantly

Attraction. in the papyri, even in the most illiterate of them; and in legal documents we have the principle stretched further in formulæ, such as *ἀρουρῶν δέκα δύο ἢ ὅσων ἐὰν ᾧσιν οὐσῶν*. There are to be noted some exceptions to the general rule of attraction, on which see Blass 173. In several cases of alleged breach of rule we may more probably (with Blass) recognise the implied presence of the "internal accusative": so in 2 Co 1⁴, Eph 1⁶ 4¹, where Dr Plummer (*CGT*, 2 Co *l.c.*) would make the dative the original case for the relative.

Relatives and Interrogatives confused.

Confusion of relative and indirect interrogative is not uncommon. "*Ὅσος, οἶος, ὅποῖος, ἡλίκος* occur in the NT as indirect interrogatives, and also—with the exception of *ἡλίκος*—as relatives," W. F. Moulton observes (*WM* 210 n.); and in the papyri even *ὅς* can be used in an indirect question. Good examples are found in PP ii. 37 (ii/B.C.) *καλῶς οὖν ποιήσεις φροντίσας δι' ὧν δεῖ ταῦτα ἐργασθῆναι*, and RI. 29 (iii/B.C.) *φράζοντες [τό τε] αὐτῶν ὄνομα καὶ ἐν ἡι κόμηι οἰκοῦσιν καὶ π[όσου τιμῶν]ται*. So already in Sophocles, *Antig.* 542, *OT* 1068 (see Jebb's notes); and in Plato, *Euth.* 14E *ἀ μὲν γὰρ διδόασιν, παντὶ δῆλον*. It is superfluous to say that this usage cannot possibly be extended to direct question, so as to justify the AV in Mt 26⁵⁰. The more illiterate papyri and inscriptions show *τίς* for relative *ὅστις* or *ὅς* not seldom, as *εὔρον γεοργὸν τίς αὐτὰ ἐλκύση—τίνος ἐὰν χριαν ἔχης—τίς ἂν κακῶς ποιήσει*,¹ etc. Jebb on Soph. *OT* 1141 remarks that while "*τίς* in classical Greek can replace *ὅστις* only where there is an indirect question, . . . Hellenistic Greek did not always observe this rule: Mk 14³⁶." There is no adequate reason for punctuating Jas 3¹³ so as to bring in this misuse of *τίς*. But Mt 10¹⁹ and Lk 17⁸ are essentially similar;² nor does there seem to be any decisive reason against so reading Ac 13²⁵. Dieterich (*Unters.* 200) gives several inscriptional exx., and observes that the use was specially strong in Asia

¹ BU 822 (iii/A.D.), BM 239 (iv/A.D.), *JHS* xix. 299. See p. 21 above. Gn 33⁸⁸ is a clear ex. from LXX. ² I must retract the denial I gave in *CR* xv. 441.

Minor. It is interesting therefore to note Thumb's statement (*ThLZ* xxviii. 423), that the interrogative is similarly used in Pontic now—a clear case of local survival. The NT use of *ὅτι* for *τί* in a direct question is a curious example of the confusion between the two categories, a confusion much further developed in our own language.

MGr developments are instructive when we are examining the relatives and interrogatives. The normal relative is *ποῦ*, followed by the proper case of the demonstrative, as *ὁ γιατρός ποῦ τὸν ἔστειλα*, "the doctor whom I sent," etc. The ingenious Abbé Viteau discovers a construction very much like this, though he does not draw the parallel, in *Jn* 9¹⁷ *ὅτι ἠνέφξεν σου τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς*, "thou whose eyes he hath opened": he cites *Mk* 6¹⁷ⁱ. 8²⁴ as further exx. Since *ὅτι* and *ἡνέξ* are passable equivalents, we have here a "pure Hebraism"—a gem of the first water! We might better Viteau's instruction by tracing to the same fertile source the MGr idiom, supporting our case with a reference to Jannaris *HG* § 1439, on MGr parallels to *Mk* 7²⁶ (*ἦς . . . αὐτῆς*) and the like.¹ It will be wise however for us to sober ourselves with a glance at Thumb's remarks, *Hellen.* 130, after which we may proceed to look for parallels nearer home than Hebrew. In older English this was the regular construction. Thus, "thurh God, *the* ic thurh *his* willan hider ásend wæs" (*Gen* 45⁸); "namely oon *That* with a spere was thirled *his* brest-boon" (Chaucer, *Knights Tale* 1851 f.). Cf the German "der du bist" = who art.² The idiom is still among us; and Mrs Gamp, remarking "which her name is Mrs Harris," will hardly be suspected of Hebraism! The presence of a usage in MGr affords an almost decisive disproof of Semitism in the *Koinḗ*, only one small corner of whose domain came within range of Semitic influences; and we have merely to recognise afresh the ease with which identical idioms may arise in totally independent languages. It does not however follow that Blass is wrong when he claims

¹ See below, p. 237; also Wellh. 22, who adds exx. from D.

² See Skeat's Chaucer, *Prologue and Knights Tale*, p. xxxvi. I owe the suggestion to my friend Mr E. E. Kellett.

Mk 7²⁵ 17 13¹⁹, Lk 3¹⁶, and passages in Rev, as "specially suggested by Semitic usage." The phenomenon is frequent in the LXX (see WM 185), and the NT exx. are nearly all from places where Aramaic sources are presumed. A vernacular use may be stretched (cf pp. 10 f.) beyond its natural limits, when convenient for literal translation. But Blass's own quotation, οὐ ἡ πνοὴ αὐτοῦ ἐν ἡμῖν ἐστίν,¹ comes from a piece of free Greek. That this use did exist in the old vernacular, away from any Semitic influence, is proved by the papyri (p. 85). The quotations in Kühner-Gerth § 561 n.², and in Blass and Winer *ll.c.*, show that it had its roots in the classical language. As was natural in a usage which started from anacoluthon, the relative and the pleonastic demonstrative were generally, in the earlier examples, separated by a good many intervening words.

The modern Interrogative is mostly ποιός, for τίς has practically worn down to the indeclinable τί, just as our *what* (historically identical with the Latin *quod*) has become indifferent in gender. The NT decidedly shows the early stages of this extension of ποιός. It will not do for us to refine too much on the distinction between the two pronouns. The weakening of the special sense of ποιός called into being a new pronoun to express the sense *qualis*, namely, ποταπός, which was the old ποδαπός ("of what country?"), modified by popular etymology to suggest πότε, and thus denuded of its association in meaning with ἀλλοδ-απός, ἡμεδ-απός, and ὑμεδ-απός.³

We take next the Numerals. The use of εἷς as ordinal; of εἷς as an ordinal is "undoubtedly a Hebrew idiom," according to Blass, p. 144. Our doubts, nevertheless, will not be repressed; and they are encouraged by the query in Thumb's review. To begin with, why did the Hebraism affect only the first numeral, and not its successors? If the use was vernacular Greek, the reason of the restriction is obvious: πρῶτος is the only ordinal which altogether differs in form from the

¹ Clement *ad Cor.* 21 *fn.* (Lightfoot, p. 78). Nestle (*ZNTW* i. 178 ff.) thinks the writer was of Semitic birth. Gal 2¹⁰ will serve instead.

² The suffix is that of Latin *prop-iquos*, *long-iquos*, Skt. *apo-āhe*, etc.: ποδ- and ἀλλοδ- are *quod*, *what*, *aliud*, while ἡμεδ-, ὑμεδ-, answer to ablative forms in Skt.

cardinal.¹ When we add that both German and English say "page forty" (WM 311), we are prepared for the belief that the Greek vernacular also had this natural use. Now, although *εἰς καὶ εἰκοστός*, *unus et vicesimus*, *one and twentieth*, are (as Blass says) essentially different, since the ordinal element is present at the end of the phrase, this is not so with *τῇ μῇ καὶ εἰκάδι*,² BU 623 (ii/iii A.D.). But the matter is really settled by the fact that in MGr the cardinals beyond 4 have ousted the ordinals entirely (Thumb, *Handbuch* 56); and Dieterich (*Unters.* 187 f.) shows from inscriptions that the use is as old as Byzantine Greek. It would seem then that the encroachment of the cardinal began in the one case where the ordinal was entirely distinct in form, spread thence over other numerals, and was finally repelled from the first four, in which constant use preserved alike the declension and the distinct ordinal form. Had Semitic influence been at work, there is no conceivable reason why we should not have had *τῇ πέντε* at the same time. Simultaneously with this process we note

the firm establishment of simplified ordinals from 13th to 19th, which now (from iii/B.C onwards) are exclusively of the form *τρισκαδέκατος*, *τεσσαρεσκαδέκατος*, etc., with only isolated exceptions. Similarly we find *δέκα τρεῖς*, *δέκα ἕξ*, etc., almost invariably in papyri, and *δέκα δύο* as well as *δώδεκα*.³ These phenomena all started in the classical period: cf Meisterhans³ 160.

There is a further use of *εἰς* which calls for remark, its development into an indefinite article, like *ein* in German, *un* in French, or our own *an*: in MGr the process is complete. The fact that

¹ *Δεύτερος* is not derived from *δύο*, but popular etymology would naturally connect them. Curiously enough, Hebrew shares the peculiarity noted above, which somewhat weakens our argument: Aramaic, like Latin and English, uses a word distinct from the cardinal for *second* as well as *first*. Hebrew has lost all ordinals beyond 10, and Aramaic shows them only in the *Jerus. Targ.* See Dalman, *Gramm.* 99 f. For days of the month, the encroachment of cardinals has gone further still in both dialects. The fact that the ordinals up to 10 are all treated alike in Hebrew, reinforces our view.

² *Εἰκάς*, like *τριάς*, *δεκάς*, *τριακάς*, etc., was originally either *No. 20* or a set of 20, though used only for the 20th of the month. Cf in Philo *τριάς* = *3rd day* (LS), and *τρεπάς*, the usual name for Wednesday, surviving in MGr: see p. 237.

³ Wellhausen notes that D has only *δέκα δύο* and *ἄ*.

[^a See p. 246.

εις progressively ousted *τις* in popular speech, and that even in classical Greek there was a use which only needed a little diluting to make it essentially the same,¹ is surely enough to prove that the development lay entirely within the Greek language, and only by accident agrees with Semitic. (See Wellh. 27.) We must not therefore follow Meyer (on Mt 8¹⁰), in denying that *εις* is ever used in the NT in the sense of *τις*: it is dangerous to import exegetical subtleties into the

ὁ *εις*.

NT, against the known history of the Common Greek. The use of ὁ *εις* in Mk 14¹⁰ is, as noted in *Expos.* VI. vii. 111, paralleled in early papyri.²

In Blass's second edition (p. 330) we find a virtual surrender of the Hebraism in *δύο δύο, συμπόσια συμπόσια* (Mk 6^{30t}), *δεσμός δεσμός* (Mt 13³⁰ in Epiphanius—a very probable reading, as accounting for the variants): he remarks on *μίαν μίαν* in Sophocles (Frag. 201) that "Atticists had evidently complained of it as vulgar, and it was not only Jewish-Greek." Winer compared Aeschylus *Persæ* 981, *μυρία μυρία πεμπαστών*. Deissmann (*ThLZ*, 1898, p. 631) cites *δήση τρία τρία* from OP 121 (iii/A.D.); and (as W. F. Moulton noted WM 312 n.) the usage is found in MGr.³ Thumb is undeniably right in calling the coincidence with Hebrew a mere accident. In the papyri (e.g. Tb P 63⁵—ii/B.C.) the repetition of an *adjective* produces an elative = *μεγάλου μεγάλου = μεγίστου*. It should be added that in Lk 10¹ we have a mixed distributive *ἀνὰ δύο δύο* (B *al*): so in *Ev. Petr.* 35, as Blass notes, and *Acta Philippi* 92 (Tisch).⁴ See Brugmann, *Distributiva* (cited above, p. 21).

Two single passages claim a word before "Noah the eighth person." we pass on from the numerals. "Ογδοον *Nῶε ἐφύλαξεν* in 2 Pet 2⁵ presents us with

¹ It is difficult to see any difference between *εις* and *τις* in Aristophanes, *Av.* 1292:—

πέρδιξ μὲν *εις* κάπηλος ὀνομάζετο
χωλός, Μανίππυ δ' ἦν χελιδὼν τοῦνομα, κ.τ.λ.

From the papyri we may cite as exx. AP 30 (ii/B.C.) Κορυδύλου ἐνὸς τῶν ἀλιείων (sc. προσκληθέντος); BU 1044 (iv/A.D.) ἑνος (sic = *εις*) λεγόμενον (= -ος) Φαῖσις.

² We may add good exx. from Par P 15 (ii/B.C.) τὸν ἕνα αὐτῶν Ὄρων—τοῦ ἐνὸς τῶν ἐγκαλουμένων Νεχουθοῦ. Tb P 357 (ii/A.D.) τοῦ τοῦ ἐνὸς αὐτῶν πατρός.

³ Thumb, *Hellen.* 128, *Handbuch* 57.

⁴ See W. Schulze, *Græca Latina* 13. Add now Wellh. 31.

a classical idiom which can be shown to survive at any rate in literary Common Greek: see exx. in WM 312, and Schaefer *l.c.* I have only noticed one instance in the papyri (p. 107), and in 2 Pet we rather expect bookish phrases. The AV of this passage is an instructive illustration for our inquiries as to Hebraisms. "Noah the eighth person" is not English, for all its appearing in a work which we are taught to regard as the impeccable standard of classic purity. It is a piece of "translation English," and tolerably unintelligible too, one may well suppose, to its less educated readers. Now, if this specimen of translators' "nodding" had made its way into the language—like the misprint "strain *at* a gnat"—we should have had a fair parallel for "Hebraism" as hitherto understood. As it stands, a phrase which no one has ever thought of imitating, it serves to illustrate the over-literal translations which appear very frequently in the LXX and in the NT, where a Semitic original underlies the Greek text. (Compare what is said of Gallicisms in English on p. 13.)

Last in this division comes a note on "Seventy times seven." Mt 18²². Blass ignores entirely the rendering "seventy-seven times" (RVmargin), despite the fact that this meaning is unmistakable in Gen 4²⁴ (LXX). It will surely be felt that W. F. Moulton (WM 314) was right in regarding that passage as decisive. A definite *allusion* to the Genesis story is highly probable: Jesus pointedly sets against the natural man's craving for seventy-sevenfold revenge the spiritual man's ambition to exercise the privilege of seventy-sevenfold forgiveness. For a partial grammatical parallel see *Iliad* xxii. 349, δεκάκις [τε] καὶ Φείκοσι, "tenfold and twenty-fold," if the text is sound.

It will be worth while to give statistics
Prepositions:— for the relative frequency of Prepositions in
Relative the NT, answering to those cited from Helbing
Frequency. (above, pp. 62 f.) for the classical and post-
 classical historians. If we represent *ἐν* by unity, the order of
 precedence works out thus:—*εἰς* ·64, *ἐκ* ·34, *ἐπί* ·32, *πρός*
 ·25, *διά* ·24, *ἀπό* ·24, *κατά* ·17, *μετά* ·17, *περί* ·12, *ὑπό*
 ·08, *παρά* ·07, *ὑπέρ* ·054, *σύν* ·048, *πρό* ·018, *ἀντι* ·008,
ἀνά ·0045. We shall have to return later to prepositions
 compounded with verbs, following our present principle of

dealing with them in connexion with the parts of speech with which they are used. A few miscellaneous matters come in best at this point. First let us notice the prominence in Hellenistic of combinations of prepositions with adverbs. In papyri we find such as *ἐκ τότε*, OP 486 (ii/A.D.), *ἀπὸ πέρυσι* (Deissmann *BS* 221), and even *ἀφ' ὅτε ἐλουσάμην*, "since I last bathed," OP 528 (ii/A.D.). In NT we have *ἀπὸ τότε*, *ἀπὸ πέρυσι*, *ἀπ' ἄρτι*, *ἐκ πάλαι*, *ἐφ' ἅπαξ*, *ἐπὶ τρίς*, etc. The roots of the usage may be seen in the classical *ἐς αἰεί* and the like. Some of these combinations became fixed, as *ὑποκάτω*, *ὑπεράνω*, *κατέναντι*. This may be set beside the abundance of "Improper" prepositions. All of these, except *ἐγγύς* and *ἄμα*, take gen. only.¹ Thumb comments² on the survival of such as *ἕως*, *ἐπάνω*, *ὀπίσω*, *ὑποκάτω*, in MGr. Hebraism in this field was supposed to have been responsible for the coining of *ἐνώπιον*, till Deissmann proved it vernacular.³ The compound preposition *ἀνά μέσον* was similarly aspersed; but it has turned up abundantly in the papyri,—not however in any use which would help 1 Co 6⁵, where it is almost impossible to believe the text sound. (An exact parallel occurs in the *Athenæum* for Jan. 14, 1905, where a writer is properly censured for saying, "I have attempted to discriminate between those which are well authenticated," *i.e.* (presumably) "[and those which are not].") It is hard to believe Paul would have been so slovenly in writing, or even dictating.) We have a further set of "Hebraisms" in the compound prepositions which are freely made with *πρόσωπον*, *χείρ* and *στόμα* (Blass 129 f.): see above, p. 81. Even here the Semitism is still on the familiar lines: a phrase which is possible in native Greek is extended widely beyond its idiomatic limits because it translates exactly a common Hebrew locution; and the conscious use of Biblical turns of speech explains the application of such phrases on the lips of men whose minds are saturated with the sacred writers' language. As early as iii/B.C.,

¹ Παρπλήσιον Phil 2²⁷ κACD has dat. ² *ThLZ* xxviii. 422. ³ *BS* 213. Cf *Εσρος*. vi. vii. 113: add OP 658 (iii/A.D.), and Tb P 14 (114 B.C.) *παρηγγελκότες ἐνώπιον*, "I gave notice in person." Hb P 30 (before 271 B.C.) is the earliest ex. Cf Par P 63 (ii/B.C.) *ἐνωπίους* (so Mahaffy); and see Mayser 457.

in a Libyan's will, we meet with *κατὰ πρόσωπόν τινος*;¹ and in mercantile language we constantly find the formula *διὰ χειρός*, used absolutely, it is true—e.g. MP 25 (iii/B.C.), "from hand to hand," as contrasted with "through an intermediary." We may refer to Heitmüller's proof² that the kindred phrase *εἰς τὸ ὄνομά τινος* is good vernacular. The strong tendency to use compound prepositional phrases, which we have been illustrating already, would make it all the easier to develop these adaptations of familiar language.

The eighteen classical prepositions are, as we have just seen, all represented in NT Greek, except *ἀμφί*, which has disappeared as a separate word, like *ambi* in Latin, and like its correlative in English, the former existence of which in our own branch is shown by the survival of *um* in modern German. It was not sufficiently differentiated from *περί* to assert itself in the competition; and the decay of the idea of duality weakened further a preposition which still proclaimed its original meaning, "on both sides," by its resemblance to *ἀμφοτέροι*. *Ἀνά* has escaped the same fate by its distributive use, which accounts for seven instances, the phrase *ἀνά μέσον* for four, and *ἀνά μέρος* for one. *Ἀντί* occurs 22 times, but *ἀνθ' ὧν* reduces the number of free occurrences to 17. Rare though it is, it retains its individuality. "In front of," with a normal adnominal genitive, passes naturally into "in place of," with the idea of equivalence or return or substitution, our *for*. For the preposition in Jn 1¹⁶, an excellent parallel from Philo is given in WM (p. 456 n.).³ *Πρό* occurs 48 times, including 9 exx. of *πρὸ τοῦ* c. inf., which invades the province of *πρὶν*. In Jn 12¹ we have *πρὸ ἑξ ἡμερῶν τοῦ πάσχα*, which looks extremely like *ante diem tertium Kalendas*. The plausible Latinism forces itself on our attention all the more when we compare *IMA* iii. 325 (ii/A.D.)

¹ Deissmann *BS* 140.

² *Im Namen Jesu* 100 ff. So p. 63, for *ἐν ὀνόματι ὄτι*, Mk 9⁴¹.

³ Blass compares *γῆν πρὸ γῆς ἐλαύνεσθαι*, "from one land to another," *ἐπιπλῖν ἑξ ἐπιπλῶν*, and the like (p. 124). The Philonic passage is from *De Poster. Caini* § 145 (p. 254 M.): *διὰ τὰς πρώτας αἰεὶ χάριτας, πρὶν κορεσθέντας ἐξυβρίσαι τοὺς λαχόντας, ἐπισχῶν καὶ ταμεινόμενος εἰσαυθίς ἑτέρας ἀντ' ἐκείνων, καὶ τρίτας ἀντὶ τῶν δευτέρων καὶ αἰεὶ νέας ἀντὶ παλαιότερων . . . ἐπιδίδωσι.*

πρὸ τῆ Καλανδῶν Ἀγούστων, and parallels in translated documents to be seen in Viereck's *Sermo Græcus* (see pp. 12, 13, 21, etc.). And yet it is soon found that the same construction occurs in phrases which have nothing in common with the peculiar formula of Latin days of the month. In the Mysteries inscription from Andania (Michel 694, i/B.C.) we recognise it in Doric—πρὸ ἀμερῶν δέκα τῶν μυστηρίων; and the illiterate vernacular of FP 118 (ii/A.D.), πρὸ δύο ἡμερῶν ἀγόρασον τὰ ὀρνιθάρια τῆς εἰορτῆς ("buy the fowls two days before the feast"), when combined with Jn *l.c.*, makes the hypothesis of Latinism utterly improbable. The second genitive in these three passages is best taken as an ablative—"starting from the mysteries," etc. It is found as early as Herodotus, who has (vi. 46) δευτέρῳ ἔτει τούτων, "in the second year from these events": cf also OP 492 (ii/A.D.) μετ' ἐνιαυτὸν ἕνα τῆς τελευτῆς μου, "a year after (starting from) my death." See also the note on ὀψέ, *supr.* p. 72. There remains the idiomatic use of πρό, seen in 2 Co 12² πρὸ ἐτῶν δεκατεσσάρων, "fourteen years before." Blass (p. 127 n.) cites πρὸ ἀμερῶν δέκα from the will of Epicteta (Michel 1001), written in the Doric of Thera, "end of iii/B.C. or beginning of ii/B.C., therefore pre-Roman"—to cite Blass's own testimony.¹ It becomes clear that historically the resemblance between the *ante diem* idiom and the Greek which translates it is sheer coincidence, and the supposed Latinism goes into the same class as the Hebraisms we have so often disposed of already.² This enquiry, with the general considerations as to Latinisms which were advanced above (pp. 20 f.), will serve to encourage scepticism when we note the

¹ Add FP 122 (i/ii A.D.), BU 180 (ii/iii A.D.), 592 (ii/A.D.), NP 47 (iii/A.D.), Ch P 15 (iv/A.D.), BU 836 (vi/A.D.).

² W. Schulze, *Græc. Lat.* 14-19, has a long and striking list of passages illustrating the usage in question, which shows how common it became. His earliest citation is πρὸ τριῶν ἡμερῶν τῆς τελευτῆς from Hippocrates (v/B.C.), which will go with that from Herodotus given above. We have accordingly both Ionic and Doric warrant for this Κοινή construction, dating from a period which makes Latin necessarily the borrower, were we bound to deny independent development. Schulze adds a parallel from Lithuanian! Our explanation of the dependent gen. as an ablative is supported by πρὸ μᾶς ἡμέρας ἡ c. acc. et inf., in OGIS 485 (ii/B.C.) and Jos. *Ant.* xiv. 817: ἡ replaces the ablative genitive exactly as it does after comparatives.

resemblance of *ὡς ἀπὸ σταδίων δεκαπέντε* (Jn 11¹⁸) to a *millibus passuum duobus* (Blass 95). Blass cites Jn 21⁸, Rev 14²⁰, and the usage of Κοινή writers like Diodorus and Plutarch. *Mutatis mutandis*, this idiom is identical in principle with that just quoted for *πρό*. After noting the translation-Hebraism *φοβείσθαι ἀπό* in Mt 10²⁸ (= Lk 12⁴),¹ we proceed to observe the enlargement of the sphere of *ἀπό*, which encroaches upon *ἐκ*, *ὑπό*, and *παρά*.^a The title of the modern vernacular Gospels, “*μεταφρασμένη ἀπὸ τὸν Ἀλεξ. Πάλλη*,” reminds us that *ἀπό* has advanced further in the interval. Already in the NT it sometimes expressed the agent after passive verbs (e.g. Lk 8⁴⁸), where it is quite unnecessary to resort to refinements unless the usage of a particular writer demands them. The alleged Hebraism in *καθαρός ἀπό* is dispelled by Deissmann’s quotations, *BS* 196. The use of prepositions, where earlier Greek would have been content with a simple case, enables *ἐκ* in NT to outnumber *ἀπό* still, though obsolete to-day,^b except in the Epirot *ἀχ* or *ὄχ*.² Thus *ἀπό* is used to express the partitive sense, and to replace the genitive of material (as Mt 27²¹ 3⁴); *ἐκ* can even make a partitive phrase capable of becoming subject of a sentence, as in Jn 16¹⁷. For present purposes we need not pursue further the NT uses of *ἀπό* and *ἐκ*, which may be sought in the lexicon; but we may quote two illustrative inscriptional passages with *ἐκ*. Letronne 190 and 198 have *σωθεὶς ἐκ*, “safe home from” (a place), which has affinity with Heb 5⁷; and *ὑπάρχων θεὸς ἐκ θεοῦ καὶ θεᾶς*, from the Rosetta stone (*OGIS* 90—ii/B.C.), will elucidate Phil 3⁵, if the reader of the Greek should, conceivably, fall into the misconceptions which so many English readers entertain. It gives us an unpleasant start to find the language of the Nicene Creed used centuries earlier of Ptolemy Epiphanes!³

We have already (pp. 62 f.) sketched the developments of

¹ Were the active *φοβεῖν* still extant (below, p. 162), this might be taken as “do not be panic-stricken by.” It is like *προσέχειν ἀπό*, Lk 12¹. See p. 107.

² Thus *ὄχ τὸ βουνό*, “from the hill,” occurs in a modern song, Abbott 128 f.

³ Epiphanes = Avatar: the common translation “illustrious” is no longer tenable. See Dittenberger’s note, *OGIS* i. p. 144. So this title also anticipates the NT (*ἐπιφάνεια*). Cf what is said on Christian adaptations of heathen terms, above, p. 84. (On *ἀπό* see also below, p. 237.) [^a See p. 246.

eis, and need say no more of the single-case prepositions, with one very large exception.^a The late Greek uses of

Further uses of *ἐν*. *ἐν* would take too much space if discussed in full here. It has become so much a maid-of-

all-work that we cannot wonder at its ultimate disappearance, as too indeterminate. Students of Pauline theology will not need to be reminded of Deissmann's masterly monograph on "*The NT Formula ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*," with its careful investigation of LXX uses of *ἐν*, and proof of the originality of Paul's use. But SH (on Rom 6¹¹) seem rightly to urge that the idea of the mystic indwelling originated with the Master's own teaching: the actual phrase in Jn 15⁴ may be determined by Pauline language, but in the original Aramaic teaching the thought may have been essentially present. While there are a good many NT uses of *ἐν* which may be paralleled in vernacular documents, there are others beside this one which cannot: in their case, however, analogy makes it highly improbable that the NT writers were innovating. If papyri have *προβεβηκότες ἤδη τοῖς ἔτεσι* (TP 1—ii/B.C.), we need not assume Hebraism in Lk 1⁷ merely because the evangelist inserts *ἐν*: his faithful preservation of his source's *ἡμέραις* is another matter. See pp. 61 f. above. In Ac 7¹⁴ (LXX) we have *ἐν* = "amounting to," from which that in Mk 4⁸ *bis* does not greatly differ. This is precisely paralleled by BU 970 (ii/A.D.) *προοῖκα ἐν δραχμαῖς ἑννακοσίαις*, OP 724 (ii/A.D.) *ἔσχεσ τὴν πρώτην δόσιν ἐν δραχμαῖς τεσσαράκοντα*, BU 1050 (i/A.D.) *ἰμάτια . . . ἐν . . . δραχμαῖς ἑκατόν* ("to the value of"). The use in Eph 2¹⁶ *ἐν δόγμασιν*, "consisting in," is akin to this. For *ἐν τοῖς* = "in the house of," as in Lk 2⁴⁹, we have RL 38² (iii/B.C.) *ἐν τοῖς Ἀπολλωνίου*, Tb P 12 (ii/B.C.) *ἐν τοῖς Ἀμεννέως* "in A.'s office," OP 523 (ii/A.D.) *ἐν τοῖς Κλαυδίου*: cf Par P 49 (ii/B.C.) *εἰς τὰ Πρωτάρχου καταλύσω*, and even *ἐν τῷ Ὄρου* in Tb P 27. We have in official documents *ἐν* meaning "in the department of": so Tb P 27 (ii/B.C.) *τὸ ἐν αὐτῷ ὀφειλόμενον*, 72 *ἄς ἐν Μαρρεῖ τοπογραμματοεῖ*, *al.* I do not recall an exact NT parallel, but 1 Co 6², *εἰ ἐν ὑμῖν κρίνεται ὁ κόσμος*, is not far away. We have another use of *ἐν* with a personal dative in 1 Co 14¹¹ "in my judgement": possibly Jude¹ *ἐν Θεῷ* is akin to this. Such uses would answer to *παρά* c. dat. in classical Greek

^a See p. 246.

The last might seem to be expressed more naturally by the "dative of person judging" (like Ac 7²⁰ ἀστέιος τῷ Θεῷ, or 1 Co *l.c.* ἔσομαι τῷ λαλοῦντι βάρβαρος). But the earliest uses of dative and locative have some common ground, which is indeed the leading cause of their syncretism. Thus we find loc. in Sanskrit used quite often for the dat. of indirect object after verbs of speaking. How readily ἐν was added to the dative, which in older Greek would have needed no preposition, we see well in such a passage as OP 488 (ii/iii A.D.), where "more . . . by one *aroura*" is expressed by ἐν. This particular dative is an instrumental—the same case as our "the more the merrier"—, and is therefore parallel to that of ἐν μαχαίρῃ, "armed *with* a sword," which we have already mentioned (pp. 12, 61). We may fairly claim that "Hebraistic" ἐν is by this time reduced within tolerably narrow limits. One further ἐν may be noted for its difficulty, and for its bearing on Synoptic questions,—the ὁμολογεῖν ἐν τινι which is common to Mt 10³² and Lk 12⁸: this is among the clearest evidences of essentially identical translations used in Mt and Lk. W. F. Moulton (WM 283 n.) cites, apparently with approval, Godet's explanation—"the repose of faith *in* Him whom it confesses": so Westcott, quoting Heracleon, who originated this view (*Canon*⁵ 305 n.). Deissmann (*In Christo* 60) quotes Delitzsch's Hebrew rendering בְּ יְהוָה, and puts it with Mt 3¹⁷ 9³⁴ 11⁶ 23²¹, as an example of a literal translation "mit ängstlicher, die hermeneutische Pedanterie nahelegender Pietät." Dr Rendel Harris recalls the Græcised translation in Rev 3⁵, and gives me Syriac parallels. On the whole, it seems best not to look for justification of this usage in Greek. The agreement of Mt and Lk, in a point where accidental coincidence is out of the question, remains the most important element in the whole matter, proving as it does that Luke did not use any knowledge of Aramaic so as to deal independently with the translated Logia that came to him.¹

Of the prepositions with two cases, *διά* and *μετά* show no signs of weakening their hold on both; but *κατά* c. gen. and *περί* *ὑπέρ* and *ὑπό* c. acc. distinctly fall behind

¹ Of the similar agreement as to φοβεῖσθαι ἀπό, above, p. 102.

We may give the statistics in proof. Διά gen. 382, acc. 279; μετά gen. 361, acc. 100; κατά gen. 73, acc. 391; περί gen. 291, acc. 38; ὑπέρ gen. 126, acc. 19; ὑπό gen. 165, acc. 50. Comparing this list with that in a classical Greek grammar, we see that μετά, περί and ὑπό¹ have been detached from connexion with the dative—a fact in line with those noted above, pp. 62 ff. Turning to details, we find that κατά (like ἀνά, Rev 21²¹) is used as an adverb distributively, as in τὸ καθ' εἰς or εἰς κατὰ εἰς Mk 14¹⁹, [Jn] 8⁹, Rom 12⁵. The MGr καθεῖς or καθένας, "each," preserves this, which probably started from the stereotyping of τὸ καθ' ἕνα, ἐν καθ' ἕν, etc., declined by analogy: cf ἔνδημος from ἐν δήμῳ (ᾧν), or proconsul from pro consule.² The enfeebling of the distinction between περί and ὑπέρ c. gen. is a matter of some importance in the NT, where these prepositions are used in well-known passages to describe the relation of the Redeemer to man or man's sins. It is an evident fact that ὑπέρ is often a colourless "about," as in 2 Co 8²³: it is used, for example, scores of times in accounts, with the sense of our commercial "to." This seems to show that its original fullness of content must not be presumed upon in theological definitions, although it may not have been wholly forgotten. The distinction between ἀντί and the more colourless ὑπέρ, in applying the metaphor of purchase, is well seen in Mk 10⁴⁵ (= Mt 20²⁸) λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν, and the quotation of this logion in 1 Tim 2⁶ ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων.² Διά c. acc. mostly retains its meaning "for the sake of," "because of," distinct from "through," "by the instrumentality of," which belongs to the genitive. As early as MP 16 and 20 (iii/B.C.), we have ἵνα διὰ σὲ βασιλεῦ τοῦ δικαίου τύχω; but if the humble petitioner had meant "through you," he would have addressed the king as a mere medium of favour: referring to a sovereign power, the ordinary meaning "because of you" is more appropriate. This applies exactly to Jn 6⁵⁷. So Rom 8²⁰, where Winer's explanation is correct (p. 498). In much later Greek, as Hatzidakis shows (p. 213)

¹ For ὑπό c. dat. can be quoted OGIS 54 (iii/B.C.) ὑφ' ἐαυτῶι ποιησάμενος, and OP 708 (as late as ii/A.D.) ἐκ τοῦ ὑπὸ σοι νομοῦ. LXX has περί c. dat.

² Note that δοῦς ἐαυτῶν is substituted for the translation-Greek δοῦναι τῆν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ: on this see above, p. 87. See further on ὑπέρ, p. 287.

διά c. acc. monopolised the field, which it still holds in MGr.¹ With the genitive, διά is often contrasted with ἐκ, ὑπό, etc., as denoting mediate and not original authorship, as 1 Co 8^c, Mt 1²². In Heb 2¹⁰ it is used of God, who is "the final Cause and the efficient Cause of all things" (Westcott). There seems no adequate reason for accepting Blass's conjectural emendation, δι' ἀσθενείας, in Gal 4¹³: "because of an illness" is an entirely satisfactory statement (see Lightfoot *in loc.*), and the Vulgate *per* is not strong enough to justify Blass's confidence.² Μετά c. gen. has in Lk 1⁶⁸ a use influenced by literal translation from Semitic.^a Its relations with σύν are not what they were in Attic, but it remains very much the commoner way of saying *with*. Thumb points out (*Hellen.* 125) that MGr use disproves Hebraism in πολεμῆν μετὰ τινος, Rev 12⁷ *al.*^b Thus, for example, Abbott 44: πολέμησε μὲ τρεῖς χιλιάδες Τούρκους, "he fought with 3000 Turks."

and with
three.

The category of prepositions used with three cases is hurrying towards extinction, as we should expect. Μετά, περί and ἰπέ have crossed the line into the two-case class; and in the NT πρὸς has nearly gone a step further, for its figures are c. gen. 1 (Ac 27⁸⁴, literary), dat. 6 (= "close to" or "at," in Mk, Lk, Jn *ter* and Rev), acc. 679. With the dative, however, it occurs 104 times in LXX, and 23 times c. gen.: the decay seems to have been rapid. Cf however PFi 5 πρὸς τῷ πυλῶνι, as late as 245 A.D. For παρά the numbers are, c. gen. 78, dat. 50, acc. 60. Blass notes that c. dat. it is only used of persons, as generally in classical Greek, except in Jn 19²⁵. One phrase with παρά calls for a note on its use in the papyri. Οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ is exceedingly common there to denote "his agents" or "representatives." It has hitherto been less easy to find parallels for Mk 3²¹, where it must mean "his family": see Swete and Field *in loc.* We can now cite GH 36 (ii/B.C.) οἱ παρ' ἡμῶν πάντες,

¹ Contrast Ac 24² with OP 41 (iii/iv A.D.) πολλῶν ἀγαθῶν ἀπολαύομεν διὰ σαί.

² Οὐ δυνάμενος δι' ἀσθένειαν πλεῦσαι may be quoted from OP 726 (ii/A.D.), and a like phrase from OP 261 (i/A.D.), but of course they prove little or nothing. [^a See pp. 246 f.; ^b see p. 247.]

BU 998 (ii/B.C.), and Par P 36 (ii/B.C.).¹ Finally we come to *ἐπί*, the only preposition which is still thoroughly at home with all the cases (gen. 216, dat. 176, acc. 464). The weakening of case-distinctions is shown however by the very disproportion of these figures, and by the confusion of meaning which is frequently arising. In Heb 8¹⁰ 10¹⁶ we construe *καρδίας* as acc. only because of *ἐπὶ τὴν διάνοιαν* which follows it in the latter passage: on the other hand, the original in Jer 31(38)³³ is singular, which favours taking it as genitive.² Our local *upon* can in fact be rendered by *ἐπί* with gen., dat., or acc., with comparatively little difference of force. Particular phrases are appropriated to the several cases, but the reason is not always obvious, though it may often be traced back to classical language, where distinctions were rather clearer. Among the current phrases we may note *ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό* "together," "in all," perpetually used in arithmetical statements: see Ac 1¹⁵ 2⁴⁷. Cf Blass² 330. The common *ἐφ' ᾧ* c. fut. indic. "on condition that," does not appear in the NT. But with a pres. in 2 Co 5⁴, and an aor. in Rom 5¹², the meaning is essentially the same ("in view of the fact that'), allowing for the sense resulting from a jussive future.

¹ *Expos.* vi. vii. 118, viii. 436. See Witkowski's note, p. 72.

² For Mk 6³⁹ *ἐπὶ τῷ χόρτῳ*, Mt 14¹⁹ substitutes *ἐπὶ τοῦ χ.*, but with *ἐπὶ τὸν χ.* in D. In Ac 7¹¹ D has gen. for acc., and in 8¹⁶ acc. for dat. In Eph 1¹⁰ it seems difficult to draw any valid distinction between the cases of *ἐπὶ τοῖς οὐρανοῖς* and *ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς*. Nor can we distinguish between *ἐπ' ἐσχάτου* in Heb 1¹ and the dative in Tb P 69 (ii/B.C.), *ὣν ἡ διοίκησις ἐπ' ἐσχάτῳ τέτακται*.

ADDITIONAL NOTES.—P. 79. Mr Thackeray says *πρῶτος* is used for *πρότερος* regularly in LXX. The latter occurs not infrequently in Ptolemaic papyri, but seems to have weakened greatly in the Roman period.—P. 98. The Ptolemaic PP iii. 28 has *ἐδραγματοκλέπτει τρίτος ὧν*. Cf Abbott *JG* 562 on *μόνος αὐτός* Jn 6^{16κ}. On Mt 18²², W. C. Allen takes 70×7 in Gen and Mt *ll. cc.* alike. A further parallel for cardinal in place of adverb is BU 1074 (late iii/A.D.) *τρισπυθιονεῖκης*, but *δεκαδυμιονεῖκης*, etc.—P. 99. In *Syll.* 385⁹ Hadrian says he could not find *ἐκ πότε φέρειν αὐτὸ ἤρξασθε*. This is a fairly close parallel to the *ἕως πότε* which Dr Nestle brings up against my argument about Semitisms. If it "may be quotable from early Greek," I cannot quite see why it is for Dr Nestle "a Hebraism, even if it is still used by Pallas in his MGr translation." I seem to hear the shade of Hadrian demanding "Am I a Jew!"—P. 102. BU 1079 (41 A.D.) *βλέπε σατὸν ἀπὸ τῶν Ἰουδαίων*, "take heed to yourself against the Jews (*i. e.* moneylenders)," contains an idiom which the Hebraists will hardly care to claim now!—P. 103. Fresh exx. of *ἐν* accumulate in a great variety of meanings. Amongst them I have only room for the Delphian inscr., *Syll.* 850⁹ (iii/B.C.) *κριθέντω ἐν ἀνδρῶσι τριῶσι*, "let them be tried before three judges," a good illustration of *ἐν* in Ac 17³¹.

CHAPTER VI.

THE VERB: TENSES AND MODES OF ACTION.

OUR first subject under the Verb will be one which has not yet achieved an entrance into the grammars. For the last few years the comparative philologists—mostly in

“Aktionsart.” Germany—have been busily investigating the problems of *Aktionsart*, or the “kind of action” denoted by different verbal formations. The subject, complex in itself, has unfortunately been entangled not a little by inconsistent terminology; but it must be studied by all who wish to understand the rationale of the use of the Tenses, and the extremely important part which Compound Verbs play in the Greek and other Indo-Germanic languages. The English student may be referred to pp. 477 ff. of Dr P. Giles’s admirable *Manual of Comparative Philology*, ed. 2. A fuller summary may be found in pp. 471 ff. of Karl Brugmann’s *Griech. Gramm.*, ed. 3, where the great philologist sets forth the results of Delbrück and other pioneers in comparative syntax, with an authority and lucidity all his own.

The student of Hebrew will not need telling that a Tense-system, dividing verbal action into the familiar categories of Past, Present and Future, is by no means so necessary to language as we once conceived it to be. It may be more of a surprise to be told that in our own family of languages Tense is proved by scientific inquiry to be relatively a late invention, so much so that the elementary distinction between Past and Present had only been developed to a rudimentary extent when the various branches of the family separated so that they ceased to be mutually intelligible. As the language then possessed no Passive whatever, and no distinct Future, it will be realised that its resources

needed not a little supplementing. But if they were scanty in one direction, they were superabundant in another. Brugmann distinguishes no less than twenty-three conjugations, or present-stem classes, of which traces remain in Greek; and there are others preserved in other languages. We must add the aorists and perfect as formations essentially parallel. In most of these we are able to detect an *Aktionsart* originally appropriate to the conjugation, though naturally blurred by later developments. It is seen that the

Point Action; Aorist has a "punctiliar" action,¹ that is, it regards action as a *point*: it represents the point of entrance (*Ingressive*, as βαλεῖν "let fly," βασιλεύσαι "come to the throne"), or that of completion (*Effective*, as βαλεῖν "hit"), or it looks at a whole action simply as having occurred, without distinguishing any steps in its progress (*Constative*,² as βασιλεύσαι "reign," or as when a sculptor says of his statue, ἐποίησεν ὁ δεῖνα "X. made it"). On

the same graph, the Constative will be a line reduced to a point by perspective. The Present has generally a *durative* action—"linear," we may call it, to keep up the same graphic illustration—as in βάλλειν "to be throwing," βασιλεύειν "to be on the throne."

The *Perfect* action is a variety by itself, denoting what began in the past and still continues: thus **Perfect Action;** from the "point" root *weido*, "discover, descry," comes the primitive perfect οἶδα, "I discovered (εἶδον) and still enjoy the results," i.e. "I know." The present stems which show an *ι*-reduplication (ἵστημι, γίγνομαι) are

supposed to have started with an *Iterative* action, so that γίγνομαι would originally present the succession of moments which are individually represented by ἐγενόμεν. And so throughout the conjugations which are exclusively present. Other conjugations are capable of making both present and aorist

¹ I venture to accept from a correspondent this new-coined word to represent the German *punktuell*, the English of which is preoccupied.

² Unity of terminology demands our accepting this word from the German pioneers, and thus supplementing the stores of the *New English Dictionary*. Otherwise one would prefer the clearer word "summary."

stems, as ἔφην compared with ἔβην, γράφειν with τραπέειν, στένειν with γενέσθαι. In these the pure verb-root is by nature either (a) "punctiliar," (b) durative, or (c) capable of being both. Thus the root of ἐνεγκεῖν, like our *bring*, is essentially a "point" word, being classed as "Effective": accordingly it forms no present stem. That of φέρω, *fero*, *bear*, on the other hand, is essentially durative or "linear", and therefore forms no aorist stem.¹ So with that of ἔστι, *est*, *is*, which has no aorist, while ἐγενόμην, as we have seen, had no durative present. An example of the third class is ἔχω, which (like our own *have*) is ambiguous in its action. "I had your money" may mean either "I received it" (point action) or "I was in possession of it" (linear action). In Greek the present stem is regularly durative, "to hold," while ἔσχω is a point word, "I received": thus, ἔσχων παρὰ or ἀπὸ σοῦ is the normal expression in a papyrus receipt.² Misapprehension of the action-form of ἔχω is responsible for most of the pother about ἔχωμεν in Rom 5¹. The durative present can only mean "let us enjoy the possession of peace": (δικαιωθέντες) ἔσχομεν εἰρήνην is the unexpressed antecedent premiss; and Paul wishes to urge his readers to remember and make full use of a privilege which they *ex hypothesi* possess from the moment of their justification. See p. 247.

Rationale of
Defective
Verbs.

It is evident that this study of the kind of action denoted by the verbal root, and the modification of that action produced by the formation of tense and conjugation stems, will have considerable influence upon our lexical treatment of the many verbs in which present and aorist are derived from different roots. Ὀράω (cognate with our "beware") is very clearly durative wherever it occurs in the NT; and

¹ The new aorist (historically perfect) in the Germanic languages (our *bore*) has a constative action.

² Note also a petition, Par P 22 (ii/b.c.), in which the tenses are carefully distinguished, as the erasure of an aorist in favour of the imperfect shows. Two women in the Serapeum at Memphis are complaining of their mother, who had deserted her husband for another man: καὶ τοῦτο ποιήσασα

οὐκ ἔσχε τὸ τῆς ἀδικησάσης πρόσωπον, ἀλλὰ συνηγάσατο ὡς ἐπανελεῖται αὐτὸν ἐδηλούμενος, "she did not put on the face of the wrong-doer, but (her paramour) began to intrigue with her to destroy (her husband)."

we are at liberty to say that this root, which is incapable of forming an aorist, maintains its character in the perfect, "I have watched, continuously looked upon," while *ὄπωπα* would be "I have caught sight of." *Ἔιδον* "I discovered," and *ᾤφθην* "I came before the eyes of," are obviously point-words, and can form no present. *Ἐἶπον* has a similar disability, and we remember at once that its congeners (*F*) *ἔπος*, *vox*, Sanskrit *vāc*, etc., describe a single utterance: much the same is true of *ἔρρέθην*, and its cognate nouns (*F*) *ῥῆμα*, *verbum*, and *word*. On the other hand, *λέγω*, whose constative aorist *ἔλεξα* is replaced in ordinary language by *εἶπον*, clearly denotes speech in progress, and the same feature is very marked in *λόγος*. The meaning of *λόγος* has been developed in post-Homeric times along lines similar to those on which the Latin *sermo* was produced from the purely physical verb *sero*. One more example we may give, as it leads to our remaining point. *Ἔσθίω* is very obviously durative: *ὁ ἐσθίων μετ' ἐμοῦ*, Mk 14¹⁸, is "he who is taking a meal with me." The root *ed* is so distinctly durative that it forms no aorist, but the punctiliar *φαγεῖν* (originally "to divide") supplies the defect. It will be found that *φαγεῖν* in the NT is invariably constative:¹ it denotes simply the action of *ἐσθίειν* seen in perspective, and not either the beginning or the end of that

action. But we find the compound *κατεσθίειν*,
Compounds and *καταφαγεῖν*, used to express the completed
Perfective act, eating something till it is finished. How
Action. little the preposition's proper meaning affects

the resulting sense is seen by the fact that what in Greek is *κατεσθίειν* and in Latin "*devorare*," is in English "eat up" and in Latin also "*comesse*." In all the Indo-Germanic languages, most conspicuously and systematically in the Slavonic but clearly enough in our own, this function of verb compounds may be seen. The choice of the preposition which is to produce this *perfective* action² depends upon conditions

¹ There is one apparent exception, Rev 10¹⁰, where *ὅτε ἔφαγον αὐτό* is "when I had eaten it up." But *ἔφαγον* is simply the continuation of *κατέφαγον* (see below, p. 115).

² One could wish that a term had been chosen which would not have suggested an echo of the tense-name. "Perfective action" has nothing whatever to do with the Perfect tense.

which vary with the meaning of the verbal root. Most of them are capable of "perfectivising" an imperfective verb, when the original adverb's local sense has been sufficiently obscured. We may compare in English the meaning of *bring* and *bring up*, *sit* and *sit down*, *drive* and *drive away* and *drive home*,¹ *knock* and *knock in* and *knock down*, *take* and *overtake* and *take over* and *betake*, *carry* and *carry off* and *carry through*, *work* and *work out* and *work off*, *fiddle* and *fiddle in* (Tennyson's "Amphion"), *set* and *set back* and *set at* and *overset*, *see* and *see to*, *write* and *write off*, *hear* and *hear out*, *break* and *to-break* (Judg 9⁵³ AV), *make* and *make over*, *wake* and *wake up*, *follow* and *follow up*, *come* and *come on*, *go* and *go round*, *shine* and *shine away* (= dispel by shining). Among all the varieties of this list it will be seen that the compounded adverb in each case *perfectivises* the simplex, the combination denoting action which has accomplished a result, while the simplex denoted action in progress, or else momentary action to which no special result was assigned. In the above list are included many exx. in which the local force of the adverb is very far from being exhausted. *Drive in*, *drive out*, *drive off*, *drive away*, and *drive home* are alike perfective, but the goals attained are different according to the distinct sense of the adverbs. In a great many compounds the local force of the adverb is so strong that it leaves the action of the verb untouched. The separateness of adverb and verb in English, as in Homeric Greek, helps the adverb to retain its force longer than it did in Latin and later Greek. In both these languages many of the compound verbs have completely lost consciousness of the meaning originally borne by the prepositional element, which is accordingly confined to its perfectivising function. This is especially the case with *com* (*con*) and *ex* (*e*) in Latin, as in *consequi* "follow out, attain," *efficere* "work out";² and with *ἀπό*,^a *διά*, *κατά* and *σύν* in Greek, as in *ἀποθανεῖν* "die" (*θνήσκειν* "be dying"), *διαφυγεῖν* "escape" (*φεύγειν* = "flee"), *καταδιώκειν* "hunt down" (*διώκω* = "pursue"),

¹ "Prepositions," when compounded, are still the pure adverbs they were at the first, so that this accusative noun turned adverb is entirely on all fours with the rest.

² See p. 287.

[^a See p. 247.

κατεργάζεσθαι "work out," συντηρεῖν "keep safe" (τηρεῖν = "watch"). An example may be brought in here to illustrate how this principle works in details of exegesis. In Lk 8²⁹ the true force of the pluperfect, combined with the vernacular usage of πολλοῖς χρόνοις (see p. 75), goes to show that the meaning is "it had long ago obtained and now kept complete mastery of him." Συναρπάξω then, as the perfective of ἀρπάξω, denotes not the temporary paroxysm, but the establishment of a permanent hold. The interpretation of σύν here depends upon the obvious fact that its normal adverbial force is no longer at work. It is however always possible for the dormant σύν to awake, as a glance at this very word in LS will show. "Seize and carry away" is the common meaning, but in ξυναρπάσασαι τὰς ἐμὰς εἶχον χέρας (Euripides *Hec.* 1163) we may recognise the original *together*. Probably the actual majority of compounds with these prepositions are debarred from the perfective force by the persistency of the local meaning: in types like διαπορεύεσθαι, καταβαίνειν, συνέρχεσθαι, the preposition is still very much alive. And though these three prepositions show the largest proportion of examples, there are others which on occasion can exhibit the perfectivising power. Lightfoot's interpretation brings ἐπιγινώσκω under this category. The present simplex, γινώσκειν, is durative, "to be taking in knowledge." The simplex aorist has point action, generally *effective*, meaning "ascertain, realise," but occasionally (as in Jn 17²⁵, 2 Tim 2¹⁹) it is constative: ἔγνω σε gathers into one perspective all the successive moments of γινώσκωσι σέ in Jn 17³. Ἐπιγινῶναι, "find out, determine," is rather more decisive than the γινῶναι (effective); but in the present stem it seems to differ from γινώσκειν by including the goal in the picture of the journey there—it tells of knowledge already gained. Thus 1 Co 13¹² would be paraphrased, "Now I am acquiring knowledge which is only partial at best: then I shall have learnt my lesson, shall *know*, as God in my mortal life knew me." But I confess I lean more and more to Dean Robinson's doctrine (*Ephes.* 248 ff.): the vernacular is rich in ἐπί compounds of the kind he describes.

The meaning of the Present-stem of these perfectivised roots naturally demands explanation. Since θνή-

σκειν is "to be dying" and ἀποθανεῖν "to die," what is there left for ἀποθνήσκειν? An analysis of the occurrences of this stem in the NT will anticipate

Present Stem of perfectivised Verbs. some important points we shall have to make under the heading of Tenses. Putting aside the special use μέλλω ἀποθνήσκειν,¹ we find the present stem used as an *iterative* in 1 Co 15³¹, and as *frequentative* in Heb 7⁸ 10²³, 1 Co 15²², Rev 14¹⁸: the latter describes action which recurs from time to time with different individuals, as the iterative describes action repeated by the same agent.² In Jn 21²³ and 1 Co 15³² it stands for a future, on which usage see p. 120. Only in Lk 8⁴², 2 Co 6⁹, and Heb 11²¹ is it strictly durative, replacing the now obsolete simplex θνήσκω.³ The simplex, however, vanished only because the "linear perfective" expressed its meaning sufficiently, denoting as it does the whole process leading up to an attained goal. Καταφεύγειν, for example, implies that the refuge is reached, but it depicts the journey there in a *cour d'œil*: καταφνυγείν is only concerned with the moment of arrival. A very important example in the NT is the recurrent οἱ ἀπολλύμενοι "the perishing." Just as much as ἀποκτείνω and its passive ἀποθνήσκω, ἀπόλλυμαι⁴ implies the *completion* of the process of destruction. When we speak of a "dying" man, we do not absolutely bar the possibility of a recovery, but our word implies death as the goal in sight. Similarly in the cry of the Prodigal, λιμῶ ἀπόλλυμαι, Lk 15¹⁷, and in that of the disciples in the storm, σώσον, ἀπολλύμεθα, Mt 8²⁵, we recognise in the perfective verb the sense of an *inevitable* doom, under the visible conditions, even though the subsequent story tells us it was averted. In οἱ ἀπολλύμενοι, 1 Co 1¹⁸ αἰ, strongly durative though the verb is, we see perfectivity in the fact that the goal is *ideally* reached: a complete transformation of its

¹ Μέλλω c. pres. inf. occurs eighty-four times in NT; c. fut. thrice in Ac (μ. ἔσεσθαι); c. aor. six times (Ac 12⁶, Rom 8¹⁸, Gal 3²³, Rev 3² (ἀποθανεῖν) 3¹⁶ 12⁴; also Lk 20³⁶ in D and Marcion).

² Both will be (. . .), a series of points, on the graph hitherto used.

³ Τέθνηκα is really the perfect of ἀποθνήσκω: a perfect needed no perfectivising in a "point-word" like this.

⁴ Note that in all three the simplex is obsolete, for the same reason in each case.

subjects is required to bring them out of the ruin implicit in their state.

Before passing on, we may note the survival in NT Greek of a classical idiom by which the preposition in a compound is omitted, without weakening the sense, when the verb is repeated. Thus in Euripides, *Bacch.* 1065, *κατήγον, ἦγον, ἦγον*, answers to the English "pulled down, down, down." I do not remember seeing this traced in the NT, but in Rev 10¹⁰ (*supra*, p. 111 n.) *ἔφαγον* seems to be the continuation of *κατέφαγον*; in Jn 1¹² *ἔλαβον* takes up *παρέλαβον*, and in Rom 15⁴ *προεγράφη* is repeated as *ἐγράφη*. So also *ἐραυῶντες* 1 Pet 1^{10t}, *ἐνδυσάμενοι* 2 Co 5³, and *στῆναι* Eph 6¹³ (?): add 1 Co 10⁹, Phil 1^{24t}.—not, I think, Rom 2^{9t} or Mt 5^{17, 19}. The order forbids 1 Co 12². In all these cases we are justified in treating the simplex as a full equivalent of the compound; but of course in any given case it may be otherwise explicable.

"The perfective *Aktionsart* in Polybius," the earliest of the great *Κοινή* writers, forms the subject of an elaborate study by Dr Eleanor Purdie, in *Indog. Forsch.* ix. 63–153 (1898). In a later volume, xii. 319–372, H. Meltzer controverts Miss Purdie's results in detail; and an independent comparison with results derivable from NT Greek shows that her conclusions may need considerable qualification. Research in this field is, as Brugmann himself observes (*Griech. Gram.*³ 484), still in its initial stages; but that the Newnham philologist is on the right lines generally, is held by some of the best authorities, including Thumb, who thinks her thesis supported by MGr.⁴ Her contention is that since Homer the aorist simplex had been progressively taking the constative colour, at the expense of its earlier punctiliar character; and that there is a growing tendency to use the compounds, especially those with *διά*, *κατά*, and *σύν*, to express what in the oldest Greek could be sufficiently indicated by the simplex. To a certain extent the NT use agrees with that of Polybius. Thus *φυγεῖν* is constative eleven times, "to flee," with no suggestion of the prolongation of flight (*φεύγειν*) or of its successful accom-

⁴ See p. 247.

plishment (*διαφυγεῖν* or *καταφυγεῖν*). (It seems to me clear that in Heb 11³⁴ we have *ἔφυγον* for the *beginning* of action, —not the goal of safety attained, but the first and decisive step away from danger. Similarly in Mt 23³³ we should read “how are ye to *flee from* the judgement of Gehenna?”—just as in 3⁷. The thought is not of the inevitableness of God’s punishment, but of the stubbornness of men who will not take a step to escape it. The perfective therefore would be inappropriate.) The papyri decidedly support this differentiation of simplex and compound. In the same way we find that *διῶξαι* is always constative in NT, while the perfective *καταδιῶξαι*, “hunt down,” occurs once in Mk 1³⁶, where “followed after” (AV and RV) is not exact. *Ἐργάσασθαι* is certainly constative in Mt 25¹⁶, 3 Jn⁵, and Heb 11³³: it surveys in perspective the continuous labour which is so often expressed by *ἐργάζεσθαι*. In Mt 26¹⁰, and even 2 Jn⁸, the same is probably the case: the stress lies on the *activity* rather than on its product. This last idea is regularly denoted by the perfective compound with *κατά*. *Φυλάξαι* “guard” seems always constative, *διαφυλάξαι* “preserve” occurring in Lk 4¹⁰. Similarly *τηρῆσαι* “watch, keep,” a continuous process seen in perspective: *συν-* and *δια-τηρεῖν* (present stem only) denote “watching” which succeeds up to the point of time contemplated. (See p. 237.) *Ἀγωνίζεσθαι* is only used in the durative present, but *καταγωνίσασθαι* (Heb 11³³) is a good perfective. *Φαγεῖν* and *καταφαγεῖν* differ quite on Polybian lines (see above). On the other hand, in the verbs Miss Purdie examines, the NT makes decidedly less use of the compound than does Polybius; while the non-constative aorists which she notes as exceptions to the general tendency are reinforced by others which in Polybius are seldom such. Thus *ιδεῖν* is comparatively rare in Polybius: “in several cases the meaning is purely constative, and those exx. in which a perfective¹ meaning must be admitted bear a very small proportion to the extremely frequent occurrences of the compound verb in the like

¹ That is, “punctiliar”: Miss Purdie does not distinguish this from perfective proper (with preposition). Brugmann, following Delbrück, has lately insisted on reserving “perfective” for the compounds. Uniformity of terminology is so important that I have altered the earlier phraseology throughout.

sense" (*op. cit.* p. 94 f.). In the NT, however, the simplex *ιδεῖν* is exceedingly common, while the compound (*καθορᾶν*, Rom 1²⁰) only appears once. It is moreover—so far as I can judge without the labour of a count—as often punctiliar (ingressive) as constative: Mt 2¹⁰, "when they caught sight of the star," will serve as an example, against constative uses like that in the previous verse, "the star which they saw." (In numerous cases it would be difficult to distinguish the one from the other.) Here comes in one of Meltzer's criticisms, that the historian's strong dislike of hiatus (cf above, p. 92) accounts for very many of his preferences for compound verbs. This fact undeniably damages the case for Polybius himself; but it does not dispose of inferences—less decided, but not unimportant—which may be drawn from NT Greek and that of the papyri. We are not surprised to find that the NT has no perfective compounds of *θεάομαι*, *θεωρέω*, *λογίζομαι*, *πράσσω*, *κινδυνεύω*, *ἄρχομαι*, *μέλλω*, *ὀργίζομαι*, *δύνω* (unless in Col 3⁹), or *μίσγω* (*μίγνυμι*), to set beside those cited from the historian. *Νοέω* is rather difficult to square with the rule. Its present simplex is often obviously linear, as in *νοῶν καὶ φρονῶν*, the standing phrase of a testator beginning a will: the durative "understand" or "conceive" is the only possible translation in many NT passages. The aor. in Jn 12⁴⁰ and Eph 3⁴ may be the constative of this, or it may be ingressive, "realise." But it is often difficult to make a real perfective out of the compound *κατανοῆσαι*, which should describe the *completion* of a mental process. In some passages, as Lk 20²³ ("he detected their craftiness"), or Ac 7³¹ ("to master the mystery"), this will do very well; but the durative action is most certainly represented in the present *κατανοεῖν*, except Ac 27³⁹ (? "noticed one after another"). *Μαθεῖν* is sometimes constative, summing up the process of *μανθάνειν*; but it has often purely point action, "ascertain": so in Ac 23²⁷, Gal 3², and frequently in the papyri. In other places moreover it describes a fully learnt lesson, and not the process of study. On Miss Purdie's principle this should be reserved for *καταμαθεῖν*, which occurs in Mt 6²⁸: both here and for *κατανοήσατε* in the Lucan parallel 12^{24. 27} the RV retains the durative "consider." It may however mean "understand,

take in this fact about." The NT use of *τελέω*, again, differs widely from that of Polybius, where the perfective compound (*συντ.*) greatly predominates: in NT the simplex outnumbers it fourfold. Moreover the aorist in the NT is always punctiliar ("finish"): only in Gal 5¹⁶ is the constative "perform" a possible alternative. *Ὀργισθῆναι* is another divergent, for instead of the perfective *διοργ.*, "fly into a rage," we six times have the simplex in the NT, where the constative aorist "be angry" never occurs.¹ Finally we note that *καθέζεσθαι* is always purely durative in NT ("sit," not "sit down," which is *καθίσει*), thus differing from Polybian use. A few additions might be made. Thus Lk 19¹³ has the simplex *πραγματεύεσθαι* "trade," with the perfective compound in v.¹⁵ *διεπραγματεύσαντο* "gained by trading." But the great majority of the *διά* compounds retain the full force of the *διά*.

**Provisional
Results.**

The net result of this comparison may perhaps be stated thus, provisionally: for anything like a decisive settlement we must wait for some *χαλκέντερος* grammarian who will toil right through the papyri and the *Κοινή* literature with a minuteness matching Miss Purdie's over her six books of Polybius—a task for which a year's holiday is a *condicio sine qua non*. The growth of the constative aorist was certainly a feature in the development of later Greek: its consequences will occupy us when we come to the consideration of the Tenses. But the disuse of the "point" aorist, ingressive or effective, and the preference of the perfective compound to express the same meaning, naturally varied much with the author. The general tendency may be admitted as proved; the extent of its working will depend on the personal equation. In the use of compound verbs, especially, we cannot expect the *negligé* style of ordinary conversation, or even the higher degree of elaboration to which Luke or the *auctor ad Hebræos* could rise, to come near the profusion of a literary man like Polybius.²

**Time and
Tense.**

Perhaps this brief account of recent researches, in a field hitherto almost untrodden by NT scholars, may suffice to prepare the

¹ Rev 11¹⁸ might mean "were angry," but the ingressive "waxed angry" (at the accession of the King) suits the context better.

² See p. 237.

way for the necessary attempt to place on a scientific basis the use of the tenses, a subject on which many of the most crucial questions of exegesis depend. It has been made clear that the notion of (present or past) *time* is not by any means the first thing we must think of in dealing with tenses. For our problems of *Aktionsart* it is a mere accident that *φεύγω* is (generally) present and *ἔφευγον*, *ἔφυγον*, and *φυγών* past: the main point we must settle is the distinction between *φευγ* and *φυγ* which is common to all their moods.

The Present:— On the Present stem, as normally denoting linear or durative action, not much more need now be said. The reader may be reminded of one idiom which comes out of the linear idea, the use of words like *πάλαι* with the present in a sense best expressed by our perfect. Thus in 2 Co 12¹⁹ “have you been thinking all this time?” or Jn 15²⁷, “you have been with me from the beginning.” So in MGr, *ἔξῆντα μῆνας σ’ἀγαπῶ* (Abbott 222). The durative present in such cases gathers up past and present time into one phrase. It must not be thought, however, that the durative meaning monopolises the present stem. In the prehistoric period only certain conjugations had linear action; and though later analogic processes mostly levelled the primitive diversity, there are still some survivals of importance. The punctiliar force is obvious in certain presents. Burton (*MT* 9) cites as “aoristic presents” such words as *παραγγέλλω* Ac 16¹⁸, *ἀφίενται* Mk 2⁵ (“are this moment forgiven,”—contr. *ἀφέωνται* Lk 5²³), *ἰᾶται* Ac 9³⁴, etc. So possibly *ἀφίομεν* Lk 11⁴, which has *ἀφήκαμεν* as its representative in Mt. But here it seems better to recognise the *iterative* present—“for we *habitually* forgive”: this is like the difference between Lk and Mt seen in their versions of the prayer for daily bread. (Cf also Lk 6³⁰.) Blass (p. 188) adds *ἀσπάζεται* as the correlative to the regular *ἀσπασαθε*. It is very possible that in the prehistoric period a distinct present existed for the strong aorist stem, such as Giles plausibly traces in *ἄρχεσθαι* compared with the durative *ἔρχεσθαι*.¹ The conjecture—which is necessarily unverifiable

¹ *Manual*² 482. The *ap* is like *pa* in *τραπεῖν* against *τρέπειν*, the familiar Greek representative of the original vocalic *r*.

—would sufficiently explain this verb's punctiliar action. But it may indeed be suspected that point and line action were both originally possible in present and aorist-stem formations which remained without formative prefix or suffix. On this assumption, analogical levelling was largely responsible for the durative character which belongs to most of the special conjugation stems of the present. But this is conjectural, and we need only observe that the punctiliar roots

denoting future time; which appear in the present stem have given rise to the use of the so-called present tense to denote future time.¹ In *ἀϋριον ἀποθνήσκωμεν* (1 Co 15³²) we have a verb in which the perfective prefix has neutralised the inceptive force of the suffix *-ίσκω*: it is only the obsolescence of the simplex which allows it ever to borrow a durative action. *Εἶμι* in Attic is a notable example of a punctiliar root used for a future in the present indicative. But though it is generally asserted that this use of present tense for future originates in the words with momentary action, this limitation does not appear in the NT examples, any more than in English. We can say, "I am going to London to-morrow" just as well as "I go": and *διέρχομαι* in 1 Co 16⁵, *γίνεται* in Mt 26², and other futural presents that may be paralleled from the vernacular of the papyri, have no lack of durativity about them. In this stage of Greek, as in our own language, we may define the futural present as differing from the future tense mainly in the tone of assurance which is imparted. That the Present is not primarily a *tense*, in the usual acceptation of the term, is

and past time; shown not only by the fact that it can stand for future time, but by its equally well-known use as a past. The "Historic" present is divided by Brugmann (*Gr. Gram.*³ 484 f.) into the "dramatic" and the "registering" present. The latter registers a date, with words like *γίνεται*, *τελευταῖα*, etc. I cannot recall a NT example, for Mt 2⁴ is not really parallel. The former, common in all vernaculars—we have only to overhear a servant girl's "so she says to me," if we

¹ Compare the close connexion between *aorist* (not present) subjunctive and the future, which is indeed in its history mainly a specialising of the former.

desiderate proof that the usage is at home among us—is abundantly represented in the NT.¹ From that mine of statistical wealth, Hawkins's *Horæ Synopticæ*, we find that Mk uses the historic present 151 times, Mt 93 times, Lk 8 times, with 13 in Ac; also that it is rare in the rest of the NT, except in Jn. But it is not true that it was "by no means common in Hellenistic Greek." Sir John Hawkins himself observes that it is common in Josephus and in Job: Mr Thackeray notes 145 exx. in 1 Sam alone—its rarity in LXX was only inferred from the absence of λέγει. That Luke invariably (except in 8⁴⁹) altered Mark's favourite usage means that it was too *familiar* for his liking. I have not catalogued the evidence of the papyri for this phenomenon, but it is common. OP 717 may be cited as a document contemporary with the NT, in which a whole string of presents does duty in narrative. It may be seen alternating with past tenses, as in the NT: cf the curious document Par P 51 (ii/B.C.), recording some extremely trivial dreams. Thus ἀνύγω . . . ὀρώ . . . κλαίγω . . . ἐπορευόμην . . . καὶ ἔρχομαι . . . ἔλεγον, etc. It was indeed a permanent element in prose narrative, whether colloquial or literary;² but it seems to have run much the same course as in English, where the historic present is not normally used in educated conversation or in literature as a narrative form. It carries a special effect of its own, which may be a favourite mannerism of a particular author, but entirely avoided by others. Applying this principle, we conceive that Josephus would use the tense as an imitator of the classics, Mark as a man of the people who heard it in daily use around him; while Luke would have Greek education enough to know that it was not common in cultured speech of his time, but not enough to recall the encouragement of classical writers whom he probably never read, and would not have imitated if he had read them. The limits of the historic present are well seen in the fact that it is absent from Homer, not because it was foreign to

¹ An instructive parallel for λέγει Ἰησοῦς, especially as in the Oxyrhynchus Logia, may be seen in Roman edicts. Thus *Syll.* 376 Καίσαρ (Nero) λέγει; ib. 656 (ii/A.D.—a proconsul); *OGIS* 665 (49 A.D.), etc.

² A peculiar use of the historic present is noticeable in MGr, where it frequently takes up a past tense: thus, ὁ Τσόλκας ἐξεσπάθωσε, κράζει τὰ παλληκάρια, "drew his sword and calls" (Abbott 44—see also 22, 26, etc.). See p. 139 n.

the old Achaian dialect, but because of its felt incongruity in epic style: it is absent from the *Nibelungenlied* in the same way.

The Moods of the present stem will be treated under their separate heads later. But there are two uses which should come in here, as bearing on the kind of action belonging to

Present and Aorist in Prohibitions: the tense-stem. The first concerns the two normal methods of expressing Prohibition in classical Greek, which survive in NT Greek, though less predominant than before. There

is a familiar rule that $\mu\eta$ is used with present imperative or aorist subjunctive; but the distinction between these, expounded by Gottfried Hermann long ago, seems to have been mostly unnoticed till it was rediscovered by Dr Walter Headlam in *CR* xvii. 295, who credits Dr Henry Jackson with supplying the hint. Dr Jackson himself contributes a brief but suggestive note in xviii. 262 f. (June 1904), and Dr Headlam then writes in full upon the subject in xix. 30-36, citing the dicta of Hermann from which the doctrine started, and rebutting some objections raised by Mr H. D. Naylor.* Dr Jackson's words may be cited as linking the beginning and end of the language-history, and proving incidentally that the alleged distinction must hold for the NT language, which lies midway. "Davidson told me that, when

in Modern Greek; he was learning modern Greek, he had been puzzled about the distinction, until he heard a Greek friend use the present imperative to

a dog which was barking. This gave him the clue. He turned to Plato's *Apology*, and immediately stumbled upon the excellent instances 20E $\mu\eta$ *θορυβήσητε*, before clamour begins, and 21A $\mu\eta$ *θορυβεῖτε*, when it has begun." The latter means in fact "desist from interrupting," the former "do not interrupt (in future)." Headlam shows how the present imperative often calls out the retort, "But I am not doing so," which the aorist locution never does: it would require "No, I will not." This is certainly the case in MGr, where $\mu\eta$ *γράφης* is addressed to a person who is already writing, $\mu\eta$ *γράψης* to one who has not begun. The

in Papyri; facts for classical and for present-day Greek may be supplemented from the four volumes of OP: we need not labour the proof of a canon which could hardly be invalid for a period lying between periods

* See p. 247.

in which it is known to have been in force. I have noted in OP six cases of μή c. aor. subj. referring to requests made in a letter, which of course cannot be attended to till the letter arrives. Thus μή ἀμελήσης, μή ἄλλως ποιήσης, ὄρα μηδενὶ . . . προσκρούσης, etc. (all ii/A.D.). One other (OP 744, i/B.C.) is worth quoting as a sample of such requests followed by a reply: εἶρηκας . . . ὅτι Μή με ἐπιλάθης. Πῶς δύναμαί σε ἐπιλαθεῖν; On the other hand, we have four cases of μή c. pres. imper., all clearly referable to the rule. Τοῦτο μὴ λέγε (what he had said)—μὴ ἀγωνία (bis) “don’t go on worrying”—μὴ σκλύλλε ἐατὴν ἐνπῆναι (sic!) “don’t bother to give information (??)”: in the last case (295—i/A.D.) the writer had apparently left school young, and we can only guess her meaning, but it may well be “stop troubling.” As we shall see, the crux is the differentia of the present imperative, which is not easy to illustrate decisively from the papyri. Hb P 56 (iii/B.C.) σὺ οὖν μὴ ἐνόχλει αὐτόν (as you are doing) is good. FP 112 (i/A.D.)—the only case there—is obscured by hiatus. The prevalence of reports and accounts in Tb P i. gives little opportunity for the construction; but in the royal edict Tb P 6 (ii/B.C.), we find καὶ μηθενὶ ἐπιτρέπετε καθ’ ὄντιν οὖν τρόπον πράσσειν τι τῶν προδεδηλωμένων, the conformity of which with the rule is suggested by the words “as we have before commanded,” with which the sentence apparently opens: a hiatus again causes difficulty. The frequency of these prohibitions in NT presents a very marked contrast and in NT. to the papyri, but the hortatory character of the writing accounts for this. The following table gives the statistics for μή with the 2nd person:—

	c. pres. imp.	c. aor. subj.
Mt.	12	29
Mk	8	9
Lk	27	19
Ac	5	4
Jn and Epp	19	1
Rev	3	5
Paul	47	8
Heb	5	5
Jas	7	2
1 Pet	1	2
	—	—
	134	84

We have included the cases where *μή* is preceded by *ὄρα* or the like. But sometimes this is not (as in the Gospels) a mere compound prohibition, like our "take care not to . . ." In Gal 5¹⁵ "take heed lest" can hardly be classed as a prohibition at all; while in Mk 1⁴⁴, *ὄρα μηδενὲ εἶπης*, there is virtual parataxis, *ὄρα* being only a sort of particle adding emphasis. The analysis of the list raises several suggestive points. In Mt we note that except 1²⁰ and 3⁹ all the examples are from sayings of Christ, 39 in all, while in Lk 32 are thus described (36 if we include a citation of four precepts from the Decalogue). Since Mt has 12 pres. to 27 aor., but Lk 21 to 11, we see that there was no sort of uniformity in translating from the Aramaic. There is no case where Mt and Lk have varied the tense while using the same word in reporting the same logion;¹ but we find Mt altering Mk in 24²³, manifestly for the better, if the canon is true. In Mk the balance is heavily inclined to the pres., for 5 out of 9 aor. examples are in the recitation of the commandments. In Jn there is only one aor., 3⁷, an exception the more curious in that *desine mirari* seems clearly the meaning; but see below. Paul uses the aor. even less than he appears to do, for Rom 10⁶ is a quotation, and Col 2²¹ *ter* virtually such: this leaves only 2 Th 3¹³, 1 Tim 5¹, 2 Tim 1⁸, with Gal 5¹⁵, on which see above. Heb has only two aorists (10³⁵ 12²⁵—the latter with *βλέπετε*), apart from a triple quotation 3⁸. 15 4⁷. The very marked predominance of the *μή ποίει* type is accordingly unbroken except in Mt, and in Rev. and 1 Pet so far as they go. In the NT as a whole the proportion is 61 p.c. to 39, which does not greatly differ from the 56 to 44 noted in the Attic Orators by Miller (*AJP* xiii. 423).

Passages
agreeing.

Before we proceed to draw our deductions from the canon thus applied to the NT, it will be well to present a few of the passages in which it obviously holds. In the following places the reply to the *μή ποίει* must clearly be either "I am not doing so" or "I will stop doing it":—Mk 5³⁶

¹ D uses *κωλύσῃ* in Lk 18¹⁶, where Mt and Mk, as well as the other MSS in Lk, have the much more appropriate present.

9⁸⁰ and parallels, Lk 7¹³ 8⁴⁰ 8⁵² (cf Mk τί κλαίετε;) 10²⁰ 11⁷ 14¹² 23²⁸, Jn 2¹⁶ 5¹⁴ 19²¹ 20^{17, 27}, Ac 10¹⁵ 18⁹ 20¹⁰, Rom 11^{18, 20} 14²⁰, 1 Co 7²⁷, 1 Tim 5²³, Jas 2¹, 1 Pet 4¹², Rev 5⁵. In the following, the *μη ποιήσης* would be answered with "I will avoid doing so":—Mt 6¹³ 10⁹ 17⁹, Mk 8²⁸ 9²⁵, Lk 6²⁹ 10⁴ (contrast the two prohibitions) 14⁸ 21⁸, Ac 7⁶⁰ 9³⁸ 16²⁸ 23²¹, 1 Tim 5¹, 2 Tim 1⁸, Rev 6⁶ 7⁸ 10⁴ (following *ἡμελλον γράφειν*—he had not begun).

Difficulties.

It must however be admitted that rather strong external pressure is needed to force the rule upon Paul. It is not merely that his usage is very one-sided. So is that of Jn, and yet (with the doubtful exception of 10³⁷) every present he uses fits the canon completely. But does *μη ἀμέλει* in 1 Tim 4¹⁴ require us to believe that Timothy *was* "neglecting" his "charism"—*μηδενὲ ἐπιτίθει* and *μηδὲ κοινώνει* in 5²², that he was warned to stop what he was hitherto guilty of? May we not rather say that *μη ἀμέλει* is equivalent to *πάντοτε μελέτα* or the like, a marked *durative*, with a similar account of *μηδὲ κοινώνει*? If we paraphrase the first clause in 5²² "always be deliberate in choosing your office-bearers," we see the *iterative*¹ force of the present coming in; and this we recognise again in typical passages like Lk 10⁷, Rom 6¹³, Eph 4²⁶, Heb 13⁹, 2 Jn¹⁰, 1 Jn 4¹. Then in 1 Co 14³⁹ how are we to imagine Paul bidding the Corinthians "desist from forbidding" the exercise of their darling charism? His *μη κωλύετε* means "do not discourage glossolaly, as after my previous words you might be inclined to do." In other words, we have the *conative*,¹ which is clearly needed also in such passages as Gal 5¹. *Μη ποιεῖ* accordingly needs various mental supplements, and not one only. It is "Stop doing," or "Do not (from time to time)," or "Do not (as you are in danger of doing)," or "Do not attempt to do." We are not justified in excluding, for the purposes of the present imperative in prohibitions, the various kinds of action which we find attached to the present stem elsewhere.

¹ See below, p. 128. In 1 Co *l.c.* we might also trace the iterative, if the meaning is "Do not repress glossolaly, whenever it breaks out." So Dr Findlay. Dr Abbott (*JG* 318 ff.) cites Mk 13²¹ against the "Do not persist" rule; and Mr Naylor points to the *ἐτι* required in 1 Ti 5²⁰.

But since the simple linear action is by far the commonest in the present stem, it naturally follows that *μὴ ποίει* usually means "stop doing," though (as Headlam admits, *CR* xix. 31) it does not always mean this. To account for such difficulties on the other side as *Jn* 3⁷, we may well pursue the quotation from the scholar who started us on this discussion. "*Μὴ δράσης* always, I believe, means *I warn you against doing this, I beseech you will not*; though this is sometimes used when the thing is being done; notably in certain cases which may be called colloquial or idiomatic, with an effect of impatience, *μὴ φροντίσης* *Oh, never mind!* *μὴ δείσης* *Never fear!* *μὴ θαυμάσης* *You mustn't be surprised.*"

Why Paul
prefers
μὴ ποίει.

One of my main motives in pursuing this long discussion has been to solve a question that has consequences for our Church History. What are we to infer when we find Paul bidding his converts *μὴ μεθύσκεσθε* (*Eph* 5¹⁸), *μὴ ψεύδεσθε* (*Col* 3⁹), or James changing the logion of *Mt* 5^{34, 36} into the suggestive present (5¹²)? What has been said will make it clear that such commands were very practical indeed,—that the apostles were not tilting at windmills, but uttering urgent warnings against sins which were sure to reappear in the Christian community, or were as yet only imperfectly expelled. The critics who make so much of lapses among Christian converts of the first generation in modern missions might have damned Paul's results with equal reason. Time has shown—time will show.¹

Present
Participle.

The second point in which we shall anticipate later discussion concerns the uses of the Participle. Like the rest of the verb, outside the indicative, it has properly no sense of time attaching to it: the linear action in a participle, connected with a finite verb in past or present time, partakes in the time of its principal. But when the participle is isolated by the addition of the article, its proper timelessness is free to come out. This can hardly happen with the aorist, where point action in such a connexion cannot well exist without the suggestion of past time: *ἡ τεκούσα* must be rendered "she who bore a child," not because *τεκούσα* is past in

¹ See p. 238.

time like ἔτεκε, but because the action is not in progress and therefore must be past. But ἡ τίκτουσα is common in tragedy (cf Gal 4²⁷) as a practical synonym of ἡ μήτηρ, the title of a continuous relationship. Winer (p. 444) gives a good selection of classical exx.: add from the papyri such as CPR 24 etc. (ii/A.D.) τοῖς γαμοῦσι, "the contracting parties," who are called οἱ γεγαμηκότες in a similar document, CPR 28 (ii/A.D.). So ὁ κλέπτων, Eph 4²⁸, is not "he who stole" or "he who steals," but simply "the stealer," differing from ὁ κλέπτης "the thief" only in being more closely associated with the verb κλεπτέτω which is coming. If the Baptist is called ὁ βαπτίζων (Mk 6^{14. 24}), "the baptiser," the phrase is less of a technical term than the noun, but is otherwise synonymous therewith. An agent-noun almost necessarily connotes linear action: there are only a few exceptions, like "murderer," "bankrupt," where the title is generally given in respect of an act committed in the past. Hence it coincides closely with the action of the present participle, which with the article (rarely without—see Kühner-Gerth i. 266) becomes virtually a noun. We return to the aorist participle later, and need not say more on the minute part of its field which might be connected with the subject of this paragraph. But it must be remarked that the principle of a timeless *present* participle needs very careful application, since alternative explanations are often possible, and grammar speaks to exegesis here with no decisive voice. In my *Introduction*² (p. 199) Mt 27⁴⁰, ὁ καταλύων τὸν ναόν, "the destroyer of the temple," was given as an ex. of a participle turned noun. But the *conative* force is not to be missed here: "you would-be destroyer" gives the meaning more exactly. Another ambiguous case may be quoted from Heb 10¹⁴: is τοὺς ἀγιαζομένους timeless, "the objects of sanctification," or iterative, "those who from time to time receive sanctification," or purely durative, "those who are in process of sanctification"? The last, involving a suggestive contrast with the perfect τετελείωκεν—telling (like the unique ἐστὲ σεσφισμένοι of Eph 2^{5. 8}) of a work which is finished on its Author's side, but progressively realised by its objects,—brings the tense into relation with the recurrent οἱ σφζόμενοι and οἱ ἀπολλύμενοι, in which durative action is conspicuous.

The examples will suffice to teach the importance of caution.

The Imperfect. We turn to the Imperfect, with which we enter the sphere of Tense proper, the idea of past time being definitely brought in by the presence of the augment. This particle—perhaps a demonstrative base in its origin, meaning “then”—is the only decisive mark of past or present time that the Indo-Germanic verb possesses, unless the final *-i* in primary tenses is rightly conjectured to have denoted present action in its prehistoric origin. Applied to the present stem, the augment throws linear action into the past; applied to the aorist, it does the same for punctiliar action. The resultant meaning is naturally various. We may have pictorial narrative, as contrasted with the summary given by the aorist. Thus the sculptor will sometimes sign his work *ὁ δέινα ἐποίηει*, sometimes *ἐποίησε*: the former lays the stress on the labour of production, the latter on the artist's name. When the difference is a matter of emphasis, we naturally find it sometimes evanescent. *Ἐφη*, imperfect in form, is aorist in meaning, because *φᾶ* is a punctiliar root. But *ἔλεγεν* often differs very little from *εἶπεν*—its pictorial character is largely rubbed off by time, and in MGr the two forms are mere equivalents. In words less worn the distinction can hardly ever be ignored. The categories to which we were alluding just now, in discussing the participle, are everywhere conspicuous in the imperfect indicative. Thus we have frequently the *iterative*, its graph (.....) instead of (—), describing past action that was repeated. Especially important, because more liable to be missed, is the *conative* imperfect, for which we might give the graph (—). Action going on implies the contingency of its failure to reach an end: our linear graph may either be produced beyond our vision, or reach a definite terminus in view (*κατήσθιον*, perfective, see above, p. 111), or stop abruptly *in vacuo*. How important this is for the NT may be seen from some of the passages in which the Revisers have earned our gratitude by their careful treatment of the Tenses, a specially strong point of their work. Ac 26¹¹ is a notable example: the AV commits Paul to the statement that he had actually forced weak Christians to renounce their Master

Now in itself *ἠνάγκαζον* might of course be "I repeatedly forced," the iterative imperfect just referred to. But the sudden abandonment of the aorist, used up to this point, gives a strong grammatical argument for the alternative "I tried to force," which is made certain by the whole tone of the Apostle in his retrospect: we cannot imagine him telling of such a success so calmly!^a Other typical exx. are Mt 3¹⁴, Lk 1⁵⁹, Ac 7²⁶, the RV being right in all: in Ac *l.c.* the AV curiously blundered into the right meaning by mistranslating a wrong text. (Their *συνήλασεν* would naturally mean that he "drove" them to shake hands! Did the translators (Tyndale and his successors) mistake this for *συνήλλασεν*, or did they consciously emend? The Vulgate *reconciliabat* may have encouraged them.) In Mk 9³⁸ the Revisers unfortunately corrected the text without altering the translation: it seems clear that the imperfect is conative, the man refusing to be stopped in his good work. So also in Heb 11¹⁷ *προσέφερεν* appears to be a conative imperfect, as the RV takes it: the contrast between the ideally accomplished sacrifice, as permanently recorded in Scripture (*προσενήνοχεν*), and the historic fact that the deed was not finished, makes an extremely strong case for this treatment of the word. I cannot therefore here agree with Thumb, who says that we expect an aorist, and suggests that *ἔφερον* had already begun to be felt as an aorist as in MGr *ἔφερα*, the aorist of *φέρνω* (*ThLZ* xxviii. 423). He cites no ancient parallel;¹ and of all NT writers the author of Heb is the least likely to start an innovation of this kind.^b (See p. 238.)

The Aorist:— In the Aorist indicative, as in the Imperfect, we have past time brought in by the use of the augment. To appreciate the essential character of aorist action, therefore, we must start with the other moods. The contrast of its point action with the linear of the present stem is well seen in *δός σήμερον* in Mt 6¹¹, against *δίδου τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν* in Lk 11³: cf also Mt 5⁴² *τῷ αἰτοῦντι δός*, but *παντὶ αἰτοῦντι δίδου* in Lk 6³⁰; and (with respective parts reversed) Mt 5¹² *χαίrete*, without note of time, but Lk 6²³ *χάρητε ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ*. The Imperative shows the contrast so well that we may add another example:^c Rom 6¹³ gives us present *παριστάνετε* (see pp. 122 ff.) and *παραστήσατε* to-

¹ *ἔφερε* in Hb P 45 might serve. So possibly Mk 11². [^a^b^c See p. 247.

gether in marked antithesis—the daily struggle, always ending in surrender, and the once-for-all surrender to God which brings deliverance. Note further the delicate *nuance* in Ac 15^{37f.}: Barnabas, with easy forgetfulness of risk, wishes *συν-παραλαβεῖν* Mark—Paul refuses *συνπαραλαμβάνειν*, to have with them day by day one who had shown himself unreliable. Examples are very numerous, and there are few of the finer shades of meaning which are more important to grasp, just because they usually defy translation. The three kinds of point action, Ingressive, Effective, and Constativ¹, are not

Classified. always easy to distinguish. Two or even three of them may be combined in one verb, as we saw above with *βαλεῖν* (p. 109); for of course this may be the summary of *βάλλειν* “throw,” as well as “let fly” and “hit”. In usage however nearly all verbs keep to one end or other of the action; though the marked growth of the constative enlarges the number of cases in which the whole action is comprised in one view. Thus from *βασιλεύειν* we have the ingressive aorist in *βασιλεύσας ἀναπαύσεται*, “having come to his throne he shall rest” (Agraphon, OP 654 and Clem. Al.), and the constative in Rev 20⁴ “they reigned a thousand years.” The ingressive especially belongs to verbs of state or condition (Goodwin *MT* 16).² For the effective aorist, we may compare durative *τελεῖν* “fulfil, bring to perfection” (2 Co 12⁹ “my power *is being perfected* in weakness”) with the aorist *τελέσαι* “finish” (Lk 2³⁹ etc.): for constative in Gal 5¹⁶ see above, p. 118.

The aorist participle raises various questions of its own, which must be considered here in so far as they concern the nature of aorist action. The connotation of past time has largely fastened on this participle, through the idiomatic use in which it stands before an aorist indicative to qualify its action. As point action is always completed action, except in the ingressive, the participle naturally came to involve

¹ We may express them by the graph A —→—B, denoting motion from A to B. A will be Ingressive, B Effective, and the Constativ^e would be the line reduced to a point by perspective. ² Thus *ἀποδημεῖν* = live abroad; *ἀπεδήμησεν* = went abroad, Lk 15¹³, Ll P 1 (iii/b.c.) with date of leaving.

past time relative to that of the main verb. Presumably this would happen less completely when the participle stood second. The assumption of past time must not however be regarded as a necessary or an accomplished process. In many cases, especially in the NT, the participle and the main verb denote *coincident* or *identical* action. So ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν Mt 22¹ etc.,¹ καλῶς ἐποίησας παραγενόμενος Ac 10³². The latter puts into the past a formula constantly recurring in the papyri: thus FP 121 (i/ii A.D.) εὐ ποιήσεις δούς "you will oblige me by giving"—*si dederis* in Latin. In Jn 11²³ we have εἰπούσα first for past action and then εἶπασα (BC*) for coincident: the changed form is suggestive, but is perhaps without conscious significance. One probable example of coincident action may be brought in here because of its inherent difficulty, though it belongs rather to lexicon than to grammar. The participle ἐπιβαλὼν (Mk 14⁷²)—which may well have been obscure even to Mt and Lk, who both dropped it—has now presented itself in the Ptolemaic papyrus Tb P 50, ἐπιβαλὼν συνέχωσεν τὰ ἐν τῇ ἐαυτοῦ γῆι μέρη τοῦ σημαινομένου ὑδραγωγοῦ, which I translate, "he set to and dammed up." It is true that in Tb P 13 ἐπιβολή means "embankment," as Dr Swete has pointed out to me.² But Dr F. G. Kenyon has since observed that if ἐπιβάλλω were here used of casting up earth, it would add nothing to συνέχωσεν alone. Moreover, since Mark's phrase has to be explained in any case, there is good reason for taking the word in the same sense in both places. Many versions either take this view of ἐπιβαλὼν (cf Euthymius' gloss ἀρξάμενος), or translate the paraphrase ἤρξατο found in D. Mt and Lk substitute the ingressive aorist ἔκλαυσεν. If this account is right, ἐπιβαλὼν is the aorist coincident with the first point of the linear ἔκλαιεν, and the compound phrase expresses with peculiar vividness both the initial paroxysm

¹ This phrase, except for Ac 19¹⁸ 25⁹, occurs in the Semitic atmosphere alone; so that we should look at the Hebrew קָרָא וַיִּשָּׁא, which suggested it through the medium of the LXX. (It is not Aramaic, Dalman thinks, *Words* 24 f.) The form of the Hebrew prompts Dr Findlay to suggest that ἀποκριθεὶς is *ingressive*, εἶπεν *consecutive* upon it. It is not fatal that ἀποκριθῆναι is generally *constative*. We should note here Ac 19², where the coincident aor. ptc. is doctrinally important: cf RV.

² See notes in *Expos* VI. vii. 118 and viii. 430

and its long continuance, which the easier but tamer word of the other evangelists fails to do.

There are even cases where the participle seems to involve *subsequent* action. Thus in that of Subsequent Action. Pindar *Pyth.* iv. 189 we have, "when the flower of his sailor-folk came down to Iolcos, Jason *mustered and thanked* them all (λέξατο ἐπαινήσας)." This is really *coincident* action, as Gildersleeve notes; but of course, had the poet felt bound to chronicle the exact order of proceedings, he would have put the muster first. I am strongly disposed to have recourse to this for the much-discussed ἀσπασάμενοι in Ac 25¹⁸, though Hort's suspicions of "prior corruption" induce timidity. It might seem more serious still that Blass (p. 197) pronounces "the reading of the majority of the MSS . . . not Greek,"¹ for Blass came as near to an Athenian *revenant* as any modern could hope to be. But when he says that the "accompanying circumstance . . . cannot yet be regarded as concluded," may we not reply that in that case Pindar's ἐπαινήσας equally needs emending? The effective aorist κατήνησαν is very different from a durative like ἐπορεύοντο, which could only have been followed by a word describing the purpose before them on their journey. But in "they arrived on a complimentary visit" I submit that the case is really one of *identical* action. The RV *text* gives the meaning adequately.² There are a good many NT passages in which exegesis has to decide between antecedent and coincident action, in places where the participle stands second: Heb 9¹² will serve as an example. It would take too much space

¹ Blass here slurs over the fact that *not one uncial* reads the future. The paraphrastic rendering of the Vulgate cannot count, and a reading supported by nothing better than the cursive 61 had better be called a conjecture outright. (Blass's misquotation κατήλθον, by the way, is not corrected in his second edition.) As little can I share his confidence that Jn 11² "is certainly an interpolation" (p. 198 n.). What difficulty is there in the explanation he quotes, "who *as is well known* did (or, has done) this"? (See p. 238.)

² We may quote an example from the vernacular: OP 530 (ii/A.D.) ἐξ ὧν δώσεις Σαραπίωνι τῷ φίλῳ . . . λυτρώσασά μου τὰ ἱμάτια δρ. ἑκατόν, "of which you will give 'my uncle' Sarapion 100 drachmæ and *redeem* my clothes." We should add that Dr Findlay would regard ὄσρ. in Ac 1.2. as denoting the *initial act* of κατήνησαν. See further p. 238.

to discuss adequately the alleged examples of *subsequent* action participles for which Ramsay pleads (*Paul*, p. 212), but a few comments must be ventured. In Ac 16⁶ (WH)—the first of a series of passages which Rackham (*Acts*, p. 184) regards as “decisive”—we really have nothing to show *when* the Divine monition was given. Assuming Ramsay’s itinerary correct, and supposing that the travellers realised the prohibition as far on as Pisidian Antioch, the aorist remains *coincident*, or even antecedent, for they had not yet crossed the Asian frontier. In 23³⁵ (and 22²⁴) it is entirely arbitrary to make assumptions as to the order of the items. The former is “he said . . ., meanwhile ordering him . . .,” which may perfectly well mean that Felix first told his soldiers where they were to take Paul, and then assured the prisoner of an early hearing, just before the guards led him away. In 22²⁴ Lysias presumably said in one sentence, “Bring him in and examine him.” In 17²⁶ the *ὀρίσας* is not “later” than the *ἐποίησεν* in time: the determination of man’s home *preceded* his creation, in the Divine plan. Rackham’s other “decisive” exx. are 24²², in which *εἶπας* and *διαταξάμενος* are items in the action described by *ἀνεβάλετο*; and 7³⁶, where the constative *ἐξήγαγεν* describes the Exodus as a whole. Rackham’s object is to justify the reading of *NBHLP al* in 12²⁵, by translating “they returned to J. and fulfilled their ministry and took with them John.” Now “returned . . . in fulfilment . . .” is a good coincident aorist and quite admissible. But to take *συνπαραλαβόντες* in this way involves an unblushing aorist of *subsequent* action, and this I must maintain has not yet been paralleled either in the NT or outside. Hort’s conjecture—*τὴν εἰς Ἰ. πληρώσαντες διακονίαν*—mends this passage best. The alternative is so flatly out of agreement with the normal use of the aorist participle that the possibility of it could only introduce serious confusion into the language. Prof. Ramsay’s appeal to Blass will not lie, I think, for any “subsequent action” use: we have already referred to the great grammarian’s *non possumus* for Ac 25¹³, which entirely bars his assent to any interpretation involving more than coincident action. All that he says on 23³⁵ is that *κελεύσας* = *ἐκέλευσέν τε*, which is not warrant for Ramsay’s inference

On the whole case, we may safely accept the vigorous statement of Schmiedel on Ac 16⁶ (*EB* ii. 1599): "It has to be maintained that the participle must contain, if not something antecedent to 'they went' (*διήλθον*), at least something synchronous with it, in no case a thing subsequent to it, if all the rules of grammar and all sure understanding of language are not to be given up."¹

**Timeless
Aorists.**

The careful study of the aorist participle will show surviving uses of its original timeless character, besides those we have noted already. Lk 10¹⁸ *ἐθεώρου* (durative) *τὸν Σατανᾶν . . . ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ πεσόντα*,—which is nearly like Aeschylus *PV* 956 f.,
οὐκ ἐκ τῶνδ' ἐγὼ [sc. περιγᾶμων]

δισσοὺς τυράννους ἐκπεσόντας ἤσθόμην,²

or Homer *Il.* vi. 284 (also, however, with aorist in the main verb),
εἰ κείνόν γε Φίδοιμι κατελθόντ' Ἄϊδος εἴσω—

belongs to a category of which many exx. are given by Goodwin *MT* § 148, in which the sense of past time does not appear: cf Monro *HG* 212, 401. "I watched him fall" will be the meaning, the aorist being constative: *πίπτοντα* "falling" (cf Vulg. *cadentem*) would have been much weaker, suggesting the possibility of recovery. The triumphant *ἔπεσεν ἔπεσεν* of Rev 18² (cf next page) is the same action. We need not stay to show the timelessness of the aorist in the imperative, subjunctive and infinitive: there never was any time connotation except when in reported speech an optative or infinitive aorist took the place of an indicative. Cases where an aorist indicative denotes present time, or even future, demand some attention. *Ἐβλήθη* in Jn 15⁶ is paralleled by the well-known classical idiom seen in Euripides *Alc.* 386, *ἀπωλόμην εἴ με λείψεις*, "I am undone if you leave me."^{3a} Similarly in *ἐξέστη*, Mk 3²¹, English again demands the perfect, "he has gone out of his mind." Jannaris *HG* § 1855 notes that this idiom survives in MGr. In Rom 14²³ an analogous use of the perfect may be seen. The difficult aorist of Mk 1¹¹ and parallels, *ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα*, is probably "on thee I have set the seal of my approval": literally "I set,"

¹ Ac 21¹⁴ may be rendered "we ceased, with the words . . ."

² Suggested by my friend Mr H. Bisseker.

³ See Giles, *Manual*² 499.

[^a See p. 247.

at a time which is not defined. None of these *exx.* are really in present time, for they only seem to be so through a difference in idiom between Greek and English. We have probably to do here with one of the most ancient uses of the aorist—the ordinary use in Sanskrit—expressing what has *just happened*:^a cf Mk 16⁶, Lk 7¹⁶ 14²⁰ 15³² 24³⁴, Jn 11⁴² 12¹⁹ 13¹ (ἤλαθεν) 13³¹ 21¹⁰, Rev 14⁸ 18², etc., and see p. 140.¹ In two other uses we employ the present, the “epistolary” (as Eph 6²²), and the so-called “gnomic” aorist. Goodwin (*MT* § 155) observes that the gnomic aorist and perfect “give a more vivid statement of general truths, by employing a distinct case or several distinct cases in the past to represent (as it were) all possible cases, and implying that what has occurred is likely to occur again under similar circumstances.” The present is much commoner than the aorist,² which generally (Goodwin § 157) refers to “a single or a sudden occurrence, while the present (as usual) implies duration.” The gnomic aorist survives in MGr (Jannaris *HG* § 1852), and need not have been denied by Winer for Jas 1¹¹ and 1 Pet 1²⁴: see Hort’s note on the latter. Jas 1²⁴ combines aor. and perf. in a simile, reminding us of the closely allied Homeric aorist in similes.

<p>English Rendering of Aorist Indicative.</p>	<p>This is not, however, the only usage in which the Greek has to be rendered in English idiom by what we call our Perfect Tense. Our English Past—historically a syncretic tense, mostly built on the Perfect—is essentially a <i>definite</i> tense, connoting always some point or period of time at which the action occurred. But in Greek this is not necessarily involved at all. Idiomatically we use the past in pure narrative, where the framework of the story implies the continuous dating of the events; and though the Greek aorist has not this implication, we may regard the tenses as equivalent in practice. But outside narrative we use the periphrastic <i>have</i> tense as an</p>
--	---

¹ In classical Greek we may find an aorist of this kind used with a sequence which would naturally suggest a foregoing perfect, as Euripides, *Medea*, 213 f.: ἐξήλαθον δόμων μή μοι τι μέμνησθ'. See Verrall's note.

² In the important article quoted below (p. 247, additional note upon p. 115), Prof. Thumb observes that the perfectivising preposition enabled a present or imperfect to replace the gnomic aorist in similes. [° See p. 247.

indefinite past; and it thus becomes the inevitable representative of the Greek aorist when no time is clearly designed: e.g. 1 Co 15⁶ *τινὲς ἐκοιμήθησαν*, "fell asleep (at various times)," and so "have fallen asleep." This has two unfortunate results. We have to decide for ourselves whether a Greek aorist refers to definite or indefinite time—often no easy task. And we have to recognise that our own perfect is ambiguous: it is not only the genuine Perfect, describing action in the past with continuance into present time, but also the simple indefinite Past. As Dr J. A. Robinson says (*Gospels*, p. 107), on *ἔκρυψας* and *ἀπεκάλυψας* in Mt 11²⁵: "If we render, 'Thou didst hide . . . Thou didst reveal,' . . . our minds are set to search for some specially appropriate moment to which reference may be made. The familiar rendering, 'Thou hast hid . . . Thou hast revealed,' expresses the sense of the Greek far more closely, though we are using what we call a 'perfect.' The fact needs to be recognised that our simple past and our perfect tense do not exactly coincide in meaning with the Greek aorist and perfect respectively. The translation of the aorist into English must be determined partly by the context and partly by considerations of euphony."¹ The use of the English perfect to render the aorist evidently needs careful guarding, lest the impression of a true perfect be produced. Take for example Rom 1⁵. The AV "we have received" decidedly rings as a perfect: it means "I received originally and still possess." This lays the emphasis on the wrong element, for Paul clearly means that when he did receive a gift of grace and a commission from God, it was *through Christ* he received it. This is not an indefinite aorist at all. If a man says to his friend, "Through you I got a chance in life," we should never question the idiom: "have got" would convey a distinct meaning. Among the paraphrasers of Rom, Moffatt

¹ This thesis was elaborately worked out by Dr R. F. Weymouth in a pamphlet, *On the Rendering into English of the Greek Aorist and Perfect* (1890: since in 2nd ed.). His posthumous *NT in Modern Speech* was intended to give effect to the thesis of the pamphlet. Weymouth's argument is damaged by some not very wise language about the RV; but in this one point it may be admitted that the Revisers' principles were (very rarely) applied in rather too rigid a manner. See however pp. 137 ff.

and the *Twentieth Century NT* rightly give the past tense here with the RV: Rutherford, Way and Weymouth less accurately give the perfect. The limitations of our idiom are evident in the contrasted tenses of Mk 16⁶ and 1 Co 15⁴. 'Ἠγέρθη states simply the past complete fact, the astounding news of what had just happened—see above on this use of the aorist. 'Εγγύερται sets forth with the utmost possible emphasis the abiding results of the event, which supply the main thought of the whole passage. But "He is risen" is the only possible translation for the former; while in the latter, since a definite time is named, our usage rather rebels against the perfect which the sense so strongly demands. We must either sacrifice this central thought with the AV and the free translators, who had a chance that was denied to the literal versions, or we must frankly venture on "translation English" with the RV: to fit our idiom we might detach the note of time and say "that he hath been raised—raised on the third day, according to the scriptures."

The subject of the rendering of the Greek aorist is so important that no apology is needed for an extended enquiry. We will examine the usage of AV and RV in Mt, which will serve as a typical book. If my count is right, there are 65 indicative aorists in Mt which are rendered by both AV and RV alike with the English perfect,¹ or in a few cases the present; while in 41 the AV is deserted by the RV for the simple past.² These figures alone are enough to dispose of any wholesale criticism. In 11 of the 41 Weymouth himself uses the past in his free translation. His criticism therefore touches between a quarter and a third of the

¹ Including 6¹², where the AV would certainly have translated ἀφῆκαμεν as the RV has done. In a private memorial which was sent to the Revisers by an unnamed colleague, before their final revision, it is stated that out of nearly 200 places in the Gospels where the aorist was rendered by the English perfect, the Revisers had only followed the AV in 66. The figures above for Mt show that the appeal took effect; but in Jn 17, which is specially named, the 21 exx. remain in the published text. That the majority were right there, I cannot doubt: the English perfect in that chapter obscures a special feature of the great prayer, the tone of detachment with which the Lord contemplates His earthly life as a period lying in the past.

² One passage, 18¹¹, is only in RVmg.

passages which come under our notice in Mt. From which we may fairly infer that the Revisers' English was, after all, not quite as black as it was painted. In examining the material, we will assume in the first instance that the aorist is rightly rendered by our perfect (or present) in all the places where AV and RV agree. (This is only assumed for the sake of argument, as will be seen below.) Our first task then is with the 41 passages in which there is a difference. Of these Weymouth's own translation justifies 2¹⁵ (a very *definite* aor.—see Hos 11¹) 5^{31. 33. 33. 43} (here AV was misled by its wrong translation of τοῖς ἀρχαίοις—it is right in vv.^{21. 27}) 10^{34L}. (AV *came* in one of the three) 17¹² 21⁴² 25^{40 bis}. We may further deduct 21¹⁶ as justified by the AV in v.⁴², and 25^{24. 26} as on all fours with the past "I sowed." It remains to discuss the legitimacy of the English past in the rest of the exx. Our test shall be sought in idiomatic sentences, constructed so as to carry the same grammatical conditions: they are purposely assimilated to the colloquial idiom, and are therefore generally made parallel in grammar only to the passages they illustrate. In each case the preterite tacitly implies a definite occasion; and the parallel will show that this implication is at least a natural understanding of the Greek. Where the perfect is equally idiomatic, we may infer that the Greek is indeterminate. Taking them as they come, 2² εἶδομεν seems to me clearly *definite*: "I saw the news in the paper and came off at once." 3⁷ ὑπέδειξεν: "has warned" may be justified, but "Who told you that?" is presumably English. We may put together 5¹⁷ 10^{34L} (ἦλθον) 15²⁴ (ἀπεστάλην). As we have seen, the AV and Weymouth use the past in one of these passages, and they are all on the same footing. "I came for business, not for pleasure" is good enough English, even if "have come" is likewise correct and not very different. Or compare Shakspeare's

"Why came I hither but for that intent?"

In 7²² (ἐπροφητεύσαμεν, ἐξεβάλομεν, ἐποιήσαμεν) the perfect would be unobjectionable, but the past is quite idiomatic: cf such a sentence as "Now then—didn't I make speeches all over the country? Didn't I subscribe liberally to the

party funds?" 10⁸ (ἐλάβετε): cf "What do you expect? You paid nothing: you get nothing." 11¹⁷ (ἠύλισαμεν, etc.): cf "There's no pleasing you. I made small talk, and you were bored: I gave you a lecture, and you went to sleep." 11²⁵ (ἀπέκρυψας, ἀπεκάλυψας—see above): cf "I am very glad you kept me in the dark, and told my friend." 13¹⁷ (ἐπεθύμησαν, εἶδον, ἤκουσαν): here no better justification is needed than Watts's

"How blessed are our ears
That hear this joyful sound,
Which kings and prophets waited for,
And sought, but never found."

13⁴⁴ (ἔκρυψε): the aorist is almost gnomic, like Jas 1²⁴, but it would be wrong to obliterate the difference between the aorist and the present (historic) which follows.¹ 15¹⁸ ἐφύτευσεν): cf "Every movement which you didn't start is wrong." 16⁷ (ἐλάβομεν): cf "I brought no money away with me." 19¹² (εὐνούχισαν) is to my mind the only decided exception. Unless Origen's exegesis was right, the third verb does not refer to a single event like the other two, except so far as may concern a moment of renunciation in the past: the perfect therefore would perhaps be less misleading, despite apparent inconsistency. 21²⁰ (ἐξηράνθη): cf "How on earth did that happen?" (AV wrongly joins πῶς and παραχρῆμα.) 21⁴² (ἐγενήθη—for ἐγένετο see p. 138) is ambiguous: if it is the aorist of an event just completed, the AV is right, but this may well be pure narrative. 28¹⁶ (διεφημίσθη): here the added words "[and continueth]" leave the verb to be a narrative aorist. Finally 28²⁰ (ἐνετελάμην) is obviously idiomatic: cf "Mind you attend to everything I told you." In all these passages then, with one possible exception, the simple past is proved to be entirely idiomatic; and if this is allowed, we may freely concede the perfect as permissible in several cases, and occasionally perhaps preferable.

Let us go back for a moment to our lists for Mt, to

¹ For this idiom see p. 121 n. above. Wellhausen, on Mk 7²⁸ (*Einl.* 16), makes it an Aramaism. In view of the MGR usage, we can only accept this with the proviso that it be counted good vernacular Greek as well.

draw some inferences as to the meaning of the aorist where simple narrative, and the reference to a specific time, are mostly excluded. Parenthetically, we might strike out a few of the passages in which AV and RV agree on the English perfect. 13²⁸ is not indefinite: "You did that" is quite as correct as "You have done it," and seems to me more suitable where the emphasis is to lie on the subject. In 19⁶ *συνέζευξεν* carries the thought immediately and obviously to the wedding day: "those whom God *joined* together" is on this view preferable. Similarly *ἀφήκαμεν* (-*κεν*) in 19^{27, 29} calls up unmistakably the day of the sacrifice. In 20⁷ we cannot object to rendering "has hired"; but it may be observed that "nobody asked you" is not exactly a Græcism. And surely *ἡμαρτον παραδούς* (27⁴) is definite enough—"I sinned when I betrayed"? We may end this section by putting together the exx. of two important categories. Under the head of "things just happened" come 9¹⁸ *ἔτελεύτησεν* (with *ἄρτι*); 5²⁸ *ἐμοίχευσεν* and 14¹⁵ *παρήλθεν* and 17¹² *ἦλθε* (with *ἤδη*); 6¹² *ἀφήκαμεν*, 12²⁸ *ἔφθασεν*, 14² etc. *ἠγέρθη*, 16¹⁷ *ἀπεκάλυψε*, 18¹⁵ *ἐκέρδησας*, 20¹² *ἐποίησαν* -*ας*, 26¹⁰ *ἠργάσατε* 26¹³ *ἐποίησε*, 26⁶⁵ *ἐβλασφήμησεν*, *ἠκούσατε*, 26^{25, 64} *εἶπας*, 27¹⁹ *ἔπαθον*, 27⁴⁶ *ἐγκατέλιπες*, 28⁷ *εἶπον*, 28¹⁸ *ἔδότη* (unless 11²⁷ forbids), and perhaps 21⁴² *ἐγενήθη*. Some of these may of course be otherwise explained. If they rightly belong to this heading, the English perfect is the correct rendering. Equally tied to the *have* tense are the aorists of indefinite time-reference; but we must be ready to substitute our preterite as soon as we see reason to believe that the time of occurrence is at all prominently before the writer's mind. Clear examples of this are 5²¹ etc. *ἠκούσατε*, 8¹⁰ *εὔρον*, 10²⁵ *ἐπεκάλεσαν*, 12⁸ etc. *ἀνέγνωτε* (*οὐδέποτε* in 21¹⁶ brings in the note of time: cf Shakspeare, "Why dost thou wrong her that *did* ne'er wrong thee?"), 13¹⁵ *ἐπαχύνθη* etc., 15⁶ *ἠκυρώσατε*, 13²⁴ 18²³ 22² *ὠμοιώθη* (probably because the working out of the comparison included action partially past: Zahn compares Jn 3¹⁹), 21¹⁶ *κατηρτίσω*, 23²³ *ἀφήκατε*, 24⁴⁵ *κατέστησεν*, 25^{20, 22} *ἐκέρδησα*, 27²³ *ἐποίησε*.

The Perfect;— Our study of the English periphrastic perfect prepares us for taking up the most important, exegetically, of all the Greek Tenses. In Greek, as in

English, the line between aorist and perfect is not always easy to draw. The aorist of the event just passed has inherently that note of close connexion between past and present which is the differentia of the Greek perfect; while the perfect was increasingly used, as the language grew older, as a substitute for what would formerly have been a narrative aorist. A cursory reading of the papyri soon shows us how much more the vernacular tends to use this tense; and the inference might be drawn that the old distinction of aorist and perfect was already obsolete. This would however be entirely unwarrantable. There are extremely few passages in the papyri of the earlier centuries A.D. in which an aoristic perfect is demanded, or even suggested, by the context. It is simply that a preference grows in popular speech for the expression which links the past act with present consequences.^a

**Used in place
of Aorist.**

example from the prince of Attic writers will show that this is not only a feature of late Greek. Near the beginning of Plato's *Crito*, Socrates explains his reason for believing that he would not die till the third day. "This I infer," he says in Jowett's English, "from a vision which I *had* last night, or rather only just now." The Greek, however, is *τεκμαίρομαι ἔκ τινος ἐνυπνίου, ὃ ἑώρακα ὀλίγον πρότερον ταύτης τῆς νυκτός*, where point of time in the past would have made *εἶδον* as inevitable as the aorist is in English, had not Socrates meant to emphasise the present vividness of the vision. It is for exactly the same reason that *ἐγγήγερται* is used with the point of time in 1 Co 15⁴ (see above). So long as the close connexion of the past and the present is maintained, there is no difficulty whatever in adding the note of time. So in Rom 16⁷ we have to say either "who were in Christ before me," or (much better) "who have been in Christ longer than I." A typical parallel from the papyri may be seen in OP 477 (ii/A.D.) *τῶν τὸ πέμπτον ἔτος . . . ἐφηβευκότων*—a fusion of "who came of age *in*" and "who have been of age *since* the fifth year." Now, if the tendency just described grew beyond a certain limit, the fusion of aorist and perfect would be complete. But it must be observed that it was not the perfect which survived in the struggle for existence. In MGr the old perfect forms only survive in the passive participle (with reduplication syllable

^a See pp. 247 f.

lost), and in the *-κα* which was tacked on to the aorist passive (*ἐδέθηκα* for *ἐδέθην*): there is also the isolated *εὔρηκα* or *βρήκα* (Thumb, *Handb.* 94), aoristic in meaning. It does not appear that the perfect had at all superseded the aorist—though in a fair way to do so—at the epoch when it was itself attacked by the weakening of reduplication which destroyed all chance of its survival as a distinct form, in

Ultimate decay of the Perfect. competition with the simpler formation of the aorist. But these processes do not fairly set in for at least two centuries after the

NT was complete. It is true that the LXX and inscriptions show a few examples of a semi-aoristic perfect in the pre-Roman age, which, as Thumb remarks (*Hellenismus*, p. 153), disposes of the idea that Latin influence was working; cf Jannaris, § 1872. But it is easy to overstate their number.^a Thus in Ex 32¹ *κεχρόνικε* is not really aoristic (as Thumb and Jannaris), for it would be wholly irregular to put an aorist in *oratio obliqua* to represent the original present or perfect “Moses is tarrying” or “has tarried”: its analogue is rather the *χρονίζει* of Mt 24⁴⁸. Nor will it do to cite the perfects in Heb 11¹⁷ *αἰ* (see pp. 129, 143 ff.), where the use of this tense to describe what “stands written” in Scripture is a marked feature of the author’s style:^b cf Plato, *Apol.* 28C, *ἄσοι ἐν Τροίᾳ τετελευτήκασιν*, as written in the Athenians’ “Bible.” In fact Mt 13⁴⁶ *πέπρακεν καὶ ἠγόρασεν* is the only NT example cited by Jannaris which makes any impression. (I may quote in illustration of this OP 482 (ii/A.D.) *χωρὶς ὧν ἀπεγραφάμην καὶ πέπρακα*.) The distinction is very clearly seen in papyri for some centuries. Thus *τῆς γενομένης καὶ ἀποπεπεμμένης γυναικός* NP 19 (ii/A.D.), “who was my wife and is now divorced”; *ὄλον τὸν χαλκὸν [δεδα]πάνηκα εἰς αὐτῷ* BU 814 (iii/A.D.), where an erased *ἐ-* shows that the scribe meant to write the aorist and then substituted the more appropriate perfect. As may be expected, illiterate documents show

Perfect and Aorist used together.

confusion most: e.g. OP 528 (ii/A.D.) *οὐκ ἐλουσάμην οὐκ ἤλιμε* (= *ἤλειμμαί*) *μέχρι εἰς Ἀθύρ*.

It is in the combinations of aorist and perfect that we naturally look first for the weakening of the distinction, but even there it often appears clearly drawn. At the same time, we may find a writer like Justin

^{a b} See p. 248.

Martyr guilty of confusion, as in *Apol.* i. 22 *πεποικέναι . . . ἀνεγείραι*, 32 *ἐκάθισε καὶ εἰσελήλυθεν*, 44 *νοῆσαι δεδύνηνται καὶ ἐξηγήσαντο*. Other aoristic perfects may be seen in 60 *ἐξήλθον . . . καὶ γεγόνασι*, 62 *ἀκήκοε . . . καὶ . . . ἔλαβε*, ii. 2 *πεποίηκε . . . καὶ . . . ἐκολάσατο*, etc. We may compare from the LXX such a mixture as Is 53⁵ *ἐτραυματίσθη . . . μεμαλάκισται* (aor. in A). The NT is not entirely free from such cases: cf Mt 13⁴⁶ (above). In Jn 3³² *ἔώρακεν* and *ἤκουσεν*—contrast 1 Jn 1³—is explained by Blass as due to the greater stress laid on the *seeing*. Mk 5¹⁹ *ὅσα . . . σοι πεποίηκεν καὶ ἠλέησέν σε* shows the proper force of both tenses. In Lk 4¹⁸ it seems best, with Nestle and Wellhausen, to put a stop after *ἔχρισέ με*, so that *ἀπέσταλκε* is the governing verb of all the infinitives, and is not parallel with *ἔχρισε*. Ac 21²⁸, *εἰσήγαγεν καὶ κεκοίνωκεν*, needs no explaining. To Rev 3⁵ 5⁷ and 8⁵ we must return later. There are other places where aorist and perfect are used in the same context, but they do not belong to this category of aorist and perfect joined with *καί* and with identical subject. When the nexus is so close, we might fairly suppose it possible for the tenses to be contaminated by the association, even where a perfect would not have been used aoristically by itself. But there are evidently no NT exx. to place by the side of those from Justin, except Mt 13⁴⁶ and the passages from Rev. (See further p. 238.)

We come then to the general question of Aoristic Perfects in NT? the existence of aoristic perfects in the NT.

It is a question which must be settled on its merits, without any appeal to the *a priori*, for aoristic perfects may certainly be found in and even before the epoch of the NT writings. We are entirely at liberty to recognise such perfects in one writer and deny them to another, or to allow them for certain verbs and negative the class as a whole. Among the authorities we find Blass (p. 200) admitting them for Rev and most sparingly in other places. Even less concession is made by W. F. Moulton (WM 340 n.). Burton (*MT* 44) allows rather more, but says, "The idiom is confined to narrow limits in the NT." The extremely small proportion of even possible exx. will naturally prevent us from accepting any except under very clear necessity. We begin by ruling out the alleged exx. from Heb (7¹⁸ 9¹⁸ 11¹⁷

11²⁸), since they are obviously covered by the author's *usus loquendi* described above (p. 142). Some isolated cases may also be cleared out of the way. Lk 9³⁶ *ἑώρακαν* seems to be virtually reported speech: *ἃ ἑώρακαμεν* takes this form regularly in *orat. obl.*, which the form of this sentence suggests. In Jas 1²⁴, *κατενόησεν καὶ ἀπελήλυθεν καὶ εὐθέως ἐπελάθετο*, the aorist expresses two momentary acts, which are thrown into narrative form, and the perfect accurately describes the one action with continuance.¹ In Ac 7³⁵, *ἀπέσταλκεν*, with the forest of aorists all round, is more plausibly conformed to them, and it happens that this word is alleged to have aoristic force elsewhere. But, after all, the abiding results of Moses' mission formed a thought never absent from a Jew's mind. Then there is an important category in which we are liable to be misled by an unreal parallelism in English. Burton rightly objects to our deciding the case of *νυχθήμερον ἐν τῷ βυθῷ πεποίηκα* (2 Co 11²⁵) by the easy comment that it "goes quite naturally into English" (Simcox). But it does not follow that we have here a mere equivalent for *ἐποίησα*. That would only place the experience on a level with the others: this recalls it as a memory specially vivid now. There is in fact a perfect of broken as well as of unbroken continuity: in the graph "*^...>...^B*," which leads from a past moment to the moment of speech, the perfect will tolerate the company of adjuncts that fasten attention on the initial point (as in Rom 16⁷, above) or on some indeterminate point in its course (as here), or on several points in its course. Cf Lucian *Pisc.* 6 *ποῦ γὰρ ἐγὼ ὑμᾶς ὕβρικα;*—Plato *Theæt.* 144B *ἀκήκοα μὲν τοῦνομα, μνημονεύω δ' οὗ* (see Goodwin *MT* § 46)—BU 163 (ii/A.D.) *φασὶ οἱ παρόντες ἐκείνον μᾶλλον* (? "often") *τοῦτο πεποιηκέναι, καὶ γὰρ ἄλλοι ὡς πληγέντες ὑπὸ αὐτοῦ ἀναφόριον δεδώκασιν*—EP 11 (222 B.C.) *πλεονάκεις γεγράφαμεν*. To this category belong perfects with *πώποτε*, as Jn 1¹⁸ 5³⁷ 8³³, and such cases as 2 Co 12¹⁷, *ὧν ἀπέσταλκα*, "of those whom (from time to time) I have sent." The aorist is obviously much commoner; but the perfect may still be used to express a close nexus with present time.

We turn finally to the residuum of genuinely aoristic

¹ Cf *Syll.* 807¹⁷ (ii/A.D.) *καὶ ἀνέβλεψεν καὶ ἐλήλυθεν καὶ ἠχαρίστησεν δημοσίῳ τῷ θεῷ* (sc. Asclepius).

perfects, or those which have a fair claim to be thus regarded. First, we may frankly yield those alleged for Rev, viz. 5⁷

In Rev. and 8⁵ εἴληφεν (and by consequence probably 3³ 11¹⁷ and 2²⁷), 7¹⁴ and 19⁸ εἶρηκα (-αν).

Since these are without apparent reduplication, they may well have been actual aorists in the writer's view: Bousset remarks how little Rev uses ἔλαβον. Secondly, we have

*Εσχηκα. ἔσχηκα in 2 Co 2¹³ 1⁹ 7⁵, Rom 5^{2a}—outside Paul only in Mk 5¹⁵. We must, I think,

treat all the Pauline passages alike, though Blass believes the perfect justifiable except in 2 Co 2¹³. It seems clear that an aorist would suit all passages in 2 Co; and in the first of them it seems hopeless to squeeze a natural perfect force into the Greek:¹ an aorist would suit Mk *l.c.* perfectly, but that matters less. Now, if we may take them together, we can see an excellent reason why ἔσχηκα should have been used as an aorist. There is no Greek for *possessed*, the constative aorist, since ἔσχον is almost (if not quite) exclusively used for the ingressive *got, received*.^b *Εσχον occurs only 20 times in the NT, which is about 3 per cent. of the whole record of ἔχω. There is not one place where ἔσχον *must* be constative: Jn 4¹⁸ may be rendered "thou hast espoused"—as in Mk 12²³, the forming of the tie is the point. The NT does not contravene Dr Adam's dictum (p. 49 of his notes on Plato's *Apology*) that "the aorist means *got, acquired*, not *had*." The similarity of ἔσχηκα to the aorists ἔθηκα and ἀφήκα gave a clear opening for its appropriation to this purpose, and the translation "possessed" will generally suit the case. We thus get in the required aoristic perfects in Rev and in Paul without sacrificing a principle. Passing over πέπρακα (Mt 13⁴⁶), where the absence of an aorist from the same root may have something to do with the usage, we

Πέπρακα.
Γέγονα.

come to the perplexing case of γέγονα. Its affinities would naturally be with the present, and there seems small reason for letting it do the work of the common ἐγενόμην. Yet even Josephus

¹ Plummer (*CGT in loc.*) says, "As in 1⁹, the perfect shows how vividly he recalls the feelings of that trying time": so Findlay. This means applying what is said above on *πειπίηκα* in 2 Co 11²⁵. But is this natural, when the coming of Titus with good news had produced *ἀνεις* so complete? (See p. 238.)

^{a b} See p. 248.

(c. *Apion*. i. 21) has ὀλίγω πρότερον τῆς Πεισιστράτου τυραννίδος ἀνθρώπου γεγονότος, "who flourished a little before P." From the papyri we may cite two exx. (both from ii/A.D.). OP 478, "I declare that my son . . . has reached (προσβεβηκέναι) the age of 13 in the past 16th year of Hadrian . . . and that his father was (γεγονέναι) an inhabitant . . . and is now dead (τετελευτηκέναι)." BU 136 διαβεβαιουμένου τοῦ Π. μὴ γεγονέναι τὸν πατέρα τῆς ἐκδικουμένης ὀνηλάτην. Now there are not a few NT passages in which it is far from easy to trace the distinct perfect force of γέγονα, and exx. like those above make it seem useless to try. But aoristic sense is not really *proved* for any of the 45 NT passages in which γέγονα (indic.) occurs, and in the great majority it has obviously present time. Lk 10³⁶ and Jn 6²⁵ are unpromising for our thesis. But the first has the vivid present of story-telling—"seems to have shown himself neighbour." The second—inevitably translated "when *camest* thou hither?"—is only another instance of the perfect with point of time, dealt with already: it is the combination of "when *did* you come?" and "how long *have* you been here?" The aoristic use of γέγονα is said by Burton to be general in Mt: Blass only admits it in 25⁶. Even this last is more like a historic present. The remaining passages mostly belong to the formula which tells us that the abiding significance of an event lies in its having been anticipated in prophecy. In general, it would appear that we can only admit a case of the kind with the utmost caution. K. Buresch, in his valuable article "Γέγοναν" (*RhM* 1891, pp. 193 ff.), noting an example of aoristic γεγόνασι in Plato (?) *Alcib.* 124A,¹ observes that this is never found in Greek that is at all respectable. In later Greek, he proceeds, the use of γέγονα greatly increases. "It has present force always where it denotes a state of rest, preterite force where it denotes becoming. Hence in innumerable cases it is quite an equivalent of εἰμί, as with *exstisti*, *factus* or *natus sum*, *veni*, etc." (p. 231 n.). It may be doubted however whether this canon will adequately account for the exx. from Josephus and the papyri with which we began.²

Since the earliest period of Greek, certain perfects pos-

¹ But see p. 238. ² Note γέγονα there is *constative*: ἐγενόμην is mostly *ingressive*.

sessed a present meaning, depending upon the mode of action belonging to the root, and on that exhibited in the present. Thus the markedly conative present

Perfects with Present Force. *πειθω*, "apply persuasion," with its new perfect

πέπεικα and aorist *ἔπεισα* to match, kept its ancient perfect *πέποιθα*, which is intransitive (like most early perfects—see below, p. 154), with meaning *I trust*. Monro's account of the Perfect in its Homeric stage of development may be quoted: "If we compare the meaning of any Perfect with that of the corresponding Aorist or Present, we shall usually find that the Perfect denotes a permanent *state*, the Aor. or Pres. an *action* which brings about or constitutes that state. Thus, . . . *ᾠλετο was lost, ὄλωλε is undone*. . . . Thus the so-called *Perfecta præsentia*, . . . *ἔσθηκα, . . . μέμνημαι, πέποιθι, οἶδα, ἔοικα, κέκτημαι, etc.*, are merely the commonest instances of the rule. . . . Verbs expressing sustained sounds . . . are usually in the Perfect" (*HG* 31). This last remark explains *κέκραγα*, which has survived in Hellenistic, as the LXX seems to show decisively. W. F. Moulton (*WM* 342 n.) says, "In *Jn* 1¹⁵ *hath cried* seems the more probable meaning," observing that the pres. *κράζω* is rare in classical writers. It is common in NT, a fact which probably weighed with him in making *κέκραγεν* a normal perfect. But the LXX, when exx. are so numerous and well distributed, must certainly count as evidence for the vernacular here; and when we find *κέκραγα* 14 times, sometimes indisputably present, and never I think even probably perfect—cf esp. *Ps* 141(140)¹ *πρὸς σέ ἐκέκραξα . . . πρόσχες τῇ φωνῇ τῆς δεήσεώς μου ἐν τῷ κεκραγῆναι με πρὸς σέ* (Heb. *אָרָאָה*); and *Job* 30²⁰, where *κέκραγα* translates the impf. *אָרָאָה* —, it is difficult to suppose the word used as a true perfect in NT. It has not however been "borrowed from the literary language in place of the Hellenistic *κράζει*" (*Blass* 198). *Κράζω* has its own distinction as a durative—cf *Ps* 32(31)³ *ἀπὸ τοῦ κράζειν με ὄλην τὴν ἡμέραν*; and *κέκραγα*, with *κεκράξομαι* and *ἐκέκραξα*, may well have been differentiated as expressing a single cry. In any case we cannot treat the LXX as evidence for the literary character of the survival. One may doubt the necessity of putting *ἤλπικα* and *πέπεισμαι* into this category; but *τέθνηκα*

naturally belongs to it; and *ἤγγημαι* in Ac 26² (contr. Phil 3⁷) is one of the literary touches characteristic of the speech before Agrippa: see Blass *in loc.* (See further p. 238.)

The Pluperfect. The Pluperfect, which throws the Perfect into past time, was never very robust in Greek. It must not be regarded as a mere convenience for expressing relative time, like the corresponding tense in English. The conception of relative time never troubled the Greeks; and the aorist, which simply states that the event happened, is generally quite enough to describe what we like to define more exactly as preceding the time of the main verb. A typical case of a pluperfect easily misunderstood is Lk 8²⁹, which we referred to on p. 75 in connexion with the concurrent ambiguity of *πολλοῖς χρόνοις*, and again (p. 113) in connexion with the perfectivising force of *σύν*. Since vernacular usage so clearly warrants our rendering the former "for a long time," we are free to observe that to render "oftentimes it had seized him" (RV text) involves a decided abnormality. It would have to be classed as the past of the "perfect of broken continuity" which we discussed above (p. 144) on 2 Co 11²⁵. But it must be admitted that the extension of this to the pluperfect is complex, and if there is a simple alternative we should take it; RVmg is essentially right, though "held fast" would be better than "seized." We need not examine further the use of this tense, which may be interpreted easily from what has been said of Perfect action. It should be noted that it appears sometimes in conditional sentences where an aorist would have been possible: e.g. 1 Jn 2¹⁹ *μεμενῆκεισαν ἄν*. The pluperfect expresses the continuance of the contingent result to the time of speaking. In Mt 12⁷ *ἐγνώκειτε* is virtually an imperfect to a present *ἔγνωκα*, in which the perfect form has the same rationale as in *οἶδα*; and in Jn 19¹¹ *ἔδόθη*¹ would have only pictured the original gift and not the presence of it with Pilate at the moment.

Last comes the Future. The nature of
The Future:— its action may be looked at first. This may
Its Action. be examined in the history of its form. Its

¹ On the periphrastic pluperfect, *ἦν δεδομένον*, see pp. 225 ff.

close connexion with the sigmatic aorist act. and mid., and the two aorists pass., is obvious. Except in the passive, in fact, the future was mainly a specialised form of the aorist subjunctive.¹ As such it will naturally share the point action of the aorist. We cannot however decisively rule out the possibility that another formation may have contributed to the Greek future, a formation which would be originally linear in action. The Aryan (Indo-Iranian) and Letto-Slavonic branches of the Indo-Germanic family have a future in *-syō*, which however was very moderately developed in these contiguous groups before they separated. Greek, geographically contiguous with Aryan on the other side in prehistoric times, may have possessed this future; but the existing Greek future can be very well explained without it, though it might be safest to allow its probable presence. In any case there is no question that the action of the Future is in usage mixed. **ἄξω* is either "I shall lead" or "I shall bring"—the former durative, the latter effective. Thus in Mk 14²⁸ *προάξω ὑμᾶς* is probably "I shall go before you," while *ἄξων* (Ac 22⁵) "to bring," and *ἄξει* (1 Th 4¹⁴) "he will bring," refer to the end of the action and not its progress. An ingressive future may probably be seen in *ὑποταγήσεται*, 1 Co 15²⁸: the *τότε* seems to show that the Parousia is thought of as initiating a new kind of subordination of the Son to the Father, and not the perpetuation of that which had been conspicuous in the whole of the mediatorial æon. The exposition of this mystery must be taken up by the theologians. We pass on to note another example of the ingressive future, to be found in Jn 8³². **Ἐλευθεροῦν* appears to be always punctiliar in NT, but it is not necessarily so: cf Sophocles *OT* 706 *τό γ' εἰς ἑαυτὸν πᾶν ἐλευθεροῖ στόμα*, "as for himself, he *keeps* his lips wholly pure" (Jebb). (It is true Sir R. Jebb uses "set free" in his note, but the durative force of his translation seems more suitable.) It is therefore noteworthy that in v.³³ we have the paraphrase *ἐλεύθεροι γενήσεσθε*, to bring out the (ingressive) point action of the future that precedes. Sometimes the possession of two future forms enabled the language to differentiate these meanings. Thus *ἔξω* was associated

¹ See Giles, *Manual* 2 446-8.

with ἔχω, and meant "I shall possess"; σχήσω with ἔσχου, and so meant "I shall get."¹ There is one possible ex. in NT: in 1 Pet 4¹⁸ φανεῖται may well be durative as in Attic—note the durative σῴζεται preceding it in the same clause; while φανήσεται (Mt 24³⁰) has obviously point action. See the classical evidence marshalled in Kühner-Gerth i. 114 ff., 170 ff.: add the note in Giles, *Manual*² 483 n. Since Hellenistic generally got rid of alternative forms—even σχήσω is entirely obsolete,³—this distinction will not be expected to play any real part in NT Greek. Indeed even those futures which by their formation were most intimately connected with the aorist, such as φοβηθήσομαι (for which Attic could use a durative φοβήσομαι), exercised the double mode of action which was attached to the tense as a whole: cf Heb 13⁶, where "be afraid" (durative) seems to be the meaning, rather than "become afraid." This question settled, we next have *Shall and Will.* to decide between *shall* and *will* as the appropriate translation. The volitive future involves action depending on the will of the speaker or of the subject of the verb: in *I will go, you shall go*, it is the former; in *will you go?* it is the latter. Side by side with this there is the purely futuristic *we shall go, they will go*. It is impossible to lay down rules for the rendering of the Greek future—the case is almost as complicated as are the rules for the use of *shall* and *will* in standard English. Not only are the volitive and the futuristic often hard to distinguish, but we have to reckon with an archaic use of the auxiliaries which is traditional in Bible translation. For instance, in such a passage as Mk 13²⁴⁻²⁷ we have *shall* seven times where in modern English we should undeniably use *will*.³ But in v. 18 ("the same *shall* be saved") the substitution of *will* is not at all certain, for the words may be read as a promise (a volitive use), in which *shall* is

¹ See Brugmann, *Kurze vergl. Gramm.* 568, for this as seen in καλῶς σχήσει and καλῶς ἔξει: also his *Gr. Gram.*³ 480.

² It occurs in OGIS 751 (ii/B.C.) ἀσθενῶς [σχή]σενε—see note—and in the archaising Lp P 41 (iv/A.D.) παρ[ασχ]ήσασθαι: both are only *ex suppl.*

³ The use of *shall* when prophecy is dealing with future time is often particularly unfortunate. I have heard of an intelligent child who struggled under perplexity for years because of the words "Thou *shalt* deny me thrice": it could not therefore be Peter's fault, if Jesus commanded him! The child's

correct. Speaking generally, it may fairly be claimed that unless volitive force is distinctly traceable from the context, it would be better to translate by the futuristic form. The modernising of our English NT in this respect would involve the sacrifice of a very large number of *shalls* in the 3rd person, for our idiom has changed in many dependent clauses, in which neither *shall* nor *will* is any longer correct. In Mk 14¹⁴, for example, we should certainly say, "Follow him, and wherever he *goes* in. . . ." It is one of the points in which modernising is possible without sacrificing dignity—a sacrifice too palpable in some of the attempts to render the NT into twentieth century English.

**Moods of the
Future.**

What remains to be said about the Future will most appropriately come in when we discuss categories such as Commands and Prohibitions, Conditional Sentences, etc. It will suffice to remark here that the moods of the Future have in Hellenistic Greek receded mostly into their original non-existence, as experiments that proved failures. The imperative and subjunctive never existed: a few *lapsus calami* like *καυθήσωμαι*, or analogically formed aorist subjunctives like *ἄψηθε*, *δώση* (WH *App*² 179), will not be counted as efforts to supply the gap. The optative, which only performed the function of *orat. obl.* substitute for fut. indic., has disappeared entirely. The infinitive, originally limited in the same way, except for the construction with *μέλλω*,¹ has shrunk very considerably, though not obsolete. With *μέλλω* it is only found in the word *ἔσεσθαι*. The innumerable confusions in the papyri, where a future form often is a mere blunder for an aorist, show that the tense was already moribund for most practical purposes: see Hatzidakis 190 ff. Finally the participle, the only modal form which may claim prehistoric antiquity, retains a limited though genuine function of its own. The volitive force (here final or quasi-final) is the commonest, as Brugmann remarks,² and the papyri keep up the classical use; but futuristic forms are not wanting—cf 1 Co 15³⁷, Heb 3⁵, Ac 20²².

determinism is probably more widely shared than we think; and a modernised version of many passages like Mk 14³⁰—*e.g.* "you will be renouncing me three times"—would relieve not a few half-conscious difficulties.

¹ Goodwin *MT* § 75.

² *Gr. Gram.* 496.

CHAPTER VII.

THE VERB: VOICE.

Voice:— THE phenomena of Voice in Greek present us with conditions which are not very easy for the modern mind to grasp. Active we know, and Passive we know, nor can we easily conceive a language in which either is absent. But nothing is more certain than that the parent language of our family possessed no Passive, but only Active and Middle, the latter originally equal with the former in prominence, though unrepresented now in any language save by forms which have lost all distinction of meaning. What the prehistoric distinction

History of the Middle. was, we can only guess. It is suggestive that in the primitive type which is seen in the Greek *τίθημι—τίθεμαι*, the principle of vowel-gradation (*Ablaut*) will account for *-θε-* as a weakening of *-θη-*, and *-μι* as a weakening of *-μαι*, if we posit an accent on the root in one form and on the person-ending in the other. Such an assumption obviously does not help with *τίθεμεν—τιθέμεθα*, nor with *λύω—λύομαι*; but if it accounts for part of the variation, we have enough to suggest a tentative interpretation of the facts. If such be the origin of the two forms, we might assume a difference of emphasis as the starting-point: in the active the action was stressed, in the middle the agent. We may illustrate this by the different emphasis we hear in the reading of the sentence in the Anglican liturgy which reminds the penitent of the Divine forgiveness. One reader says "*He* pardoneth," wishing to lay all stress on the one Source of pardon, another "*He* pardoneth," the pardon itself being the uppermost thought with him. We could easily suppose the former represented by *ἀφίεται* and the latter by *ἀφίησι* in a language in which stress accent is free to alter the weight of syllables as it shifts from one to another.¹

¹ See below, p. 238.

The Middle in Sanskrit, Out of these postulated conditions, which are of course the merest conjecture, we could readily derive the *nuance* which meets us in the earliest accessible developments of Indo-Germanic speech. The Indian grammarians acutely named the active *parasmai-pada* and the middle *ātmane-pada*, "a word for another" and "for oneself" respectively. Thus *yájate* would be "he sacrifices for himself," while *yájati*, unless the dat. *ātmane* is present in the context, is "he sacrifices for another." The essence of the middle therefore lies in its calling attention to the agent as in some way closely concerned with the action. The same characteristic is ultimately found in other languages. In Latin the middle has been somewhat obscured formally by the entrance of the *r* suffix, which it shares with its most intimate relative, the Keltic branch. But this has not caused any confusion with the active; so that the Latin, Greek, and Sanskrit middle voice may be put together, the differentia of Latin being that it has made no reserve like the Greek aorist and future middle, in lending its middle forms to the invading passive. In our inquiry into the

"Deponents." meaning conveyed by the middle, we naturally start with the verbs which are found in active only or middle only, to both of which classes the unsatisfactory name "deponent" should be given, if retained for either. Typical words not used in the middle, in the parent language, are the originals of our verbs *eat*, *come*, *am*, and the Greek *δίδωμι* (simplex) and *ρέω*; while no active can be traced for *νέομαι*, *ἔπομαι* (= *sequor*), *μαίνομαι*, *μητίομαι* (= *mētior*), *κάθημαι*, *κείμαι*.¹ The former class will be seen to denote "an action, an occurrence, or a state"; as likewise do the latter, but "prevailingly such as take place in the sphere of their subject, the whole subject being concerned in the action." Where the distinction is so fine, it is easily seen that many cases must arise in which we can no longer detect it, and are in danger of over-refining if we try. Our investigation must take account of the rather extensive categories in which one part of the verb affects the middle and another the active form. We

¹ I quote from Brugmann, *Kurze vergl. Gramm.* § 799, and mainly follow his account throughout this paragraph.

have a number of cases in which the "strong" perfect active attaches itself in meaning to the middle, either figuring among the parts of a verb which has no other active forms, or siding with the intransitive middle where the rest of the active is transitive. So conspicuous is this, that the grammars in which we learnt Greek thirty years ago actually gave "τέτυπα"—the product, by the way, of an inventive imagination—as the perfect middle of that highly irregular and defective verb which in those days was our model regular.¹ As exx. of this attachment we may cite γέγονα from γίνομαι and ἐλήλυθα from ἔρχομαι,² with ἀνέφεγα, ἐστάναι, ἀπόλωλα, σέσηπα, and πέποιθα as intransitive perfects from transitive verbs. Among the few remaining strong perfects occurring in the NT, we note ἀκήκοα, κέκραγα,³ πέπονθα, τέτ(ε)υχα, and εἶληφα, as from verbs with a future middle. We have the defectives οἶδα, ἔοικα, and εἴωθα; and the two isolated actives ἐνήνοχα and γέγραφα remain the only real exceptions to the rule which finds some link with the middle in each of the relatively few survivors of the primitive perfect active. The list might perhaps be slightly extended from other vernacular Greek: thus ἀγήγοχα (ἀγείοχα, ἀγέωχα) is found freely in papyri, and belongs to a purely active verb. The conjecture that the perfect originally had no distinction of active and middle, its person-endings being peculiar throughout, affords the most probable explanation of the facts: when the much later -κα perfect arose, the distinction had become universal.

Future Middle in Active sense. Parallel with this peculiarity, but much more extensive, is the category of middle futures attached to active verbs. As an abnormality for which no reason could be detected, it naturally began to suffer from levelling in Hellenistic, but is still prominent. We have in NT ἀκούσω as well as ἀκούσομαι, κράξω beside κεκράξομαι, γελάσω, ἐμπτύσω, ἀπαντήσω, διώξω, ρεύσω, σπουδάσω,

¹ In this the grammars followed ancient authority: thus Dionysius Thrax says, "μεσότης δὲ ἢ ποτὲ μὲν ἐνέργειαν ποτὲ δὲ πάθος παριστώσα, οἷον πέποιθα, διέφθορα, ἐποιησάμην, ἐγραψάμην."

² The aorist ἦλθον is really due to the influence of a third constituent root in this defective verb.

³ Κεκράξομαι is only formally passive.

χωρήσω, ἐμπαίξω, ἀρπάσω, κλέψω, ἀμαρτήσω—all these from the selected list of such verbs in Rutherford's small grammar of Attic Greek, which supplies only about as many exx. of the preservation of the old future middle. (Some of these active futures, indeed, have warrant in classical Greek of other dialects than Attic, even from the Homeric period; but the list will sufficiently illustrate the weakening of this anomaly.) In spite of this, we still find in NT ὄψομαι, -βήσομαι, γνώσομαι, φάγομαι, ἀποθανοῦμαι, κομίσομαι and κομιοῦμαι, λήψομαι, πίομαι, πεσοῦμαι, τέξομαι, φεύξομαι, which are enough to show that the phenomenon was anything but obsolete. Rutherford classes most of them as "verbs which denote the exercise of the bodily functions" or "intellectual or emotional activity"; and he would suggest that "the notion of *willing* implied in the future tense" may be the reason of the peculiarity. Brugmann connects it with the tendency of the strong aorist to be intransitive. This would naturally prompt the transitive use of the sigmatic aorist and consequently the future, so that the middle future attaches itself to the active intransitive forms. The explanation is only invoked for cases like βήσομαι, and does not exclude Rutherford's suggestion. We may fairly take the existence of this large class of futures as additional evidence of a close connexion between the middle flexion and the stressing of the agent's interest in the action of the verb.

Use of the Middle: how far is it reflexive? What has been said of the history of the Middle prepares us for the statement that this voice is quite inaccurately described by empiric grammarians as essentially reflexive. As a matter of fact, the proportion of strictly reflexive middles is exceedingly small. In NT we may cite ἀπήγγεατο (Mt 27⁵) as the clearest example, and a survival from classical Greek. But even here one may question whether the English intransitive *choke* is not a truer parallel than the reflexive *hang oneself*. It is curious that in Winer's scanty list of exx. (WM 316), presumably selected as the most plausible, we have to discount all the rest. Λούομαι accompanies its correlate νίπτομαι; and its one decisively middle form (ὡς λουσαμένη, 2 Pet 2²²) would raise difficulties if it occurred in a better Hellenist. Certainly, if the

pig's ablutions are really reflexive rather than passive, sundry current notions need revising. To our author at any rate *λουσαμένη* did not suggest willing co-operation.¹ In citing *κρύπτομαι* (Jn 8⁵⁹), *bonus dormitat Homerus*: *ἐκρύβη* is not middle in form, nor does the verb show any distinct middle in NT. In *παρασκευάζεται* (1 Co 14⁸) the intransitive *prepare, make preparations*, gives a better sense than the reflexive. We might bring in such an example as *μὴ σκύλλου* Lk 7⁶, compared with the illiterate contemporary papyrus OP 295, *μὴ σκλύλλε ἐατήν*. But though no doubt a reflexive meaning ultimately accrued to the Middle, and in MGr almost drives other uses off the field, it would be wrong to suppose that it was originally there. If the active is transitive, the middle indicates that the action goes no further than the agent himself, a sense which naturally comes out of the concentration on the agent characteristic of the middle. Thus *νίπτομαι* is "I wash," with or without object, but implying that the action stops with myself. If then there is no object, *νίπτομαι* = "I wash myself": if there is, *νίπτομαι τὰς χεῖρας* = "I wash my hands." This characteristic produced a passive use of the middle, in Brugmann's opinion, before the dialectic differentiation of Indo-Germanic speech. Intransitive use is a natural development from the fundamental idea of the middle; and from intransitive to passive is but a step. The well-known classical use of *ἀποθνήσκει ὑπό τινος*, as correlative to *ἀποκτείνει τις*, illustrates the development. It may seem to us strange that the same form should be used indifferently as active or passive in meaning—that, for example, *ἐνεργουμένη* in Jas 5¹⁶ should be translated "working" (RV) or "inwrought,"² with only the context to decide. Our own coincident transitive and intransitive,

¹ The rhythmical conclusion of the proverb suggests that it originated in an iambic line from comedy. Was 2 Pet citing from memory a verse the metrical nature of which he did not realise? If so, the original would of course not admit *λουσαμένη*—it would run *λελουμένη δ' ὅς ἐστις κυλισμὸν βορβόρου*, or *λουθεῖσ' ἀπαξ ὅς*, or the like. But see below, p. 238, and J. B. Mayor, *Comm.* p. lxii.

² See Mayor *in loc.*, and J. A. Robinson, *Eph.* 247. W. F. Moulton strongly favoured the second rendering. Why the Revisers did not give it even a marginal place, is hard to divine: it was there in their first revision.

however, is almost equally capable of producing ambiguity, or would be if it were not for the studied avoidance of ambiguity which is necessarily characteristic of an analytic language. "He who hides can find," "He who hides is safe," exhibit the same form both as transitive and intransitive; and it would be easy to devise a context in which the second would become really ambiguous.

The Middle paraphrased by Reflexive in Dative case. From what has been said, it is clear that the most practical equivalent of the Middle will generally be the active with the *dative* of the reflexive pronoun. This is in fact the nearest approach to a general statement which we can formulate, premising of course that it is rough in itself, and an exaggeration of the differentia. In προσέχετε ἑαυτοῖς (Lk 12¹), "pay attention for yourselves," we have a phrase differing little from φυλάσσετε (v.¹⁵), "be on your guard," being only rather more emphatic. Mk 14⁴⁷ σπασάμενος τὴν μάχαιραν is paraphrased by Mt (26⁶¹) ἀπέσπασεν τ. μ. αὐτοῦ: here, as in Ac 14¹⁴, where διαρρήξαντες τὰ ἱμάτια ἑαυτῶν replaces the more idiomatic διαρρηξάμενοι τὰ ἰ., we see the possessive gen. expressing the same shade of meaning. Sometimes we find redundancy, as when in Jn 19²⁴ διεμερίσαντο . . . ἑαυτοῖς stands against the unaccompanied

verb in the same quotation Mt 27³⁵. A few **Typical Middles:—** typical illustrations of the general principle may be added. Προσκαλοῦμαι, "I call to myself," is clear: its opposite ἀπωθούμαι, "I thrust away from myself," is not really different, since ἀπωθῶ ἑμαυτῶ would show a legitimate *dativus commodi*. We have in fact to vary the exact relation of the reflexive perpetually if we are to represent the middle in the form appropriate to the particular example. Συμβουλευσαντο Mt 26⁴ answers to συμβούλευσαν ἑαυτοῖς, "they counselled one another": here we have the *reciprocal* middle, as in μάχεσθαι.¹ Ἐξελέγοντο Lk 14⁷ "they picked out for themselves," and so "chose": cf the distinction

¹ Cf the closeness of ἀλλήλους and ἑαυτοῦς. Brugmann has some notes on this middle in *Indog. Forsch.* v. 114. Cf MGr τὰ παρηγορηθούμε, "that we may comfort one another" (Abbott 228, distich 56).

of *αἰρῶ* and *αἰροῦμαι*. *Πείθειν* is "to exercise suasion": in the middle it keeps the action within the sphere of the agent, and consequently means "to admit suasion to oneself." *Ἐρῶμαι*, from the old noun *χρῆ* "necessity," is "I make for myself what is necessary with something"—hence the instrumental, as with the similar middle *utor* in Latin. Less

Dynamic, easy to define are the cases of "*dynamic*" middle, where the middle endings only emphasised the part taken by the subject in the action of the verb, thus *νίχω* and *νίχομαι* (not NT) "to swim." The category will include a number of verbs in which it is useless to exercise our ingenuity on interpreting the middle, for the development never progressed beyond the rudimentary stage. We need not stay to detail here the cases where the middle introduces a wholly new meaning. On the point of principle, it should however be noted that mental as opposed

Mental Action. to physical applications of the idea of the verb will often be introduced in this way, since mental action is especially confined within the sphere of the agent. Thus *καταλαμβάνω* "seize, overtake" (Jn 1⁵ 12³⁵), in the middle denotes mental "comprehending," as Ac 4¹⁸.

Hellenistic Use of the Middle. "On the whole the conclusion arrived at must be that the NT writers were perfectly capable of preserving the distinction between the active and middle." Such is the authoritative summary of Blass (p. 186), which makes it superfluous for us to labour any proof. Differences between Attic and Hellenistic use in details are naturally found, and the unclassical substitutions of active for middle or middle for active are so numerous as to serve the Abbé Viteau for proof of Hebraism on a large scale. As Thumb remarks (*Hellenismus* 127), a mere glance into Hatzidakis's *Einleitung*—an indispensable classic, the absence of which from Viteau's list of works consulted accounts for a great deal—would have shown him that in the Hellenistic period Greeks by birth were guilty of many innovations in the use of the voices which could never have owed anything to Hebrew. The NT exx. which Hatzidakis gives (pp. 195 ff.) are not at all inconsistent with the dictum of Blass quoted above. The sphere of the middle was, as we have seen, not at all sharply

delimited, and usage inevitably varied in different localities and authors. There are plenty of middles in Attic, and even in Homer, in which the rationale of the voice is very hard to define. Naturally such words may have dropped a no longer intelligible distinction, just as popular Latin did in such words as *sequor* and *utor*, while in other words the distinction may have been applied in a different manner. We can see why *γαμείσθαι* = *nubere* fell out of use in Hellenistic:¹ even if a need was still felt for a separate word to suit the bride's part in a wedding, the appropriateness of the middle voice was not clear, and the distinction was liable to lapse. The accuracy with which the middle was used would naturally vary with the writers' Greek culture. Note for example how Mt and Lk correct the *ἐφύλαξάμην* (*legem observare*) of their source in Mk 10²⁰. In Mk 2²³ they have removed another incorrect use, unless *ὁδοποιεῖν* is to be read there with B etc. (WHmg); for *ὁδὸν ποιεῖν* means "construct a road" (Gildersleeve *Synt.* 69), and the middle should have been used instead. In the less educated papyrographers we find blunders of this kind considerably earlier than the time when the more subtle meanings of the middle disappeared.^a As early as 95 B.C. we find *ἐὰν αἰρήτε* and *ἐὰν αἰρήσθε* used side by side for "if you like" (GH 36), and in the preceding century *διαλύωμεν* appears in the sense of *διαλυόμεθα* in LPe. These are of course sporadic, but some violations of classical usage have almost become fixed. This especially applies to the idiomatic use of *ποιεῖσθαι* with a noun as substitute for a verb. Here the middle sense was not clearly discernible to the plain man, and *ποιεῖν* invades the province of the middle very largely. We still have *μνείαν ποιεῖσθαι* (as in Eph 1¹⁶) BU 632 (ii/A.D.), *καταφυγὴν ποιεῖσθαι* TP 5 (ii/i B.C.), BU 970 (ii/A.D.), etc. But the recurrent phrase *τὸ προσκύνημά (σου) ποιῶ* only twice (Letr. 117, Tb P 412) has the middle. Mt 6² π. *ἐλεημοσύνην*, Mk 15¹ *συμβούλιον π.*,² Lk 18⁷ π. *ἐκδίκησιν*, etc., will serve as specimens of a fairly large

¹ Speaking generally: it survives in the legal language of marriage contracts, as OP 496 (early ii/A.D.), and even Lp P 41 (iv/A.D.). [^a See p. 248.

² Of the modern phrase *συμβόλιον γὰρ τὰ κάμουν* "to consult," of physicians (Abbott 200). (On *ποιεῖν* in such phrases, cf Robinson, *Eph.* 172.)

class of usages, in which we cannot accuse the writers of ignorance, since the middle could only defend itself by prescription. So when a new phrase was developed, there might be hesitation between the voices: *συνᾶραι λόγον* appears in Mt 18²³ 25¹⁹, BU 775 (ii/A.D.), but the middle, as in FP 109 (i/A.D.), OP 113 (ii/A.D.), is more classical in spirit. In places however where an educated Hellenist like Paul markedly diverges from the normal, we need not hesitate on occasion to regard his variation as purposed: thus *ἡρμოსάμην* 2 Co 11² fairly justifies itself by the profound *personal* interest the apostle took in this spiritual *προμνηστική*.

Αἰτῶ and
Αἰτοῦμαι.

This is not the place for discussing, or even cataloguing, all the verbs which vary from classical norm in respect of the middle voice; but there is one special case on which we must tarry a little longer. The distinction between *αἰτῶ* and *αἰτοῦμαι* claims attention because of the juxtaposition of the two in Jas 4^{2f.}, 1 Jn 5¹⁵, Mk 6²²⁻²⁵ 10^{35. 38} (= Mt 20^{20. 22}). The grammarian Ammonius (iv/A.D.) declares that *αἰτῶ* means to ask *simpliciter*, with no thought of returning, while *αἰτοῦμαι* involves only request for a loan. This remark serves as an example of the indifferent success of late writers in their efforts to trace an extinct subtlety. Blass (p. 186) says that *αἰτοῦμαι* was used in business transactions, *αἰτῶ* in requests of a son from a father, a man from God, and others on the same lines. He calls the interchange in Jas and 1 Jn *ll. cc.* "arbitrary"; but it is not easy to understand how a writer like James could commit so purposeless a freak as this would be. Mayor in his note cites grammarians who made *αἰτοῦμαι* = *αἰτῶ μεθ' ἰκεσίας*, or *μετὰ παρακλήσεως*, which certainly suits the idea of the middle better than Ammonius' unlucky guess. "When *αἰτεῖτε* is thus opposed to *αἰτεῖσθε*," Mayor proceeds, "it implies using the words, without the spirit, of prayer." If the middle is really the stronger word, we can understand its being brought in just where an effect of contrast can be secured, while in ordinary passages the active would carry as much weight as was needed. For the alternation of active and middle in the Herodias story, Blass's ingenious remark may be recalled, that "the daughter of Herodias, after the king's declaration, stands in a kind of business relation to

him" (p. 186 n.), so that the differentia of the middle cited above will hold.

The line of demarcation between Middle and Passive is generally drawn by the help of the passive aorist, which is supposed to be a sound criterion in verbs the voice of which is doubtful. It should however be pointed out that historically this criterion has little or no value. The "strong" aorist passive in *-ην* is nothing but a special active formation, as its endings show, which became passive by virtue of its preference for intransitive force. The *-θην* aorist was originally developed, according to Wackernagel's practically certain conjecture, out of the old aorist middle, which in non-thematic formations ran like *ἔδομην—ἔδόθης—ἔδοτο*: when the thematic *-σο* displaced the older *-θης* (Skt. *-thās*), the form *ἔδόθης* was set free to form a new tense on the analogy of the *-ην* aorist, which was no more necessarily passive than the identic formation seen in Latin *habēs, habet*. Compare *ἐχάρην* from *χαίρω* (later also *χαίρομαι*, by formal levelling),¹ where the passive idea remained imperceptible even in NT times: the formally passive *ἐκρύβη*, from *κρύπτω*, in Jn 8⁵⁹ (cf Gen 3¹⁰) will serve as an ex. of a pure intransitive aorist from a transitive verb.² In Homer (cf Monro *HG* 45) the *-θην* aorist is very often indistinguishable in use from the aorist middle; and it is unsafe to suppose that in later periods of the language the presence of an aorist in *-θην* or *-ην* is proof of a passive meaning in a "deponent" verb. Of course the *-θην* forms, with their derivative future, were in the very large majority of cases passive; but it may be questioned whether there was markedly more passivity in the "feel" of them than there was in the present or perfect formations. For example, from *ἀποκρίνομαι*, "answer," we have *ἀπεκρινάμην* in Attic Greek and predominantly in the papyri, while *ἀπεκρίθην* greatly outnumbers it in the NT; but the evidence noted above (p. 39) shows that the two forms were used concurrently in the *Κοινή*, and without

¹ So Ac 3⁸ D: cf Trygaeus in Arist. *Pax* 291 (Blass).

² To match these specimens of formal passives with middle meaning, we may cite middles in passive sense. Thus BU 1053, 1055 (i/b.c.) τὸ ἐν ὀφείλῃ θησόμενον, "the amount that shall be charged as due."

the slightest difference of sense. W. F. Moulton was inclined to see "a faint passive force . . . in most of the instances" of *ἐστάθην* in NT, though observing that it "is in regular use as an intransitive aorist" in MGr¹ (WM 315 n.). He also suggested the possibility that *ἐκοιμήθην* in 1 Th 4¹⁴ might be a true passive, "was put to sleep," which gives a strikingly beautiful sense. A purely middle use of *κοιμηθῆναι*, "fell asleep," is patent in such phrases as Ch P 3 *ἦνίκα ἤμελλον κοιμηθῆναι ἔγραψα ἐπιστόλια β* (iii/B.C.). The active *κοιμᾶν* however, though apparently dormant in classical prose,² revives in the LXX, as Gen 24¹¹. We may also compare the clear passive in FP 110 (i/A.D.) *ἵνα τὰ πρόβατα ἐκεῖ κοιμηθῆι*, "may be folded," as the edd. translate. It seems possible therefore to conceive the passive force existing side by side with the simple intransitive, as apparently happened in *ἐστάθην* (see note¹ below); but we cannot speak with confidence.

Perhaps the matter is best summed up with the remark that the two voices were not differentiated with anything like the same sharpness as is inevitable in analytic formations such as we use in English. We have seen how the bulk of the forms were indifferently middle or passive, and how even those which were appropriated to one voice or the other are perpetually crossing the frontier. Common ground between them is to be observed in the category for which we use the translation "submit to," "let oneself be," etc.³ Thus in Tb P 35 (ii/B.C.) *ἑαυτὸν αἰτιάσεται*, "will get himself accused," is a middle; but in 1 Co 6⁷ *ἀδικεῖσθε* and *ἀποστερεῖσθε* are described as passives by Blass, who says that "'to let' in the sense of occasioning some result is expressed by the middle" (p. 185). The dividing line is a fine one at best. *Ἀπογράψασθαι* in Lk 2⁵ might seem to determine the voice of the present in vv.^{1, 3}, but Blass finds a passive in v.¹ Is

Common
Ground.

Perhaps the matter is best summed up with the remark that the two voices were not differentiated with anything like the same

sharpness as is inevitable in analytic formations such as we use in English. We have seen how the bulk of the forms were indifferently middle or passive, and how even those which were appropriated to one voice or the other are perpetually crossing the frontier. Common ground between them is to be observed in the category for which we use the translation "submit to," "let oneself be," etc.³ Thus in Tb P 35 (ii/B.C.) *ἑαυτὸν αἰτιάσεται*, "will get himself accused," is a middle; but in 1 Co 6⁷ *ἀδικεῖσθε* and *ἀποστερεῖσθε* are described as passives by Blass, who says that "'to let' in the sense of occasioning some result is expressed by the middle" (p. 185). The dividing line is a fine one at best. *Ἀπογράψασθαι* in Lk 2⁵ might seem to determine the voice of the present in vv.^{1, 3}, but Blass finds a passive in v.¹ Is

¹ *Ἐστάθηκα* is used as aor. to *στέκω* "stand," and *ἐστήθηκα* to *στήνω* "place" (Thumb *Handb.* 92).

² Cf *πορεύειν* and *φοβεῖν*, which have entirely given up their active: we should hardly care to call *πορευθῆναι* and *φοβηθῆναι* passive. In MGr we have some exx. of the opposite tendency, as *δαμονίζω* "drive mad" (Abbott 224, no. 47): in older Greek this verb is purely middle. See other exx. in Hatzidakis 198 f.

³ Gal 5² *περιτέμνησθε* will serve as a good example.

there adequate evidence for separating them? Formally ἀποκόψονται, Gal 5¹² (Dt 23¹), is middle,¹ and so are βάπτισα. and ἀπόλουσαι, Ac 22¹⁶ (cf 1 Co 6¹¹ 10³); but if the tense were present or perfect, could we decide? The verb ὑποτάσσω furnishes us with a rather important application of this question. What is the voice of ὑποταγήσεται in 1 Co 15²⁸? Is it passive—"be subjected" *by* as well as "to him that did subject all things to him"? Or is it middle—"be subject"? Findlay (*EGT in loc.*) calls it "middle in force, like the 2nd aor. pass. in Rom 10³, in consistency with the initiative ascribed to Christ throughout." I incline to this, but without accepting the reflexive "subject himself," which accentuates the difference between the identical ὑποταγή and ὑποταγήσεται; the neutral "be subject" explains both, and the context must decide the interpretation. In Rom 10³ the RV renders "did not subject themselves," despite the passive; and the reflexive is an accurate interpretation, as in ὑποτάσσεσθε Col 3¹⁸. The question next presents itself whether we are at liberty to press the passive force of the aorist and future and perfect of ἐγείρω, when applied to the Resurrection of Christ. A glance at the concordance will show how often ἠγέρθην etc. are merely intransitive; and we can hardly doubt that ἠγέρθη, in Mk 16⁶ and the like, translated *er* (cf Delitzsch). But if the context (as in 1 Co 15) strongly emphasises the action of God, the passive becomes the right translation. It is in fact more for the exegete than for the grammarian to decide between *rose* and *was raised*, even if the tense is apparently unambiguous: one may confess to a grave doubt whether the speaker of Greek really felt the distinction.²

¹ The verb must be similarly treated with reference to its *voice*, whether we translate with text or margin of RV. The various arguments in favour of the margin, to which the citation of Dt *L.c.* commits us above, are now reinforced by Ramsay's advocacy, *Expos.* for Nov. 1905, pp. 358 ff. He takes the wish rather more seriously than I have done (*infra*. 201); but I should be quite ready to go with Mr G. Jackson, in the same *Expos.*, p. 373. See also Findlay *in loc.* (*Exp. B* 328 f.).

² On the Passive, reference should be made to Wellh. 25 f., for *exx.* showing how this voice was largely replaced by other locutions in Aramaic (especially the impersonal plural, p. 58 f. above), and consequently in Synoptic translations. One or two other problems, in which Voice is concerned, must be reserved. On βιάζεται in Mt 11¹², Lk 16¹⁶, see *Expositor*, Oct. 1908, "Lexical Notes," s. v.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE VERB: THE MOODS.

The Moods in general.

THE Moods which we have to discuss will be the Imperative, Subjunctive, and Optative, and those uses of the Indicative which make it a "*modus irrealis*." In this preliminary chapter we shall aim at evaluating the primary meanings of the Moods, leaving to the systematic grammar the exhaustive classification of their uses, especially in dependent clauses. The moods in question are characterised by a common subjective element, representing an attitude of mind on the part of the speaker. It is not possible for us to determine with any certainty the primitive root-idea of each mood. The Imperative is tolerably clear: it represented command—prohibition was not originally associated with it, and in Greek only partially elbowed its way in, to be elbowed out again in the latest developments of the language. The Subjunctive cannot be thus simply summarised, for the only certain predication we can make of its uses is that they all concern future time. We shall see that its force can mostly be represented by *shall* or *will*, in one of their various senses. Whether the Subjunctive can be morphologically traced to a single origin is very problematic. A possible unification, on the basis of a common mood-sign *-ā-*, was conjectured by the writer some years ago (*AJP* x. 285 f.: see the summary in Giles, *Manual*² 460 n.). It is at least a curious coincidence that the mood-sign thus obtained for the Subjunctive should functionally resemble the *-yē-* under which the Optative can confessedly be unified. We are dealing with prehistoric developments, and it is therefore futile to speculate whether it would be more than a coincidence, should these two closely allied moods prove to have been formed by suffixes which

make nouns of nearly identical function. However clearly the Optative may be reduced to a single formation, it gives us nevertheless no hope of assigning its meanings to a single root-idea: Optative and Potential, *may* and *might* in their various uses, defy all efforts to reduce them to a unity. In this book the discussion of the Potential might almost be drawn on the lines of the famous chapter on snakes in Iceland, but for literary survivals in the Lucan writings. (See pp. 197 ff.) No language but Greek has preserved both Subjunctive and Optative as separate and living elements in speech, and Hellenistic Greek took care to abolish this singularity in a fairly drastic way. It ought to be added, before we pass from this general introduction, that in a historical account of the Moods a fourth, the *Injunctive*, has to be interpolated, to explain certain phenomena which disturb the development of the others, and perhaps of the Indicative as well. The Injunctive was simply an imperfect or aorist indicative without the augment. *Δύου, λύεσθε, λύσασθε, λύθητε, λύετε, λύσατε* and *σχές* will suffice as specimens, enough to illustrate how largely it contributed to the formation of the Imperative. Syntactically it represented the bare combination of verbal idea with the ending which supplies the subject; and its prevailing use was for prohibitions, if we may judge from Sanskrit, where it still remains to some extent alive. The fact that this primitive mood thus occupies ground appropriate to the Subjunctive, while it supplies the Imperative ultimately with nearly all its forms, illustrates the syntactical nearness of the moods. Since the Optative also can express prohibition, even in the NT (Mk 11¹⁴), we see how much common ground is shared by all the subjective moods.

Before taking the Moods in detail, we must tarry a little over the consideration of two important particles which vitally affect their constructions, *άν* and *μή*. The former of these is a very marked peculiarity of Greek. It is a kind of leaven in a Greek sentence: itself untranslatable, it may transform the meaning of a clause in which it is inserted. In Homer we find it side by side with another particle, *κέν* or *κέ* (probably Aeolic), which appears to be somewhat weaker in force: the later dialects generally

Particles affect-
ing Moods:—

"Αν.

select one or the other for exclusive use. The general definition of its meaning is not very easily laid down. "Under the circumstances," "in that case," "anyhow," may express it pretty well.¹ The idiomatic use of "just," common in Scotland, approximates to *ἄν* (*κὲν*) very fairly when used in apodosis: *ἐγὼ δὲ κεν αὐτὸς ἔλωμαι*, "I'll jist tak her mysel'." (See p. 239.) It had become stereotyped by the time we reach Hellenistic Greek, and we need not therefore trace its earlier development. Two originally connected usages are now sharply distinguished. In one, *ἄν* stands with optative or indicative, and imparts to the verb a contingent meaning, depending on an *if* clause, expressed or understood, in the context. In the other, the *ἄν* (in the NT period more often written *ἐάν*—see pp. 42 f., 56) has formed a close contact with a conjunction or a relative, to which it generally imparts the meaning *-soever*: of course this exaggerates the differentia in most cases. Here the subjunctive, invariable in Attic, does not always appear in the less cultured Hellenistic writers. How greatly this use preponderates in the NT will best be shown by a table²:—

	"Ἀν (ἐάν) with subj. (or indic.) joined with relative or conjunction.	"Ἀν conditional, with verb.				
		With indic.			With opt.	
		Impf.	Aor.	Pluperf.	Pres.	Aor.
Mt	55	1	7	0	0	0
Mk	30	0	1	0	0	0
{ Lk	28	2	4	0	3	1
{ Ac	10	0	1	0	3	2
Jn, 1 Jn, 3 Jn . . .	15	7	7	1	0	0
		(incl. ἡδέερα bis)				
Rev	5	0	0	0	0	0
Paul	27	3	3	0	0	0
Heb	1	4	1	0	0	0
Jas	1	0	0	0	0	0
Total	172	17	24	1	6	3

¹ Brugmann *Gram.* § 499 gives "allenfalls, eventuell, unter Umständen."

² The corresponding figures for the LXX will be instructive. A rough count in HR gives 739 as the total occurrences of *ἄν* (including *καὶ ἄν*), apart from *ἐάν* = *ἄν*. Out of these 26 are with aor. opt.; *εἴη* comes 3 times and *ἐχοίμ* once (in 4 Mac, an artificial work which supplies by itself 11 out of the exx. just noted); 22 can be classified as iterative; 41 are with aor. indic., 6 with imperf. and 1 with pluperf.; and 8 are abnormal (6 with relative and fut. indic., and 1 each with pres. indic. and fut. indic.). I have included all cases in which *ἄν* was read by any of the authorities cited in Swete's manual edition.

The disproportion between these totals—172 and 51—would be immensely increased if *ἐάν* (*if*) and *ἄν* were added. We shall see later (pp. 198 and 200) that the conditional *ἄν* is rapidly decaying. The other use, though extremely abundant in our period, falls away rapidly long before the papyri fail us; and even within the NT we notice some writers who never show it, or only very seldom. This prepares us for the ultimate disappearance of the particle except in composition (MGr *ἄν if*, from the old *ἄν*;¹ *σάν as* or *when*, from *ὡς ἄν*—see below; and *κᾶν even*, used like the NT *κᾶν = καί*, not affecting construction).

We proceed to mention a few miscellaneous points in the NT use of *ἄν*. There are three places in which the old
Iterative ἄν. *iterative* force seems to survive: Ac 2⁴⁵ and 4³⁵ *καθότι ἄν τις χρεῖαν εἶχεν*, and 1 Co 12³ *ὡς ἄν ἤγασθε*.² “As you *would* be led (from day to day)” translates the last by an English iterative construction which coincides with the conditional, as in Greek: Goodwin *MT* § 249 pleads for a historical connexion of these two uses of *ἄν*. The aorist no longer appears in this construction as in classical Greek. Then we should note the appearance of *ὡς ἄν* in constructions which foreshadow the MGr idiom just mentioned.³ Rom 15²⁴ is an interesting case, because of the *present* subjunctive that follows: “when I am on my way” (durative) transfers into the subjunctive the familiar use of present for future. In 1 Co 11³⁴ it has the easier aorist, “whenever I shall have arrived,” and so in Phil 2²³. In 2 Co 10⁹, however, it means “as it were.”⁴ MGr *σάν* has gone further, and takes the indicative as an ordinary word for *when*. The weakening of the connexion between compounds of *ἄν* and the subjunctive is seen in the appearance of the indicative with

¹ On *ἄν* and *ἐάν* (*if*) in NT see above, p. 43 n.

² Winer (p. 384) would make all these parallel with the use of *ἄν* c. indic. in Mk 6⁵⁶ and the like. I deal with the question below.

³ For vernacular evidence see Par P 26 (ii/b.c.—with gen. abs.), 46 (ii/b.c.—with aor. subj.); BM 20 (ii/b.c.) *συνεταξας ὡς ἄν εἰς Μέμφιν*; OGIS 90²⁸ (ii/b.c.—the Rosetta Stone) *ὡς ἄν . . . συνεστηκυλας*, etc. Exx. are numerous.

⁴ Both the exx. of *ἄν* c. partic. quoted by Winer (p. 378) are *ὡς ἄν*: add 2 Mac 12⁴. I have noted *one* ex. of genuine *ἄν* c. ptc. in a Kowí inscr., IMA iii. 174 *δικαιότερον ἄν σωθῆντα* (= *Syll.* 356, a despatch of Augustus).

δταν and *ἐάν* (*if*), and other words of the kind. So not infrequently in Mk, as 3¹¹ *δταν ἐθεώρουν*, 11²⁵ *δταν στήκετε*,

11¹⁹ *δταν ἐγένετο*: add Rev 4⁹ *δταν δώσουσιν*,
 **Όταν*, etc. 8¹ *δταν ἤνοιξεν*. Parallel with these are
 c. indic.

Mk 6⁵⁸ *οπου ἄν εἰσεπορεύετο* and *οσοι ἄν ἤψαντο*, Rev 14⁴ *οπου ἄν ὑπάγει* (where however we are entirely free to spell *ὑπάγη* if we like). Since these are in the least cultured of NT writers, and include presents and futures as well as past tenses, we should hardly class them with the cases of iterative *ἄν* just given from well-educated writers such as Luke and Paul, though there is an obvious kinship. If *ἄν* added *-ever* to the force of a relative or conjunction, there seemed no reason to forbid its use with a past tense where that meaning was wanted. The papyri yield only a small number of parallels, showing that in general the grammatical tradition held. Thus BU 607 (ii/A.D.) *όπόταν ἀναιροῦνται*, FP 126 (iv/A.D.) *οσ' ἄν πάσχετε*, Par P 26 (ii/B.C.) *δταν ἔβημεν κατ' ἀρχὰς εἰς τὸ ἱερόν* (= merely *when*), BU 424 (ii/iii A.D.) *ἐπὶ ἄν ἐπιθύομεν* (also = *when*), BM 331 (ii/A.D.) *οσα ἐὰν παρελαβόμεν*.^a The tendency to drop the distinction of *when* and *whenever*.^b may be connected with the fact that *όπότε* is freely used for *when* in papyri—so the later uncials in Lk 6⁸. *Ἐάν* with indicative is found in 1 Th 3⁸ *στήκετε*, 1 Jn 5¹⁵ *οἶδαμεν*, to mention only two cases in which indic. and subj. are not formally identical in sound. Winer quotes even *ἐὰν ἦσθα*, from Job 22⁸ (*ἦς* A), just as in Hb P 78 (iii/B.C.), where *ἦσθα* is certainly subj., and *ἐὰν ἦσαν* in Tb P 333 (iii/A.D.). They are probably extensions from the ambiguous *ἐὰν ἦν*, which is normally to be read *ἦ*: see *CR* xv. 38, 436, and above, p. 49. We may add a selection from papyri:—Par P 18 *ἐὰν μαχοῦσιν μετ' ἐσοῦ*. 62 (ii/B.C.) *ἐάνπερ ἐκπληρώσουσιν*. Tb P 58 (ii/B.C.) *ἐὰν δεῖ*. BU 546 (Byz.) *ἐὰν οἶδεν*. OP 237 (ii/A.D.) *ἐὰν δ' εἰσίν*. AP 93 (ii/A.D.) *ἐὰν φαίνεται*.

The same lesson is taught by conjunctions
 **Ἄν* dropped from which still take the subjunctive, though *ἄν* has
 its compounds. been allowed to fall out. It does not seem to make any difference whether *ἕως* or *ἕως ἄν* is written. So with many other compounds. Thus PP i. 13 (Ptol.) *οσα*

^a See p. 239.

^b See p. 248.

ὀφείλωσιν τινες, CPR 24, 25 (ii/A.D.) ἐφ' ὃν ἦ χρόνον, 237 ὅσα αὐτῷ προστέκῃται, Tb P 6 (ii/B.C.) ἕως μένωσι, GH 38 (i/B.C.) ἕως καταβῆς, OP 34 (ii/A.D.) μήτε διδότη . . . πρὶν αὐτῷ ἐπιστέλλῃται, etc., etc. The prevalence of this omission in the papyri with conjunctions meaning *until* (ἄχρι, μέχρι, μέχρι οὐ, ἕως, πρὶν, πρὸ τοῦ, etc.), is paralleled in the NT: cf Mk 14³², 2 Pet 1¹⁹, Lk 13⁸, etc.—see the list in WM 371. With πρὶν (ἦ), however, the ἄν occurs in the only place (Lk 22⁶) where it is used with subjunctive.¹

Εἰ μήτι ἄν. In 1 Co 7⁵ μὴ ἀποστερεῖτε ἀλλήλους, εἰ μήτι ἄν [om. B, probably to ease a difficulty] ἐκ συμφώνου πρὸς καιρόν, we have a curious combination which seems to be matched in the papyri.² So BU 326 (ii/A.D.) εἴ τι ἐὰν ἀνθρώπινον π[ά]θη, and εἴ τι ἐὰν μετὰ ταῦτα γεγραμμένα καταλίπω, "if I should leave a codicil": the latter phrase is repeated subsequently without ἐάν in this rather illiterate will. OP 105 (ii/A.D.) εἴ τι ἄλλο αἰὰν (ἔ)χω. FP 130 (iii/A.D.) εἴ τινος ἂν χρία σοί ἐστιν. BM 233 (iv/A.D.) εἴ τι ἄν ἀπαξᾶπλῶς ἀναλώσης. These documents are too illiterate for illustrating Paul: some early scribe is more likely to be responsible than the apostle. Note that Origen quotes ἐὰν μήτι. This explanation (Deissmann's) seems on the whole preferable to the alternative cited from Buttman in WM 380 n. Winer's editor himself compared the ἄν to that in κἄν and ὡς ἄν which does not affect construction: cf Tb P 28 (ii/B.C.) εἰ κἄν δύναται.

Μή. More important still in its influence on the moods is the subjective negative μή, the distinction between which and the objective *ne* (replaced in Greek by οὐ) goes back to the period of Indo-Germanic unity, and survives into the Greek of the present day. The history of μή has been one of continuous aggression. It started in principal clauses, to express prohibition. As early as Homer

¹ Luke once uses it with subj. and once with opt., both times correctly with a negative clause preceding (Lk *l.c.*, Ac 25¹⁶). The papyrus writers are not so particular. Elsewhere in NT the infin. construction is found.

² See Deissmann *BS* 204 n. He quotes BU 326, but will not allow that *εἰ μήτι ἄν* is a kind of analysis of *ἐὰν μήτι*, though this gives the meaning correctly. Blass², p. 321, has not summarised him quite adequately, if I understand Deissmann correctly. The point is that *ἄν* is added to *εἰ μήτι* as it might be to *ὅπως* or *ὅτε*, meaning *unless in a given case, unless perhaps*. See further p. 239.

$\mu\acute{\eta}$ had established itself in a large and complex variety of uses, to which we have to appeal when we seek to know the true nature of the modal constructions as we come to them. Since every Greek grammar gives the ordinary rules distinguishing the uses of $\omicron\upsilon$ and $\mu\acute{\eta}$, we need not examine them here in their historical relationship: what must be said will come up best as we deal with the moods *seriatim*. But the broad differences between Hellenistic and earlier Greek in this respect raise questions affecting the moods as a whole, and especially the verb infinite. We must therefore sketch the subject briefly here.

Blass's Canon. The difference between $\omicron\upsilon$ and $\mu\acute{\eta}$ in the *Koinḗ* of the NT becomes a very simple matter if we accept the rule which Blass lays down (p. 253). "All instances," he says, "may practically be brought under the single rule, that $\omicron\upsilon$ negatives the indicative, $\mu\acute{\eta}$ the other moods, including the infinitive and participle." In reviewing Blass, Thumb makes the important addition that in MGr $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ (from $\omicron\upsilon\delta\acute{\epsilon}\nu$, which stepped into the place of $\omicron\upsilon$, as we can easily understand from many of its adverbial uses in NT) belongs to the indicative and $\mu\acute{\eta}(\nu)$ to the subjunctive. The classical paper of Gildersleeve in the first number of his *AJP* (1880), on encroachments of $\mu\acute{\eta}$ upon $\omicron\upsilon$ in the later Greek, especially in Lucian, makes it very clear that the Attic standard was irrecoverable in Lucian's day even by the most scrupulous of Atticists: cf the parallel case of the optative (below, p. 197). It is of course obvious that the ultimate goal has not been completely reached in NT times. $\mu\acute{\eta}$ has not been driven away from the indicative. Its use in questions is very distinct from that of $\omicron\upsilon$,¹ and is

¹ Blass (p. 254 n.) thinks that $\mu\acute{\eta}\tau\iota$ in Jn 21⁵ "hardly lends itself to the meaning 'certainly not I suppose.'" But the tone of this word, introducing a *hesitant* question (as Jn 4²⁹), is not really inappropriate. We often hear "I suppose you haven't got . . . on you, have you?" Moreover, the papyri show us that $\pi\rho\sigma\phi\acute{\alpha}\gamma\iota\omicron\nu$ is not so broad a word as "something to eat." See my note, *Expos.* vi. viii. 437, to which I can now add OP 736 and 738 (cir. A.D. 1). The apostles had left even $\acute{\alpha}\rho\tau\omicron\iota$ behind them once (Mk 8¹⁴): they might well have left the "relish" on this occasion. It would normally be fish; cf Mk 6³⁸. (While speaking of Jn *l.c.*, I should like to add that the address $\Pi\alpha\iota\delta\iota\alpha$, "Lads!", may be paralleled in MGr, e.g. in the Klepht ballad, Abbott 42— $\pi\alpha\iota\delta\iota\alpha$ $\mu\omicron\nu$ and $\pi\alpha\iota\delta\iota\alpha$, to soldiers.) See further p. 239.

maintained in NT Greek without real weakening. *Mή* remains after *εἰ* c. indic. in unfulfilled conditions, except in Mk 14²¹ (and Mt). But in simple conditions *εἰ οὐ* is common. Luke has 6, Jn 3, Paul 16, Jas 2, and Mt, Heb, 2 Pet, and Rev one each. Against this total of 31, we have 4 exx. of *εἰ μή* in simple conditions with verb expressed, and three of these (1 Co 15², 2 Co 13⁵, Gal 1⁷) are anything but normal: ¹ 1 Tim 6³ is more ordinary, according to classical standards. Blass adds *εἰ δὲ μὴ οἶδας* from the agraphon in D at Lk 6⁴. *Εἰ μή* is three times as common in NT as *εἰ οὐ*, but we soon see that it is restricted to three uses: (1) in protasis of unreal conditions; (2) meaning *except*, much like *πλήν*; (3) with *δέ*, meaning *otherwise*, without verb expressed. Lk 9¹³, with a deliberative subjunctive following, is exceptional. Such being the facts, it is difficult to combat the assertion that *εἰ οὐ* came to be the norm; ² though doubtless several of its exx. were correct according to classical standards, as in Rom 8⁹, where a single word is negated rather than a sentence. A few survivals of *μή* in relative sentences preserve literary construction; so Ac 15²⁹ D, 1 Jn 4³ (unless we desert the extant MSS for patristic evidence and read *λύει*, with WHmg and Blass), Tit 1¹¹, 2 Pet 1⁹. A genuine example of the old distinction is traceable in the otherwise identic phrases of Jn 3¹⁸ and 1 Jn 5¹⁰: the former states the *charge, quod non crediderit*, the latter the simple *fact, quod non credidit*. But it must be allowed that this is an isolated case.¹ We will leave to the next chapter the only other exception to Blass's canon, the limited use of *οὐ* with the participle.

First among the Moods we take up the
The Imperative:— Imperative. It is the simplest possible form of the verb. *Ἄγε* the imperative of *ἄγω*, and *ἄγέ* the vocative of *ἄγός*, are both of them interjections formed by isolating the root and adding no suffix—the thematic vowel *ε* is now generally regarded as a part of the root rather than a suffix. In our own language, where nouns and verbs have in hosts of cases reunited through the disappearance of suffixes, we can represent this identity easily. "Murder!", in Russia or Armenia, might be either verb or noun—a general order to

¹ See below, p. 239.

² See p. 240.

soldiers charging a crowd, or the scream of one of the victims. The interjection, as we might expect, was indifferently used for 2nd and 3rd person, as is still shown by the Latin *agito*, Skt. *ajatāt*, (= *age* + *tōd*, the ablative of a demonstrative pronoun, "from this (moment),") added to make the command more peremptory). How close is the kinship of the interjection and the imperative, is well shown by the demonstrative adverb *δεῦρο*, "hither," which only needs the exclamation mark to make it mean "come here": it even forms a plural *δεῦτε* in this sense. We shall recall this principle when we describe the use of the infinitive in commands.

There being in Greek a considerable variety of forms in which one man may express to another a wish that is to control his action, it will be necessary to examine the tone of that mood which is appropriated to this purpose. As we might expect from our own language, the imperative has a very decided tone about it. The context will determine how much stress it is carrying: this may vary from mere permission, as in Mt 8³² (cf *ἐπέτρεψεν* in the presumed source Mk 5¹³) or 1 Co 7¹⁶, to the strongest command. A careful study of the imperative in the Attic Orators, by Prof. C. W. E. Miller (*AJP* xiii. 399 ff.), brings out the essential qualities of the mood as used in hortatory literature. The grammarian Hermodenes asserted harshness to be a feature of the imperative;¹ and the sophist Protagoras even blamed Homer for addressing the Muse at the beginning of the *Iliad* with an imperative.² By a discriminating analysis of the conditions under which the orators use the imperative, Miller shows that it was most avoided in the proem, the part of the speech where conciliation of the audience's favour was most carefully studied; and the criticism of Protagoras, which the ancients took more seriously than many moderns have done, is seen to be simply due to the rhetorician's applying to poetry a rule that was unchallenged in rhetoric. If a cursory and limited observation may be trusted, the *éthos* of the imperative had not changed in the age of the papyri. Imperatives

¹ Σχήματα δὲ τραχέα μάλιστα μὲν τὰ προστακτικά.

² *Ap.* Aristotle *Poetics* ch. 19.

are normal in royal edicts, in letters to inferiors, and among equals when the tone is urgent, or the writer indisposed to multiply words: they are conspicuously few in petitions. When we come to the NT, we find a very different state of things. The prophet is not accustomed to conciliate his hearers with carefully softened commands; and in the imperial edicts of Him who "taught with authority," and the ethical exhortations of men who spoke in His name, we find naturally a large proportion of imperatives. Moreover, even in the language of prayer the imperative is at home, and that in its more urgent form, the aorist. Gildersleeve observes (on Justin Martyr, p. 137), "As in the Lord's Prayer, so in the ancient Greek liturgies the aor. imper. is almost exclusively used. It is the true tense for 'instant' prayer." The language of petition to human superiors is full of *δέομαι, καλῶς ποιήσεις*, and various other periphrases whereby the request may be made palatable. To God we are bidden by our Lord's precept and example to present the claim of faith in the simplest, directest, most urgent form with which language supplies us.

The distinction between present and aorist imperative has been drawn already, to some extent, in the discussion of prohibitions; for though the subjunctive has to be used in the aorist, it is difficult to question that for this purpose the two moods hardly differ—the reason for the ban on *μὴ ποιήσον* lies buried in the prehistoric stage of the language. And whatever the distinction may be, we must apply the same essential principles to commands and prohibitions, which were felt by the Greeks to be logically identical categories: see Miller *op. cit.* 416. The only difference will be that the meaning of *μὴ ποιήσης* (above, pp. 122 ff.) comes from the future sense inherent in the subjunctive, while in estimating the force of *ποιήσον* we have nothing but the aorist idea to consider. This, as we have often repeated, lies in the "point action" involved. In the imperative therefore the conciseness of the aorist makes it a decidedly more sharp and urgent form than the present. The latter may of course show any of the characteristics of linear action. There is the iterative, as in Lk 11^s, the conative,

Tenses of Imperative.

as in Mk 9³⁹ ("do not try to stop him, as you are doing"), Phil 2¹² ("set to working out"); and of course the simple durative *passim*. Writers differ in their preferences between the tenses. Thus 1 Pet shows a marked liking for the aorist, which he has 22 times in commands (2nd pers.), against 6 presents; on the other hand Paul has 9 presents to 1 aorist (apart from LXX citations) in Gal, and 20 to 2 in Phil. In Mt 5-7 the presents (still 2nd pers.) are 19 to 24, and in corresponding parts of Lk 21 to 16. In seven passages only do the two evangelists use different tenses, and in all of them the accompanying variation of phraseology accounts for the difference in a way which shows how delicately the distinction of tenses was observed. Mt 5⁴² = Lk 6³⁰, and Mt 6¹¹ = Lk 11³, we have dealt with. Mt 5¹² has continuous presents, following *ἔταν* c. aor. subj.: in Lk 6²⁸ a little more stress on the ingressive element in these aorists makes the addition *ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ* suitable, and this carries with it the aor. imper. In Lk 12⁵⁸ *δός* is natural with *ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ*: Mt 5²⁵ has *ἴσθι εὐνοῶν*, which is curious in view of *ταχύ*. But since *εἰμί* has no aorist, it is not surprising that its imperative is sometimes quasi-ingressive: cf Mk 5³⁴, Lk 19¹⁷, and the phrase *γνωστὸν ἔστω* (Ac *ter*). The punctiliar *στρέψον*, *turn*, in Mt 5³⁹ answers well to the linear *πάρεχε*, *hold out*, *offer*, in Lk 6²⁹. The vivid phrase *ἀγωνίζεσθε εἰσελθεῖν* of Lk 13²⁴ may well preserve more of the original than the constative *εἰσέλθατε* of Mt 7¹³. In all these cases some would recognise the effects of varying translation from an Aramaic original, itself perhaps not wholly fixed in detail; but we see no trace of indifference to the force of the tenses. The remaining example is in a quotation from Ps 6⁹, in which Mt 7²³ preserves the LXX except in the verb *ἀποχωρεῖτε*, while Lk 13²⁷ modifies the address to *ἐργάται ἀδικίας*: here it is enough to say that the perfective *ἀποχωρεῖτε* may have quasi-ingressive sense even in the present.

We have so far discussed only commands and prohibitions in the 2nd person. Not much need be added as to the use of the 3rd. Here the veto on the aorist in prohibition is withdrawn: we need not stay to ask why. Thus in Mt 6³ *μὴ γνώτω*, 24^{17. 18} *μὴ καταβάτω . . . μὴ ἐπιστρεψάτω*, which

all come under ordinary aorist categories. As in classical Greek, the 3rd person is naturally much less common than the 2nd. Though the 1st person is not

**Expressions
for First
Person.**

formally brought in under the Imperative, it will be well to treat it here: a passage like Mk 14⁴² *ἐγείρεσθε ἄγωμεν* shows that

logically it is fair to speak of three persons in the imperative mood, since *ἄγωμεν* only differs from *ἐγείρεσθε* in that the speaker is included with the objects of the command. That this should affect the tone of the command is of course inevitable; but indeed all three persons necessarily differ considerably in the *étos* they severally show. The closeness of connexion between this volitive subjunctive 1st person and the regular imperative is well seen in Sanskrit, where the Vedic subjunctive is obsolete in the epic period except for the 1st person, which stands in the grammars as an ordinary part of the imperative—*bharāma, bharata, bharantu*, like *φέρωμεν, φέρετε, φερόντων* (Att.). In Hellenistic Greek the imperative 1st person is beginning to be differentiated from other subjunctives by the addition of *ἄφες, ἄφετε*, a use which has recently appeared in a papyrus of the Roman period (OP 413, *ἄφες ἐγὼ αὐτήν θρηνήσω*), and has become normal in MGr (*ἄς* with 1st and 3rd subj. making imperative). This is always recognised in Mt 7⁴ = Lk 6⁴²: why not in 27⁴⁹ = Mk 15³⁶ one has never been able to see. To force on Mt a gratuitous deviation from Mk seems a rather purposeless proceeding. Translating both passages simply "Let us see," the only difference we have left is in the speakers, which is paralleled by several similar variations (Hawkins *HS* 56 ff.). It is possible that Jn 12⁷, *ἄφες αὐτήν ἵνα τηρήσῃ*,¹ has the same construction in the 3rd person, to be literally rendered like the rest by our auxiliary, "Let her keep it." (So practically RV text.) The alternative is "Let her alone: let her keep it," which is favoured by Mk 14⁶. The acc. *αὐτήν*, compared with the *ἐγὼ* seen in OP 413, discourages our treating *ἄφες* as a mere auxiliary.² We shall

¹ *Τετήρηκεν* (a-text) is a self-evident correction.

² If we suppose the *τί κόρους παρέχετε*; (durative) to indicate that Judas and the rest were trying to stop Mary, the "let her keep it" (*τηρήσῃ* constative)

be seeing shortly that *ἴνα* c. subj. is an imperative (*ἴνα εἰπῆς* = MGr *νὰ 'πῆς*,¹ *say!*). The word had not yet by any means developed as far as our *let*, or its own MGr derivative *ἄς*. Note that it much more frequently takes the infin. (8 times in NT):² other parts of the verb take infin. 7 times and *ἴνα* c. subj. once (Mk 11¹⁶). Our own word helps us in estimating the coexistence of auxiliary and independent verb in the same word: in our rendering of Mt 7⁴ "allow me" is the meaning, but to substitute "allow" for "let" in a phrase like "let us go" would be impossible. "Ἄφες is "let" as in "do let me go," while MGr *ἄς* is the simple auxiliary.

Perfect Imperative.

The scanty relics of the Perfect Imperative need detain us very briefly. In the active it never existed, except in verbs whose perfect had the force of a present:³ we find *κεκραγέτωσαν* in LXX (Is 14³¹), but no ex. in NT. In the passive it was fairly common in 3rd person (periphrastic form in plural), expressing "a command that something just done or about to be done shall be *decisive* and *final*" (Goodwin). We have this in Lk 12³⁵. The rare 2nd person is, Goodwin adds, "a little more emphatic than the present or aorist": it shares, in fact, the characteristic just noted for the 3rd person. Cf *πεφίμωσο* Mk 4³⁹ with *φίμώθητι* 1²⁵. The epistolary *ἔρρωσο* in Ac 23³⁰ (*a*-text), 15²⁹ (*passim* in papyri), does not come in here, as the perfect has present meaning.

We are ready now to look at the other forms of Command—we use the word as including Prohibition—which supplement the mood appropriated to this purpose. We shall find that forms of command can be supplied by all six moods of the verb—acquiescing for the moment in a convenient misuse of the term "mood," to cover all the subjects of this chapter and the next. The Future Imperative is exceedingly common in this sense.

(1) Future Indicative;

may be taken as forbidding interference with an act already begun. That the *ἡμέρα τοῦ ἐνταφιασμοῦ* was already come, is stated as much by the *προέλαβεν* of Mk 14⁸ as by the phrase in Jn. The action of v.⁸ is narrated completely (as it is by Mk), before the interruption is described.

¹ Thumb *Handb.* 100.

² So Hb P 41 (iii/b.c.).

³ Goodwin *MT* § 108.

It seems to come to it by two roads, as may be seen by the study of its negatives. A command like *οὐ φονεύσεις*, which can be seen in earlier Greek and becomes abundant in the Hellenistic vernacular, is proved by its *οὐ* to be a purely *futuristic* form. Such a future may have the tone of absolute indifference, as in the colloquial *σὺ ἴψῃ*, "you will see to that," Mt 27⁴. Or it may show that the speaker takes the tone of one who does not contemplate the bare possibility of disobedience. Thus in Euripides *Med.* 1320 *χειρὶ δ' οὐ ψαύσεις ποτέ*, "you *will* never be able to touch me," shades into "you *shall* never touch me." Against Winer's remark (p. 397) that this form "was considered milder than the imperative," we may set Gildersleeve's emphatic denial. "A prediction may imply resistless power or cold indifference, compulsion or concession" (*Synt.* 116). We have also a rare form in which the negative *μή* proclaims a *volitive* future, in its origin identical with the *μή ποιήσης* type already discussed. Demosthenes has *μή βουλήσεσθε εἰδέναι*, and *μή ἔξεσται* BU 197 (i/A.D.), *μή ἀφήσις* BU 814 (iii/A.D.), show its sporadic existence in the vernacular *Κοινή*. Blass adds *μηδένα μισήσετε* from Clem. Hom. iii. 69.^a These passages help to demonstrate the reality of this rare form against Gildersleeve's suspicions (*Synt.* 117).¹ Yet another volitive future is seen in the imperatival use of the future with *οὐ* in a question: Ac 13¹⁰ *οὐ παύσῃ διαστρέφων*; Prediction and Command approximate in the NT use of *οὐ μή* (see below, pp. 187 ff.), which in Mt 15⁵, Lk 1¹⁵, Jn 13⁸, Gal 4³⁰, and possibly elsewhere, is most naturally classed as imperatival.

(2) **Subjunctive**; Next among these forms of command comes the subjunctive, already largely dealt with. So we have had the 1st person, as Jn 14³¹ *ἄγωμεν*, Gal 5²⁶ *μὴ γινώμεθα*. The future and the imperative between them carried off the old jussive use of the subjunctive in positive commands of 2nd and 3rd person. The old rule which in ("Anglicistic") Latin made *sileas!* an entirely grammatical retort discourteous to the Public Orator's *sileam!*

¹ To this class I should assign the use of *ὅπως* c. fut. = imper., as in Plato 337B *ὅπως μοι μὴ ἐπεῖς*, *don't tell me*: *ὅπως* is merely a conjunction, "in which case." Though common in colloquial Attic, it is mostly ousted in Hellenistic by *ὅτι*; but see Hb P 45, 60, 168 *al.* (iii/B.C.), Tb P 414 (ii/A.D.), BU 625 (ii/iii A.D.).

[^a See pp. 240, 248.

—which in the dialect of Elis produced such phrases as *ἐπιμέλειαν ποιῆται Νικόδρομος*, “let Nicodromus attend to it”¹—has no place in classical or later Greek, unless in *Soph. Phil.* 300 (see Jebb). Add doubtfully *Ll P 1 vs.*⁸ (iii/B.C.), *Tb P 414*^{26a}. (ii/A.D.). We have dealt already with *μὴ ποιήσης*, the historical equivalent of the Latin *ne feceris*. In the 3rd person the subjunctive is little used: *1 Co 16*¹¹, *2 Co 11*¹⁶, *2 Th 2*³ are exx. The tone of these clauses is less peremptory than that of the imperative, as may be seen from their closeness to the clauses of warning. Such *μὴ* clauses, with subj.—rarely future (as in *Col 2*³, *Heb 3*¹²), which presumably makes the warning somewhat more instant—are often reinforced by *ὄρα*, *βλέπε*, or the like. It must not be supposed that the *μὴ* clause historically “depends on” this introductory word, so that there is an ellipsis when it stands alone. Even where the apparent governing verb is a real independent word and not a mere auxiliary—e.g. in *Mk 14*³⁸, *προσεύχεσθε ἵνα μὴ ἔλθητε εἰς πειρασμόν*—the parataxis was probably once as real as it is in a phrase like *Lk 12*¹⁵ *ὀράτε καὶ φυλάσσεσθε*. In *Rev 19*¹⁰ *22*⁹ we find *μὴ* standing alone after *ὄρα*: cf our colloquial “Don’t!” One important difference between prohibition and warning is that in the latter we may have either present or aorist subjunctive: *Heb 12*¹⁵ is an ex. of the present. But we must return to these sentences later. An innovation in Hellenistic is *ἵνα* c. subj. in commands, which takes the place of the classical *ὅπως* c. fut. indic. Whether it was independently developed, or merely came in as an obvious equivalent, we need not stop to enquire. In any case it fell into line with other tendencies which weakened the telic force of *ἵνα*; and from a very restricted activity in the vernacular of the NT period it advanced to a prominent position in MGr syntax (see above, p. 176). In the papyri we have a moderate number of exx., from which may be cited² *FP 112* (99 A.D.) *ἐπέχον (= -ων) Ζωίλωι καὶ εἴνα αὐτὸν μὴ δυσωπήσης*, “attend to Z. and don’t look askance at him.” An earlier ex. appears in a letter of Cicero (*Att.* vi. 5) *ταῦτα*

¹ Caener 264 (iv/iii B.C.). It must however be noted that Brugmann (*Gram.*³ 500) calls the connexion of this with the prehistoric jussive 3rd sing. “sehr zweifelhaft”: he does not give his reasons.

² Earlier are *Tb P 408* (3 A.D.), *BU 1079* (41 A.D.).

οὖν, πρῶτον μὲν, ἵνα πάντα σφίξῃται· δεύτερον δέ, ἵνα μηδὲ τῶν τόκων ὀλιγορήσῃς. Winer (WM 396) would find it "in the Greek poets," citing however only Soph. *OC* 155. W. F. Moulton, in setting this aside as solitary and dubious, observes that the scholiast took the passage this way—in his day of course the usage was common.^a An ex. for the 1st person may be added: BU 48 (ii/iii A.D.) ἐὰν ἀναβῆς τῇ ἑορτῇ, ἵνα ὁμόσε γενώμεθα. In the NT the clearest ex. is Eph 5³³ ἡ δὲ γυνὴ ἵνα φοβῆται τὸν ἄνδρα, which is correlated with ἀγαπάτω in the first clause. So 1 Co 7²⁹, 2 Co 8⁷, Mk 5²³: Gal 2¹⁰ is the same construction put indirectly. Mk 10⁵¹ and parallels have really the same: θέλω ἵνα more nearly coalesce in Mk 6²⁵ 10³⁵, Jn 17²⁴. The combination θέλω ἵνα,^b which of course is not confined to quasi-imperative use, gave birth ultimately to the MGr auxiliary θά (θενά, etc.),

(3) **Optative**; forming the future tense. The Optative can express commands through either of its main constructions, but its evanescence in the Κοινή naturally limits NT illustrations. The Optative proper (neg. μή), however, does occur in Mk 11¹⁴: note that Mt (21¹⁸) substitutes the familiar construction οὐ μή c. subj. The Potential with ἄν (neg. οὐ), as λέγοις ἄν, "pray speak," is not found in NT at all.¹ The imperatival

(4) **Infinitive**; Infinitive has been needlessly objected to. It is unquestionable in Phil 3¹⁶, Rom 12¹⁵, and highly probable in Tit 2²⁻¹⁰: we must not add Lk 9³, which is merely a case of mixed direct and indirect speech. The epistolary χαίρειν, Ac 15²³ 23²⁶, Jas 1¹, is the same in origin. We no longer need Winer's reminder (p. 397) that the verbs in 1 Th 3¹¹, 2 Th 2¹⁷ 3⁵ are optatives; but it is well to note that our assurance rests on something better than the accentuation, which any one of us may emend, if he sees fit, without any MS that counts saying him nay. The infin. for imper. was familiar in Greek, especially in laws and in maxims. It survives in the Κοινή, as the papyri show: on AP 86 (i/A.D.), ἐξεῖναι and μισθῶσαι, cf Radermacher in *RhM* lvii. 147, who notes it as a popular use.^c Hatzidakis

¹ An ex. perhaps occurs in Par P 42 (ii/B.C.), χαρίζου (= -οιο) δ' ἂν καὶ τοῦ σώματος ἐπιμελούμενος τῷ ὑγιαίνειν.
[^{a b c} See p. 248.]

shows (p. 192) that in the Pontic dialect, the only form of MGr in which the infinitive form survives, the infin. is still used as an imperative for all numbers and persons. We have therefore every reason to expect it in the NT, and its rarity there is the only matter for surprise.¹ Last among

(5) **Participle.** Participle, the admission of which, despite Winer's objections (p. 441), is established beyond question by the papyri. The proof of this will be given when we deal with the Participle in its place. Here it is sufficient to point out that a passage like 1 Pet 3st, where adjectives and participles alike obviously demand the unexpressed *έστέ*, gives us the rationale of the usage clearly enough. It is a curious fact that while *ισθι* occurs 5 times in NT, *έστω* (*ήτω*) 14, and *έστωσαν* twice, *έστέ*, which we should have expected to be common, does not appear at all. *Γίνεσθε* occurs and *έσεσθε*, but it seems more idiomatic to drop the copula: compare the normal absence of the verb with predicates like *μακάριος, κατάρατος, εύλογητός, ούαί*, which sometimes raises doubts whether an indicative or an imperative (optative) is understood. We are accordingly absolved from inventing an anacoluthon, or some other grammatical device when we come to such a passage as Rom 12⁹⁻¹⁹, where adjectives and participles, positive and negative, in imperative sense are interrupted by imperatives in vv.^{14. 16. 19} and infinitives in v.¹⁵. The participles are obviously durative in their action: this is well seen in v.¹⁹, where *έκδικούντες*, meaning either "do not avenge yourselves (whenever wronged)"—iterative sense—or "do not (as your tendency is)" (*supr.* p. 125), is strongly contrasted with the decisive aorist *δότε*, "once and for all make room for the Wrath² (which alone can do justice on wrong)." The infinitives are appropriate in the concise maxim of v.¹⁵. Assuming the cogency of the vernacular

¹ See Deissmann *BS* 344. I do not however think there is any real ellipsis of a verb of command: see below, p. 203. Historically there is probably no ellipsis even in the epistolary *χαίρειν*. It should be stated that Viteau i. 146 claims this also as a Hebraism! See Thumb, *Hellen.* 130 f.; also Meisterhans³ 244-6, for its use in decrees.

² So the EV in the First Revision, and the American Revisers, beyond all question rightly. It is one more example of the baneful effects of the two-thirds rule upon the RV.

evidence given on p. 223 below, we may select the following as probable exx. of imperatival participle from the list of passages in which the absence of such evidence compelled Winer *l.c.* to adopt other interpretations¹:—1 Pet 3^{1.7} 2¹⁸ 4^{8a}: in this last passage ἔχοντες might of course be constructed with νήψατε, and at first sight it seems possible in this way to avoid an asyndeton. But πρὸ πάντων only introduces a series of asyndetic precepts, in which φιλόξενοι and διακονοῦντες must have the same construction. To supply the imperative idea (as in 4¹¹) seems simplest, though of course vv.⁸⁻¹¹ are all still dependent on the imperatives of v.⁷. Since Peter is evidently given to this construction, we may take 2¹² in the same way, though it would pass as an easy *constr. ad sensum* with v.¹¹: one would be inclined to add 1¹⁴, but Hort's alternative must be noted.² These are all the passages we can accept from Winer's list of exx. proposed; a glance at the unrecorded remainder will vividly show what astounding fatuities, current in his day, the great grammarian had to waste his space in refuting. But we may extend the list somewhat. Paul was not so fond of this construction as his brother apostle: note how in 1 Pet 3¹, echoing Eph 5²², the ὑποτασσόμεναι is slipped into the place where Paul (according to B and Jerome) left an ellipsis, having used the verb just before in a regular sequence. But the exx. we have already had are conclusive for Paul's usage. Add Col 3¹⁶ (note the imperative to be supplied after πάντα in v.¹⁷), 2 Co 9^{11.13} and Eph 4^{2.3} (cf 1 Pet 2¹²).³ In 2 Co 8²⁴ ἐνδεικνύμενοι is read by B (and the δ-text uncials,—presumably the reason why WH relegate it to the margin): it is however obvious that the ἐνδειξασθε of NC and the later uncials is not likely to be original as against the participle, which would challenge correction. The imper. in Versions counts for little, if we are right in our account of the idiom; but the participle *ustai knyandans* in Wulfila is a noteworthy piece

¹ We follow Winer's order, tacitly agreeing with his explanation when we pass over a passage cited. The exx. in which the ptc. would be indicatival will be dealt with below. (An important ex. is added on p. 240.)

² I must withdraw 5⁷, cited in *Expos.* VI. x. 450: the participle there goes closely with ταπεινώθητε. Probably 3⁷ was meant—"sed μνημονικὸν ἀμάρτημα," as Cicero says.

³ 2 Co *l.c.* may be for indic. (so virtually RV)

of evidence on the other side. 2 Co 9¹¹ is more simply explained this way than by the assumption of a long parenthesis. Rom 13¹¹ means "and this (do) with knowledge," the participle being rather the complement of an understood imperative than imperative itself. Heb 13⁵ gives us an ex. outside Peter and Paul. With great hesitation, I incline to add Lk 24⁴⁷, punctuating with WHmg: "Begin ye from Jerusalem as witnesses of these things." The emphatic *ὑμεῖς*, repeated in v.⁴⁹, thus marks the contrast between the Twelve, for whom Jerusalem would always be the centre, and one to be raised up soon who would make the world his parish: the hint is a preparation for Luke's Book II. There are difficulties, but they seem less than the astonishing breach of concord which the other punctuation forces on so correct a writer. (See p. 240.) On this usage in general W. F. Moulton (WM 732 n.) sided with Winer, especially against T. S. Green's suggestion that it was an Aramaism; but he ends with saying "In Heb 13⁵, Rom 12^{9a}, it must not be forgotten that by the side of the participles stand *adjectives*, with which the imperative of *εἶναι* is confessedly to be supplied." This is, as we have seen, the most probable reason of a use which new evidence allows us to accept without the misgivings that held back both Winer and his editor. It is not however really inconsistent with Lightfoot's suggestive note on Col 3¹⁶, in which he says, "The absolute participle, being (so far as regards mood) neutral in itself, takes its colour from the general complexion of the sentence. Thus it is sometimes indicative (e.g. 2 Co 7⁵, and frequently), sometimes imperative (as in the passages quoted [Rom 12^{9a}, 16^a, Eph 4^{2a}, Heb 13⁵, 1 Pet 2¹²⁽⁷⁾ 3¹. 7. 9. 15. 16]), sometimes optative (as [Col] 2², 2 Co 9¹¹, cf Eph 3¹⁷)." The fact is, when we speak of a part of *εἶναι* being "understood," we are really using inexact language, as even English will show. I take the index to my hymn-book and note the first line of three of Charles Wesley's hymns:—"Happy the souls that first believed," "Happy soul that free from harms," "Happy soul, thy days are ended." In the first, on this grammatical principle, we should supply *were*, in the second *is (the)*, while we call the third a vocative, that is, an interjection. But the very "!"-mark which concludes the stanza in each case

shows that all three are on the same footing: "the general complexion of the sentence," as Lightfoot says, determines in what sense we are to take a grammatical form which is indeterminate in itself.

Some Elliptical Imperative Clauses. A few more words are called for upon the subject of defective clauses made into commands, prayers, imprecations, etc., by the exclamatory form in which they are cast, or by the nature of their context. In Rom 13¹¹ and Col 3¹⁷ we have already met with imperatives needing to be supplied from the context: Mt 27^{19, 25}, Col 4⁶, Gal 1⁵ (see Lightfoot) and Jn 20¹⁹ are interjectional clauses, and there is nothing conclusive to show whether imperative or optative, or in some like clauses (*e.g.* Lk 1²⁸) indicative, of εἶναι would be inserted if the sentence were expressed in full logical form. Other exx. may be seen in WM 732 ff. But there is one case of heaped-up ellipses on which we must tarry a little, that of Rom 12⁶⁻⁸. There is much to attract, despite all the weight of contrary authority, in the punctuation which places only a comma at end of v.⁵, or—what comes to nearly the same thing—the treatment of ἔχοντες as virtually equivalent to ἔχομεν: "But we have grace-gifts which differ according to the grace that was given us, whether that of prophecy (differing) according to the measure of our faith, or that of service (differing) in the sphere of the service, or he that teaches (exercising—ἔχων—his gift) in his teaching, or he that exhorts in his exhorting, he who gives (exercising this charism) in singleness of purpose, he who holds office in a deep sense of responsibility, he who shows compassion in cheerfulness." In this way we have διάφορον supplied with προφητείαν and διακονίαν, and then the ἔχοντες χαρίσματα is taken up in each successive clause, in nearly the same sense throughout: the durative sense of ἔχω, *hold* and so *exercise*, must be once more remembered. But as by advancing this view we shall certainly fall under the condemnation for "hardihood," pronounced by such paramount authorities as SH, we had better state the alternative, which is the justification for dealing with this well-known crux here. The imperatival idea, which on the usual view is understood in the several clauses, must be derived from the fact that the

prepositional phrases are successively thrown out as interjections. If we put into words the sense thus created, perhaps ἔστω will express as much as we have the right to express: we may have to change it to ὧμεν with ἐν τῇ διακονίᾳ ("let us be wrapped up in," like ἐν τούτοις ἰσθι 1 Ti 4¹⁵). In this way we arrive at the meaning given in paraphrase by the RV.

We take next the most live of the **The Subjunctive.** Moods, the only one which has actually increased its activities during the thirty-two centuries of the history of the Greek language.¹ According to the classification adopted by Brugmann,² there are three main divisions of the subjunctive, the *volitive*, the *deliberative*, and the *futuristic*. Brugmann separates the last two, against W. G. Hale, because the former has μή as its negative, while the latter originally had οὐ. But the question may well be asked whether the first two are radically separable. Prof. Sonnenschein well points out (*CR* xvi. 166) that the "deliberative" is only "a question as to what is or was to be done." A command may easily be put in to the interrogative tone: witness οἶσθ' οὐν ὃ δρᾶσον; *quin redeamus?* (= *why should we not?* answering to *redeamus=let us*), and our own "Have some?" The objection to the term "deliberative," and to the separation of the first two classes, appears to be well grounded. It should further be observed that the future indicative has carried off not only the futuristic but also the volitive and deliberative subjunctives; cf such a sentence as εἴπωμεν ἢ συγῶμεν; ἢ τί δρᾶσομεν;³ With the *caveat* already suggested, we may outline the triple division. The Volitive has been treated largely under the substitutes for the imperative. We must add the use with μή in *warning*, which lies near that in prohibition; cf Mt 25⁹. Introductory words like φοβούμαι, σκόπει, etc., did not historically

¹ So if we start from the mention of the Achæians on an Egyptian monument of 1275 B. C.—'Αχαιωᾶσα = 'Αχαιῶς, the prehistoric form of 'Αχαιοί. See Hess and Streitberg in *Indog. Forsch.* vi. 123 ff.

² *Gram.* 3 490 ff.

³ Eurip. *Ion* 771. On the subjunctive element in the Greek future see above, p. 149. Lat. *ero, faxo*, Greek πτόμαι, φάγομαι (Hellenistic mixture of ἔδομαι and ἔφαγον), χέω, are clear subjunctive forms, to name only a few.

determine the construction: thus Heb 4¹ was really "Let us fear! haply one of you may . . .!"^a Out of the Volitive arose the great class of dependent clauses of Purpose, also paratactic in origin. The closeness of relation between future and subjunctive is seen in the fact that final clauses with *ὅπως* c. fut. were negatived with *μή*: the future did not by any means restrict itself to the futuristic use of the mood which it pillaged. On the so-called Deliberative we have

(2) **Deliberative**; already said nearly enough for our purpose.

It is seen in questions, as Mk 12¹⁴ *δῶμεν ἢ μή δῶμεν*; Mt 23³³ *πῶς φύγητε*; Rom 10¹⁴ *πῶς ἐπικαλέσονται*; The question may be dependent, as Lk 9⁵⁴ *θέλεις εἰπῶμεν*;¹ *ib.* 58, with which cf Marcus viii. 50, *ἔχουσι ποῦ αὐτὰ ῥίψωσι*. We see it both with and without *ἵνα* in Lk 18⁴¹. In the form of the future we meet it in sentences like Lk 22⁴⁹ *εἰ πατάξομεν ἐν μαχαίρῃ*; The present subjunctive may possibly be recognised in Mt 11⁸ *ἕτερον προσδοκῶμεν*; Finally, the

(3) **Futuristic.**

Futuristic is seen still separate from the future tense in the Homeric *καὶ ποτέ τις φείψῃσι*, and in isolated relics in Attic Greek, like *τί πάθῳ*; Its primitive use reappears in the *Κοινή*, where in the later papyri the subjunctive may be seen for the simple future. Blass (p. 208) quotes it occurring as early as the LXX, Is 33²⁴ *ἀφελῆ γὰρ αὐτοῖς ἢ ἁμαρτία*.² So Ac 7⁸⁴ (LXX). From the futuristic subjunctive the dependent clauses with *εἰάν* and *ὅταν* sprang: the negative *μή*, originally excluded from this division of the subjunctive, has trespassed here from the earliest times. There is one passage where the old use of the subjunctive in comparisons seems to outcrop, Mk 4²⁶ *ὡς ἄνθρωπος βάλῃ τὸν σπόρον . . . καὶ καθεύδῃ* (etc., all *pres. subj.*).^{3b} Mr Thackeray quotes Is 7² 17¹¹ 31⁴. To place this use is hard—note Brugmann's remarks on the impossibility of determining the classification of dependent clauses in general,—but perhaps the futuristic suits best: cf our "as a man will sow," etc. The survival of this out-of-the-way subjunctive in the artless Greek of LXX and Mk is somewhat curious;

¹ MGr *θα εἰποῦμε*; is simple future, *shall we say?*

² See p. 240.

³ It must be noted that Blass² (p. 321) calls this impossible, and inserts *εἰάν*. But *BDLA* and the best cursives agree on this reading: why should they agree on the *lectio ardua*? 'Ὅτι εἰάν' (AC) has all the signs of an obvious correction.

^a See p. 248.

^b See p. 249.

it is indeed hardly likely, in the absence of evidence from the intermediate period, that there is any real continuity of usage. But the root-ideas of the subjunctive changed remarkably little in the millennium or so separating Homer from the Gospels; and the mood which was more and more winning back its old domain from the future tense may well have come to be used again as a "gnomic future" without any knowledge of the antiquity of such a usage. Other examples of this encroachment will occur as we go on.

Tenses.

The kind of action found in the present, aorist, and perfect subjunctive hardly needs further comment, the less as we shall have to return to them when we deal with the dependent clauses. One result of the aorist action has important exegetical consequences, which have been very insufficiently observed. It affects relative, temporal or conditional clauses introduced by pronoun or conjunction with *ἄν* (often *εἰάν* in NT, see pp. 42f). The verbs are all futuristic, and the *ἄν* ties them up to particular occurrences. The present accordingly is conative or continuous or iterative: Mt 6² *ὅταν ποιῆς ἐλεημοσύνην* "whenever thou *art* for doing alms," 6¹⁶ *ὅταν νηστεύητε* "whenever ye *are* fasting," Jn 2⁵ *ὅτι ἂν λέγῃ* "whatever he *says* (from time to time)." The aorist, being future by virtue of its mood, punctiliar by its tense, and consequently describing complete action, gets a future-perfect sense in this class of sentence; and it will be found most important to note this before we admit the less rigid translation. Thus Mt 5²¹ *ὃς ἂν φονεύσῃ* "the man who *has* committed murder," 5⁴⁷ *εἰάν ἀσπάσησθε* "if you *have* only saluted," Mk 9¹⁸ *ὅπου εἰάν αὐτὸν καταλάβῃ* "wherever it *has* seized him:" the cast of the sentence allows us to abbreviate the future-perfect in these cases. Mt 5³¹ at first sight raises some difficulty, but *ἀπολύσῃ* denotes not so much the carrying into effect as the determination. We may quote a passage from the *Meidias* of Demosthenes (p. 525) which exhibits the difference of present and aorist in this connexion very neatly: *χρῆ δὲ ὅταν μὲν τιθῆσθε τοὺς νόμους ὅποιοί τινές εἰσιν σκοπεῖν, ἐπειδὰν δὲ θῆσθε, φυλάττειν καὶ χρῆσθαι—τιθῆσθε* applies to *bills*, *θῆσθε* to *acts*.

The part which the Subjunctive plays in the scheme of the Conditional Sentences demands a few lines here, though

any systematic treatment of this large subject must be left for our second volume. The difference between *εἰ* and *εἰάν* has been considerably lessened in Hellenistic as compared with earlier Greek. We have seen that *εἰάν* can even take the indicative; while (as rarely in classical Greek) *εἰ* can be found with the subjunctive. The latter occurs only in 1 Co 14⁵, where the peculiar phrase accounts for it: cf the inscription cited by Deissmann (*BS* 118), *ἐκτὸς εἰ μὴ εἰάν*¹ . . . *θελήσῃ*. We should hardly care to build much on Rev 11⁵. In Lk 9¹⁸ and Phil 3¹⁴ we probably have deliberative subjunctive, "unless we are to go and buy," "if after all I am to attain . . . to apprehend." The subjunctive with *εἰ* is rare in early papyri: cf OP 496 (ii/A.D.) *εἰ δὲ ᾗν (= ᾗ) ὁ γαμῶν πρότερος τετελευτηκώς, ἐχέτω κτλ.* The differentiation of construction remains at present stereotyped: *εἰ* goes with indicative, is used exclusively when past tenses come in (*e.g.* Mk 3²⁶), and uses *οὐ* as its negative; while *εἰάν*, retaining *μή* exclusively, takes the subjunctive almost invariably, unless the practically synonymous future indicative is used. *Ἐάν* and *εἰ* are both used, however, to express future conditions. This is not only the case with *εἰ* c. fut.—in which the NT does not preserve the "minatory or monitory" connotation² which Gildersleeve discovered for classical Greek—but even with *εἰ* c. pres. in such documents as BU 326, quoted above, p. 59. The immense majority of conditional sentences in the NT belong to these heads. We deal with the unfulfilled condition below, pp. 200 f., and with the relics of *εἰ* c. opt., p. 196.

Some Uses of
the Negatives:—
οὐ μή.

Leaving the Dependent Clauses for subsequent treatment, let us turn now to some aspects of the negative *μή*, mainly though not exclusively concerning the Subjunctive. Into the vexed question of the origin of the *οὐ μή* construction we must not enter with any detail. The classical discussion of it in Goodwin *MT* 389 ff. leaves some very serious difficulties, though it has advanced our knowledge. Goodwin's insistence that denial and prohibition must be

¹ Cf above (p. 169), on *εἰ μήτι εἰν*.

² But 1 Co 3¹⁴: cf Hb P 59 (iii/B.C.).

dealt with together touches a weak spot in Prof. Sonnenschein's otherwise very attractive account of the prohibitory use, in a paper already quoted (*CR* xvi 165 ff.). Sonnenschein would make *οὐ μὴ ποιήσης* the interrogative of the prohibition *μὴ ποιήσης*, "won't you abstain from doing?" Similarly in Latin *quin noli facere?* is "why not refuse to do?" The theory is greatly weakened by its having no obvious application to denial. Gildersleeve (*AJP* iii. 202 ff.) suggests that the *οὐ* may be separate: *οὐ μὴ σκώψης* = *no! don't jeer*, *οὐ μὴ γένηται* = *no! let it never be!*^a Brugmann (*Gram.*³ 502) practically follows Goodwin, whom he does not name. We start from *μὴ* in cautious assertion, to which we must return presently: *μὴ γένηται* = *it may perchance happen*, *μὴ σκώψης* = *you will perhaps jeer*, *μὴ ἐρεῖς τοῦτο* = *you will perhaps say this*. Then the *οὐ* negatives the whole, so that *οὐ μὴ* becomes, as Brugmann says, "certainly not." *Non nostrum est tantas componere lites*: these questions go back upon origins, and we are dealing with the language in a late development, in which it is antecedently possible enough that the rationale of the usage may have been totally obscured.

The use of *οὐ μὴ* in the Greek Bible calls for special comment, and we may take for our text some remarks of Gildersleeve's from the brief article just cited. "This emphatic form of negative (*οὐ μὴ*) is far more common in the LXX and the NT than it is in the classic Greek. This tendency to exaggeration in the use of an adopted language is natural." And again, "The combination has evidently worked its way up from familiar language. So it occurs in the mouth of the Scythian archer, Ar. *Thesmoph.* 1108 *οὐκὶ μὴ λαλήσι σὺ;*" Our previous inquiries have prepared us for some modifications of this statement. "The NT" is not a phrase we can allow; nor will "adopted language" pass muster without qualification. In *Exp T* xiv. 429 n. the writer ventured on a preliminary note suggested by NP 51, a Christian letter about coeval with κ and Β, in which Mt 10⁴² or Mk 9⁴¹ is loosely cited from memory and *οὐκ ἀπολλῖ* (*sic*) substituted for *οὐ μὴ ἀπολέσῃ*. Cf *Didache* 15 quoting Mt 5²⁶. *Οὐ μὴ* is rare, and very emphatic, in the non-literary papyri. On the other hand, we find it 13 times in OT citations in NT, and abundantly in the

^a See p. 249.

Gospels, almost exclusively in *Logia*. In all of these we have certain or probable Semitic originals. Apart from these, and the special case of Rev, it occurs only four times in Paul and once in 2 Pet. It will be seen therefore that if "translation Greek" is put aside, we have no difference between papyri and NT. Paul's few exx. are eminently capable of bearing emphasis in the classical manner. The frequency of οὐ μὴ in Rev may partly be accounted for by recalling the extent to which Semitic material probably underlies the Book; but the unlettered character of most of the papyrus quotations, coupled with Gildersleeve's remark on Aristophanes' Scythian, suggests that elementary Greek culture may be partially responsible here, as in the rough translations on which Mt and Lk had to work for their reproduction of the words of Jesus. The question then arises whether in places outside the free Greek of Paul we are to regard οὐ μὴ as bearing any special emphasis. The analysis of W. G. Ballantine (*AJP* xviii. 453 ff.), seems to show that it is impossible to assert this. In the LXX, οὐ is translated οὐ or οὐ μὴ indifferently within a single verse, as in Is 5²⁷. The Revisers have made it emphatic in a good many passages in which the AV had an ordinary negative; but they have left over fifty places unaltered, and do not seem to have discovered any general principle to guide their decision. Prof. Ballantine seems to be justified in claiming (1) that it is not natural for a form of special emphasis to be used in the majority of places where a negative prediction occurs, and (2) that in relative clauses, and questions which amount to positive assertions, an emphatic negative is wholly out of place: he instances Mk 13² and Jn 18¹¹—Mt 25⁹ is decidedly more striking. In commenting on this article, Gildersleeve cites other examples of the "blunting . . . of pointed idioms in the transfer from classic Greek": he mentions the disproportionate use of "the more pungent aorist" as against the "quieter present imperative"—the tendency of Josephus to "overdo the participle"—the conspicuous appearance in narrative of the "articlar infinitive, which belongs to argument." So here, he says, "the stress" of οὐ μὴ "has been lost by over-familiarity." One is inclined to call in the survival among uneducated people of the older English double negatives—"He didn't say nothing to nobody,"

and the like—which resemble *οὐ μὴ* in so far as they are old forms preserved by the unlearned, mainly perhaps because they give the emphasis that is beloved, in season and out of season, by people whose style lacks restraint. But this parallel does not take us very far, and in particular does not illustrate the fact that *οὐ μὴ* was capable of being used by a cultured writer like Paul with its full classical emphasis.¹

Let us now tabulate NT statistics. In WH *text*, *οὐ μὴ* occurs in all 96 times. Of these 71 exx. are with aor. subj.; in 2, the verb is ambiguous, ending in *-ω*; and 15 more, ending in *-εις* (*-ει*) or *-ης* (*-η*), might be regarded as equally indeterminate, as far as the evidence of the MSS readings is concerned. There remain 8 futures. Four of these—Mt 16²² *ἔσται*, with Lk 21³³ and Rev 9⁶ 18¹⁴ (see below)—are unambiguous: the rest only involve the change of *ο* to *ω*, or at worst that of *ου* to *ω*, to make them aor. subj. The passages are:—Mt 26³⁵ (*-σομαι* \aleph BCD) = Mk 14³¹ (*-σομαι* ABCD, against \aleph and the mob). (The attestation in Mt is a strong confirmation of the future for the Petrine tradition in its earliest Greek form.) Lk 21³³ (*-σονται* \aleph BDL) answers to the Marcan *οὐ παρελεύσονται* (13³¹ BD: the insertion of *μὴ* by \aleph ACL etc. means a mere assimilation to Lk), while Mt has *οὐ μὴ παρέλθωσιν* (24³⁵): it is at least possible that our Lucan text is only a fusion of Mk and Mt. In Jn 10⁵ ABD *al.* support *ἀκολουθήσουσιν*. In Heb 10¹⁷ (from LXX) we have the *μνησθήσομαι* of \aleph ACD 17 and the Oxyrhynchus papyrus emended to *μνησθῶ* (following the LXX) in correctors of \aleph and D and all the later MSS. There remains *εὐρήσουσιν* in Rev 9⁶ (AP *εὐρωσιν*, against \aleph B₂) 18¹⁴. We need not hesitate to accept the future as a possible, though moribund, construction: the later MSS in trying to get rid of it bear witness to the levelling tendency. There is no apparent difference in meaning. We may pass on to note

¹ Winer (p. 634) refers to "the prevailing opinion of philologists" in his own time (and later), that *οὐ μὴ ποιήσης* originates in an ellipsis—"no fear that he will do it." It is advisable therefore to note that this view has been abandoned by modern philology. To give full reasons would detain us too long. But it may be observed that the dropping out of the vital word for *fearing* needs explanation, which has not been forthcoming; while the theory, suiting *denials* well enough, gives no natural account of *prohibitions*.

the distribution of *οὐ μὴ* in NT. It occurs 13 times in LXX citations. Apart from these, there are no exx. in Ac, Heb, or the "General Epp", except 2 Pet 1¹⁰. Rev has it 16 times. Paul's use is limited to 1 Th 4¹⁵ (*v. infr.*) 5³, 1 Co 8¹⁸, Gal 5¹⁶. Only 21 exx. in all come from these sources, leaving 64 for the Gospels. Of the latter 57 are from actual words of Christ (Mt 17, Mk 8 [Mk] 1, Lk 17, Jn 14): of the remaining 7, Mt 16²² and 26³⁵ (= Mk 14³¹), Jn 13⁸ 20²⁵ have most obvious emphasis, and so may Lk 1¹⁵ (from the special nativity-source¹) and Jn 11⁵⁶. That the locution was very much at home in translations, and unfamiliar in original Greek, is by this time abundantly clear. But we may attempt a further analysis, by way of contribution to the minutiae of the Synoptic problem. If we go through the exx. of *οὐ μὴ* in Mk, we find that Mt has faithfully taken over every one, 8 in all. Lk has 5 of these logia, once (Mk 13² = Lk 21⁶) dropping the *μὴ*. Mt introduces *οὐ μὴ* into Mk 7¹², and Lk into Mk 4²² and 10²⁹, both Mt and Lk into Mk 13³¹ (see above).² Turning to "Q", so far as we can deduce it from logia common to Mt and Lk, we find only two places (Mt 5²⁸ = Lk 12⁵⁹, Mt 23³⁹ = Lk 13³⁵) in which the evangelists agree in using *οὐ μὴ*. Mt uses it in 5¹⁸ (Lk 21³⁸ has a certain resemblance, but 16¹⁷ is the parallel), and Lk in 6⁸⁷ *bis* (contrast Mt 7¹). Finally, in the logia peculiar to Mt or Lk, the presence of which in "Q" is therefore a matter of speculation, we find *οὐ μὴ* 4 times in Mt and 7 in Lk. When the testimony of Jn is added, we see that this negative is impartially distributed over all our sources for the words of Christ, without special prominence in any one evangelist or any one of the documents which they seem to have used. Going outside the Gospels, we find *οὐ μὴ* in the fragment of Aristion (?) ([Mk] 16¹⁸); in 1 Th 4¹⁵ (regarded by Ropes, *DB* v. 345, as an *Agraphon*); and in the Oxyrhynchus "Sayings"—no. 2 of the first series, and the preface of the second. The coincidence of all these separate

¹ It comes from the LXX of 1 Sam 1¹¹, if A is right there, with *πλεον* changed to the acr. subj. But A of course may show a reading conformed to the NT.

² As to Mk 4²², note that in the doublet from "Q" neither Mt (10²⁶) nor Lk (12⁸) has *οὐ μὴ*: the new Oxyrhynchus "Saying," no. 4, has also simple *οὐ*.

witnesses certainly is suggestive. Moreover in Rev, the only NT Book outside the Gospels which has *οὐ μή* with any frequency, 4 exx. are from the Epp. to the Churches, where Christ is speaker; and all of the rest, except 18¹⁴ (which is very emphatic), are strongly reminiscent of the OT, though not according to the LXX except in 18²² (= Ezek 26¹³). It follows that *οὐ μή* is quite as rare in the NT as it is in the papyri, when we have put aside (a) passages coming from the OT, and (b) sayings of Christ, these two classes accounting for nearly 90 per cent. of the whole. Since these are just the two elements which made up "Scripture" in the first age of Christianity, one is tempted to put it down to the same cause in both—a feeling that inspired language was fitly rendered by words of a peculiarly decisive tone.

In connexion with this use of negatives, *Μή* in Cautious Assertions.

we may well pursue here the later developments of that construction of *μή* from which the use of *οὐ μή* originally sprang, according to the theory that for the present holds the field. It is obvious, whatever be its antecedent history, that *μή* is often equivalent to our "perhaps." A well-known sentence from Plato's *Apology* will illustrate it as well as anything: Socrates says (p. 39A) ἀλλὰ μή οὐ τοῦτ' ἦ χαλεπὸν, θάνατον ἐκφυγεῖν, "perhaps it is not this which is hard, to escape death." This is exactly like Mt 25⁹ as it stands in \aleph ALZ: the *οὐ μή* which replaces *οὐ* in BCD does not affect the principle. The subjunctive has its futuristic sense, it would seem, and starts most naturally in Greek from the use of *μή* in questions: how this developed from the original use of *μή* in prohibition (whence comes the final sentence), and how far we are to call in the sentences of fearing, which are certainly not widely separable, it would not be relevant for us to discuss in this treatise. *Μὴ τοῦτ' ἦ χαλεπὸν*, if originally a question, meant "will this possibly be difficult?" So in the indicative, as Plato *Protag.* 312A ἀλλ' ἄρα μή οὐχ ὑπολαμβάνεις, "but perhaps then you do not suppose" (Riddell 140). We have both these forms abundantly before us in the NT:—thus Lk 11⁸⁵ σκόπει μή τὸ φῶς . . . σκότος ἐστίν, "Look! perhaps the light . . . is darkness"; Col 2⁸ βλέπετε μή τις ἔσται ὁ συλαγωγῶν, "Take heed! perhaps there will be someone who

. . . " (cf Heb 3¹²); Gal 4¹¹ φοβοῦμαι ὑμᾶς μή πως εἰκὴ κεκοπίακα, "I am afraid about you: perhaps I have toiled in vain." So in the papyri, as Par P 49 (ii/B.C.) ἀγωνιῶ μήποτε ἀρρωστῆι τὸ παιδάριον, NP 17 (iii/A.D.) ὑφωροῦμε . . . μὴ ἄρα ἐνθρώσκων ἔλαθεν ὕδατι, "I suspect he may have jumped into the water unnoticed": so Tb P. 333 (216 A.D.) ὑφορῶμαι οὖν μὴ ἔπαθάν τι ἀνθρώπινον. In all these cases the prohibitive force of μὴ is more or less latent, producing a strong deprecatory tone, just as in a direct question μὴ either demands the answer *No* (as Mt 7⁹ etc.), or puts a suggestion in the most tentative and hesitating way (Jn 4²⁹). The fineness of the distinction between this category and the purpose clause may be illustrated by 2 Co 2⁷, where the paratactic original might equally well be "Perhaps he will be overwhelmed" or "Let him not be overwhelmed." In Gal 2² the purpose clause (if such it be), goes back to the former type—"Can it be that I am running, or ran, in vain?"¹ So 1 Th 3⁵. The warning of Ac 5³⁹ might similarly start from either "Perhaps you will be found," or "Do not be found": the former suits the ποτέ better. It will be seen that the uses in question have mostly become hypotactic, but that no real change in the tone of the sentence is introduced by the governing word. The case is the same as with prohibitions introduced by ὅρα, βλέπετε, προσέχετε, etc.: see above, p. 124. One very difficult case under this head should be mentioned here, that of 2 Tim 2²⁶. We have already (p. 55) expressed the conviction that δῶη is really δῶη, subjunctive. Not only would the optative clash with ἀνανήψωσω, but it cannot be justified in itself by any clear syntactic rule. The difficulty felt by WH (*App*² 175), that "its use for two different moods in the same Epistle would be strange," really comes to very little; and the survival of the epic δῶη is better supported than they suggest. There is an apparent case of γνώη subj. in Clement *Paed.* iii. 1, ἐαυτὸν γὰρ τις εἰάν γνώη, θεὸν εἴσεται. A respectable number of quotations for δῶη is given from early Christian litera-

¹ Τρέχω would be subjunctive, since the sentence as it stands is felt as final. This interpretation as a whole has to reckon with the alternative rendering, "Am I running (said I), or have I run, in vain?"—a decidedly simpler and more probable view: see Findlay in *Exp B* p. 104; *Thess.* (in *CGT*) p. 69.

ture in Reinhold 90 f. Phrynichus (Rutherford *NP* 429 456) may fairly be called as evidence not only for the Hellenistic δῶη and διδῶη (which he and his editor regard as "utterly ridiculous") but for the feeling that there is a subjunctive δῶη, though he only quotes Homer. But we must not press this, only citing from Rutherford the statement that some MSS read "δῶη" for δῶ in Plato *Gorg.* 481A, where the optative would be most obviously out of place. If we read the opt. in 2 Tim *l.c.*, we can only assume that the writer misused an obsolete idiom, correctly used in Lk 3¹⁵ in past sequence. Against this stands the absence of evidence that Paul (or the *auctor ad Timotheum*, if the critics demur) concerned himself with literary archaisms, like his friends the authors of Lk, Ac, and Heb. Taking δῶη and ἀνανήψωσιν together, we make the μήποτε introduce a hesitating question, "to try whether haply God may give": cf the well-known idiom with εἰ,¹ "to see if," as in Ac 27¹², Rom 1¹⁰, Lk 14²⁸, Phil 3^{11f.} See in favour of δῶη the careful note in WS 120, also Blass 50.²

We take next the Optative, which makes **The Optative:**—so poor a figure in the NT that we are tempted
Optative to hurry on. In MGr its only relic³ is the
Proper; phrase μὴ γένοιτο, which appears in Lk 20¹⁶ and 14 times in Rom (10), 1 Co (1) and Gal (3). This is of course the Optative proper, distinguished by the absence of ἄν and the presence (if negative) of μὴ. Burton (*MT* 79) cites 35⁴ proper optatives from the NT, which come down to

¹ Note OP 743 ὁλος διαπονοῦμαι εἰ "Ε. χαλκοῦς ἀπόλεσεν, where Witkowski says (p. 57) "idem quod frequentius ἀγωνιῶ μὴ." *Aliter* G. and H.

² Unfortunately we cannot call the LXX in aid: there are a good many exx. of δῶη, but they all seem optative. Τίς δῶη . . . ; in Num 11²⁹, Judg 9²⁹, 2 Sam 18³³, Job 31³⁵, Ca 8¹, Jer 9², might well seem deliberative subj., but Ps 120(119)³ τί δοθείη σοι καὶ τί προστεθείη σοι ; is unfortunately quite free from ambiguity. We may regard these as real wishes thrown into the interrogative form. The LXX use of the optative looks a promising subject for Mr Thackeray's much-needed Grammar. We will only observe here that in Num *l.c.* the Hebrew has the simple imperf.—also that A has a tendency to change opt. into subj. (as Ruth 1⁹ δῶ . . . εἴρητε), which accords with the faint distinction between them. In Dt 28^{24f.} we have opt. and fut. indic. alternating, with same Hebrew. A more surprising fusion still—worse than 2 Tim *l.c.* with δῶη—is seen in 2 Mac 9²⁴ ἔάν τι παράδοξον ἀποβαίη καὶ προσπέληθῃ.

³ But see p. 240.

⁴ Read 38: I correct the remaining figures.

23 when we drop *μὴ γένοιτο*. Of these Paul claims 15 (Rom 15^{5, 13}, Philem 20, 2 Tim 1^{16, 18} 4¹⁶, the rest in 1 and 2 Th), while Mk, Lk, Ac, Heb, 1 Pet and 2 Pet have one apiece, and Jude two. *Ὁναίμην* in Philem 20 is the only proper optative in the NT which is not 3rd person.¹ Note that though the use is rare it is well distributed: even Mk has it (p. 179), and Lk 1³⁸ and Ac 8²⁰ come from the Palestinian stratum of Luke's writing. We may bring in here a comparison from our own language, which will help us for the Hellenistic optative as a whole.² The optative *be* still keeps a real though diminishing place in our educated colloquial: "be it so" or "so be it," is preserved as a formula, like *μὴ γένοιτο*, but "Be it my only wisdom here" is felt as a poetical archaism. So in the application of the optative to hypothesis, we should not generally copy "Be it never so humble," or "If she be not fair to me": on the other hand, "If I *were* you" is the only correct form. "God bless you!" "Come what may," "I wish I were at home," are further examples of optatives still surviving. But a somewhat archaic style is recognisable in

"Were the whole realm of nature mine,
That were a present far too small."

We shall see later that a Hellenist would equally avoid in colloquial speech a construction like

*εἰ καὶ τὰ πάντ' ἔμ' εἴη,
τὰ πάντα μοι γένοιτ' ἄν
ἔλασσον ἢ ὥστε δοῦναι.*

The Hellenist used the optative in wishes and prayers very much as we use our subjunctive. It is at home in formulæ, as in oaths *passim*: *εὐορκούντι μὲμ μοι εὖ εἴη, ἐφιορκούντι δὲ τὰ ἐναντία* (OP 240—i/A.D.), *ἢ ἐνοχοὶ εἴμεν τῶι ὄρκωι* (OP 715—ii/A.D.), . . . *παραδώσω . . . ἢ ἐνσχεθείην τῷ ὄρκῳ* (BM 301—ii/A.D.), etc. But it is also in free use, as OP 526 (ii/A.D.) *χαίροις, Καλόκαιρε*, LPb (ii/B.C.) *ὄς διδοίη σοι*, LPw (ii/iii A.D.), *μηδεὶς με καταβιάσαιτο* and *εἰσέλθοις καὶ ποιήσῃς*,

¹ Some support for the persistence of this optative in the *Koinḗ* may be found in its appearance in a curse of iii/B.C., coming from the Tauric Chersonese, and showing two Ionic forms (Audollent 144, no. 92).

² Cf Sweet, *New English Grammar: Syntax* 107 ff.

BU 741 (ii/A.D.) δ μὴ γένοιτο, BM 21 (ii/B.C.) σοὶ δὲ γένοιτο εὐημερεῖν, BCH 1902, p. 217, κεχολωμένον ἔχοιτο Μῆνα καταχθόνιον, Hl P 6 (iii/iv A.D.) ἐρρωμένον σε ἢ θία πρόνοια φυλάξαι. In hypotaxis the optative of wish appears in

in Hypothesis, clauses with εἰ, as is shown by the negative's being μὴ, as well as by the fact that we can add εἰ, σί, ἰφ, to a wish, or express a hypothesis without a conjunction, by a clause of jussive or optative character. *Ei* with the optative in the NT occurs in 11 passages, of which 4 must be put aside as indirect questions and accordingly falling under the next head. The three exx. in Ac are all in *or. obl.*: 20¹⁶ ("I want if I can to . . ."), and 27³⁹ ("We will beach her if we can"), are future conditions; and 24¹⁹ puts into the past (unfulfilled) form the assertion "They ought to bring their accusation, if they have any" (ἔχουσι). The remainder include εἰ τύχοι in 1 Co 14¹⁰ 15³⁷, the only exx. in Paul, and two in 1 Pet, εἰ καὶ πάσχοιτε 3¹⁴ and εἰ θέλοι 3¹⁷. The examination of these we may defer till we take up Conditional Sentences together. We only note here that HR give no more than 13 exx. from LXX of εἰ c. opt. (apart from 4 Mac and one passage omitted in uncials): about 2 of these are wishes, and 5 are cases of ὡς(περ) εἶ τις, while 2 seem to be direct or indirect questions. Neither in LXX nor in NT is there an ex. of εἰ c. opt. answered with opt. c. ἄν, nor has one been quoted from the papyri.¹ To the optative proper belongs also that after final particles, as we infer from the negative μὴ and from its being an alternative for the (jussive) subjunctive. It does not how-

ever call for any treatment in a NT grammar. in Final clauses. We have seen already (p. 55) that ἵνα δοῖ and ἵνα γνοιῖ are unmistakably subjunctives: if ἵνα δόῃ be read (*ib.* and pp. 193 f.) in Eph 1¹⁷ it will have to be a virtual *wish* clause, ἵνα serving merely to link it to the previous verb; but δόῃ is preferable. This banishment of the final optative only means that the NT writers were averse to bringing in a

¹ Meanwhile we may observe that Blass's dictum (p. 213) that the *ei c. opt.* form is used "if I wish to represent anything as generally possible, without regard to the general or actual situation at the moment," suits the NT exx. well; and it seems to fit the general facts better than Goodwin's doctrine of a "less vivid future" condition (Goodwin, *Greek Gram.* 301).

construction which was artificial, though not quite obsolete. The obsolescence of the optative had progressed since the time of the LXX, and we will only compare the writers and papyri of i/A.D. and ii/A.D. Diel in his program *De enuntiatis finalibus*, pp. 20 f., gives Josephus (i/A.D.) 32 per cent. of optatives after *ἵνα*, *ὅπως* and *ὥς*, Plutarch *Lives* (i/A.D.) 49, Arrian (ii/A.D.) 82, and Appian (ii/A.D.) 87, while Herodian (iii/A.D.) has 75. It is very clear that the final optative was the hall-mark of a pretty Attic style. The Atticisers were not particular however to restrict the optative to past sequence, as any random dip into Lucian himself will show. We may contrast the more natural Polybius (ii/B.C.), whose percentage of optatives is only 7,¹ or Diodorus (i/B.C.), who falls to 5. The writer of 4 Mac (i/A.D.) outdoes all his predecessors with 71, so that we can see the *cacoethes Atticissandi* affecting Jew as well as Gentile. The papyri of our period only give a single optative, so far as I have observed: OP 237 (late ii/A.D.) *ἵνα . . . δυνήθελν*. A little later we have LPw (ii/iii A.D.) *ἵν' εὐοδον ἄρτι μοι εἴη*, in *primary* sequence; and before long, in the Byzantine age, there is a riot of optatives, after *εἰάν* or anything else. The deadness of the construction even in the Ptolemaic period may be well shown from TP 1 (ii/B.C.) *ἠξίωσα ἵνα χρηματισθήσονται*—future optative! Perhaps these facts and citations will suffice to show why the NT does not attempt to rival the *littérateurs* in the use of this resuscitated elegance.

Potential
Optative.

We turn to the other main division of the Optative, that of which *οὐ* and *ἄν* are frequent attendants. With *ἄν* the Potential answers to our own *I should, you or he would*, generally following a condition. It was used to express a future in a milder form, and to express a request in deferential style. But it is unnecessary to dwell upon this here, for the table given above (p. 166) shows that it was no longer a really living form in NT times. It was literary, but not artificial, as Luke's use proves. It figures 30 times in LXX, or 19 times when 4 Mac is excluded, and its occurrences are

¹ See Kälker's observations, *Quæst.* 288 f.

tolerably well distributed and not abnormal in form. We should note however the omission of *ἄν*, which was previously cited in one phrase (p. 194 n.).¹ We shall see that *ἄν* tends to be dropped with the indicative; the general weakening of the particle is probably responsible for its omission with the optative as well. *Τίς ἄν δώῃ*, Job 31³¹ *αι*, does not differ from *τίς δώῃ* elsewhere; and no distinction of meaning is conveyed by such an omission as appears in 4 Mac 5¹³ *συγγνωμότησειεν*, "even if there is (ἔστί) [a God], he would forgive." In other ways we become aware how little difference *ἄν* makes in this age of its senescence. Thus in Par P 35 (ii/B.C.) *ἐξήνεγκεν ὅπόσ' ἄν ἐρευν[ῶ]το*,² the dropping of *ἄν* would affect the meaning hardly at all, the contingent force being practically *nil*. So when Luke says in 1⁶² *ἐνένευον . . . τὸ τί ἄν θέλοι* "how he would like,"—cf Ac 10¹⁷, Lk 15²⁶ 18³⁶ (D) 9⁴⁶,—there is a minimum of difference as compared with Ac 21³³ *ἐπυνθάνετο τίς εἴη* "who he might be," or Lk 18³⁶ *καὶ τί εἴη τοῦτο*. Not that *ἄν* c. opt. in an indirect question is always as near as in this case to the unaccompanied optative which we treat next. Thus in the inscr. *Μαγν.* 215 (i/A.D.) *ἐπερωτᾷ . . . τί αὐτῷ σημαίνει ἢ τί ἄν ποιήσας ἀδεῶς διατελοίη* represents the conditional sentence, "If I were to do what, should I be secure?" *i.e.* "what must I do that I may . . .?" So in Lk 6¹¹ *τί ἄν ποιήσαιεν* is the hesitating substitute for the direct *τί ποιήσομεν*; Ac 5²⁴ *τί ἄν γένοιτο τοῦτο* answers to "What *will* this come to?" Cf Esth 13³ *πυθόμενον . . . πῶς ἄν ἀχθεῖη . . .* "how this might be brought to pass" (RV). In direct question we have Ac 17¹⁸ *τί ἄν θέλοι . . . λέγειν*; The idiomatic opt. c. *ἄν* in a softened assertion meets us in Ac 26²⁹ *καὶ ἄν, εὐξαίμην ἄν* "I could pray." Among all the exx. of *ἄν* c. opt. in Luke there is only one which has a protasis, Ac 8³¹ *πῶς γὰρ ἄν δυναίμην, εἰ μὴ τις ὁδηγήσει με*;—a familiar case of future

¹ Par P 63 (ii/B.C.) has a dropped *ἄν* in a place where it is needed badly: *ἄλλα μὲν οὐθένα ἐπειπαιμι πλὴν δι' ἑλκεσθαι βεβούλευται*. But I would read *οὐθέν ἄ<ν>*—if one may conjecture without seeing the papyrus. (So Mahaffy now reads: he also substitutes *ἀλλά*, and *κακῶς* for *ἐλκεσθαι*.)

² It is unfortunate that this crucial *ῶ* is missing, for *ἐρευνᾶτο* (an unaugmented form) is quite possible, though less likely. The papyrus has another optative, in indirect question, *εἴησαν εἰσπορευόμενοι*.

condition with the less vivid form in the apodosis.¹ No more need be said of this use; nor need we add much about the other use of the Potential, that seen in indirect questions. The tendency of Greek has been exactly opposite to that of Latin, which by the classical period had made the optative ("subjunctive") *de rigueur* in indirect questions, whatever the tense of the main verb. Greek never admitted *τίς εἴην* = *quis sim* into primary sequence, and even after past tenses the optative was a refinement which Hellenistic vernacular made small effort to preserve. On Luke's occasional use of it we need not tarry, unless it be to repeat Winer's remark (p. 375) on Ac 21⁸³, where the opt. is appropriate in asking about the unknown, while the accompanying indicative, "what he has done," suits the conviction that the prisoner had committed *some* crime. The tone of remoteness and uncertainty given by the optative is well seen in such a reported question as Lk 3¹⁵ *μήποτε αὐτὸς εἶη ὁ Χριστός*, or 22²³ *τὸ τίς ἄρα εἶη . . . ὁ ταῦτα μέλλων πράσσειν*. It will be noted that Luke observes the rule of sequence, as he does in the use of *πρίν* (p. 169).²

"Unreal"
Indicative.

The Indicative—apart from its Future, which we have seen was originally a subjunctive in the main—is suited by its whole character only to positive and negative statements, and not to the expression of contingencies, wishes, commands, or other subjective conceptions. We are not concerned here with the forces which produced what is called the "unreal" use of the indicative, since Hellenistic Greek received it from the earlier age as a fully grown and normal usage, which it proceeded to limit in sundry directions. Its most prominent use is in the two parts of the unfulfilled conditional statement. We must

¹ It is sentences of this kind to which Goodwin's "less vivid form" does apply: his extension of this to be the rule for the whole class I should venture to dissent from—see above, p. 196 n.

² On the general question of the obsolescence of the optative, reference may be made to F. G. Allinson's paper in *Gildersleeve Studies* 353 ff., where itacism is alleged to be a contributory cause. Cf OP 60 (iv/A. D.) *ἔν' οὖν ἔχαυτε . . . καὶ καταστήσῃται* (= -ε), where *ἔχητε* is meant; OP 71 (ib) where *εἰ σοὶ δοκοῖ* is similarly a misspelt subj. (or indic.). When *αι* had become the complete equivalent of *η*, *η*, *ει*, and *αι* of *ε*, the optative forms could no longer preserve phonetic distinctness. Prof. Thumb dissents: see p. 240.

take this up among the other Conditional Sentences, in vol. ii., only dealing here with that which affects the study of the indicative as a *modus irrealis*. This includes the cases of omitted *ἄν*,¹ and those of *οὐ* instead of *μή*. It happens that the only NT example of the latter has the former characteristic as well: Mk 14²¹ (= Mt 26²⁴) *καλὸν αὐτῷ εἰ οὐκ ἐγεννήθη*—Mt improves the Greek by adding *ἦν*. It is only the ultimate sense which makes this “unreal” at all: as far as form goes, the protasis is like Heb 12²⁶ *εἰ ἐκεῖνοι οὐκ ἐξέφυγον*, “if they failed to escape” (as they did). There, “it was a warning to us” might have formed the apodosis, and so that sentence and this would have been grammatically similar. We might speak thus of some villain of tragedy, e.g. “A good thing if (nearly = that) there never was such a man.” Transferred as it is to a man who is actually present, the saying gains in poignancy by the absence of the contingent form. *Εἰ οὐ* occurs fairly often with the indicative, but elsewhere always in simple conditions: see above, p. 171. The dropping of *ἄν* in the apodosis of unfulfilled conditions was classical with phrases like *ἔδει, ἐχρῆν, καλὸν ἦν*. Such sentences as “If he did it, it was the right thing,” may be regarded as the starting-point of the use of the indicative in unfulfilled condition, since usage can easily supply the connotation “but he did not do it.” The addition of *ἄν* to an indicative apodosis produced much the same effect as we can express in writing by italicising “if”: “*if* he had anything, he gave it,” or “if he had anything, in that case (*ἄν*) he gave it,” alike suggest by their emphasis that the condition was not realised. We further note the familiar fact that the imperfect in all “unreal” indicatives generally denotes present time:² cf the use with *ὄφελον* in Rev 3¹⁵ and 2 Co 11¹. (These are the sole NT examples of this kind of unreal indicative. The sentences of unrealised wish resemble those of unfulfilled condition further in using the aorist (1 Co 4⁸) in reference to past time; but this could

¹ Cf OP 526 (ii/A.D.) *εἰ καὶ μὴ ἀνέβην, ἐγὼ τὸν λόγον μου οὐ παρέβην*, OP 530 (ii/A.D.) *εἰ πλεῖον δέ μοι παρέκειτο, πάλιν σοι ἀπεστάλκειν*, Rein P 7 (ii/B.C.) *οὐκ ἀπέστη εἰ μὴ ἠνάγκασε σεσημειῶσθαι . . . συγγραφῆν, αἰ.*

² In Lk 17⁸ note *present* in protasis. Cf Par P 47 (ii/B.C., = Witk. p. 64) *ἰ μὴ μικρὸν τι ἐντρέπομαι, οὐκ ἂν με ἴδες*, “but for the fact that I am.”

hardly have been otherwise.¹) The difference of time in the real and unreal imperfect will be seen when we drop the *ἄν* in the stock sentence *εἰ τι εἶχον, ἐδίδουν ἄν*, "if I had anything (*now*), I should give it," which by eliminating the *ἄν* becomes "if (*i.e.* whenever) I had anything, I used to give it." Goodwin (*MT* § 399, 410 ff.) shows that this use of the imperf. for present time is post-Homeric, and that it is not invariable in Attic—see his *exx.* For the NT we may cite Mt 23³⁰ 24⁴⁸ (*ἴδει*) = Lk 12³⁹, Jn 4¹⁰ 11^{21, 32}, 1 Jn 2¹⁹ as places where *εἰ* with imperf. decidedly denotes a *past* condition; but since all these *exx.* contain either *ἦμην* or *ἴδειν*, which have no aorist, they prove nothing as to the survival of the classical ambiguity—we have to decide by the context here, as in all cases in the older literature, as to whether present or past time is meant. The distribution of tenses in the apodosis (when *ἄν* is present) may be seen in the table on p. 166. The solitary pluperf. is in 1 Jn 2¹⁹. It need only be added that these sentences of unfulfilled condition state nothing necessarily unreal in their apodosis: it is of course usually the case that the statement is untrue, but the sentence itself only makes it untrue "under the circumstances" (*ἄν*), since the condition is unsatisfied. The time of the apodosis generally determines itself, the imperfect regularly denoting present action, except in Mt 23³⁰ (*ἤμεθα*).

Unrealised *purpose* makes a minute addition to the tale of unreal indicatives in the NT. The afterthought *ἔδραμον* in Gal 2², with which stands 1 Th 3⁵, has plenty of classical parallels (see Goodwin *MT* § 333), but no further *exx.* are found in NT writers, and (as we saw above, p. 193 n.) the former *ex.* is far from certain. Such sentences often depend on unfulfilled conditions with *ἄν*, and the decadence of these carries with it that of a still more subtle and less practical form of language.

¹ There is one *ex.* of *ὄφελον* c. fut., Gal 5¹², and there also the associations of the particle (as it now is) help to mark an expression never meant to be taken seriously. The dropping of augment in *ὄφελον* may be Ionic, as it is found in Herodotus; its application to 2nd or 3rd pers. is probably due to its being felt to mean "I would" instead of "thou shouldst," etc. Note among the late *exx.* in LS (p. 1099) that with *με . . . ἀλέσθαι*, a first step in this development. Grimm-Thayer gives LXX parallels. See also Schwyzler *Perg.* 173.

CHAPTER IX.

THE INFINITIVE AND PARTICIPLE.

Nominal Verbs and Verbal Nouns.

THE mention of "The Verb" has been omitted in the heading of this chapter, in deference to the susceptibilities of grammarians who wax warm when *λύειν* or *λύσας* is attached to the Verb instead of the Noun. But having thus done homage to orthodoxy, we proceed to treat these two categories almost exclusively as if they were mere verbal moods, as for most practical purposes they are. Every schoolboy knows that in origin and in part of their use they belong to the noun; but on this side they have been sufficiently treated in chapters iv. and v., and nearly all that is distinctive is verbal.

The Infinitive:— The Greek Infinitive is historically either
Its Origin. a locative (as *λύειν*) or a dative (as *λύσαι*, *εἶναι*, etc.) from a noun base closely connected with a verb.¹ We can see this fact best from a glance at Latin, where *regere* is obviously the locative of a noun like *genus*, *regi* the dative of a noun much like *rex* except in quantity, and *rectum*, *-tuū*, *-tū* the accusative, dative, and locative, respectively, of an action-noun of the 4th declension. In Plautus we even find the abstract noun *tactio* in the nominative governing its case just as if it were *tangere*. Classical Greek has a few well-known exx. of a noun or adjective governing the case appropriate to the verb with which it is closely connected. Thus Plato *Apol.* 18B τὰ μετέωρα φροντιστής, Sophocles *Ant.* 789 σὲ φύξιμος: see Jebb's note. Vedic

¹ On the morphology of the Infinitive see Giles *Manual*² 468 ff. It should be noted that no syntactical difference survives in Greek between forms originally dative and those which started in the locative.

Sanskrit would show us yet more clearly that the so-called infinitive is nothing but a case—any case—of a noun which had enough verbal consciousness in it to “govern” an object. The isolation and stereotyping of a few of these forms produces the infinitive of Greek, Latin, or English. It will be easily seen in our own language that what we call the infinitive is only the dative of a noun: Middle English had a locative with *at*. In such a sentence as “He went out to work again,” how shall we parse *work*? Make it “hard work,” and the Noun claims it: substitute “work hard,” and the Verb comes to its own. One clear inference from all this is that there was originally

No voice
distinction.

no voice for the infinitive. *Δυνατὸς θαυμάσαι*, “capable for wondering,” and *ἄξιος θαυμάσαι*, “worthy for wondering,” use the verbal noun in the same way; but one means “able to wonder,” and the other “deserving to be wondered at.” The middle and passive infinitives in Greek and Latin are merely adaptations of certain forms, out of a mass of units which had lost their individuality, to express a relation made prominent by the closer connexion of such nouns with the verb.

Survivals of
Case force.

There are comparatively few uses of the Greek Infinitive in which we cannot still trace the construction by restoring the dative or locative case from whence it started. Indeed the very fact that when the form had become petrified the genius of the language took it up afresh and declined it by prefixing the article, shows us how persistent was the noun idea. The imperative use, the survival of which we have noticed above (pp. 179 f.), is instructive if we are right in interpreting it in close connexion with the origins of the infinitive. A dative of purpose used as an exclamation conveys at once the imperatival idea. The frequent identity of noun and verb forms in English enables us to cite in illustration two lines of a popular hymn:—

“So now to watch, to work, to war,
And then to rest for ever!”

A schoolmaster entering his classroom might say either “Now then, to work!” or “at work!”—dative or locative, express-

ing imperative 2nd person, as the hymn lines express 1st person. Among the NT exx., Phil 3¹⁶ has the 1st,¹ and the rest the 2nd person. The noun-case is equally traceable in many other uses of the infinitive. Thus the infinitive of purpose, as in Jn 21³ ἀλιεύειν *a-fishing*, or Mt 2² προσκυνῆσαι *for worshipping*,—of consequence, as Heb 6¹⁰ ἐπιλαθέσθαι *to the extent of forgetting*,—and other “complementary” infinitives, as Heb 11¹⁵ καιρὸν ἀνακάμψαι *opportunity for returning*, 2 Tim 1¹² δυνατὸς φυλάξαι *competent for guarding*. The force of such infinitives is always best reached by thus going back to the original dative or locative noun.

Tenses.

From the account just given of the genesis of the infinitive it follows that it was originally destitute of *tense* as much as of voice. In classical Sanskrit the infinitive is formed without reference to the conjugation or conjugations in which a verb forms its present stem: thus √ *ḥru* (κλύω), inf. *ḥrotum*, pres. *ḥṛṇomi*—√ *yuj* (*iungo*), *yoktum*, *yunajmi*—√ *bhū* (φύω, *fuī*, *be*), *bhavitum*, *bhavāmi*. We can see this almost as clearly in Latin, where action-nouns like *sonitum*, *positum*, *tactum* and *tactio*, etc., have no formal connexion with the present stem seen in *sonat*, *pōnit*, *tangit*. The *σ* in λῦσαι has only accidental similarity to link it with that in ἔλυσα. But when once these noun forms had established their close contact with the verb, accidental resemblances and other more or less capricious causes encouraged an association that rapidly grew, till all the tenses, as well as the three voices, were equipped with infinitives appropriated to their exclusive service. Greek had been supplied with the complete system from early times, and we need say nothing further on the subject here, since the infinitive presents no features which are not shared with other moods belonging to the several tenses.²

¹ Brugmann, *Gram.* 517 n., regards ὡς ἔπος εἰρεῖν as being for *εἰρωμεν*, and coming therefore under this head. It is a literary phrase, found only in Heb 7⁹: of the would-be literary papyrus, OP 67 (iv/A.D.). On this and other exx. of the “limitative infin.” see Grünwald in Schanz *Beiträge* II. iii. 22 ff., where it is shown to be generally used to qualify *pās* or *οὐδέτε*s, and not as here.

² The Hellenistic weakening of the Future infinitive, which in the papyri is very frequently used for aorist or even present, would claim attention here if we were dealing with the *Κουή* as a whole. See Kalker 281, Hatzidakis 190 f., 142 f. The NT hardly shows this form: apart from *εἶσεσθαι*, I

Infinitive of Purpose, etc. Some important questions arise from the free use in NT of the infinitive which is equivalent to *ἵνα* c. subj. In *ThLZ*, 1903, p. 421, Prof. Thumb has some suggestive remarks on this subject. He shows that this infinitive is decidedly more prominent in the *Κοινή* than in Attic, and is perhaps an Ionic element, as also may be the infin. with *τοῦ*, of which the same is true. In the Pontic dialect of MGr—as mentioned above, pp. 40 f.—the old infin. survives, while it vanished in favour of *νά* c. subj. in European MGr, where the infin. was less prominent in ancient times.^a Now the use of the infin. in Pontic is restricted to certain syntactical sequences. To these belong verbs of movement, like *come, go up* (cf Lk 18¹⁰, Par P 49—ii/B.C., = Witk. 29—*ἐὰν ἀναβῶ κἀγὼ προσκυνῆσαι*), *turn, go over, run, rise up, incline*, etc. The NT (and LXX) use generally agrees with this; and we find a similar correspondence with Pontic in the NT use of the infinitive after such verbs as *βούλομαι, ἐπιθυμῶ, σπουδάζω, πειράζω, ἐπιχειρῶ, αἰσχύνομαι, φοβοῦμαι, ἀξιῶ, παραινῶ, κελεύω, τάσσω, ἐῶ, ἐπιτρέπω, δύναμαι, ἔχω, ἄρχομαι*. With other verbs, as *παρακαλῶ*, the *ἵνα* construction prevails. This correspondence between ancient and modern vernacular in Asia Minor, Thumb suggests, is best explained by assuming two tendencies within the *Κοινή*, one towards the universalising of *ἵνα*, the other towards the establishment of the old infinitive in a definite province: the former prevailed throughout the larger, western portion of Hellenism, and issued in the language of modern Hellas, where the infinitive is obsolete; while the latter held sway in the eastern territory, exemplifying itself as we should expect in the NT, and showing its characteristic in the dialect spoken to-day in the same country. Prof. Thumb does not pretend to urge more than the provisional acceptance of this theory, which indeed can only be decisively accepted or rejected when we have ransacked all the available inscriptions of Asia Minor for their evidence on the use of the infinitive. But it

can only cite He 3¹⁸, Ac 26⁷ (WH mg). Jn 21²⁵ has *χωρήσειν* (κBC), replaced by *χωρήσαι* in the later MSS; but the future is wanted here. The aorist may be due to the loss of future meaning in *χωρήσειν* by the time when the late scribes wrote. The obsolescence of fut. infin. with *μέλλω* in NT and papyri has been remarked already (p. 114 n.).

[^a See p. 249.

is certainly very plausible, and opens out hints of exceedingly fruitful research on lines as yet unworked.

“Ecbatic” *ἵνα*. The long debated question of “*ἵνα ἐκβατικόν*” may be regarded as settled by the new light which has come in since H. A. W. Meyer waged heroic warfare against the idea that *ἵνα* could ever denote anything but purpose. All motive for straining the obvious meaning of words is taken away when we see that in the latest stage of Greek language-history the infinitive has yielded all its functions to the locution thus jealously kept apart from it. That *ἵνα* normally meant “in order that” is beyond question. It is perpetually used in the full final sense in the papyri, having gained greatly on the Attic *ὄπως*. But it has come to be the ordinary construction in many phrases where a simple infinitive was used in earlier Greek, just as in Latin *ut* clauses, or in English those with *that*, usurp the prerogative of the verbal noun. “And this is life eternal, that they should know thee” (Jn 17^s), in English as in the Greek, exhibits a form which under other circumstances would make a final clause. Are we to insist on recognising the ghost of a purpose clause here?^a Westcott says that *ἵνα* here “expresses an aim, an end, and not only a fact.” The *ἵνα* clause then, as compared with (τὸ) *γινώσκειν*, adds the idea of *effort* or *aim* at acquiring knowledge of God. I will not deny it, having indeed committed myself to the assumption as sufficiently established to be set down in an elementary grammar.¹ But I have to confess myself troubled with unsettling doubts; and I should be sorry now to commend that *ἵνα* as strong enough to carry one of the heads of an expository sermon!

Let us examine the grounds of this scepticism a little more closely. In Kälker’s often quoted monograph on the language of Polybius, pp. 290 ff., we have a careful presentation of *ἵνα* as it appears in the earliest of the *Κοινή* writers, who came much nearer to the dialect of common life than the Atticists who followed him. We see at once that *ἵνα* has made great strides since the Attic golden age. It has invaded the territory of *ὄπως*, as with *φροντίζειν* and *σπου-*

¹ *Introd.* 217.

[^a See p. 249.

δάξεν, to mention only two verbs found in the NT. The former occurs only in Tit 3⁸; the latter eleven times. And instead of Attic *ὄπως*, or Polybian *ἵνα*, behold the infinitive in every occurrence of the two! Under Kälker's next head Polybius is brought into an equally significant agreement with the NT. He shows how the historian favours *ἵνα* after words of commanding, etc., such as *διασαφεῖν*, *αἰτεῖσθαι*, *γράφειν*, *παραγγέλλειν*, and the like. One ex. should be quoted: *συνετάξατο πρὸς τε Ταυρίωνα παρασκευάζειν ἵππεῖς πεντήκοντα καὶ πεζοὺς πεντακοσίους, καὶ πρὸς Μεσσηνίους, ἵνα τοὺς Ἴσους τούτοις ἵππεῖς καὶ πεζοὺς ἑξαποστείλωσι*. The equivalence of infin. and *ἵνα* c. subj. here is very plain. In the later *Κοινή* of the NT, which is less affected by literary standards than Polybius is, we are not surprised to find *ἵνα* used more freely still; and the resultant idiom in MGr takes away the last excuse for doubting our natural conclusions. There is an eminently sensible note in SH on Rom 11¹¹, in which the laxer use of *ἵνα* is defended by the demands of exegesis, without reference to the linguistic evidence. The editors also (p. 143) cite Chrysostom on 5²⁰: *τὸ δὲ ἵνα ἐνταῦθα οὐκ αἰτιολογίας πάλιν ἀλλ' ἐκβάσεώς ἐστίν*. It will be seen that what is said of the weakening of final force in *ἵνα* applies also to other final constructions, such as *τοῦ* c. infin. And on the other side we note that *ὥστε* in passages like Mt 27¹ has lost its consecutive force and expresses a purpose.^a It is indeed a repetition after many centuries of a development which took place in the simple infinitive before our contemporary records begin. In the time when the dative *δόμεναι* and the locative *δόμεν* were still distinct living cases of a verbal noun, we may assume that the former was much in use to express designed result: the disappearance of distinction between the two cases, and the extension of the new "infinitive mood" over many various uses, involved a process essentially like the vanishing of the *exclusively* final force in the normally final constructions of Greek, Latin, and English. The burden of making purpose clear is in all these cases thrown on the context; and it cannot be said that any difficulty results, except in a minimum of places. And even in these the difficulty is probably due only to the fact that we necessarily

^a See p. 249.

read an ancient language as foreigners: no difficulty ever arises in analogous phrases in our own tongue.

Latinism?

The suggestion of Latin influence in this development has not unnaturally been made by some very good authorities;¹ but the usage was deeply rooted in the vernacular, in fields which Latin cannot have touched to the extent which so far-reaching a change involves. A few exx. from papyri may be cited:—OP 744 (i/B.C.) ἐρωτῶ σε ἵνα μὴ ἀγωνιάσης. NP 7 (i/A.D.) ἔγραψα ἵνα σοι φυλαχθῶσι (cf BU 19 (ii/A.D.)). BU 531 (ii/A.D.) παρακαλῶ σε ἵνα κατάρχησ. 625 (ii/iii A.D.) ἐδήλωσα Λογγίνῳ εἶνα ἐτυμάση. OP 121 (iii/A.D.) εἶπά σοι εἶνα δώσωσιν. BM 21 (ii/B.C.) ἠξίωσά σε ὅπως ἀποδοθῆ: ἀξιῶ c. infin. occurs in the same papyrus. Par P 51 (ii/B.C.) λέγω . . . ἵνα προσκυνήσης αὐτόν. In such clauses, which remind us immediately of Mt 4³ 16²⁰, Mk 5¹⁰ 3⁹ etc., the naturalness of the development is obvious from the simple fact that the purpose clause with ἵνα is merely a use of the jussive subjunctive (above, pp. 177 f.), which makes its appearance after a verb of commanding or wishing entirely reasonable. The infinitive construction was not superseded: cf AP 135 (ii/A.D.) ἐρωτῶ σε μὴ ἀμελεῖν μου. We need add nothing to Winer's remarks (WM 422 f.) on θέλω and ποιῶ c. ἵνα. 1 Co 14⁵ is a particularly good ex. under this head, in that θέλω has both constructions: we may trace a greater urgency in that with ἵνα, as the meaning demands. From such sentences, in which the object clause, from the nature of the governing verb, had a jussive sense in it which made the subjunctive natural, there was an easy transition to object clauses in which the jussive idea was absent. The careful study of typical sentences like Mt 10²⁵ 8⁸ (contrast 3¹¹) 18⁶, Jn 1²⁷ (contr. Lk 15¹⁹) 4³⁴ 15^{8, 12}, Lk 1⁴³ (for which Winer quotes a close parallel from Epictetus), will show anyone who is free from predisposition that ἵνα can lose the last shred of purposive meaning.² If the recognition of a purpose conception will suit the context better than the denial

¹ So Götzelor *De Polybi elocutione* 17 ff. for προσέχειν ἵνα and παρακαλεῖν ἵνα μή: also Kalker *op. cit.*, and Viereck *SG* 67. Against these see Radermacher *RhM* lvi. 203 and Thumb *Hellen.* 159.

² See further pp. 240 f.

of it, we remain entirely free to assume it; but the day is past for such strictness as great commentators like Meyer and Westcott were driven to by the supposed demands of grammar. The grammarian is left to investigate the extent to which the *iva* construction ousted the infinitive after particular expressions, to observe the relative frequency of these usages in different authors, and to test the reality of Thumb's proposed test (above, p. 205) for the geographical distribution of what may be to some extent a dialectic difference.

Consequence. The consecutive infin. with *ὥστε* has been already alluded to as admitting something very much like a purely final meaning. The total occurrences of *ὥστε* in the NT amount to 83, in 51 of which it takes the infin. A considerable number of the rest, however, are not by any means exx. of what we should call *ὥστε* consecutive with the indicative: the conjunction becomes (as in classical Greek) little more than "and so" or "therefore," and is accordingly found with subj. or imper. several times. Of the strict consecutive *ὥστε* c. indic. there are very few exx. Gal 2¹⁸ and Jn 3¹⁶ are about the clearest, but the line is not easy to draw. The indicative puts the result merely as a new fact, co-ordinate with that of the main verb; the infinitive subordinates the result clause so much as to lay all the stress on the dependence of the result upon its cause. Blass's summary treatment of this construction (p. 224) is characteristic of a method of textual criticism which too often robs us of any confidence in our documents and any certain basis for our grammar. "In Gal 2¹⁸ there is at any rate a v.l. with the infin."—we find in Ti "a^{scr} συνυπαχθη-ναι"—"while in Jn 3¹⁶ the correct reading in place of *ὥστε* is *ὅτι*, which is doubly attested by Chrys. (in many passages) and Nonnus."^a Those of us who are not impressed by such evidence might plead that the text as it stands in both places entirely fits the classical usage. It is just "the importance attaching to the result"—to quote one of Blass's criteria which he says would have demanded the indic. in Ac 15³⁹ in a classical writer—which accounts for the use of the indicative: in Jn 3¹⁶, "had the other construction—*ὥστε* *δοῦναι*, so much as to give—been used, some stress would have been

^a See p. 249.

taken off the *fact* of the gift and laid on the *connexion* between the love and the gift.”¹ Even if the indicative construction was obsolete in the vernacular—which the evidence hardly suffices to prove—it was easy to bring in the indicative for a special purpose, as it differed so little from the independent *ὥστε* = *and so*. The infinitives without *ὥστε* in consecutive sense were explained above (p. 204), upon Heb 6¹⁰. So in OP 526 (ii/A.D.), *οὐκ ἤμην ἀπαθῆς ἀλόγως σε ἀπολείπειν*, “so unfeeling as to leave you,” etc. Sometimes we meet with rather strained examples, as those in the Lucan hymns, 1⁶⁴.⁷² especially. The substitution of *ἵνα* c. subj. for the infin. occasionally makes *ἵνα* consecutive, just as we saw that *ὥστε* could be final: so 1 Jn 1⁹, Rev 9²⁰, Jn 9²—where Blass’s “better reading” *ὅτι* has no authority earlier than his own, unless Ti needs to be supplemented. Blass quotes a good ex. from Arrian, *οὕτω μωρὸς ἦν ἵνα μὴ ἴδῃ*. We should not however follow him in making *ἵνα* consecutive in Lk 9⁴⁵, for the thought of a purpose of Providence seems demanded by *παρακεκαλυμμένον*. 1 Th 5⁴ we can concede, but 2 Co 1¹⁷ is better treated as final: Paul is disclaiming the mundane virtue of unsettled convictions, which *aims* at saying yes and no in one breath. See p. 249.

The infinitive when used as subject or object of a verb has travelled somewhat further away from its original syntax. We may see the original idea if we resolve *humanum est errare* into “there is something human in erring.” But the locative had ceased to be felt when the construction acquired its commanding prevalence, and the indeclinable verbal noun could become nom. or acc. without difficulty. The *ἵνα* alternative appears here as it does in the purpose and consequence clauses, and (though this perhaps was mere coincidence) in the imperative use (pp. 176 and 178 f.). Thus we have Mt 5²⁹ *αὶ συμφέρει*, Mt 10²⁵ *ἀρκετόν*, Jn 18³⁹ *συνήθειά ἐστιν*, 1 Co 4³ *εἰς ἐλάχιστόν ἐστιν*, Jn 4³⁴ *ἐμὸν βρῶμά ἐστιν*, all with *ἵνα* in a subject clause. See Blass’s full list, p. 228, and note his citation from “Barnabas” 5¹³, *ἔδει ἵνα πάθῃ*: still more marked are such exx. (p. 229) as

¹ I quote from my *Introduction* 218, written before Blass’s book.

Lk 1⁴⁸, 1 Jn 5⁸, Jn 15¹⁸, etc. The prevalence of the *iva* in Jn has its bearing on Prof. Thumb's criteria described above (pp. 40 f. and 205); for if the fondness of Jn for *έμός* is a characteristic of Asia Minor, that for *iva* goes the other way. It would be worth while for some patient scholar to take up this point exhaustively, examining the vernacular documents among the papyri and inscriptions and in the NT, with careful discrimination of date and locality where ascertainable. Even the Atticists will yield unwilling testimony here; for a "wrong" use of *iva*, if normal in the writer's daily speech, could hardly be kept out of his literary style—there was a very manifest dearth of trained composition lecturers to correct the prose of these painful *littérateurs* of the olden time! Schmid, *Atticismus* iv. 81, shows how this "Infinitivsurrogat" made its way from Aristotle onwards. Only by such an inquiry could we make sure that the dialectic distribution of these alternative constructions was a real fact in the age of the NT. Tentatively I should suggest—for time for such an investigation lies wholly below my own horizon—that the preference was not yet decisively fixed on geographical lines, so that individuals had still their choice open. The strong volitive flavour which clung to *iva* would perhaps commend it as a mannerism to a writer of John's temperament; but one would be sorry to indulge in exegetical subtleties when he substitutes it for the infinitive which other writers prefer.

We might dwell on the relation of the accus. c. infin. (after verbs of saying, believing, and the like) to the periphrasis with *δτι* which has superseded it in nearly all the NT writers. But no real question as to difference of meaning arises here; and it will suffice to cite Blass's summary (pp. 230 ff.) and refer to him for details. He shows that "the use of the infinitive with words of believing is, with some doubtful exceptions, limited to Luke and Paul (Hebrews), being a 'remnant of the literary language' (Viteau [i.] 52)." So with other verbs akin to these: Luke is indeed "the only writer who uses [the acc. and infinitive] at any length, and even he very quickly passes over into the direct form." The use of *ώς* instead of *δτι* is limited, and tends to be encroached upon by *πώς*: cf Hatzidakis 19, who

**The Accusative
and Infinitive,
and substitutes.**

ought not however to have cited Ac 4²¹ in this connexion. The combination *ὡς ὅτι* in 2 Co 5¹⁹ 11²¹, 2 Th 2², is taken by Blass (*Gr.*² 321 f.) as equivalent to Attic *ὡς* c. gen. abs., the Vulgate *quasi* representing it correctly. It must be noted that in the vernacular at a rather later stage it meant merely "that": thus CPR 19 (iv/A.D.) *πρώην βίβλια ἐπιδέδωκα τῇ σῆ ἐπιμελείᾳ ὡς ὅτι ἐβουλήθη τινὰ ὑπάρχοντά μου ἀποδόσθαι*. Wessely notes there, "*ὡς ὅτι* seem to be combined where the single word would be adequate." He quotes another papyrus, *ὡς ὅτι χρεοστεῖται ἐξ αὐτοῦ ὁ κύρις Ἰανός*. Two Attic inscriptions of i/B.C. show *ὡς ὅτι* c. superl. in the sense of *ὡς* or *ὅτι* alone: see Roberts-Gardner 179. Winer (p. 771) cites Xenophon, *Hellen.* III. ii. 14, *εἰπὼν ὡς ὅτι ὀκνοίῃ*, and Lightfoot (on 2 Th 2²) and Plummer repeat the reference; but the editors have agreed to eject *ὅτι* from the text at that place. Its isolation in earlier Greek seems adequate reason for flouting the MSS here. Winer's citation from the Argument to the *Busiris* of Isocrates, *κατηγόρου αὐτοῦ ὡς ὅτι καινὰ δαιμόνια εἰσφέρει*, will hardly dispose of Blass's "unclassical" (as Plummer supposes), since the argument is obviously late.¹ We may follow Lightfoot and Blass without much hesitation.

In classical Greek, as any fifth-form boy forgets at his peril, the nominative is used regularly instead of the accusative as subject to the infinitive when the subject of the main verb is the same: *ἔφη οὐκ αὐτὸς ἀλλὰ Κλέωνα στρατηγεῖν*. This rule is by no means obsolete in NT Greek, as passages like 2 Co 10², Rom 9², Jn 7⁴ (*WH text*), serve to show; but the tendency towards uniformity has produced a number of violations of it. Heb 7²⁴ has a superfluous *αὐτόν*, and so has Lk 2⁴: Mt 26³² inserts *με*, Phil 3¹³ *ἐμαντόν*, and so on. Blass, p. 238 f., gives instances, and remarks that translations from Latin (Viereck, *SG* 68) exhibit this feature.^a Kälker (p. 280) anticipates Viereck in regarding this as a case of *propter hoc* as well as *post hoc*. But the development of

¹ Dr J. E. Sandys (*Aristotle's Constitution of Athens*, p. xxviii) makes the author of the *ὑπόθεσις* to the *Areopagiticus* "a Christian writer of perhaps the sixth century." He kindly informs me that we may assume the same age for that to the *Busiris*.

[^a See p. 249.

Greek in regions untouched by Latin shows that no outside influence was needed to account for this levelling, which was perfectly natural.

Mixed Construction. The accus. c. inf. and the *ὄτι* construction have been mixed in Ac 27¹⁰, by an inadvertence to which the best Attic writers were liable. See the parallels quoted by Winer (p. 426), and add from humbler Greek OP 237 (ii/A.D.) *δηλῶν ὄτι εἰ τὰ ἀληθῆ φανεῖν μηδὲ κρίσεως δεῖσθαι τὸ πρᾶγμα*. Also see Wellh. 23.

The Articular Infinitive. We will proceed to speak of the most characteristic feature of the Greek infinitive in post-Homeric language. "By the substantial loss of its dative force," says Gildersleeve (*AJP* iii. 195), "the infinitive became verbalised; by the assumption of the article it was substantivised again with a decided increment of its power." Goodwin, who cites this dictum (*MT* 315), develops the description of the articular infinitive, with "its wonderful capacity for carrying dependent clauses and adjuncts of every kind," as "a new power in the language, of which the older simple infinitive gave hardly an intimation." The steady growth of the articular infinitive throughout the period of classical prose was not much reduced in the Hellenistic vernacular. This is well seen by comparing the NT statistics with those for classical authors cited from Gildersleeve on the same page of Goodwin's *MT*. The highest frequency is found in Demosthenes, who shows an average of 1.25 per Teubner page, while he and his fellow orators developed the powers of the construction for taking dependent clauses to an extent unknown in the earlier period. In the NT, if my calculation is right, there is an average of .68 per Teubner page—not much less than that which Birklein gives for Plato. The fragmentary and miscellaneous character of the papyri make it impossible to apply this kind of test, but no reader can fail to observe how perpetual the construction is. I have noted 41 exx. in vol. i of BU (361 papyri), which will serve to illustrate the statement. An interesting line of inquiry, which we may not at present pursue very far, concerns the appearance of the articular infinitive in the dialects. Since it is manifestly developed to a high degree in the Attic orators, we should naturally attribute its fre-

quency in the Hellenistic vernacular to Attic elements in the *Κοινή*; and this will be rather a strong point to make against Kretschmer's view (p. 33), that Attic contributed no more than other dialects to the resultant language. To test this adequately, we ought to go through the whole *Sammlung* of Greek dialect-inscriptions. I have had to content myself with a search through Cauer's representative *Delectus*, which contains 557 inscriptions of all dialects except Attic. It will be worth while to set down the scanty results. First comes a Laconian inscr. of ii/B.C., 32 (= Michel 182) ἐπὶ τὸ καλῶς . . . διεξαγνηκέσαι. Then the Messenian "Mysteries" inscr., no. 47 (= M. 694, *Syll.* 653, 91 B.C.), which has four or five instances, all with prepositions. Four Cretan exx. follow, all from ii/B.C., and all in the same formula, περὶ τῶ (once τοῦ) γενέσθαι with accus. subject (Nos. 122-5 = M. 55, 56, 54, 60). (The Gortyn Code (Michel 1333, v/B.C.) has no ex., for all its length.) Then 148 (= M. 1001, the Will of Epikteta), dated cir. 200 B.C., in which we find πρὸ τοῦ τὰν σύνοδον ἦμεν. No. 157 (M. 417), from Calymnus, dated end of iv/B.C., is with one exception the oldest ex. we have: οἱ παραγενομένοι πᾶσαν σπουδὰν ἐποιήσαντο τοῦ {του} διαλυθέντας τοὺς πολίτας τὰ ποτ' αὐτοὺς πολιτεύεσθαι μετ' ὁμοιοίας. No. 171, from Carpathus, Michel (436) assigns to ii/B.C.: it has πρὸ τοῦ μισθωθήμειν. No. 179 (not in M.), from Priene, apparently iii/B.C., has [περὶ τ]οῦ παρορίζεσθαι τὰς χώραν. The Delphian inscr. no. 220 has πρὸ τοῦ παραμείναι. Elis contributes one ex., no. 264 (= M. 197), dated by Michel in the middle of iv/B.C., and so the oldest quoted: περὶ δὲ τῶ ἀποσταλᾶμεν . . . τὸ . . . ψάφισμα. Finally Lesbos gives us (no. 431 = M. 357), from ii/B.C., ἐπὶ τῶι πραγματευθήναι. I have looked through Larfeld's special collection of Bœotian inscriptions, and find not a single example. Unless the selections examined are curiously unrepresentative in this one point, it would seem clear that the articular infinitive only invaded the Greek dialects when the *Κοινή* was already arising, and that its invasion was extremely limited in extent. To judge from the silence of Meisterhans, the Attic popular speech was little affected by it. It would seem to have been mainly a literary use, starting in Pindar, Herodotus, and the tragedians, and matured by Attic rhetoric. The statistics of

Birklein (in Schanz *Beitr.*, Heft 7) show how it extends during the lives of the great writers, though evidently a matter of personal taste. Thus Sophocles has .94 examples per 100 lines, Aeschylus .63, and Euripides only .37. Aristophanes has .42; but if we left out his lyrics, the frequency would be about the same as in Euripides. This is eloquent testimony for the narrowness of its use in colloquial speech of the Attic golden age; and the fact is significant that it does not appear in the early *Acharnians* at all, but as many as 17 times in the *Plutus*, the last product of the poet's genius. Turning to prose, we find Herodotus showing only .07 examples per Teubner page, and only one-fifth of his occurrences have a preposition. Thucydides extends the use greatly, his total amounting to 298, or more than .5 a page: in the speeches he has twice as many as this. The figures for the orators have already been alluded to. The conclusion of the whole matter—subject to correction from the more thorough investigation which is needed for safety—seems to be that the articular infinitive is almost entirely a development of Attic literature, especially oratory, from which it passed into the daily speech of the least cultured people in the later Hellenist world. If this is true, it is enough by itself to show how commanding was the part taken by Attic, and that the literary Attic, in the evolution of the *Koiné*.

The application of the articular infin. in NT Greek does not in principle go beyond what is found in Attic writers. We have already dealt with the imputation of Hebraism which the frequency of *ἐν τῷ* c. inf. has raised. It is used 6 times in Thucydides, 26 times in Plato, and 16 in Xenophon; and the fact that it exactly translates the Hebrew infin. with *ו* does not make it any worse Greek, though this naturally increases its frequency.^a Only one classical development failed to maintain itself, viz. the rare employment of the infin. as a full noun, capable of a dependent genitive: thus in Demosthenes, *τό γ' εὖ φρονεῖν αὐτῶν*, "their good sense"; or in Plato, *διὰ παντὸς τοῦ εἶναι*. Heb 2¹⁵ *διὰ παντὸς τοῦ ζῆν* is an exact parallel to this last, but it stands alone in NT Greek, though Ignatius, as Gildersleeve notes, has *τὸ ἀδιάκριτον ἡμῶν ζῆν*. The fact that *ζῆν* was by this time an entirely isolated infinitive form may account for its peculiar treatment.^b A

^{a b} See p. 249.

similar cause may possibly contribute to the common vernacular (not NT) phrase *εἰς πείν*,¹ which we compared above (p. 81) to the Herodotean *ἀντί* c. anarthrous infin. The prepositions which Birklein (p. 104) notes as never used with the infin. retain this disqualification in the NT: they are, as he notes, either purely poetical or used in personal constructions. It may be worth while to give a table of relative frequency for the occurrences of the articular infinitive in NT books. Jas has (7 =) 1·08 per WH page; Heb (23 =) 1·09; Lk (71 =) nearly ·99; Paul (106 =) ·89 (in Pastorals not at all); Ac (49 =) ·7 ('73 in cc. 1-12, ·68 in cc. 13-28); 1 Pet (4 =) ·59; Mt (24 =) ·35; Mk (13 =) ·32; Jn (4 =) ·076; Rev (1 =) ·027. [Mk] 16⁹⁻²⁰ has one ex., which makes this writer's figure stand at 1·43: the other NT books have none. It will be found that Mt and Mk are about level with the Rosetta Stone.²

τοῦ c. inf. The general blurring of the expressions which were once appropriated for purpose, has infected two varieties of the articular infinitive. That with *τοῦ* started as a pure adnominal genitive, and still remains such in many places, as 1 Co 16⁴, *ἀξιον τοῦ πορεύεσθαι*. But though the *τοῦ* may be forced into one of the ordinary genitive categories in a fair proportion of its occurrences, the correspondence seems generally to be accidental: the extension which began in the classical period makes in later Greek a locution retaining its genitive force almost as little as the genitive absolute. The normal use of *τοῦ* c. inf. is telic. With this force it was specially developed by Thucydides, and in the NT this remains its principal use. We will analyse the exx. given in the concordance, omitting those in which *τοῦ* is governed by a preposition, and those which are due to the LXX. Mt has 6 exx.: in one of them, 21³², *τοῦ πιστεῦσαι* gives rather the content than the purpose of *μετεμελήθητε*. Luke supplies two-thirds of the total for the NT. In Lk we have 23 exx., of which 5 may be due to dependence on a noun, and about one-half

¹ But not to *εἰς βάψαι*, OP 736 (cir. A.D. 1). Winer (413) cites two exx. from Theodoret. See Kühner² § 479. 2. Add an ex. with *ἀχρεῖ* from Plutarch p. 256 D. An inscription of iii/b.c. (*OGIS* 41, Michel 370) has *ἀποσταλεις . . . ἐπὶ τὰς παραβολὰς τῶν δικῶν λαμβάνειν*: Dittenberger emends. ² See p. 241.

seem clearly final; in Ac there are 21, with 2 adnominal, and less than half final. Paul shows 13 (only in Rom, Gal, 1 and 2 Co, Phil), but there is not one in which purpose is unmistakable. In Heb there is one adnominal, one (11⁵) final or quasi-final. Jas 5¹⁷ (object clause), 1 Pet 4¹⁷ (adnominal), and the peculiar ¹ Rev 12⁷ supply the remainder. Before turning to grammatical detail, let us parenthetically commend the statistics just given to the ingenious analysts who reject the unity of the Lucan books. The uniformity of use is very marked throughout Lk and Ac: cf Ac 27¹ ("We"-document) with 15²⁰ 20³, Lk 21²² with Ac 9¹⁵, Ac 20²⁷ ("We"-document) with 14¹⁸. Note also the uniform proportion of final τοῦ, and the equality of total occurrences. When we observe that only Paul makes any marked use of τοῦ c. inf., outside Lk and Ac (the two writers together accounting for five-sixths of the NT total), and that his use differs notably in the absence of the telic force, we can hardly deny weight to the facts as a contribution to the evidence on the Lucan question. In classifying the uses of this τοῦ, we note how closely it runs parallel with ἵνα. Thus Lk 17¹ ἀνένδεκτόν ἐστιν τοῦ . . . μὴ ἐλθεῖν, and Ac 10²⁵ ἐγένετο τοῦ εἰσελθεῖν (cf 3¹²), where the τοῦ clause represents a pure noun sentence, in which τό would have been more correct, may be paralleled at once by Lk 1⁴⁸, πόθεν μοι τοῦτο ἵνα ἔλθῃ; After verbs of commanding we may have τοῦ or ἵνα. We find the simple infin. used side by side with it in Lk 1^{76t}. (purpose) and 1⁷⁹. It is not worth while to labour any proof that purpose is not to be pressed into any example of τοῦ where the context does not demand it; but we must justify our assertion about Paul. It is not meant that there are no possible or even plausible cases of final τοῦ, but only that when Paul wishes to express purpose he uses other means. In the majority of cases τοῦ c. inf. is epexegetic (Rom 1²⁴ 7³ 8¹², 1 Co 10¹³), adnominal (Rom 15²³, 1 Co 9¹⁰ 16⁴, 2 Co 8¹¹, Phil 3²¹), or in a regular ablative construction (Rom 15²², 2 Co 1⁸). The rendering

¹ WH make this a quotation from Dan 10¹³⁻²⁰: the former verse names Michael, who in the latter says ἐπιστρέψω τοῦ πολεμήσαι μετὰ κτλ (Theodotion). See below.

“so as to” will generally express it. The nearest to pure final force are Rom 6⁶ and Phil 3¹⁰; but in both it would be quite as natural to recognise result as purpose—the main purpose is expressed by a clause with *ἵνα* in each case, and the *τοῦ* c. infin. comes in to expound what is involved in the purpose stated. An extreme case of explanatory infin. is that in Rev 12⁷, where *πόλεμος* is explained by *τοῦ πολεμῆσαι* with subject in the nominative. The construction is loose even for the author of Rev, but the meaning is clear: we might illustrate the apposition by Vergil’s “et certamen erat, *Corydon cum Thyrside*, magnum;” or more closely still—if we may pursue our former plan of selecting English sentences of similar grammar and widely different sense—by such a construction as “There will be a cricket match, the champions *to play* the rest.”

Two other modes of expressing purpose have been, to a more limited extent, infected by the same general tendency. *Πρὸς τό* c. infin. occurs 5 times in Mt and once in Mk, with clearly final force, except perhaps in Mt 5²⁸, where it might rather seem to explain *βλέπων* than to state purpose. Lk 18¹ and Ac 3¹⁹ stand alone in Luke, and the former is hardly final: we go back to a more neutral force of *πρός*—“with reference to the duty” (Winer). Paul has it 4 times, and always to express the “subjective purpose” in the agent’s mind, as W. F. Moulton observes (WM 414 n., after Meyer and Alford). This then is a locution in which the final sense has been very little invaded. *Εἰς τό* c. infin. is almost exclusively Pauline. It occurs thrice in Mt, in very similar phrases, all final; Mk, Lk and Ac have it once each, with final force fairly certain. Jas and 1 Pet have two exx. each, also final; and the same may probably be said of the 8 exx. in Heb. The remaining 44 exx. are evenly distributed in Paul, esp. Rom, Th, and Co—none in Col, Philem and the Pastorals. Westcott on Heb 5¹ distinguishes between *ἵνα* and *εἰς τό*, which he notes as occurring in close connexion in a considerable number of passages: “*ἵνα* appears to mark in each case the direct and immediate end, while *εἰς τό* indicates the more remote result aimed at or reached.” This seems to be true of both *τοῦ* and

εἰς τό. Since we have seen that *ἵνα* itself has largely lost its appropriation to telic force, it would naturally follow that *εἰς τό* would lose it more easily: on the whole, however, this is hardly the case. On Heb 11⁸, Moulton and Westcott, independently, insist on the perseverance of the final meaning, in view of the writer's usage elsewhere. The *εἰς τό γεγονέναι* (mark the perfect) will in this case depend on *κατηργίσθαι*, and describe a contemplated effect of the *fiat* in Gen 1. Paul's usage is not so uniform. It is difficult to dispute Burton's assertion (*MT* § 411) that in Rom 12³, 2 Co 8⁶, Gal 3¹⁷ (not, I think,¹ in 1 Th 2¹⁶) *εἰς τό* "expresses tendency, measure of effect, or result, conceived or actual." Add (with WM 414 n.) exx. of *εἰς τό* expressing the content of a command or entreaty (as 1 Th 2¹²), or acting for the epexegetic inf. (1 Th 4⁹). Purpose is so remote here as to be practically evanescent. We must however agree with SH in rejecting Burton's reasoning as to Rom 1²⁰; for this belongs to the category of passages dealing with Divine action, in which contemplated and actual results, final and consecutive clauses, necessarily lose their differentia. It has been often asserted—cf especially a paper by Mr A. Carr on "The Exclusion of Chance from the Bible," in *Expos.* v. viii. 181 ff.—that Hebrew teleology is responsible for the blurring of the distinction between purpose and consequence: it is a "subtle influence of Hebrew thought on the grammar of Hellenistic Greek." This might be allowed—as a Hebraism of thought, not language—in passages like that last mentioned, where the action of God is described. But the idea that "Hebrew teleology" can have much to do with these phenomena as a whole is put out of court by the appearance of the same things in language which Semitic influences could not have touched. We

have already shown this for *ἵνα*. A few exx. Evidence of the Papyri, etc. may be cited for *τοῦ* from vernacular witnesses:—BU 665 (i/A.D.) ἀμελεῖν τοῦ γράφειν. BU 830 (i/A.D.) χρὴ οὖν ἐτοιμάσειν καὶ προαιρεῖν, ἵν' ἔχῃ τοῦ πωλεῖν: cf Mt 18²⁵, Jn 5⁷, for parallel construc-

¹ See Findlay *CGT in loc.*, where strong reasons are given for accepting Ellicott's interpretation, seeing here the *purpose* of God.

tions with ἔχω. BU 1031 (ii/A.D.) φρόνησον τοῦ ποιῆσαι. *JHS*, 1902, 369 (Lycaonian inscr., iii/A.D. or earlier) τῷ διχοτομήσαντί με τοῦ τὸ λοεπὸν ζῆν εἰς (cause). NP 16 (iii/A.D.) κωλύοντες τοῦ μὴ σπεῖρειν: cf Lk 4⁴², Ac 14¹⁸, etc. BU 36 (ii/iii A.D.) τοῦ ζῆν μεταστήσαι: cf 2 Co 1⁸. BU 164 (ii/iii A.D.) παρακαλῶ σε . . . πείσαι αὐτὸν τοῦ ἐλθεῖν. BM 23 (ii/B.C.) προσδεομένον μου τοῦ περιποιῆσαι. BU 595 (i/A.D.) τοῦ σὲ μὴ εὐρεθῆναι, apparently meaning "because of your not being found," as if τῷ:¹ the document is illiterate and naturally ejects the dative. OP 86 (iv/A.D.) ἔθος ἐστὶν τοῦ παρασχεθῆναι. OP 275 (i/A.D.) τοῦ ἀποσπαθῆναι ἐπίτειμον. CPR 156 ἐξουσίαν . . . τοῦ . . . θέσθαι: cf 1 Co 9⁶. BU 46 (ii/A.D.) εὐκαιρίας . . . τοῦ εὐρεῖν: cf Lk 22⁶. BU 625 (ii/iii A.D.) πᾶν ποιήσον τοῦ σὲ ἀπενέγκε: so 845 (ii/A.D.). The usage is not common in the papyri. Winer's plentiful testimony from LXX, Apocrypha, and Byzantine writers (WM 411) illustrates what the NT statistics suggest, that it belongs to the higher stratum of education in the main. For εἰς τό we may quote the recurrent formula εἰς τὸ ἐν μηδενὶ μεμφθῆναι, which is decidedly telic: as PFi 2 (iii/A.D.) *quater*, OP 82 (iii/A.D.). Miscellaneous exx. may be seen in OP 69 (ii/A.D.), BU 18 (ii/A.D.), 195 (ii/A.D.), 243 (ii/A.D.), 321 (iii/A.D.), 457 (ii/A.D.), 651 (ii/A.D.), 731 (ii/A.D.), and 747 (ii/A.D.). Like the rather commoner πρὸς τό, it seems to carry the thought of a remoter purpose, the tendency towards an end. This is well shown by the cases in which the main purpose is represented by ἵνα or ὅπως, and an ultimate object is tacked on with the articular infinitive. Thus BU 226 (i/A.D.) ὅπως εἰδῆ παρέσεσται (= θαι) αὐτὸν . . . ὅταν κτλ . . . πρὸς τὸ τυχῖν με τῆς ἀπὸ σοῦ βοηθείας. OP 237 (ii/A.D.) ὅπως φροντίσης ἀκόλουθα πρᾶξαι . . . πρὸς τὸ μὴ περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν πάλιν αὐτὸν ἐντυγχάνειν. *ib.* [ἵνα] δ' οὖν . . . διαμένῃ . . . ἢ χρήσεις πρὸς τὸ μὴ πάλιν ἀπογραφῆς δεθῆναι. This kind of final force is just what we have seen in nearly all the NT exx.; nor do those in which the purpose is least evident go beyond what we see in these other illustrations.

Before dealing with the Participle proper, we may

¹ Cf 2 Co 2¹⁸; LPb (ii/B.C.) ἄλλως δὲ τῷ μηθέν' ἔχειν πλὴν τοῦ Πτολεμαίου.

briefly touch on another category closely connected with it. Brugmann has shown (*Idg. Forsch.* v. 89 ff.) that the Greek participle, formed with the suffixes *-nt-*, *-meno-*, and *-wos-* (*-us-*), represents the proëthnic participle, which was intimately connected with the tense system; while there are primitive verbal adjectives, notably that in *-to-*, which in other languages—Latin and English are obvious examples—have become associated more intimately with the verb. The *-τός* form in Greek has never come into the verb system; and its freedom from tense connexions may be seen from the single fact that “*amatus est*” and “*he is loved*” represent different tenses, while “*scriptum est*” and “*it is written*” agree.¹ Even in Latin, a word like *tacitus* illustrates the absence of both tense and voice from the adjective in its primary use. Brugmann’s paper mainly concerns Latin and the Italic dialects, and we shall only pursue the subject just as far as the interpretation of the Greek *-τός* calls us. The absence of *voice* has just been remarked on. This is well shown by the ambiguity of *ἀδύνατον* in Rom 8^s: is it “*incapable*,” as in Ac 14^s, Rom 15¹, or “*impossible*,” as in the other NT occurrences? Grammar cannot tell us: it is a purely lexical problem. As to absence of *tense*, we may note that both in Greek and English this adjective is wholly independent of time and of “*Aktionsart*.” Both *ἀγαπητός* and *beloved* may answer indifferently to *ἀγαπώμενος*, *ἠγαπημένος*, and *ἀγαπηθείς*. This fact has some exegetical importance. Thus in Mt 25⁴¹ the timeless adjective “*cursed*” would answer to the Greek *κατάρατοι*. The perfect *κατηραμένοι* has the full perfect force, “*having become the subjects of a curse*”; and this makes the predicate translation (RVmg “*under a curse*”) decidedly more probable. That our *-d* (*-n*) participle has no tense force in itself, and that consequently we have no exact representative of either present, aorist or perfect participle passive in Greek, is a point that will often need to be borne in mind. The very word just used, *borne*, translates the

¹ The verbal adjective in *-no-* stands parallel with that in *-to-* from primitive times.

present *αἰρόμενον* in Mk 2^s, while its punctiliar equivalent *brought* represents (RVmg) the aorist *ἐνεχθείσαν* in 2 Pet 1¹⁸, and the similar *taken away* stands for *ἡρμένον* in Jn 20¹; and yet all these are called "past participle" in English grammars. Having cleared the way for a lexical treatment of the verbals in *-τός*, by leaving usage in each case to decide whether an intransitive, an active, or a passive meaning is to be assigned to each word, we may give two or three examples which will lead to a new point. *Συνητός* is a good example of an ambiguous word: it is always active, "intelligent," in NT, but in earlier writers it is also passive. LS cite Euripides *IT* 1092 *εὐξύνετος ξυνετοῖσι βοά* as combining the two. *Ἀσύνετος* in Rom 1²¹ is also active, but the next word *ἀσύνθετος*, combined with it by paronomasia, gets its meaning from the middle *συνθέσθαι*, "not covenanting." An example of the passive, and at the same time of the free use of these adjectives in composition, is *θεοδιδακτος* "God-taught." Intransitive verbs naturally cannot show passive meaning. Thus *ζεστός* *fervidus*, from *ζέ(σ)ω* "to boil." But when we examine *θνητός*, we see it does not mean "dying" but "mortal"; *παθητός* is probably not "suffering" but "capable of suffering," *patibilis*. So often with transitive verbs. "The 'invincible' Armada" would be rendered *ὁ ἀήττητος δὴ στόλος*: *invictus* would be similarly used in Latin, and "unconquered" can be read in that sense in English. A considerable number of these adjectives answer thus to Latin words in *-bilis*, as will be seen from the lexicon: we need cite no more here. It will be enough merely to mention the gerundive in *-τέος*, as it is only found in Lk 5³⁸, *βλητέον* "one must put." It is not unknown in the papyri, but can hardly have belonged to the genuine popular speech.

A considerable proportion of what we have to say about the Participle has been anticipated. One Hellenistic use, already adumbrated in the discussion of the Imperative (pp. 180 ff.), may be finished off at this point, before we go on to describe subordinate participial clauses. That the participle can be used for indicative or imperative seems to be fairly established now by the papyri. Let us present our evidence before applying it to the NT exx., which we have already

**Participle for
Indicative.**

given so far as the imperative is concerned. For indicative the following may be cited:—Tb P 14 (ii/B.C.) τῶι οὖν *σημαινομένῳ* Ἡράτι παρηγγελκότες ἐνώπιον, "I gave notice to a person" (no verb follows). Tb P 42 (ib.) ἡδίκημένος (no verb follows). AP 78 (ii/A.D.) βίαν πάσχων ἐκάστοτε, etc. (no verb). Tb P 58 (ii/B.C.) γράφας ὅπως εἰδῆς, καὶ σὺ ἀναγωνιάτος ἴσθαι. NP 49 (iii/A.D.) ὅτι ". . . ἐξαγήσαντες . . . καὶ . . . σφετερίσαντες, καὶ ἀπάντηκα αὐτοῖς. . ." On GH 26 (ii/B.C.), δ̄ *συνεπικελευούσης* τῆς τούτων μητρὸς Θρήρις τῆς Παῶτος *συνευδοκοῦντες* τῶν προγεγρα(μμένων), the edd. remark: "The construction is hopeless; one of the participles *συνεπικ.* or *συνευδ.* must be emended to the indicative, and the cases altered accordingly." The writer of the papyrus uses his cases in a way which would have convicted him of Semitic birth before any jury of NT grammarians not very long ago; but if *συνευδοκοῦμεν* is meant by the *συνευδοκοῦντες*, we may perhaps translate without emendation, taking τῶν π. as partitive gen. like Ac 21¹⁶ (*supr.*, p. 73). In Par P 63 (ii/B.C.) *ἔντευξιν* ἡμῶν *προφερόμενοι* comes in so 'ong a sentence that the absence of finite verb may be mere anacoluthon. OP 725 (ii/A.D.) ὁ δὲ Ἡ. *εὐδοκῶν* τούτοις *πᾶσι* καὶ *ἐκδειδάξειν*, "H. agrees to all this, and to teach," etc. In CPR 4 (i/A.D.), καὶ *μηδένα* *κωλύοντα*, for *κωλύειν*, seems to be the same thing in *orat. obl.*, but more clearly due to anacoluthon. For the imperative there is the formula seen in G 35 (i/B.C.) *ἑαυτῶν* δὲ *ἐπιμελόμενοι* ἴν' *ὑγιαίνητε* (1st person plural precedes): so Par P 63, G 30, Path P 1, Tb P 12 (all Ptolemaic), etc. FP 112 (i/A.D., translated above, p. 178) *ἐπέχον* (= -ων) Ζωίλωι καὶ εἶνα αὐτὸν *μὴ* *δυσωπῆσης*. Tb P 59 (i/B.C., = Witk. p. 88) *ἐν* *οἷς* *ἐὰν* *προσδέησθέ* *μου* *ἐπιτάσσοντές* *μοι* *προθυμότερον*—following a gen. abs.¹ The writer is "an official of some importance" (G. & H.) who bears a Greek name. We may observe that the participial use we are discussing is in the papyri not at all a mark of inferior education. Though fairly certain, it was not very common. It may be recalled that in a prehistoric stage Latin used the participle for an indicative, where the 2nd plur. middle for some reason became unpopular; and *sequimīnī* = *ἐπόμενοι* not only established itself in the present, but even produced

¹ Add PP ii. 19 *ἀξιῶ* *σε* . . . *δοῦς* *κτλ* (q.v.), and G 30 (= Witk. p. 88).

analogy-formations in future and imperfect, and in the subjunctive.¹ Of the constant ellipsis of *est* in perfect indic. passive. If further analogies may be permitted, we might refer to the plausible connexion claimed between the 3rd plural indicative and the participle in all languages of our family: *bheronti* (*ferunt*, *φέρουσι*, Gothic *bairand*, etc.), and *bheront-* (*ferens*, *φέρων*, *bairands*). These analogies are only adduced to show that the use of the participle always lay ready to hand, with or without the auxiliary verb, and was a natural resource whenever the ordinary indicative (or, less often, imperative) was for any cause set aside. In D we find this use apparently arising from the literal translation of Aramaic: see Wellh. 21. We may proceed to give some NT passages in which the participle appears to stand for an indicative: those where the imperative is needed were given on pp. 180 ff. As before, we shall begin with those from Winer's list (p. 441 f.) in which we may now reject his alternative construction. Rom 5¹¹ *καυχώμενοι* is most naturally taken this way: Winer's explanation seems forced. The *a*-text MSS correctly glossed the true reading with their *καυχώμεθα*. In Heb 7² we might have to take refuge in explaining *ἐρμηνευόμενος* as an indicative, if we felt ourselves tied to *δς συναντήσας* in v.¹, which is read by *κABC²DEK* 17. But it seems clear that we may here accept the conjecture of C*LP and the later MSS, the doubled sigma being a primitive error parallel with those in 11³⁵ *γυναικας* (*κAD* and the new Oxyrhynchus papyrus) and 11⁴ *αὐτοῦ τῷ Θεῷ* (where Hort's *αὐτῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ* is now found in the papyrus, as well as in Clement): this is an excellent witness to the scrupulous accuracy of the *β*-text in preserving even errors in its ancient source. In Heb 8¹⁰ 10¹⁶ *διδούς* is parallel to *ἐπιγράψω*, if the order of thought is to be maintained: the LXX had *διδούς δώσω*, but AQ and Heb omit *δώσω* (because there was only the simple Qal in the Hebrew?), leaving *διδούς* to do the work of an indicative. Winer (p. 717) would make *ἐπιγράψω* a substitute for participle, as in Col 1²⁶, 1 Co 7³⁷, etc. In Ac 24⁵ *εὐρόντες* arrives at the goal by the way of anacoluthon—Luke cruelly reports

¹ *Sequimini* imperative has a different history: of the old infinitive *ἐπέμενα*, Skt. *sacamana*. See p. 241.

the orator *verbatim*. In 2 Co 7⁵ θλιβόμενοι is most simply taken in this way: perhaps παρεκλήθημεν was in mind for the main verb. Ἀπαγγέλλων in the *a*-text (HLP and cursives) of Ac 26²⁰ would be explained thus, though the influence of ἐγενόμην is still consciously present: were this a marked irregularity, the Syrian revisers would hardly have admitted it. In Rom 12⁶ ἔχοντες is I think for ἔχομεν: see above, p. 183. In Rev 10² ἔχων is for εἶχεν: Winer allows that "ἐστί [rather ἦν] may be supplied." So 21^{12, 14}. A different class of participle altogether is that coming under the head of "hanging nominative," which our own nominative absolute translates so exactly that we forget the genitive presumed in the Greek. Heb 10¹ will be a case in point if the text is sound—Westcott and Peake accept δύναται, which is strongly supported by the combination DH boh vg: the RV (so W. F. Moulton, *Comm. in loc.*) follows the construction expressly vouched for by Theophylact, reading ἔχων as an "absolute clause." In Phil 1³⁰ ἔχοντες similarly takes the place of a gen. abs. (or dat. agreeing with ὑμῖν)—the construction is taken up as if ἐλάβετε had preceded.¹ The idiom in fact is due merely to anacoluthon: see other exx. in WM 716 and Jannaris *HG* 500. Answering Viteau, who as usual sees Hebraism here, Thumb observes (*Hellenismus* 131) that the usage is found in classical Greek, and in Hellenistic both in and outside Biblical Greek, "and is the precursor of the process which ends in MGr with the disappearance of the old participial constructions, only an absolute form in -οντας being left." This construction is identical, to be sure, with the *nom. pendens* unaccompanied by the participle: it is as common in English as in Greek, and just as "Hebraistic" in the one as in the other.²

Participles
with εἶναι.

We saw when we first introduced the participial substitute for indicative or imperative (p. 182), that its rationale was practically the suppression of the substantive verb. Our next subject will therefore naturally be the use of the participle in peri-

¹ Lightfoot rejects the alternative punctuation (WH) which would treat *ἦν* . . . *πάσχειν* as a parenthesis. So Kennedy. (*EGT in loc.*)—rightly, it seems to me.

² Add 1 Th 2¹¹: see Dr G. Milligan *in loc.*

phrastic tenses. Since the question of Semitism is rather acute here, we will deal with it first. Blass (pp. 202 ff.) discovers the influence of Aramaic especially in the periphrastic imperfect: in the case of Mt, Mk, Lk and Ac 1-12 "this is no doubt due to their being direct translations from Aramaic originals"—"based on direct translations," would be a better way to put it. Schmid (*Attic.* iii. 113 f.) has a valuable note, in which, after sketching the extent of this periphrasis in classical Greek and literary *Koinḗ*, he remarks that in Par P he can only find it in future-perfects, and twice in optative with aor. participle. Comparing this scanty result with "the extraordinary abundance of the participial periphrasis in NT . . ., one cannot avoid separating the NT use from that of the *Koinḗ*, and deriving it from the Heb. and Syr. application of the participle." We can of course have no objection to this, within limits. In translated Greek, as we have seen again and again, we expect to find over-literal renderings,—still more to find an overdoing of correct idioms which answer exactly to locutions characteristic of the language rendered. The latter is the case here. No one denies that periphrasis is thoroughly Greek: see the page and a half of classical exx. in Kühner-Gerth i. 38 ff. It is only that where Aramaic sources underlie the Greek, there is inordinate frequency of a use which Hellenistic has not conspicuously developed. Cf Wellh. 25. The exx. in Jn (see Blass 203 n.) and Paul we may treat on purely Greek lines. By way of further limiting the usage, we observe that the imperfect is the only tense in which correspondence with Aramaic is close enough to justify much of a case for dependence. No less an authority than Wellhausen warns us not to carry the thesis into the imperative: "*Ἴσθι* in imperative before participle or adjective often occurs (Mk 5³⁴, Lk 19¹⁷), and in consideration of Prov 3⁵ LXX is not to be treated as an Aramaism" (*Comm.* on Mt 5²⁵). Then we note the papyrus usage. *Ἐχων ἐστί* and *δέον ἐστί* (with other impersonal verbs) are both classical and vernacular. The future *ἔσομαι* c. perf. part. is well kept up in the papyri, and so is the periphrastic pluperfect: thus, OP 285 (i/Δ D.) *ὄν ἤμην ἐνδεδυμένος χιτῶνα*, Par P 8 (ii/B.C.) *ὄν ἤμην δι' αὐτῶν παραμεμετρηκῦα*. There can be no thought of Aramaisms

here.¹ But BU 183 (i/A.D.), ἐφ' ὃν χρόνον ζῶσα ἦ, is rather limited illustration for the present participle in this usage. Winer however cites Lucian, observing that its common appearance in the LXX "was but seldom suggested by the Hebrew." In classical Greek Rutherford showed (*CR* xvii. 249) that the idiom imparts a special emphasis. So in Thuc. iv. 54 ἦσαν δὲ τινες καὶ γενόμενοι τῷ Νικίᾳ λόγοι, "some proposals were even *actually* made to N." Antiphon (Fr. M. 3. 67) ἦν ὁ γρίφος ἐνταῦθα ῥέπων, "the puzzle *did indeed* mean as much." Aristoph. *Ach.* 484 ἔστηκας; οὐκ εἶ καταπιῶν Εὐριπίδην; "afraid to go! not *effectually* saturated with Euripides!" May we not apply this in the originally Greek parts of NT—*e.g.* Gal 1^{22t}, "I was *entirely* unknown—only they had been *hearing*"? (Cf Lightfoot.) Paul has only one other ex. in imperfect, Phil 2²⁶, where ἐπιποθῶν and ἀδημονῶν seem decidedly adjectival, and not at all improved by reading them as imperfect. (No one would cite 2 Co 5¹⁹.) Blass well remarks that in Jn "in most passages ἦν has a certain independence of its own"; and he further notes that in Ac 13–28, where Aramaic sources are almost entirely absent, the Semitisms fail, except in 22¹⁹, in a speech delivered in Aramaic. The total number of exx. of pres. partic. with imperf. of εἶναι is for Mt 3 (only 7²⁹ possibly Aramaising), Mk 16, Lk 30, Ac (1–12) 17, (13–28) 7, Jn 10, Paul 3, 1 Pet 1.² Large deductions would have to be made from these figures, on any theory, to get the maximum of exx. for the supposed literal translation of an Aramaic periphrastic imperfect. Even in Mk and Luke the ἦν is generally very distinct from the participle; and whatever was the Aramaic original, we may be quite sure that such expressions as we find in Mk 10³² or Lk 4³³ owe nothing to it in this way. See p. 249.

The participle as a whole has diverged so little from earlier usage that we have not very much more to say. The *tenses* need no further discussion in this volume; and for our present purpose little need be added to what was said about the articular participle on pp. 126 f. An

¹ Three papyri of iii/A.D. have aor. ptc. with εἰμί in fut. perf. sense. Note *Syll.* 923⁸² (ii/B.C.) ἀποκεκρμένης οὐσης: Arist. *Ran.* 721 shows this in colloquial Attic. So Col 1²¹.

² I count ἐστῶς as a present, but omit ἐξὸν ἦν, and give Jn 1⁹, but not Lk 8²⁹

idiomatic use of ὁ ὢν may be noted in Ac 13¹ κατὰ τὴν οὖσαν ἐκκλησίαν, "the local church," 14¹⁸ D τοῦ ὄντος Διὸς

**Articular
Participle.**

Προπόλεως (or πρὸ πόλεως).¹ Cf Ramsay's remark (*Ch. in Rom. Emp.* 52, quoting J. A. Robinson), that in Ac ὁ ὢν "introduces some technical phrase, or some term which it marks out as having a technical sense (cf 5¹⁷ 13¹ 28¹⁷), and is almost equivalent to τοῦ ὀνομαζομένου." An ingenious person might apply this in Eph 1¹ to the text with ἐν Ἐφέσῳ absent; but the usual view needs no defence against such an alternative. With αἱ οὖσαι in Rom 13¹ we may compare Par P 5 (ii/B.C.) ἐφ' ἱερέων καὶ ἱερείων τῶν ὄντων καὶ οὐσῶν. On the crucial passage Rom 9⁵ see SH p. 235 f., with whom I agree, though the argument that "He who is God over all," would have to be ὁ ἐπὶ π. θ. might perhaps be met by applying the idiom noted above for Ac, with a different *nuance*. Θεός may still be subject, not predicate, without making ὢν otiose: the consciousness of Ex 3¹⁴ might fairly account for its insertion. It is exegesis rather than grammar which makes the reference to Christ probable. One other Pauline passage claims a brief note, Col 2³, where the natural δὲ συλαγωγῆσει is replaced by ὁ συλαγωγῶν, to give "directness and individuality to the reference" (Lightfoot). Relative clauses are frequently ousted by the articular participle, which (as Blass observes) had become synonymous therewith.

There is a marked diminution in the use of the participle with verbs like τυγχάνω, ἄρχομαι, λανθάνω, φαίνομαι, etc. But this was, partly at any rate, mere accident, for τυγχάνω c. part. is exceedingly common in the papyri: "I happen to be" is a phrase NT writers would instinctively avoid. Καλῶς ποιήσεις c. aor. part. (sometimes infin., or even indic., but the participle greatly predominates) is the normal way of saying "please" in the papyri, and is classical. So 3 Jn 6, and in the past Ac 10³³, Phil 4¹⁴: cf 2 Pet 1¹⁹. I cannot agree with Blass's "incorrectly εὖ πράσσειν in Ac 15²⁹" (p. 245)—

¹ Cf respectively BM iii. p. 136 (18 A.D.) ἐπὶ ταῖς οὐσαις γειννίαις, Tb P 309 (ii/A.D.), ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄντος ἐν κώμῃ [τοῦ ἱεροῦ] θεοῦ μεγάλου Κρόνου—also such phrases as τοῦ ὄντος μηνὸς Χοιάκ, NP 49 (iii/A.D.), "the current month."

except in the query he attaches to the remark. Surely this is an ordinary conditional sentence, "If you keep yourselves free from these things, you will prosper"? *Εὖ ποιήσετε*, from vernacular usage, would suggest "you will oblige us"; but Blass can hardly mean this. With verbs like *οἶδα*, *ὁμολογῶ*, *μανθάνω*, the participle is being encroached upon: it appears regularly in 2 Co 12², 1 Jn 4² (not B), 2 Jn⁷, Lk 8⁴⁶, Ac 24¹⁰, but is generally replaced by acc. and inf. or a *ὅτι* clause. So Par P 44 (ii/B.C., = Witk. p. 58) *γίνωσκέ με πεπορεύσθαι*, and the recurrent *γινώσκεις σε θέλω ὅτι*: for the participle cf BU 151 (Christian period—*ἴσθι*), TP 1 (ii/B.C.—*ὁμολογος*), NP 1 (ii/A.D.—*εἰ μάθοιμι*, the optative of which suggests culture), *al.* Of course Phil 4¹¹, *ἔμαθον . . . εἶναι* "I have learned how to be," is classically correct: 1 Tim 5¹³ is in any case no ex. of *μανθάνω* c. part., for this could only mean "learn that they are going about." (The RV rendering is supported by Winer with Plato *Euthyd.* 276B *οἱ ἀμαθεῖς ἄρα σοφοὶ μανθάνουσι*, and the parallel phrase *διδάσκειν τινὰ σοφόν*: Field adds from Chrysostom *εἰ ἰατρὸς μέλλεις μανθάνειν*, with other parallels. The construction—*μανθάνω* as passive of *διδάσκω*—is not unnatural in itself. Despite Weiss, the absolute *μανθ.* seems intolerable, and there is no real alternative, unless with Blass we boldly insert *εἶναι*.)

Participial Clauses.

We come then to the manifold uses of the participle as forming an additional clause in the sentence. This is one of the great resources of Greek, in which the poverty of Latin shows markedly by contrast. Our own language comes much nearer, but even with the help of auxiliaries we cannot match the wealth of Greek: thus, we cannot by our participle distinguish *λελυκώς* and *λύσας*. The elasticity of Greek however has its disadvantages, such as the possibility of supplying in translation particles as widely apart as *because* and *although*. But it seldom happens that serious ambiguity arises from this absence of strict logical differentiation.

We need spend little space in classifying participial usages. We have already seen (pp. 170 f.) that one important criterion has disappeared in Hellenistic, by the encroachments of *μή* over the whole field, when in classical Greek it was essentially conditional. We

In Conditional,

return to this point presently. The participle in *conditional* clauses is still found very freely. It stands for *ἐάν* c. aor. subj. in Lk 9²⁵ compared with Mt 16²⁶; for *εἰ* c. pres. indic. in 1 Co 11²⁹. There seem to be no exx. of its substitution for *εἰ* c. opt., or *εἰ* c. *indic. irreal.*; but this is an accident, due to the relatively small number of sentences of

“**Conjunctive**,” the kind. Another class is called by Blass “*conjunctive*”: 1 Tim 1¹⁸ ἀγνοῶν ἐποίησα (cf Ac 3¹⁷) is his ex. In Mt 6²⁷ we have a choice—“Who can by worrying,” or “even *if* he does worry, add a span to his life?” *Concessive* clauses are often expressed

Concessive, with the participle alone: Rom 1³² “though they know,” Jas 3⁴ “big though they are,” 1 Co 9¹⁹ “free though I am,” Jude 5 (not causal, as Winer), etc. Where ambiguity is possible, we sometimes find the meaning fixed by *καίπερ*, as Phil 3⁴, 2 Pet 1¹², and Heb *ter*; once by *καίτοι*, Heb 4³, *καὶ ταῦτα* Heb 11¹², or *καὶ γε* Ac 17²⁷—note

Causal, the *οὐ* there surviving, with characteristic emphasis. The opposite *causal* sense is exceedingly common: so Ac 4²¹, Heb 6⁶ (unless temporal), Jas 2²⁵, Mt 1¹⁹, etc. *Purpose* is less often expressed by the participle, as the future was decaying:¹ we have

Final, however Mt 27⁴⁹, and two or three in Luke. The present sometimes fulfils this function, as in Ac 15²⁷. Finally come the *temporal* clauses, or those which describe

Temporal and Attendant Circumstances the *attendant circumstances* of an action: e.g. Mt 13² ὥστε αὐτὸν εἰς πλοῖον ἐμβάντα καθῆσθαι, “when he had entered, he sat down.”²

Clauses. We should not usually put a temporal clause to represent these, as it would overdo the emphasis: in comparatively few cases, like Ac 17¹ and similar narrative passages, we might replace with *ἐπεὶ* or *ὅτε*. Our English participle is generally the best representative, unless we change it to the indicative with *and*: Latin, unless the ablative absolute can be used, necessarily has recourse to *cum* c. subj., its normal method of expressing attendant circumstances. The pleonastic participles *λαβών*, *ἀναστάς*,

¹ It was not however by any means dead: of the string of final fut. participles in OP 727 (ii/A.D.); BU 98 (iii/A.D.); Ch P 4 (ii/B.C., = Witk. p. 70), etc.

² See p. 241.

πορευθείς, ἀπελθών, largely occurring in translated passages have been already referred to (p. 14). One interesting Aramaism may be noted here from Wellhausen (p. 22). He asserts that in Mk 2⁷ *λαλεῖ βλασφημεῖ* (without stop) literally translates two Aramaic participles, the second of which should in Greek appear as a participle. In Lk 22⁶⁵ we find *βλασφημοῦντες ἔλεγον* correctly. But it must be noted that with the RV punctuation Mk *l.c.* is perfectly good Greek, so that we have no breach of principle if we do allow this account of the passage.

The large use of participles in narrative, both in grammatical connexion with the sentence and in the gen. abs. construction (p. 74), is more a matter of style than of grammar, and calls for no special examination here.

We may close our discussion with some notes on the places in which the ordinary rule, that *μή* goes with the participle, is set

aside. The number of passages is not large, and they may well be brought together.¹ Mt (22¹¹) and Jn (10¹²) have one each; Luke (Lk 6⁴², Ac 7⁵ 26²² 28^{17, 19}) five; and there are two each in Heb (11^{1, 35}) and 1 Pet (1³ 2¹⁰—a quotation). Paul has Rom 9²⁵ and Gal 4²⁷ *bis* (quoted), 1 Co 9²⁶, 2 Co 4^{8, 9} *quater*, Gal 4⁸, Phil 3³, Col 2¹⁰: 1 Th 2⁴ and 2 Pet 1¹⁶ have *οὐ . . . ἀλλά*. Before discussing them, let us cite some papyrus exx. for *οὐ*. OP 471 (ii/A.D.) *τὸν οὐκ ἐν λευκαῖς ἐσθῆσιν ἐν θεατρῷ καθίσαντα*: cf Mt *l.c.* OP 491 (ii/A.D.) *ἐὰν τελευτήσω οὐδέπω πεπληρωκότων* (when they are not yet 25). AP 78 (ii/A.D.) *οὐ δυνάμενος ἐγκαρτερεῖν ἐπιδίδωμι*: contrast 1 Th 3¹. OP 726 (ii/A.D.) *οὐ δυνάμενος δι' ἀσθένειαν πλεῦσαι* (since he cannot): so 727 (ii/A.D.). Tb P 41 (ii/B.C.) *οὐ στοχασάμενος (= -ου) ὧν ἔχομεν . . . πίστεων* (in a long gen. abs. succession): so Par P 40 *οὔτε τοῦ ἱεροῦ στοχασάμενοι οὔτε τοῦ καλῶς ἔχοντος*. Par P 13 (ii/B.C.) *κρατοῦσιν οὐκ ἀναπέμψαντες τὴν φέρυην*. Tb P 34 (ii/B.C.) *μὴ παρανοχλείθω (sic) ὑπ' οὐδενός*. BU 361 (ii/A.D.) *χώραν οὐκ ἔχει, οὐκ ἐπιστάμενος τί ἐκεῖνος ἀπεκρεῖνατο*. See also Par P 14, OP 286 (i/A.D.), TP 1 (ii/B.C.), 3 and 8 (ii/B.C.). In many of these

¹ I omit *οὐκ ἐξόν*, used for *ἄδικ.*, and the common vernacular phrase *οὐχ ἰτυχών*. In the exx. of *οὐ . . . ἀλλά . . .* the negative tinges the whole sentence.

exx. we can distinctly recognise, it seems, the lingering consciousness that the proper negative for a statement of a downright fact is *οὐ*. The same feeling may have made *οὐ* rise to the lips when an emphatic phrase was wanted, as in the illiterate Tb P 34 above. The closeness of the participle to the indicative in the kinds of sentence found in this list makes the survival of *οὐ* natural. Much the same principles may be applied to the NT, though in Luke, Paul and Heb we have also to reckon with the literary consciousness of an educated man, which left some of the old idioms even where *μή* had generally swept them away. In two passages we have *οὐ* and *μή* in close contact. Mt 22¹¹ (see parallel above) is followed in the king's question by *πῶς εἰσῆλθες ὧδε μὴ ἔχων . . .*; The distinction is very natural: the first is a plain fact, the second an application of it. The emphasis would have been lost by substituting *μή*. In Pallis's MGr version of the Gospels the two phrases are alike translated with *δέν* and indic. (The completeness of MGr levelling is well illustrated by his version of Lk and Jn *ll. cc.* The former becomes *καὶ . . . δέν* c. indic.; the latter is *καὶ βοσκὸς μὴν ὄντας*, followed by *ποὺ δέν εἶναι τὰ πρόβατα δικά του*, "whose own the sheep are not." Outside the indicative *δέν* is not found.) 1 Pet 1⁸ is best left to Hort: "The change of negative participles . . . is not capricious. The first is a direct statement of historical fact; the second is introduced as it were hypothetically, merely to bring out the full force of *πιστεύοντες*." Though Blass thinks it artificial to distinguish, it is hard to believe that any but a slovenly writer would have brought in so rapid a change without any reason. The principles already sketched may be applied to the remaining passages without difficulty, in so far as they are original Greek. In the quotations from the LXX we have, as Blass notes, merely the fact that *οὐ* c. partic. was regularly translated with *οὐ*. The passages in question would also come very obviously under the rule which admits *οὐ* when negating a single word and not a sentence.

ADDITIONAL NOTES.



P. 2.—Thumb points out (*Hellen.* 125) that Josephus has only been convicted of *one* Hebraism, the use of *προσθῆσθαι* c. inf. = "to go on to do" (לְהַוִּיחַ, i. e. "to do again"). (For this, cf Wellh. 28.) He refers to Schmidt *Jos.* 514-7, and Deissmann *BS* 67 n. That the solitary Hebraism in the Palestinian writer should be a lexical one, not a grammatical, is suggestive.

P. 7.—In the *Expositor* for September 1905, Prof. Ramsay says that the earlier tombs at Lystra show *Latin* inscriptions, while at Iconium Greek is normal. This may involve our substituting Latin as the language of Paul's preaching at Lystra: such a conclusion would not in itself be at all surprising.

P. 8.—"Even a Palestinian like Justin knew no Hebrew," says Dalman (*Words* 44) in arguing against Resch's theory of a primitive Hebrew Gospel.

P. 10.—Lightfoot (on Gal 4⁶) prefers to regard Ἄββὰ ὁ πατήρ in Mk 14³⁶ as spoken by our Lord in this form. He cites from Schöttgen the address כִּי כִי, in which the second element (*κύριε*) emphasises the first by repetition; and he compares Rev 9¹¹ 12⁹ 20². Thus understood, the phrase would be a most emphatic "testimony to that fusion of Jew and Greek which prepared the way for the preaching of the Gospel to the heathen." But Lightfoot's first alternative (practically that of the text) seems on the whole more probable.

P. 16.—In Ac 2¹ D, Blass puts a full stop at the end of the verse. But we might translate without the stop:—"It came to pass during those days of fulfilment of the day of Pentecost, while they were all gathered together, that lo! there was . . ." This is the (*b*) form, with *καὶ ἰδοὺ*, so that it comes near (*a*). This punctuation helps us to give adequate force to the durative infin. *συμπληροῦσθαι*. On this view D gives us one ex. of the (*a*) form, and one of the (*b*), to reinforce the more or less doubtful ex. of (*b*) in the ordinary text of Ac 5⁷. Those who accept Blass's theory of Luke's two editions might say that the author had not quite given up the (*a*) and (*b*) constructions when he wrote his first draft of Ac: before sending the revised edition to Theophilus, he corrected what remained of these (like a modern writer going over his proofs to expunge "split infinitives"), but overlooked 5⁷. I am not commending that view here; but I may suggest a systematic study of the *grammar* of the D text in Luke as a probably fruitful field for those who would contribute to the greatest of all textual problems in the NT.

P. 23.—We might have expected to find a specimen of Cretan in Tit 1¹²; but if Epimenides the Cretan was really the author of this unflattering description of his countrymen, he waited till he came to Athens, where (among other advantages for this composition) he could write *ἄελ* and disyllabic *ἀργαί*. Plato makes him reach Athens just before the Persian War.

P. 30.—It may be worth while to add a note illustrating the early date at which some characteristic MGR elements began to appear in the vernacular.

makes it impossible to see in Jn 1¹⁸ (ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόσμον) "the combination . . of rest and motion, of a continuous relation with a realisation of it" (Westcott). Without further remark we will reserve discussion till the time comes for treating the prepositions systematically, only noting that in D there are suggestive substitutions of ἐν for εἰς in Ac 7¹² 8²³ (the latter however probably involving an entirely different sense—see p. 71), and εἰς for ἐν in Ac 11²⁵ (ἐστὶν εἰς Τάρσον). On this cf Wellh. 12.

P. 65.—D often, as Wellhausen notes (p. 13), shows acc. with ἀκούειν, κατηγορεῖν, and κρατεῖν, where the other texts have gen.

P. 67.—Both in Ac 16³⁴ and in 18⁸, D alters the dat. to ἐπὶ (eis) c. acc.; but in the latter a clause is added containing πιστεύειν τῷ θεῷ.

P. 69.—Blass's objection to recognising the noun Ἐλαιῶν, in Ac 1¹³ and Josephus, rests upon the fact that assimilation of case is generally practised, and that in τὸ ὄρος τῶν ἐλαιῶν the genitive is unmistakable. But the nom. is frequent in LXX (Thackeray): thus Gen 3²⁰, Num 21¹⁴. See also Deissmann *BS* 210. Blass rightly, I think, regards Jn 13¹³ as a vocative, and not as equivalent to φωνεῖτέ με τὸν διδάσκαλον; but Winer's 1 Sam 9⁹ is a clear ex. to put by Rev 9¹¹ and Blass's own Mk 3¹⁶ (as found in Δ and the Latt.). It is noteworthy that both Luke and Josephus (*Ant.* xx. 169 πρὸς ὄρος τὸ προσαγορευόμενον Ἐλαιῶν, *Bell. Jud.* ii. 262 εἰς τὸ Ἐλαιῶν καλούμενον ὄρος) not only use the unambiguous genitive -ῶνος (*Ant.* vii. 202 διὰ τοῦ Ἐλαιῶνος ὄρους) but also put the anarthrous Ἐλαιῶν in combination with the word *called*. This seems to show that the name was not yet fixed in the Greek speech of Jerusalem residents, and that the halfway-house to the full proper name wanted some apology. Τὸ ὄρος τῶν ἐλαιῶν will thus be a translation of the native name. The new name for the hill would spring from two sources, the vernacular word for *oliveyard*, and the impulse to decline the stereotyped ἐλαιῶν. An exact parallel for the latter was quoted in *Espos.* vi. vii. 111. In the Ptolemaic papyri Tb P 62, 64, 82, 98 the noun ἰβλων is found, which the editors connect closely with ἰβλων (τροφῆς) "for the feeding of ibises," the word being treated as nom. sing. instead of gen. pl.: they observe that "the declension of the village called Ἰβλων probably contributed to the use of this curious form." In both words then we see a gen. pl. made into a new nominative which coincides with a noun of slightly different meaning already existing.

P. 70.—Prof. Thumb tells me that the construction (parenthetic nominative) survives in MGr: thus (ἀπ') ἐδῶ καὶ πέντε μέρες [nom.]="heute vor 5 Tagen." E. W. Hopkins (*AJP* xxiv. 1) cites a rare use from Skt.: "a year (nom.) almost, I have not gone out from the hermitage." *Contra*, Wellh. 29.

Ib.—Εἰκόνας perhaps should be translated: it is the name given in BU 1059 (i/B.C.) to the personal descriptions which accompany an IOU, receipt, bill of sale, census paper, etc.

Ib.—The vocative ἦ καὶς, as Dr Rendel Harris reminds me, literally translates the Aramaic absolute כְּרִיָּה (as Dalman gives it, *Gramm.* 118 n). I should have remarked that the usage is commonest where there is translation from Semitic. The author of Heb does not use it except in OT citations, nor does Luke in Ac 13–28 (though we may note that in the three citations involved there is no article in the Hebrew). It is only another instance of over-use of an idiom through its coincidence with a native usage.

P. 74.—See Kühner-Gerth i. 401 n. ^{5, 6}, for these genitives after a negative adjective. Typical exx. are Tb P 105 (ii/B.C.) αἰ, ἀκινδυνος παντὸς κινδύνου, ἀνυπόλογον πάσης φθοράς, and ἀνυπέσθουνοι παντὸς ἐπιτίμου. Tb P 124 (ii/B.C.) ἀδιστάστους ὄντας πάσης αἰτίας. BU 970 (ii/A.D.) τῆς εἰς ἅπαντας εὐεργεσίας . .

ἀβοήθητος. They illustrate *δννομος θεου* in 1 Co 9²¹ = *ἀνευ νόμου θεου*, which differs only in that the genitive is subjective, while the rest are either objective genitives or pure ablatives.

Ib.—One or two parallels may be added for the free use of the gen. abs. For the substitution of gen. for the case in construction, cf Tb P 41 (ii/B.C.), *ικανῶν ἡμῶν ὑπόπτως ἐχόντων ἀνακεχωρήκαμεν*; BU 1040 (ii/A.D.) *χαίρω διτι μοι ταῦτα ἐποίησας, ἐμοῦ μεταμελομένου περι μηδενός*. Other exx. will be seen in CR xv. 437. For gen. abs. without expressed subjects, cf BU 925 (iii/A.D. ?) *ἀναγνωσθέντων*, 970 (ii/A.D.) *δηλωθέντος δι' ἧς προείθη μοι ἀσφαλείας*, etc.

P. 78.—Elative comparatives may be seen in D in Ac 4¹⁶, *φανερότερόν (sic) ἐστίν*, and 10²⁸ *βελτίον ἐφίστασθε* (= *ἐπ.*—cf p. 44, and WH *App*³ 151). It substitutes *πλείστοι* for *πλείους* in 19²⁸, and adds an elative *ἥδιστα* in 13⁸. On 10²⁸ Blass compares 24²² 25¹⁰ in the ordinary text, and 2 Tim 1¹⁸, Jn 13²⁷. As to *χείρων*, we should add that *χειριστος* is found in Tb P 72 (ii/B.C.), *al.*

P. 79.—Before leaving the subject of comparison, we ought to remark on curious forms which have been brought into existence by the weakening of the old formations, or their detachment from the categories of comparative and superlative. Beside the regular form *ἐλάχιστος*, which is predominantly superlative in Mt, but elative in Lk (*τερ*, and 12²⁶ doubtful) and Jas, Paul uses *ἐλαχιστότερος* in Eph 3⁸, whether as comparative or true superlative the sentence leaves uncertain. He uses *ἐλάχιστος* as superl. in 1 Co 15⁹, and as elative in 4⁸ 6². The double comparative *μειζότερος* occurs in 3 Jn 4: of our *lesser*, which is equally due to the absence of clear comparative form in a word whose meaning is clear. See Jannaris *HG* 147 for a list of these forms: add *μειζότερος*, *Archiv* iii. 173 (iv/A.D.) *al.*, *μεγιστότατος* BM 130 (i/ii A.D.), *πρεσβυτερωτέρα* BM 177 (i/A.D.), *πρώτιστα* BU 665 (i/A.D.). Exx. are found even in Homer (*πρώτιστος*).

On the Aramaising use of positive *α ἢ* or *παρά* for compar., see Wellh. 28.

P. 81.—Wellhausen (p. 26) finds in the Synoptists some traces of *insertion* of the article through literal translation of Semitic idiom: here again D is conspicuous. Thus Mt 10²⁹ *τοῦ ἀσφαλίου*. Note also his exx. of Semitism arising from the rule which drops the article with a noun in construct state preceding a definite noun: so Mt 12⁴² “the Queen of the South.”

P. 82.—Westcott translates *ἐν συναγωγῇ* (Jn 6⁵⁹ 13³⁰) “in time of solemn assembly.” Our own use of “in church,” “in or out of school,” etc., is enough to illustrate this phrase, which must be explained on the lines described in the text above: Westcott seems to be somewhat overpressing it.

P. 84.—On the presence or absence of the article when a prepositional clause has to be added as an epithet, cf J. A. Robinson, *Ephes.* 149. For its presence may be cited such passages as Eph 1¹⁵, for its omission, Eph 2¹¹ 4¹, Phil 1⁸, Col. 1⁴ 8.

It is only very seldom that we find in Greek of the NT types the complex arrangement by which the classical language will wrap up a whole series of adjuncts between the article and its noun. 1 Pet 3⁸ will serve as an exceptionally good example. The simplicity of NT style naturally causes less involved forms to be generally preferred.

One more *paralipomenon* under the Article may be brought in. In Prof. Cooke's *North Semitic Inscriptions*, no. 110 (ii/A.D.), there is a bilingual inscription, Palmyrene-Aramaic and Greek, containing within its compass a good parallel to the genealogy in Lk 3²³⁻³⁸: *Ἀαὶλάμειν Αἰράνου τοῦ Μοκίμου τοῦ Αἰράνου τοῦ Μαθθᾶ* (Wadd. 2586). There are one or two other specimens: in 113 the article is dropped for the last two steps, as in the first step in 110.

P. 85.—In Mt 6¹⁷ note that D reads *ἀλειψον*, rejecting the middle in view of

the presence of σου. In Ac 5³ ἔθετο and ²¹ συγκυλισμένοι, D makes the opposite change, which in the former case, at any rate, is no improvement.

P. 88.—Cf Wellh. 80: "ἴδιος in Mt and Lk is sometimes 3rd pers. possessive."

P. 89.—Prof. Thumb notes how *accent* may differentiate words capable of full or attenuated meaning: "God *is*," but "God is *Almighty*."

P. 94.—To the *exx.* cited from Blass (top of p. 95) add from Hawkins Jn 1²⁷ (taken like Lk 3¹⁶ from the original source in Mk 1⁷), Ac 15¹⁷ (LXX), Rev 3⁸ 7^{2,9} 13⁸. 12 20⁸, and 1 Pet 2²⁴ (Ti with κ* LP, against ABCX). The idiom is in one place translation Greek, and in the rest a sign of inferior Greek culture, which makes it the more striking that Lk and Jn (not Mt) faithfully copy their source. Since the Greek of 1 Pet is remarkably good, it does not seem likely that οὐ τῷ μῶλωπι αὐτοῦ is due to the autograph: the LXX αὐτοῦ may well have been added by a glossator who did not notice that the οὐ made it needless. This consideration may fairly be set against the *a priori* argument of Ti in favour of the reading of K. See p. 249.

P. 96.—Cf Josephus *Ant.* i. 29, αὐτὴ μὲν ἄν εἴη πρώτη ἡμέρα, Μωυσῆς δ' αὐτὴν μίαν εἶπε (quoted by Schmidt). Note in Gen 8¹³ the variation μηνὸς τοῦ πρώτου, μᾶ τῷ μηνός, which had adequate motive in the different words of the Hebrew. Prof. Thumb has traced the history of the Greek names for the days of the week in *Zeitschrift für deutsche Wortforschung* i. 163–173 (1901).

P. 102.—The importance of Heb 13²⁴ in critical questions justifies our adding one more note on ἀπό. In *Theol. Rundschau* v. 64 Deissmann writes two "marginalia" upon Harnack's famous article in *ZNTW* i. 16 ff. He notes the *masculine* διηγούμενον in 11³²—not, I presume, as a difficulty likely to give Harnack much trouble; and observes that οἱ ἀπὸ Ἰταλίας "can, according to the late Greek use of ἀπό, describe very easily the greetings of the brethren to be found in Italy." He refers to the article by E. Bröse in *Theol. Stud. und Krit.*, 1898, pp. 351–360, on ἀπό in 1 Co 11²⁸. Bröse examines ἀπό, παρὰ, ἐπὶ, and ἐκ, showing that in daily speech these prepositions were used without exactness of distinction. The argument is designed to show that ἀπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου in 1 Co *l.c.* does not mean by *tradition*, but by *revelation* from the Lord. Deissmann observes that Bröse could have made his treatment of ἀπό still more illuminating, if he had gone outside the NT: he refers to a "stop-gap" of his own in *Hermes* xxxiii. 344, which touches on the passage from Heb.

P. 105.—On ὑπέρ we may cite TP 8 (ii/B.c.) ὑπὲρ ἑαυτὸν φρονῶν: cf Rom 12⁸.

P. 112.—A very good ex. in Greek is 2 Co 4⁸, where perfective ἐξ shows the ἀπορία in its final result of despair.

P. 116.—In the Dream of Nectonebus, the last Egyptian king of the old dynasties (LPu, ii/B.c.), there occurs the phrase διατηρήσκα τὴν χόραν ἀμέμπως, which gives a striking parallel to 2 Tim 4⁷. The perfective in the king's words emphasises the fact that the watchful care has been successful; the simplex in Paul lays the stress on the speaker's own action, "I have *guarded* my trust."

P. 118.—Hawkins, *HS* 142, gives the number of compound verbs for the several parts of the NT. His figures work out thus:—Heb has 7·8 per WH page, Ac 6·4, Lk 6·0, Mk 5·7, Paul 3·8, Mt 3·6, Cath. Epp. and Rev 3·1, and Jn 2·1. The high figure of Mk in this table may be illustrated by the large use of compounds in many uneducated papyri (*e.g.* Tb P 418, of ii/fii A.D.—see my notes in *CQ* ii. 140). That Heb and Luke (whose unity comes out by this, as by so many other tests) should be at the top, is what we might expect.

P. 126.—Since writing this, I have noticed Prof. Ramsay's suggestive

language on the early Christians of the average type in *C. and B.* ii. 485: see also his *Paul* 208 f.

Pp. 126 and 129.—On the biblical use of present and aorist imperative, cf. F. W. Mozley in *JTS* iv. 279 ff. Prof. Thumb notes that Mozley independently confirms his judgement on the aoristic *προσέφερον* in Heb 11¹⁷, by the observation that *φέρε* and *άγε* are aoristic in meaning. Were the author Mark or the John of Rev, and the context less clamant for an imperfect, I should readily yield.

P. 132.—See now D. Smith, *In the Days of His Flesh*, p. 208.

Ib.—In *OGIS* 219 (iii/B.C.) there is an ex. of coincident *άσπασάμενοι* which may be worth quoting:—*έλέσθαι δέ καλ πρεσβευτάς . . . [οίτινες] άσπασάμενοι αὐτὸν παρὰ τοῦ δήμου πρῶτον μὲν κεύουσιν ὑγιαίνειν . . . [έπειτα δ' άπαγγελοῦσιν αὐτῷ τὴν τιμήν.* The "salutation" seems to consist in the double message: it is difficult anyhow to make it precede the wish for good health.

P. 143.—In Mt 25²⁴ we find *δ ελιφώς* in a phrase otherwise parallel with *ν.²⁰, δ λαβών.* The intervening space supplies an excuse for the change which takes it out of the category described in the paragraph above. Both tenses were entirely justifiable, and the rather more emphatic perfect suits the situation of *ν.²⁵* better.

P. 145.—I must make it clear that in this tentative account of *έσχηκα*—which is propounded with great hesitation, and with a full appreciation of its difficulties—there is no suggestion that the aoristic meaning proposed was more than an idiosyncrasy of individual writers, or (better) of certain localities. The pure perfect force is found long after Paul's day: thus in the formula of an IOU, *όμολογῶ έσχηκεναι παρὰ σου διὰ χειρὸς έξ οίκου χρῆσιν έντοκον* (BU 1015—early iii/A.D.), "to have received and still possess." But in AP 30 (ii/B.C.), *προσεμαρτύρουν τὸν Μ. κατεσχηκεναι τὸν οκλιαν πρὸ τοῦ πολέμου*, the aoristic *possessed* seems to be recognisable, in an early illiterate document. See p. 248.

P. 146.—*Οίμαι δέ κἀν Δαμπιδῷ, τὴν Δεωτυχιδου μὲν θυγατέρα, Ἄρχιδάμου δέ γυναίκα, Ἄγιδος δέ μητέρα, ὅ πάντες βασιλεῖς γεγόνασι, θανμάσαι ἀν κτλ.* It is hard to see why this should be cited as aoristic: Agis was on the throne at the supposed time of the dialogue.

P. 148.—In connexion with this paragraph should be mentioned the birth of the new present *στέκω* (MGr *στέκω*) from the perfect *έστηκα*, with the same meaning.

P. 152.—On this view of the prehistoric relations of act. and mid., cf. Hirt, *Indog. Forsch.* xvii. 70. The theory had been restated in terms of the new school of philology, in Osthoff and Brugmann's pioneer *Morphologische Untersuchungen* iv. 282 n. (1881). There H. Osthoff conjectures that "Skt. *dvēṣ-ti* and *dvīṣ-tē* depend on one and the same proethnic basis-form [*dueistai*], which was differentiated by the accent, according as one wished to say 'hates for himself' or 'hates for himself.'" I had overlooked this passage, and am all the more confirmed by it in the theory which I had independently developed as to the relationship of the voices in the element they severally emphasise.

On the late Greek developments of the voices the student should carefully observe the rich material in Hatzidakis 193 ff.

P. 156.—The proverb in 2 Pet 2²² is acutely treated by Dr Rendel Harris, as I ought to have remembered, in *The Story of Aḥīkār*, p. lxxvii. He cites as the probable original words appearing in some texts of Aḥīkār: "My son, thou hast behaved like the swine which went to the bath with people of quality, and when he came out, saw a stinking drain, and went and rolled himself in it."

If, as seems extremely likely, this is the source of the *παροιμία* to which 2 Pet refers, of course *λουσαμένη* is used in its correct sense. That a Greek iambic verse may have been the medium of its transmission had been anticipated: see Mayor *in loc.* I leave my note unaltered in view of the measure of uncertainty attaching in Dr Harris's judgement to the account he proposes.

P. 166.—Dr P. Giles, in a letter endorsing and improving my Scotch translation of Homer *Il.* i. 137, says, "I agree that *ἄν* is very like *just*, and if you had added *like* at the end you would have got your subjunctive also. This *like* does for many dialects what the subjunctive did for Greek, putting a statement in a polite, inoffensive way asserting only verisimilitude." It is found elsewhere.

P. 168.—Add to this list the curious anti-Christian inscription in Ramsay, *C. and B.* ii. 477 (no. 343) *οὗτος ὁ βίος μοι γέγονεν* (aoristic!) *ὄταν ἔξω ἐγώ.*

P. 169.—Since writing the paragraph on *εἰ μήτι ἄν*, I have observed several other exx. of *εἰ . . . ἄν* in illiterate Greek of a century or two later than the NT. An inscription from Cyzicus, lately published by Mr F. W. Hasluck in *JHS* xxv. 63, has *ἔτι τις δ' ἄν τολμήσει, μετέλθῃ αὐτὸν ὁ Θεός.* (The second subjunctive here is the itacistic equivalent of the optative which would have been used in earlier Greek: cf p. 199 n.). In Ramsay's *C. and B.* vol. ii. I aote the following:—No. 210 (p. 380) *εἰ δὲ τις ἄν φανεῖη . . . ἔσται . . .*, where the optative shows the writer a bit of an Atticist, but not very successful. No. 377 (p. 530) *κατεσκεύασεν τὸ ἠρώφον ἐαυτῆ καὶ τῷ ἀνδρὶ αὐτῆς Εὐθύχη καὶ εἰ τι αὖ ζῶσα συναχωρήσει· εἰ δὲ μετὰ τὴν τελευτήν μου ἐάν τις ἐπιχειρήσει κτλ.* No. 273 (p. 394) *εἰ δὲ [ἔτερος] ἄν ἐπιχειρήσει, θήσει κτλ.* Add PFi 50¹¹⁸ (iii/A.D.) *εἰ τι δὲ ἐὰν ὀφείλῃ, Τβ P 391²² (99 A.D.) ἔτι τις δὲ ἡμῶν . . . ἐὰν παραβῆ.*

P. 170.—On *μή* in questions see J. E. Harry, *Gildersleeve Studies*, 430. He shows it was absent from orators and historians, and from the later writers Aristotle, Polybius, and Diodorus. Plato uses it 24 times; but the 69 occurrences in NT outnumber those in all the prose and poetry of ten previous centuries. The inference is that it was a feature of everyday language. In nearly half the exx. the verb is *be, can, or have*; three-fourths of the total comes from Jn and Paul (only Rom and Co).

P. 171.—For *ἐκτός εἰ μή* see Deissmann, *BS* 118. Cf also Ramsay, *C. and B.* ii. 391 (no. 254) *χωρὶς εἰ μή τι πάθῃ.*

Ib.—On the encroachments of *μή*, especially as to *ὅτι μή* and *μή c. inf.* after *verba dicendi et cogitandi*, see E. L. Green in *Gildersleeve Studies*, 471 ff. Green shows how *μή* intrudes increasingly in the Koine literature. Considering the extent of this intrusion in the time of the NT, there are fewer exx. of *μή* wrongly used than would be expected, except that *μή* holds almost undisputed sway over the participle. There are 6 exx. of *μή c. inf.* after a verb of saying or denying [Lk 22³⁴ must however be struck off (WH, following NBLT)]; 2 with verbs of thinking (2 Co 11⁵, Ac 25²⁵); one case of causal *ὅτι μή*, Jn 3¹⁸; 3 of *μή* after relatives. (In excluding Col 2¹⁸ because an imper. precedes, Green ignores a yet more decisive reason—that *μή* is indisputably spurious.) The participle with *μή* in *orat. obl.* occurs only in Ac 23²⁹ 28⁶; in causal, concessive, and temporal clauses it abounds. The comparison of Plutarch with the NT shows a great advance in the use of *ὅτι μή*. The whole paper deserves study.

A few papyrus passages may be cited in illustration of the subjects of Green's paper. For *μή* in relative clauses:—BU 114 (ii/A.D.) *προοίκα ἦν ἀποδέδωκεν αὐτῷ μήτε δύναται λαβεῖν*, CPR 19 (iv/A.D.) *ἐντάξας . . . ἀ μή συνεφώνησα.* For *verba dic. et cog.*:—MP 25 (iii/B.C.) *μή ὀφείλειν ὁμῶς μοι*, BM 401 (ii/B.C.) *κατηγωνκῶς μή δύνασθαι*, OP 266 (i/A.D.) *ὁμολογεῖ μή ἐγκαλεῖν* (classical, as ὁμ. =

undertakes), OP 237 (ii/A.D.) ἀπεκρίνατο μὴ c. inf., and several cases with δηλοῦν (BU 5, 11, etc.). For ἐπεὶ μὴ cf BU 530 (i/A.D.) μέμφεται σε ἐπὶ μὴ ἀπτήγραφας αὐτῇ (the *charge*, like the ex. in Jn l.c.).

On εἰ οὐ Blass notes (*Hermes* xxiv. 312) its identity with ἀμ μὴ in the illiterate OP 119 (see p. 28).

A note may be added on μὴ ὄρι; for though the NT only uses οὐχ ὄρι, the syntax is identical with that in μήτιγε, 1 Co 6³ ("not to speak of mere affairs of daily life"). It occurs in BM 42 (ii/B.C., = Witk. p. 40) μὴ ὄρι γε τοσοῦτον χρόνου ἐπιγεγονότος, "not to speak of so much time having gone by."

P. 177.—In Mt 6¹⁹ D reads μὴ θησαυρίσεται (= -ε), which may just possibly be added to the list. But it is more likely to be a mere mistake. An earlier ex. of μὴ c. fut. than those cited in the text is Par P 15 (ii/B.C.) μὴ γούν καὶ κρατήσεις—but this may be aor. subj.

P. 181.—Essentially the same principle must be traced in θεῶς σοι (Mt 16²²), "[God be] merciful to thee." The interjectional adjective and participle are on the same footing, and must be explained in the same way. In CR xv. 436 are quoted inscriptional parallels for this phrase (Gen 43²², 2 Sam 20²⁰, 1 Chr 11¹⁹):—Letronne 221 (iv/A.D.) θεῶς ἡμῖν Πλάτων καὶ ἐνταῦθα, and without subject 557 θεῶς σοι, Ἐρμείας . . . καὶ Ἡράκλειος ἀδελφός. Letronne also quotes another inscription (ii. 286) θεῶς σοι ἀλυπί (*leg.* Ἄλυπι), "[Sarapis] help thee, Alypius," as I read it. With the development of a deprecatory force in such phrases we may compare that in our vernacular expression, "Mercy on us!"

P. 182.—Dr Rendel Harris thinks the ὑμεῖς may be only translation Greek. The suggested allusion to Paul is in any case only propounded tentatively. It is curious that ἀρξάμενος gives us trouble elsewhere in Luke. Ac 10³⁷ is fairly hopeless as it stands, and Blass thinks ἀρξ. ἀπὸ τ. Γ. interpolated from Lk 23⁶. It is conceivable that ἀρξάμενος γάρ in AD vg may preserve the relics of a better text, in which a new sentence beginning there was continued with Ἰησοῦς δ ἀπὸ Ν., ὃν (D) ἔχρισεν . . ., ὁστος (D). The change needed to make the D reading grammatical is but small. (See Wellh. 12.) A quasi-adverbial use of ἀρξάμενος may be seen in *Syll.* 537⁸, 538⁸, 540¹⁸², 549⁴, and with pres. ptc. in Tb P 526 (ii/A.D.).

P. 185.—The practically complete equivalence of subjunctive and future is quite as evident in Phrygian inscriptions as in the Alexandrian Greek Bible or late Egyptian papyri. Thus we have in *JHS* xxiii. 85 εἰ δὲ τις ἀνύξας ἔτερον βάλῃ, and in Ramsay *C. and B.* ii. 392 (no. 260) εἰ τινα ἄλλον βουληθῆ, 559 (no. 445, iii/A.D.) εἰ τις δὲ ἕτερος ἐπισπένει (so nos. 448, 449). In nos. 317, 391, 395, 399 *al* (pp. 472, 535-8) we have οὐ τεθῆ for the οὐ τεθήσεται found elsewhere. The progressive disappearance of the Future prepares us for MGr, where the tense is a periphrastic one. For the papyri, cf BU 303 (vi/A.D.) παρόσχω "I will furnish," AP 144 (v/A.D.) ἔλθω "I will come." Innumerable **EXX.** of verbs in -σει and the like, in locutions requiring subjunctives, could be cited from various sources; but these being itacistic prove less—see p. 35.

P. 194.—Prof. Thumb tells me that MGr μὴ γένοιτο seems to him a phrase of learned origin. (I notice that Pallis retains it in Lk 20¹⁶.) See p. 249.

P. 199 n. 2.—Prof. Thumb observes that he does not believe in itacism as contributory to the obsolescence of the optative, "since the coincidence of *οι* and *η* took place very late." It has been made clear in the text that the optative was doomed from the very birth of the Κοινή, while *οι* (and *υ*) did not become simple *ι* for several centuries.

P. 208.—By way of adding to our illustrations from the Bezan text of Ac, we may note that in 12¹⁷ D substitutes ἴνα σιγῇ . . .]σω for σιγᾶν, and in 16¹² ἴνα ἐξέλθῃ for ἐξέλθειν, both after words of commanding. In 17²¹ however the

omission of $\epsilon\upsilon$ ἢ $\mu\epsilon\lambda\lambda\epsilon\iota$ adds to the tale of quasi-final infinitives. Were this tendency to use $\epsilon\upsilon\alpha$ more marked, it might help us to fix the *provenance* of D, by the use of Thumb's canon (p. 205).

P. 216.—Some further exx. are noted by Votaw (p. 18) from the LXX. He gives on p. 19 the totals for the articular infin. in OT, Apocrypha, and NT: there are 1161 occurrences with a preposition, and 1614 without. The anarthrous infin. occurs 6190 times in all. In the statistics of the articular infin. I have checked my count (based on MG) by Votaw's: they differ slightly where I have omitted passages which WH enclose in double brackets, and also through my not counting twice the places where two infinitives stand under the government of a single article. Votaw's total for Heb has a slight error.

P. 224.—To the footnote it should be added that Hirt and Sommer make *sequimini* imperative the original form, supposing it simply transferred to the indicative at a later stage (*Indog. Forsch.* xvii. 64.).

P. 230.—The phrase in Mt 13^a is quoted here purely as it stands in Greek; exx. of this participle could be cited from almost any page of narrative in the NT or other Greek writing. It happens however, as Dr Rendel Harris tells me, that my example is a translation of a phrase meaning simply "he went on board a boat." He observes, "'To go up and sit in a ship' is a pure Syriac expression. Sometimes you get 'sit in the sea' for 'embark'" (Mk 4¹, the original here). This superfluous $\kappa\alpha\theta\eta\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ is rather like the pleonasm quoted from Dalman on pp. 14 ff. Of course the recognition of this as translation Greek does not affect the grammatical category in which we place $\epsilon\mu\beta\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha$.

Since I have not given a chapter to Conjunctions, I may put at the end of these addenda a note upon a use of $\delta\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}$ which has excited much discussion. In Mt 20²⁸ some have translated $\delta\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}$ "except," as if = $\epsilon\iota\ \mu\eta$ or $\pi\lambda\eta\nu$. Against this both Winer and his editor (p. 566) speak very decisively: thus, the latter says, "Even in Mk 4²² $\delta\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}$ is simply *but* (but rather), not *save, except*." I have a draft letter of his to a fellow-Reviser (dated 1871), in which he argues at length against the lax use of $\delta\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}$, which in Mt *l.c.* "would be equivalent to supplying $\epsilon\mu\acute{\omicron}\nu$ $\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota$ $\delta\omicron\upsilon\nu\alpha\iota$ in the second clause." Blass does not allude to the latter passage, but on Mk *l.c.* (p. 269) he says $\delta\lambda\lambda'$ = $\epsilon\iota\ \mu\eta$ "save that." It is certainly difficult here to separate the $\delta\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}$ from the $\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\nu\ \mu\eta$ which stands in the parallel clause. I am very unwilling to challenge an opinion held so strongly after careful study; but the discovery of Tb P 104 (i/v.c.) makes me ready to believe that the note in WM might have been altered under stress of new evidence. $\text{Καὶ μὴ ἐξέστω Φιλισκιῶν γυναῖκα ἄλλην ἐπαγαγέσθαι ἄλλὰ Ἀπολλωνίαν}$ must call for a sense of $\delta\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}$ very near to $\epsilon\iota\ \mu\eta$. That supplements may be contrived we may allow, though they are often far from simple; but is there adequate motive for straining the natural meaning of the phrase? In Gen 21²⁸ $\omicron\upsilon\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ $\epsilon\gamma\omega$ $\eta\kappa\omicron\upsilon\sigma\alpha$ $\delta\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}$ $\sigma\eta\mu\epsilon\rho\omicron\nu$, the $\delta\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}$ actually translates וְאֵל , *except*. In Mt *l.c.*, it may well be that the AV or RV supplement is correct. But I cannot feel at all sure of this; and it seems moreover that the meaning need not be affected by reading $\delta\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}$ as = $\epsilon\iota\ \mu\eta$. In Jn 15⁴, Lk 4^{30c}, Ac 27²², Gal 2¹⁶, Rev 21²⁷, etc., we are familiar with the brachylogy—essentially akin to *zeugma*—which makes $\epsilon\iota\ \mu\eta$ and the like = *but only*: why not apply this to $\delta\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}$? This would mean that only the thought of $\delta\omicron\upsilon\nu\alpha\iota$ was carried on, and not that of $\epsilon\mu\acute{\omicron}\nu$ as well. (Cf now Wellh. 24 in support of my position: also of Kuhring, p. 49.)

The study of Wellhausen's illuminating forty pages increases my regret that I can only refer to them generally in notes inserted at the last revision. My argument in chapter i. is not affected by Wellhausen's exposition; but had his

book come into my hands earlier, I should have taken care to emphasise more clearly what is said above concerning "translation Greek," and the tendency to over-use a correct vernacular idiom where it exactly or nearly translates an Aramaic original. Wellhausen rightly warns us against denying Aramaism because we can scrape together one or two parallels from holes and corners of Greek writing. That was the error of the old Purists, and we must be on our guard. But if we neo-Hellenists need to be careful, Wellhausen's criticisms of Dalman show that the neo-Semitists want watching as well. It is necessary in studying Wellhausen to remember that he only professes to speak from the Semitist's side: his *φραγγελοῦν* (*bis*) on p. 10 and *ἑαυτός* and *ἀλλήλοι* on p. 30 illustrate his limitation—*non omnia possumus omnes!* Space forbids our mentioning more than one further feature of his work, the great importance of his treatment of the Bezan text. He shows that D in a large number of places stands distinctly nearer the Aramaic which underlies the Synoptic records. If this is proved, we have manifestly taken a large step towards the solution of our great textual question. Let me finally quote his dictum that Mk is tolerably free from Hebraisms, *i.e.* pieces of translation Greek due to the LXX: Mk is however richest in Aramaisms, which Mt and Lk have largely pruned away. Of course Wellhausen's argument has no bearing on free Greek in the NT.

ADDITIONAL NOTES TO THE SECOND EDITION.

P. 3.—To anticipate a possible objection, I may say that the evidence for large Jewish settlements in Egypt from an early date is indisputable: see for example Mahaffy's and Th. Reinach's contributions to *Mélanges Nicole* (pp. 619 ff., 451 ff.). Mahaffy speaks of Aramaic trade documents in Upper Egypt from the time of Xerxes down. So far, however, no "Hebraist" has tried to use this fact to discount the deductions of Deissmann from the papyri; and I need not meet the argument before it arises. (See Preface, p. xvi. f.)

Ib.—The Rev. J. Pulliblack sends me an interesting extract from his notes of Bishop Lightfoot's lectures in 1863. Speaking of some NT word which had its only classical authority in Herodotus, he said, "You are not to suppose that the word had fallen out of use in the interval, only that it had not been used in the books which remain to us: probably it had been part of the common speech all along. I will go further, and say that if we could only recover letters that ordinary people wrote to each other without any thought of being literary, we should have the greatest possible help for the understanding of the language of the NT generally."

P. 5.—A very striking testimony may be cited from Cicero, *Pro Archia*, 23:—*Nam si quis minorem gloriae fructum putat ex Graecis versibus percipi quam ex Latinis, vehementer errat, propterea quod Graeca leguntur in omnibus fere gentibus, Latina suis finibus, exiguis sane, continentur.*

P. 14.—To the *exx.* of *ἐἰς ἀπάντησιν* c. gen. may be added two (one of them *ἐἰς συναντ.*) from the Pelagia stories (*Legenden der hl. Pelagia*, ed. Usener), pp. 19, 22. The documents are written in excellent vernacular, which does not seem open to the charge of being merely modelled on the biblical Greek.

P. 19.—Dr Marcus Dods finds a weak spot in my parallel, in that Greek was generally “not the vernacular, but a second language acquired for commercial or social purposes. The real parallel would therefore be the English-speaking Hindu, or semi-Americanised German or Pole, or the pidgin-English-speaking Chinaman, or bilingual Highlander or Welshman.” So Dr Nestle. I have modified the form of the parallel accordingly, and I think it will now stand. The Hindu and the Welshman, “*granted a tolerable primary education*” in English, will not show much difference in their written dialect.

P. 22.—A reviewer in the *Athenaeum*, to whom I am greatly indebted, criticises my attitude towards the translation of Pallis. (So far from “strongly objecting,” Mr Pallis prefers to be so styled, and not as Palli.) I cannot go into detail, but I would make two or three notes. (1) The Reviewer expresses the “shock” which even a foreigner experiences in finding Christ’s speeches “abounding in Turkish words.” Mr Pallis gives me a list of all the foreign words in his version of Mt, some two dozen in all, and not a quarter of them Turkish. This accusation of bringing in foreign words has been freely made by many on mere hearsay. (2) A lover of Hellenism can feel nothing but sympathy for the modern Greeks’ national pride in their language. But whether Greek artisans can repeat the NT Greek by heart or no, it is abundantly proved that they cannot *understand* it; and that is sufficient justification for a popular version. (3) The general question of the Purist movement tempts discussion; but it has only one side which is relevant for this book. If the movement only concerned the abolition of *foreign words*, the NT grammarian could quote Purist as readily as popular Greek. But the *καθαρεύουσα* is an artificial language in its *grammar*, and it is therefore obviously useless when we are seeking scientific evidence bearing on ancient Hellenistic. The strongest sympathiser with Purism as a national movement would have to admit that for such purposes as ours the faintest suspicion of artificiality makes MGR valueless: nothing but the unschooled speech of the people can help us here.

P. 23.—On the use of the term *Κοινή* Prof. Thumb observes that the grammarians were far from consistent with themselves. A definition like *κοινή διδλεκτος ἢ πάντες χρώμεθα* is not far from our present use; and even if the term be historically incorrect it is a pity to banish from science so well-established and pregnant a word (*Neue Jahrbücher f. d. klass. Altertum*, 1906, p. 262).

P. 32.—Dr W. H. D. Rouse, who has an exceptionally intimate first-hand knowledge of modern Greece, especially in the more out-of-the-way parts, tells me he thinks it too sweeping an assertion to say that the old dialects died out completely, except for what they contributed to the *Κοινή*. He has heard the broad *ā* in Calymnos, and *καί πρόκα* in Cos. In the lecture just quoted (*Neue Jahrb.* 1906, p. 256), Prof. Thumb gives some interesting survivals of old dialectic forms in Cyprus, which he has noticed in the curse-tablets of Audollent. We have in fact to remember that the dialects existing within the *Κοινή* were partly or even mainly characterised by the survivals from the old local dialect which the levelling process failed to destroy.

P. 34.—A good illustration of my point that dialectic differences very largely lay in pronunciation is found in Dr Rouse’s remark that “a [modern] Athenian, a Lesbian and an Astypaliote all will write *καί*, while they pronounce it respectively *kyé, sé, tsé.*”

P. 36.—The case of *τέσσαρες* acc. ought not to be left without remarking that this is isolated, as the only early cardinal which ever had a separate acc. form. In the first 900 of Wilcken’s ostraka I find 42 exx. of the indeclinable, and 29 of *τέσσαρες*, which shows how this form predominated in business

language before 200 A.D. In the same documents I find *τέσσερας* and *τεσσερά-
:οντα* only once each (both ii/A.D.): cf p. 46 above.

Ib.—A “probably Ptolemaic” ostrakon in *Mélanges Nicole*, p. 185 (E. J. Goodspeed), has *φιλανθρωπία* and *δόσις* (= *δώσεις*) to add for the early confusion of *o* and *ω*; *κατὰ μῆναν* (see p. 49) and *μηδενὶ δοῖς* (p. 55 n.⁵) evidence the writer’s scanty culture. Earlier still is *λογευόντων* HbP 77 (249 B.C.), and of Par P 40 (ii/B.C.). See Mayser, pp. 98 f., 139.

P. 38.—The point about *κόρη* needs perhaps to be stated less concisely. Brugmann makes it probable that in early Attic, as in its sister dialect Ionic, *ε̄* became *η* universally, but that in Attic *ιη* and *ρη* (*ὄριη*, *πρήτω*) broadened into *ιᾱ*, *ρᾱ*, whenever the *η* did not arise from a pre-Greek *ε̄*: this *ε̄* long maintained a different quality. But this specially Attic power of *ρ* became obsolete while *κορFη* was still pronounced with digamma.

P. 41.—Thumb (*op. cit.* 260) holds out hopes that we may get some not inconsiderable help in dating and localising textual types from such peculiarities as the confusion of tenuis, aspirata and media in Egypt and Further Asia, and that of *e* and *i* sounds in Asia Minor and Syria.

P. 44.—Among the irregular aspirations might have been given *ούχ* *Ἰουδαϊκῶς* (Gal 2¹⁴ κ* ACP 17 37). Here the *ούχι* of BD* *al* probably helps us; a repetition of the *ι* after *ούκ* would lead to the correction *ούχι* and this to *ούχ* by the dropping of the same letter. This seems simpler than Lightfoot’s explanation from the Hebrew initial “ח”, which would not explain *ούχ* *ιδού* (B *decius* in 3 K, says Mr Thackeray).

P. 48.—Usener, *Pelagia*, p. 50, quotes *ἡ Ἱεροδόλυμα* from two MSS of xi/A.D. In the same book we find the vocative *κύρι* twice (p. 14—see Usener’s note, p. 34). An additional early ex. of this shortening of *-ιο-* nouns may be found in a Ptolemaic ostrakon in *Mélanges Nicole*, p. 184, *συνψέλειν* (*i.e.* *-ιον*). (The document has the word *κράβατος*, so spelt.) See Mayser 260.

P. 49.—The NT forms *συγγενίς* and *συγγενεῖσι* (WH *App*³ 165) are both cited by Thumb from Asia Minor (*JHS* xxii. 358 and *BCH* xxiv. 389). Mayser cites *συγγενέα*: *per contra* *συγγενεῖσι* occurs Tb P 61 (ii/B.C.) *al*. So we have double forms, *ἐσθήσω* OP 466 and *ἐσθήσεσι* (as NT) BU 16, both ii/A.D.

P. 59.—An apparent false concord in B, *περὶ πάντων ὧν εἶδεν δυνάμεων* (Lk 19⁹⁷), is corrected by Prof. Burkitt from the Old Syriac, which shows that *δυνάμεων* is a mere gloss. B accordingly shows the first stage of corruption, while D (*γενομένων*) shows an independent gloss, and the other MSS present a completely regularised text. (The textual phenomena here are most instructive: of what is quoted from Wellhausen about B and D, p. 242.) Note that in MGR *πᾶσα* survived *pās*, as *πᾶσα ἕνας* “every one.”

Ib.—For indeclinable *τι* Dr Rouse reminds me of the MGR *κάτι*, as *κάτι ἡσυχία*, “a little rest.”

P. 60.—Mr Ottley calls my attention to Is 37⁹⁸, where it is very hard to resist the impression that an *accusative* stands for a genitive in apposition to an indeclinable.

Ib.—A better account of *ἡ θεός* in Ac 19⁹⁷ is given by G. Thieme, *Die Inschriften von Magnesia am Maeander und das NT* (Göttingen, 1905), pp. 10 f. He notes that the classical *ἡ θεός* often appears in Magnesian inscriptions to describe the great goddess of the city, while other people’s goddesses were *θεαί*, the usual *Κοινή* term. The town clerk is accordingly using the technical term, as we might expect. Plentiful quotations are given by Nachmanson, p. 126. We may therefore keep Blass’s comment on Luke’s accuracy, but apply it in a different way.

P. 63.—It might be added that before *ἐν* disappeared it was often used for *εἰς*, just as *εἰς* was for *ἐν*. Thus in the late gloss at Jn 5⁴; also four times in Tob, as Mr Thackeray notes, adding that it is a feature of the LXX in Jd—4 K. Cf in *Pelagia*, ἀνήλθομεν ἐν τῷ κελλίῳ (i. 4), ἀπήλαμεν ἐν τῇ μεγάλῃ ἐκκλησίᾳ (i. 5), ἐφυγον ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσι (ii. 1). Some further quotations for late uses of *ἐν* will be found in Kuhring, pp. 43 f.

Id.—On ὥραν (Jn 4⁵², Ac 10³⁰ *al*) see Usener, *Pelagia* 50, and Abbott *JG* 75, who suggests that the change from vernacular acc. to dat., Jn 4^{52a}, is brought in to denote exact time.

P. 64.—For χρᾶσθαι c. acc. add Wis 7¹⁴ (B—so RV), and *Syll.* 653⁶² (καταχρ.). The Purist Kontos (Γλωσσικαὶ Παρατηρήσεις, Athens, 1882, p. 420) complains of writers who used καταχρᾶσθαι (and even ἐπεσθαι!) with gen. As early as ii/A.D. we find a chiliarch of a Thracian cohort writing Ὀρίωνος (i.e. -ι) χαίρειν (Wilcken, *Ostr.* ii. 927): so σὺν Μηροφίλου *ib.* 240 (same date). See Ramsay *CR* iii. 332.

P. 66.—On the construction of ἀκούω, γέβομαι, and προσκυνῶ, see Abbott, *JG* 76–78.

P. 70.—Dr Rouse compares with this nominative in time-expressions Aeschines' ἤντι ἐν μέσῳ καὶ παρήμην (*In Ctes.* 71).

P. 71.—On the threefold πατήρ in Jn 17, see Abbott *JG* 96 f.

P. 72.—A full study of prepositions replacing the simple gen. may be found in Kuhring, *Praepos.* 11 ff., 20. Dr Rouse notes that ἀπό is regularly used in partitive sense now: δῶσε μου ἀπὸ τοῦτο, "give me some of that."

P. 75.—For ἐρχομαί σοι I should have quoted the well-known line of Aeschylus (*PF* 358), ἀλλ' ἦλθεν αὐτῷ Ζηνὸς ἀγρυπνον βέλως.

P. 76.—Reference should have been made to Eph 5⁶, ἵστε γινώσκοντες, where Dean Robinson assumes Hebraism, comparing 1 Sam 20³, γινώσκων ὀδεν, Jer 42 (49)²², ἵστε (imper.) γινώσκοντες ὅτι (Symmachus). So RV. If this be so, we can only suppose Paul definitely citing OT language, just as a preacher using the archaic phrase "Know of a surety" would be immediately recognised as quoting. (It may be noted that if ἵστε is indic. it is a purely literary word, such as Paul is not very likely to have used: it would be less improbable in Heb 12¹⁷. But in these places and Jas 1¹⁹ the imper. seems better, somewhat in the sense of the common classical εἶ ἴσθ' ὅτι, "you may be sure": see LS *s.v.* οἶδα 7.) It is, however, at least as probable that we are to separate the verbs and read "For you must be assured of this (the following), recognising for yourselves that . . ." So E. Haupt, Salmond, and T. K. Abbott.

P. 79.—Dr E. A. Abbott (*Joh. Gram.* 510) makes it seem probable that the Leyden papyrus is quoting from Jn 1¹⁶. He would translate πρῶτός μου "my Chief." See pp. 11–14 for his exposition, which brings in several harmonics beside the main note. I am not yet disposed to give up the view defended in the text. If Dr Abbott takes away one parallel, he gives me two new ones instead, in the quotations from scholiasts on Euripides; and his exegesis seems open to the charge of over-subtlety. Moreover, the Aelian passage, οἱ πρῶτοί μου ταῦτα ἀνιχνεύσαντες (*N.A.* viii. 12), is closely parallel for Jn 15¹²; and the doubts as to the reading expressed by the Thesaurus editor here and in Plutarch, *Cato Minor* § 18 (οὔτε πρῶτός τις ἀνέβη . . . Κατῶνος οὔτε ὑστερος ἀπέβη), only mean that a modern scholar thought πρῶτος incorrect, which is undeniable. I am tempted to claim that Dr Abbott has proved my point for me.

P. 80.—I must confess to a rather serious oversight in omitting to discuss the "Hebraistic" use of πᾶς with negative in the sense of οὐδέεις. In *CR* xv. 442, xviii. 155, I quote a number of *exx.* of πᾶς with prepositions and

adjectives of negative meaning: thus *ἀνευ* or *χωρίς πάσης υπερθέσεως*, a recurrent formula, *ἀνυπεύθυνου παντός επιτίμου* Tb P 105 (ii/B.C.), *δίχα πάσης εξουσίας* Plutarch *Cons. ad Uxor.* 1 (cf Heb 7⁷). Closely allied to this is the *Κοινή* use of *τις* with negative, as *μηδεμίᾳ κρατήσεως μηδὲ κυρίας τινὸς ἐργαίου περιγυρομένης αὐτῷ* TP 1 (ii/B.C.), which has analogues in MGR (Jannaris *HG* § 1449 c). This was accordingly claimed as “a very slight extension of a vernacular usage under the encouragement of a similar idiom in Hebrew.” It is found not only in presumed translation, as Mk 13²⁰, but in Paul, as Eph 5⁸.

Ib.—Mr J. B. Shipley sends me an ingenious suggestion that *ἐπτά* arose from a gloss, *Σκευᾶ = γινω = ἐπτά*.

Ib.—In Gal 1⁶. Ramsay maintains against Lightfoot that *ἕτερος* when definitely contrasted with *ἄλλος* denotes specific difference against generic, “another of the same kind,” against “another of a different kind.” Space precludes examination of his classical exx.; but it must not be too hastily assumed that Lightfoot is wrong. Abbott *JG* 611 supports him against Blass.

P. 86.—Add Hb P 44 (253 B.C.), *ὁρῶντες . . . ὡμίην* as an early ex.

P. 87.—The reciprocal *εἰς τὸν ἕνα* (1 Th 5¹¹) may be noted, with the MGR *ὁ ἕνας τὸν ἄλλον*. (Dr Rouse tells me the Purists say *ἐσφαξε ὁ μὲν τὸν δέ!*!)

Ib.—On “exhausted *ὄδιος*” see now Kuhring, *Praep.* 13.

P. 89.—Dr Marcus Dods criticises my treatment of *ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ νοῦ*, remarking that the danger was of a man’s being “assured by some other person’s convictions.” That is, of course, quite true, but I think my statement holds that the phrase simply lays stress on the personal pronoun—“let each man be fully assured for himself.”

P. 96.—Note that *δώδεκα* greatly predominates over *δέκα δύο* in ostraka.

P. 102.—In Kuhring’s account of *ἀπὸ* (*Praep.* 35 ff., 52 ff.) there is striking evidence of the encroachments of this preposition. The common commercial *ἔσχον ἀπὸ* (for *παρὰ*) *σοῦ* may save us from over-refining in 1 Co 11²³. The note as to the perplexing rarity in the papyri of *ἀπὸ* with the agent after passive verbs will prevent us from assuming it too readily in the NT, though its occasional presence is undoubted. For *οὐαὶ . . . ἀπὸ τῶν σκανδάλων* (Mt 18⁷) I may quote excellent parallels from *Pelagia*, *ὦ βία ἀπὸ τοῦ . . . λήρου τούτου* (Usener, pp. 11 bis, 27), and *ὦ ἀπὸ τῶν Χριστιανῶν* (p. 28): the difference in the interjection shows that this was not imitation. Usener (p. 44) notes *ὦ βία* “Murder!” as a vernacular phrase. So *Acta Thomas*, p. 224, *ὦ ἀπὸ τοῦ δολίου*. It is simply the classical *ὦ* c. gen. (cf *Ep. Diogn.* 9 *ὦ τῆς υπερβαλλούσης φιλανθρωπίας*), with the gen. strengthened, as so often. ‘Ek of material (as Mt 27²⁹) Kuhring only finds once, AP 99 (ii/A.D.): add *Mél. Nicole*, p. 281, *περιτραχηλίδιον ἐκ καθορμίων λιθινῶν*, “a necklace made of strings of stones” (iii/B.C.). As to the survival of *ἐκ* to-day authorities differ: the *Athenaeum* reviewer cites among others Psichari, who says of *ἐκ τόν*, “C’est bel et bien une forme vivante.”

P. 103.—There seem to be places where *εἰς* actually stands for the possessive genitive, as Deissmann *BS* 117 f. shows it does for the dative: TbP 16 *ὡ λήγοντες τῆι* (for *τῆς*!) [*εἰς*] *αὐτοὺς ἀθάδια*, “not desisting from their violent behaviour” (ii/B.C.); *χωρίς τοῦ εἰς αὐτὴν οἴκον* (= *ου*) Par P 5, “her house” (*ib.*). It is tempting to seek help here for 1 Pet 1¹¹, but the illiteracy of the documents must be remembered.

P. 106.—One more quotation should be made from Kuhring, whose pamphlet must be constantly in our hands as we study the NT prepositions. He seems to demolish even the solitary Hebraism I had left to *μετά*, that in Lk 1⁵⁸. AP 135 (ii/A.D.) has *τί δὲ ἡμῶν συνέβη μετὰ τῶν ἀρχόντων*; “What befell us in connexion with the magistrates?” (G. and H.). So also BU 798 (Byz.).

Kontos (Παρατηρήσεις 409 ff.) fiercely attacks *πολεμῶ μετὰ τινος*, "fight with," i.e. "against"; but he is at least eighteen centuries late.

Id.—One force of *παρά* in composition is noted by Thumb (*Neue Jahrb.* '06, p. 249), with reference to *παρήλθεν* in Mt 14¹⁵. He parallels Wellhausen's "vorgerückt" (our "advanced") by citing MGr *παραπάνω*, "far over," *παρακάτω*, "far under," *παραμέσα*, "far in." Another force is exemplified in *παραπίπτω*, which Wilcken (*Ostraka*, i. 78 f.) illustrates as a commercial word, giving Mommsen's "ungültig werden, etwa wegen eines Formfehlers." He compares Xen. *Hell.* i. 6. 4, and Polybius, xviii. 36. 6, where it is co-ordinated with *ἀγνοεῖν*, = *παραπίπτειν τῆς ἀληθείας*.

P. 110.—To the weighty authorities for *ἔχομεν* in Rom 5¹ is now added Prof. H. A. A. Kennedy: see *ExapT* for July 1906, p. 451. I still agree with SH.

P. 112.—Usener (*Pelagia*, 49) remarks on *ἀπέρχομαι* that in later Greek it is transferred to the thought of the goal. Thus *ἀπήλθαμεν ἐν τῇ μεγάλῃ ἐκκλησίᾳ* = "we arrived at the great church." *Ἀφικνούμαι* was much earlier in showing this result of perfective *ἀπό*.

P. 115.—In *Neue Jahrb.* 1906, pp. 254 ff., Prof. Thumb justifies his view that Miss Purdie's general position is right, though pure *Κοινή* texts like the NT and the papyri would have served better than a writer like Polybius, belonging to a transition period of the language. He points out that by this development of the prepositions Hellenistic gains the means of expressing aoristic *Aktionsart* in present time. Thus "*ἀπέχουσι* (Mt 6². 5. 16) is in its *Aktionsart* identical with *ἐλαβον* or *ἔσχον*, that is, it is an aorist-present, which denotes the present answering to *λαβεῖν* or *σχεῖν*." The recognition of punctiliar force in this commercial word (see Deissmann *BS* 229 and *Licht v. Osten* 74 ff.) makes it very vivid in Mt *l.c.* the hypocrites have as it were their mone-down, as soon as their trumpet has sounded.

P. 122.—Mr H. D. Naylor sends me some additional notes as to the *μὴ ποιεῖ* canon. Some of his classical exx. against Dr Headlam are very good: note Aristoph. *Av.* 1534, where the *conative* present seems clear, and *Ran.* 618-622. Mr Naylor remarks, "I venture to hold the view that the distinction is a growth. It was beginning in classical times; it was nearly crystallised in NT Greek; and it is completely so in the modern language." In other words, usage progressively restricted the various possible forces of *ποιεῖ* in this location, till only one was left. Mullach treated the matter well (pp. 345 f.), as the *Athenaeum* reviewer notes. Add to my papyrus reff. HbP 45 (iii/B.C.) *καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ πειρᾶσθε συνάγειν καὶ μὴ ὑπολιμπάνεσθε*.

P. 129.—The present of this *conative* *ἠνάγκαζον* is well seen in Gal 6¹²: cf also Jn 10³². With reference to Thumb's argument on *προσφέρω*, I find it easier to deny him Heb 11¹⁷, as I can give him a good ex. in a less literary writer: *πρόσφερε τὸ δῶρον* in Mt 5²⁴ is very probably aorist in action.

Id.—The differentia of the aorist may be effectively brought in to decide the famous difficulty in 1 Co 7²¹. If Paul meant "go on in your slavery," he must have said *χρῶ*: the aorist *χρῆσαι* can only be "seize the opportunity." We can now see that Origen took the passage this way: see *JTS* ix. 508.

P. 134.—For Jn 15⁶ Epictetus iv. 1. 39, *ἂν μὲν στρατεύσωμαι, ἀπηλλάγην πάντων τῶν κακῶν*. 1 Co 7²⁸ and Gal 5⁴ may be noted. See Abbott *JG* 586 for other exx.

P. 135.—An idiomatic old aorist belonging to this category still survives: a traveller in Cos "had a pleasant shock, on calling for a cup of coffee, to hear the waiter cry *Ἐφθασα*."

P. 141.—In a discussion of aorist and perfect (*Am. Journ. Theol.* x. 102 f.), in which Latinism is regarded as contributory to the fusion, E. J. Goodspeed

remarks on the curious development in the formulæ with the verb *διαγράφω*, "pay," in receipts. The Ptolemaic documents have *διατέγραφεν*, the early Roman *διαγεγράφηκεν*. Then in twelve years, towards the end of i/A.D., the aorist suddenly and completely ousts the perfect, having previously only appeared once, cir. 40 A.D., and the change occurs simultaneously in Elephantine and Thebes. It affects no other words: *μεμέτρημαι* and *-κεν* continue unchanged.

P. 142.—Mr Ottley has noted no case of aoristic perfect in Isaiah except in the category of aorist and perfect standing together, joined by *καί*.

Ib.—Gal 3¹⁸ 4²³ are Pauline *exx.* of the perfect for what "stands written."

P. 145.—The constative "we possessed" clearly will not suit *ἔσχάκαμεν* in Rom 5². Can it have been a mannerism which Paul dropped between the writing of "3 Corinthians" and Romans? On the other hand, another papyrus can be quoted where "possessed" suits the sense well, and the perfect stands in close connexion with the aorist: BU 297 (end of ii/A.D.), *τοῖς δικαλαῖν αἰτῶν ἔσχηκόσι καὶ ἀνευ τινὸς ἀμφισβητήσεως ἐν τῇ νομῇ ἡγενομένου* (= *οἰς*).

Ib.—I venture to question the rendering "began to amend" in Jn 4⁸². The idiomatic English "got better" suits the punctiliar *ἔσχευ*, and the comparative does not differ from the positive in *ἐὰν κομψῶς σχῶ*, TbP 414 (ii/A.D.), more than "got better" differs from "got well." The father does not suggest a *gradual* recovery.

P. 159.—On the verb *πατέχω*=pay, Wilcken observes (*Ostraka*, i. 107) that even in RL (iii/B.C.)—*e.g.* 51—the word occurs often both in act. and in mid. without apparent distinction. These sporadic *exx.* of irregular middles occur in the earliest period of the *Koinḗ*, but they do not invalidate the general rule.

P. 168.—The papyrus *exx.* of *δραῖν*=when make it an open question whether in Mk 11¹⁹ we are not to translate "when evening fell," that is the evening before the *πρωτὸ* of v.²⁰. In such a writer as Mk this is at least possible, and the other rendering produces an awkward sequence. The impf. *ἔξεπορεύοντο* may be pictorial quite as well as iterative.

P. 177.—Prof. W. Rhys Roberts suggests to me another *ex.* of *μή* c. fut. in Eurip. *Med.* 822, *λέξεις δὲ μηδὲν . . .*, where the change to *λέξεις* (especially in that order) has always seemed to him arbitrary. "Probably there are other similar cases in which the MS reading should be carefully weighed."

P. 179.—Add Epict. iv. 1. 41, *ἴνα μὴ μωρὸς ᾦ, ἀλλ' ἴνα μάθῃ*, "let him not be a fool, but learn. . . ." Dr J. O. F. Murray suggests to me that this *ἴνα* may be seen in Rev 14¹³. Since the jussive *Requiescant* falls from Divine lips, it has no bearing on controverted questions. Its superior fitness in the grammatical structure of the verse is undeniable. In 1 Co 14⁵ we have a good *ex.* of *θέλω ἴνα* and *θέλω* c. inf. side by side with no real difference.

Ib.—Prof. Burkitt (*Evang. da-Mepharra*. ii. 252 f.) reads in Mt. 23²⁸ *ταῦτα δὲ ποιῆσαι κάκεινα μὴ ἀφείναι*, after the Lewis, supposing the MSS readings to be corrections. In 2 Co 12¹ he would follow κ in reading *καυχᾶσθαι—οὐ συμφέρων μὲν—ἐλεύσομαι δὲ κ.τ.λ.*, which is presumably "Now to boast!—it is not expedient, but I shall be coming," etc. There seems no special difficulty about infin. for imper. here, and Aramaism is entirely out of court. Prof. Burkitt's reading in Mt *l.c.* is "translation Greek" no doubt, but perfectly allowable.

P. 185.—The use of *μή* in warning retains still the consciousness of its paratactic origin. Dr. Rouse quotes *φοβοῦμαι μήπως ἀπέθανε* (of Gal 4¹¹, 2 Co 11³) with the independent *μήπως* in questions expressing surprise or indignation (*μήπως εἶμαι λόρδος*; "do you suppose I'm a millionaire?") (Mullach, pp. 395 f.).

Ib.—In Gal 6¹⁰ WH read *ὡς καιρὸν ἔχωμεν* (κΒ*17). As we have seen on Rom 5¹, the MSS can hardly perhaps be regarded as decisive between *ο* and *ω*;

but the subj. is justifiable with the sense "as long as we have opportunity, let us continue to work." (*Ὡς* in MGr takes the meaning of *ἕως* as well as its own.) In classical Greek this futuristic subj. would demand *ἄν*, but words meaning *until* constantly drop it in Hellenistic.

P. 188.—Dr Giles tells me that Gildersleeve's suggestion of an independent *ὅ* in *ὅ μὴ* was anticipated in the Middle Ages: in one if not both of the best MSS of Aristophanes it is regularly punctuated *ὅ· μὴ*. . . .

P. 205.—Prof. Thumb (*Neue Jahrb.* '06, p. 259) observes that the infin. of purpose is commoner in Homer than in Attic: the preference accordingly has lingered in Asiatic and island Greek for three thousand years.

P. 206.—Dr E. A. Abbott reinforces the depleted ranks of scholars who would press the telic force of *ἵνα* in Jn. We might cite such passages as 15¹⁸ as affording scope for exegetical ingenuity on these lines. If we had no evidence from Hellenistic and MGr as to the loss of this force in *ἵνα*, we might accept such subtleties of interpretation as at least not out of character with so allusive a writer. But with our present knowledge we need much stronger evidence to prove that Jn differed so greatly from his contemporaries.

P. 207.—Prof. Burkitt notes (*Ev. da-Meph.* ii. 183) that Tatian took *ὥστε* as consecutive in Lk 4²⁹, "so that they cast him down."

P. 209.—The consecutive *ὅτι* which Blass would read in Jn 3¹⁶ does appear in later Greek, e.g. *Pelagia*, 20, *τί διδοῖς τοῖς ἀμφοῖς σου, ὅτι ζωὴν αἰώνιον ἔχουσιν*; See Abbott *JG* 534.

P. 210.—The consecutive use of *ἵνα* was recognised by Lightfoot in Gal 5¹⁷, 1 Th 5⁴: see his notes, and of what he says on *εἰς τὸ* c. inf. in 1 Th 2¹⁶.

P. 212.—For classical *exx.* of acc. and infin. where nom. would have been regular, cf Aeschylus *PV* 268 f. and the note of Sikes and Wynne-Willson; also Adam's note on Plato *Apol.* 86 B.

P. 215.—Dr Abbott touches a weak spot in my treatment of *ἐν τῷ* c. inf. He reminds me that, to prove the Biblical use free from Semitism, we must find classical parallels for it with the sense "during." Birklein's statistics unfortunately do not give us the opportunity of testing this, and in the face of Blass's dictum (p. 239) it is not worth while to try. I should transfer this "Hebraism" to the category of "possible but unidiomatic" Greek (*supra*, p. 76).

Ib.—*Ζῆν*, like *πεῖν* and *φαγεῖν*, our *living*, had become a noun in the vernacular. Thus BM iii. p. 131 (a poor weaver's petition, 140 A. D.) *μισθοῦ πορίζοντος τὸ ζῆν*, TbP 283 (illiterate, i/B. C.) *κινδυνεύω τῷ ζῆν*, *αλ.*

P. 227.—The periphrastic imperf. occurs several times in *Pelagia*, as p. 14, *ἤμην ἀπερχόμενος*; 18, *ἦν ἀκούσασα*: note also p. 26, *ἔσο γνώσκων*, like *ἴσθι εὐνοῶν* in Mt 5²⁸. Cf Usener's note p. 50. That this is pure vernacular, untainted by Hebraism, is beyond question. Dr Rouse observes that it is used now in Zaconian, as *φοροῦντερ ἔμε = ἐφοροῦμεν, ὀρούμενερ ἔμι = ὀρώμαι*.

P. 237.—A further addition to the list on p. 95 is given by Prof. Burkitt in Mt 10¹¹ D and 28, *ἡ πόλις εἰς ἣν ἂν εἰσέλθῃτε εἰς αὐτήν* (*Ev. da-Meph.* ii. 75). This goes with the passages supporting Wellhausen's thesis (above, p. 242).

P. 240.—If *μὴ γένοιτο* is "a phrase of learned origin," it is presumably parallel with some other survivals in idiomatic phrases, for which Dr Rouse instances *μετὰ χαρᾶς, ἀπὸ βροχῆς, τέλος πάντων, τῷ ὄντι, παντάπασι*. Dr Rouse himself has never heard *μὴ γένοιτο*, for which the people say *ὁ θεὸς νὰ φυλάξῃ*.

I. INDEX TO QUOTATIONS.

(a) NEW TESTAMENT.

MATTHEW	PAGE	MATTHEW— <i>continued</i>	PAGE	MATTHEW— <i>continued</i>	PAGE
1. 18	74	6. 17	85, 286	12. 28	140
1. 19	280	6. 19	58, 240	12. 42	236
1. 20	124	6. 27	280	13. 2	230, 241
1. 21	69, 86	6. 28	117	13. 5-8	79
1. 22	106	7. 1	191	13. 14	75
2. 1	48	7. 4	175, 176	13. 15	140
2. 2	138, 204	7. 9	193	13. 17	139
2. 3	48	7. 13	174	13. 24	140
2. 4	120	7. 16	59	13. 28	140
2. 10	117	7. 22	138	13. 30	97
2. 15	138	7. 23	174	13. 32	58
2. 20	58	8. 1	74	13. 44	139
2. 23	17	8. 8	208	13. 46	142, 143, 145
3. 4	91, 102	8. 10	140	14. 2	140
3. 7	116, 138	8. 19	97	14. 15	140, 247
3. 9	15, 124	8. 25	114	14. 19	107
3. 11	208	8. 32	172	15. 5	177
3. 14	129	8. 34	14	15. 6	140
3. 17	104	9. 1	90	15. 13	139
4. 3	208	9. 8	58	15. 24	138
5. 12	129, 174	9. 10	16, 17	15. 32	70
5. 17	138	9. 18	74, 140	16. 7	139
5. 18	58, 191	9. 34	104	16. 17	140
5. 21, etc. 138,	140, 186	10. 5	138	16. 20	208
5. 25	174, 226	10. 8	139	16. 22	190, 191, 240
5. 26	191	10. 9	125	16. 26	230
5. 27	138	10. 10	38	17. 9	125
5. 28	65, 140, 218	10. 19	93	17. 12	138, 146
5. 29	210	10. 25	140, 208, 210	17. 14	74
5. 31	138, 186	10. 26	191	18. 1	78
5. 33	138	10. 28	102	18. 6	208
5. 34, 36	126	10. 29	236	18. 11	137
5. 38	138	10. 32	104	18. 13	17
5. 39	79, 174	10. 34 f.	138	18. 15	140
5. 40	69	10. 42	188	18. 22	98
5. 42	129, 174	11. 1	17	18. 23	140, 160
5. 43	138	11. 3	185	18. 25	219
5. 47	186	11. 6	104	19. 6	140
6. 2	159, 186	11. 17	139	19. 12	139
6. 3	174	11. 20	79	19. 27	140
6. 11	129, 174	11. 25	91, 136, 139	19. 29	140
6. 12	137, 140	11. 27	140	20. 7	140
6. 13	125	12. 3, etc.	140	20. 12	140
6. 16	186	12. 7	148	20. 20, 22	160

INDEX TO QUOTATIONS.

251

MATTHEW—continued

	PAGE
20. 22 . . .	45
20. 23 . . .	241
20. 28 . . .	105
21. 16 . . .	138, 140
21. 19 . . .	179
21. 20 . . .	139
21. 32 . . .	216
21. 42 59, 138, 139, 140	140
22. 1 . . .	131
22. 2 . . .	140
22. 5 . . .	88, 90
22. 11 . . .	231, 232
23. 21 . . .	104
23. 23 . . .	140, 185, 248
23. 30 . . .	201
23. 33 . . .	116, 185
23. 39 . . .	191
24. 17, 18 . . .	174
24. 23 . . .	124
24. 30 . . .	150
24. 35 . . .	190
24. 43 . . .	201
24. 45 . . .	140
24. 48 . . .	142
25. 6 . . .	14, 146
25. 9 . . .	184, 189, 192
25. 16 . . .	116
25. 19 . . .	160
25. 20 . . .	140
25. 20, 24 . . .	238
25. 22 . . .	140
25. 24, 25 . . .	238
25. 24, 26 . . .	138
25. 40 . . .	138
25. 41 . . .	221
26. 2 . . .	120
26. 4 . . .	157
26. 10 . . .	116, 140
26. 13 . . .	140
26. 24 . . .	200
26. 25 . . .	140
26. 32 . . .	212
26. 35 . . .	190, 191
26. 50 . . .	93
26. 51 . . .	157
26. 53 . . .	50
26. 64 . . .	86, 140
26. 65 . . .	140
27. 1 . . .	207
27. 4 . . .	140, 177
27. 5 . . .	155
27. 11 . . .	86
27. 19 . . .	140
27. 19, 25 . . .	183
27. 21 . . .	77, 102
27. 23 . . .	140
27. 24 . . .	90
27. 32 . . .	14
27. 35 . . .	157
27. 40 . . .	127

MATTHEW—continued

	PAGE
27. 44 . . .	58
27. 46 . . .	140
27. 49 . . .	175, 230
27. 62 . . .	91
28. 1 . . .	72, 73
28. 7 . . .	140
28. 15 . . .	139
28. 18 . . .	140
28. 20 . . .	139

MARK

	PAGE
I. 7 . . .	95, 237
I. 11 . . .	134
I. 15 . . .	67
I. 17 . . .	45
I. 25 . . .	176
I. 36 . . .	116
I. 44 . . .	124
2. 1 . . .	82
2. 3 . . .	222
2. 5 . . .	119
2. 7 . . .	231
2. 15 . . .	16, 17
2. 23 . . .	16, 17, 159
3. 9 . . .	208
3. 11 . . .	168
3. 16 . . .	69, 235
3. 21 . . .	106, 134
3. 26 . . .	187
4. 1 . . .	241
4. 5-8 . . .	79
4. 8 . . .	103
4. 22 . . .	191, 241
4. 26 . . .	185
4. 28 . . .	46, 50
4. 32 . . .	58
4. 39 . . .	176
4. 41 . . .	58
5. 10 . . .	208
5. 13 . . .	172
5. 15 . . .	145
5. 19 . . .	148
5. 23 . . .	179
5. 34 . . .	174, 226
5. 36 . . .	124
6. 14, 24 . . .	127
6. 17 f. . .	94
6. 22-25 . . .	160
6. 25 . . .	179
6. 26 . . .	51
6. 38 . . .	170
6. 39 f. . .	97, 107
6. 56 . . .	167, 168
7. 12 . . .	191
7. 25 . . .	13, 94, 95
7. 26 . . .	75
7. 28 . . .	139
8. 2 . . .	70
8. 3 . . .	53

MARK—continued

	PAGE
8. 7 . . .	52
8. 14 . . .	170
8. 19 . . .	50
8. 24 . . .	94
8. 26 . . .	125
8. 36 . . .	87
9. 18 . . .	186
9. 25 . . .	125
9. 38 . . .	129
9. 39 . . .	125, 174
9. 41 . . .	100, 188
10. 7 . . .	91
10. 13 . . .	59
10. 20 . . .	159
10. 29 . . .	191
10. 32 . . .	227
10. 35, 38 . . .	160
10. 35 . . .	179
10. 45 . . .	105
10. 51 . . .	179
11. 11 . . .	72
11. 14 . . .	165, 179
11. 16 . . .	176
11. 19 . . .	168, 248
11. 25 . . .	168
12. 11 . . .	59
12. 14 . . .	185
12. 23 . . .	145
12. 40 . . .	50
13. 1 . . .	74
13. 2 . . .	189, 191
13. 6 . . .	175
13. 11 . . .	91
13. 13 . . .	150
13. 19 . . .	95
13. 24-27 . . .	150
13. 31 . . .	190, 191
14. 3 . . .	55, 176
14. 6 . . .	175
14. 8 . . .	176
14. 10 . . .	97
14. 14 . . .	151
14. 18 . . .	111
14. 19 . . .	105
14. 21 . . .	171, 200
14. 28 . . .	149
14. 30 . . .	151
14. 31 . . .	190, 191
14. 32 . . .	169
14. 36 . . .	93, 233
14. 38 . . .	178
14. 42 . . .	175
14. 47 . . .	157
14. 63 . . .	38
14. 72 . . .	131
15. 1 . . .	159
15. 2 . . .	86
15. 15 . . .	20
15. 18 . . .	71
15. 25 . . .	12

INDEX TO QUOTATIONS.

253

JOHN—continued		JOHN—continued		ACTS—continued	
	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
3. 16	209	15. 6	59, 184, 247	5. 2	237
3. 18	171, 239	15. 8, 13	208	5. 7	16, 70, 233
3. 19	140	15. 13	211	5. 14	67, 68
3. 32	143	15. 16	55	5. 15	35
4. 10	201	15. 18	79, 245	5. 17	228
4. 18	145	15. 22, 24	52	5. 21	237
4. 23	66	15. 27	119	5. 24	198
4. 29	170, 193	16. 17	102	5. 39	193
4. 34	208, 210	16. 23	66	6. 3	50
4. 35	12	17. 3	113, 206	6. 5	50
4. 52	63	17. 23	234	7. 5	231, 232
5. 7	219	17. 24	179	7. 11	107
5. 13	210	17. 25	113	7. 12	235
5. 14	125	18. 20	236	7. 14	103
5. 18	90	18. 34	87	7. 20	104
5. 24	67	18. 37	86	7. 26	129
5. 36	49	18. 39	210	7. 31	117
5. 37	144	19. 3	70	7. 35	144
5. 38	67	19. 11	148	7. 36	133
6. 10	63, 75	19. 21	125	7. 40	69
6. 25	146	19. 24	157	7. 60	125
6. 57	105	19. 25	106	8. 16	107
6. 59	236	20. 1	222	8. 20	195
6. 68	83	20. 2	59	8. 23	71, 235
7. 4	212	20. 17, 27	125	8. 31	198
[8. 9]	105	20. 19	183	9. 7	66
8. 31	67	20. 25	49, 191	9. 15	217
8. 32, 33	149	21. 3	204	9. 34	119
8. 33	144	21. 5	170	9. 38	125
8. 38	85	21. 8	102	10. 15	125
8. 57	234	21. 10	185	10. 17	198
8. 59	156, 161	21. 23	114	10. 25	16, 217
9. 2	210	21. 24	9	10. 28	236
9. 17	94	21. 25	205	10. 33	131, 228
10. 5	190			10. 37	240
10. 12	231, 232			11. 25	235
10. 29	50			11. 28	60, 92
10. 37	125			12. 6	114
11. 2	182			12. 17	240
11. 17	36			12. 25	133
11. 18	102			13. 1	228
11. 21, 32	201			13. 8	236
11. 28	131			13. 9	88
11. 42	135			13. 10	177
11. 55	12			13. 22	71
11. 56	191			13. 25	93
12. 1	100, 101			14. 6, 8	48
12. 7	175			14. 8	221
12. 9	84			14. 13	228
12. 13	14			14. 14	157
12. 19	135			14. 18	217, 220
12. 35	158			15. 17	237
12. 40	117			15. 20	217
13. 1	90, 135			15. 23	179
13. 8	177, 191			15. 27	230
13. 13	235			15. 29	171, 176, 228
13. 27	236			15. 37 f.	130
13. 31	135			15. 39	209
14. 31	177			16. 6	133, 134
15. 4	103, 241			16. 11	82

ACTS

1 CORINTHIANS—*contd.*

	PAGE
14. 10 . . .	196
14. 11 . . .	103, 104
14. 27 . . .	79
14. 39 . . .	125
15. 2 . . .	171
15. 4 . . .	187, 141
15. 6 . . .	186
15. 9 . . .	79, 286
15. 22 . . .	114
15. 28 . . .	149, 163
15. 29 . . .	58
15. 31, 32 . . .	114
15. 32 . . .	120
15. 33 . . .	45
15. 37 . . .	151, 196
15. 50 . . .	58
16. 2 . . .	54
16. 3 . . .	58
16. 4 . . .	216, 217
16. 5 . . .	120
16. 6 . . .	74
16. 11 . . .	178

2 CORINTHIANS

1. 4 . . .	93
1. 8 . . .	217, 220
1. 9 . . .	145
1. 17 . . .	210
2. 7 . . .	193
2. 13 . . .	145, 220
4. 8 . . .	237
4. 8, 9 . . .	231
5. 3 . . .	115
5. 4 . . .	107
5. 19 . . .	212, 227
6. 9 . . .	114
7. 5 . . .	145, 182, 225
8. 6 . . .	219
8. 7 . . .	179
8. 11 . . .	217
8. 18 . . .	68
8. 23 . . .	105
8. 24 . . .	181
9. 11 . . .	182
9. 11, 13 . . .	181
10. 2 . . .	212
10. 9 . . .	167
10. 14 . . .	68
11. 1 . . .	200
11. 2 . . .	160
11. 5 . . .	239
11. 16 . . .	178
11. 21 . . .	212
11. 25 . . .	144, 145, 148
12. 2 . . .	101, 229
12. 9 . . .	180
12. 17 . . .	144
12. 19 . . .	119
13. 5 . . .	171

GALATIANS

	PAGE
1. 5 . . .	183
1. 6 f. . . .	80, 246
1. 7 . . .	171
1. 22 f. . . .	227
2. 2 . . .	193, 201
2. 10 . . .	179
2. 13 . . .	209
3. 2 . . .	117
3. 17 . . .	219
3. 23 . . .	114
4. 6 . . .	10, 233
4. 8 . . .	231
4. 11 . . .	193, 248
4. 13 . . .	106
4. 27 . . .	127, 231
4. 30 . . .	177
5. 1 . . .	61, 125
5. 12 . . .	163, 201
5. 14 . . .	87
5. 15 . . .	124
5. 16 . . .	118, 130, 191
5. 26 . . .	177
6. 5 . . .	90

EPHESIANS

1. 1 . . .	228
1. 6 . . .	98
1. 10 . . .	107
1. 13 . . .	67, 68
1. 15 . . .	236
1. 16 . . .	159
1. 17 . . .	55, 196
2. 5, 8 . . .	127
2. 11 . . .	84, 236
2. 15 . . .	103
3. 4 . . .	117
3. 8 . . .	236
3. 16 . . .	55
3. 17 . . .	182
4. 1 . . .	84, 93, 236
4. 2, 3 . . .	181
4. 2 f. . . .	182
4. 26 . . .	125
4. 28 . . .	127
5. 18 . . .	126
5. 22 . . .	181
5. 33 . . .	179
6. 13 . . .	115
6. 22 . . .	185

PHILIPPIANS

1. 5 . . .	236
1. 30 . . .	225
2. 1 . . .	59
2. 12 . . .	174
2. 23 . . .	167

PHILIPPIANS—*continued*

	PAGE
2. 26 . . .	227
2. 30 . . .	64
3. 3 . . .	231
3. 4 . . .	230
3. 5 . . .	10, 102
3. 7 . . .	148
3. 10 . . .	218
3. 11 f. . . .	187, 194
3. 13 . . .	212
3. 16 . . .	179, 204
3. 19 . . .	50
3. 21 . . .	217
4. 11 . . .	229
4. 14 . . .	228

COLOSSIANS

1. 4, 8 . . .	236
1. 26 . . .	224
2. 1 . . .	52
2. 2 . . .	182
2. 8 . . .	178, 192, 228
2. 18 . . .	239
2. 19 . . .	231
2. 21 . . .	124
3. 9 . . .	126
3. 16 . . .	181, 182
3. 17 . . .	181, 183
3. 18 . . .	163
4. 6 . . .	183
4. 15 . . .	48

1 THESSALONIANS

2. 4 . . .	231
2. 12 . . .	219
2. 16 . . .	219
3. 1 . . .	231
3. 2 . . .	68
3. 5 . . .	193, 201
3. 8 . . .	168
3. 11 . . .	179
4. 9 . . .	219
4. 14 . . .	149, 162
4. 15 . . .	191
4. 17 . . .	14
5. 3 . . .	191
5. 4 . . .	210

2 THESSALONIANS

1. 8 . . .	9
2. 2 . . .	212
2. 3 . . .	178
2. 17 . . .	179
3. 5 . . .	179
3. 6 . . .	52
3. 13 . . .	124

1 TIMOTHY		PAGE
1. 13	.	230
2. 6	.	105
4. 14	.	125
4. 15	.	184
5. 1	.	124, 125
5. 13	.	229
5. 22	.	125
5. 23	.	125
6. 3	.	171

2 TIMOTHY		PAGE
1. 8	.	124, 125
1. 11	.	234
1. 12	.	204
1. 16, 18	.	195
1. 18	.	78, 236
2. 19	.	113
2. 25	.	55, 193, 194

TITUS		PAGE
1. 11	.	171
1. 12	.	88, 233
2. 2-10	.	179
2. 13	.	84
3. 8	.	207

PHILEMON		PAGE
20	.	195

HEBREWS		PAGE
1. 1	.	107
2. 10	.	106
2. 15	.	215
3. 5	.	151
3. 8, 15	.	124
3. 12	.	74, 178, 193
3. 16	.	86
4. 1	.	185
4. 3	.	230
4. 7	.	124
5. 1	.	218
5. 7	.	102
6. 4f.	.	66
6. 6	.	230
6. 10	.	204, 210
7. 1	.	224
7. 2	.	224
7. 5	.	53
7. 8	.	114
7. 9	.	204
7. 13	.	143
7. 24	.	212

HEBREWS—continued		PAGE
7. 27	.	90
8. 6	.	56
8. 9	.	74
8. 10	.	107, 224
9. 12	.	51, 132
9. 18	.	143
10. 1	.	58, 225
10. 14	.	127
10. 16	.	107, 224
10. 17	.	190
10. 28	.	114
10. 35	.	124
11. 1	.	231
11. 3	.	219
11. 4	.	224
11. 5	.	217
11. 12	.	230
11. 15	.	204
11. 17	.	129, 142, 143, 238
11. 21	.	114
11. 28	.	144
11. 32	.	237
11. 33	.	116
11. 34	.	116
11. 35	.	224, 231
12. 7	.	82
12. 15	.	178
12. 25	.	124, 200
13. 5	.	182
13. 6	.	150
13. 9	.	125
13. 24	.	237

JAMES		PAGE
1. 1	.	179
1. 11	.	135
1. 13	.	74
1. 24	.	135, 139, 144
2. 1	.	125
2. 25	.	230
3. 4	.	230
3. 13	.	93
4. 2f.	.	160
5. 16	.	156
5. 17	.	217

1 PETER		PAGE
1. 2	.	82
1. 8	.	231, 232
1. 10f.	.	115
1. 14	.	181
1. 18	.	84
1. 24	.	135
2. 10	.	231
2. 11	.	91, 181
2. 12	.	181, 182

1 PETER—continued		PAGE
2. 15	.	53
2. 18	.	181
2. 24	.	237
3. 1, 7	.	181
3. 1, 7, 9, 15, 16	.	182
3. 3	.	236
3. 7	.	181
3. 8f.	.	180
3. 14	.	196
3. 17	.	196
4. 3	.	11
4. 7	.	181
4. 8ff.	.	181
4. 11	.	181
4. 12	.	125
4. 17	.	217
4. 18	.	150
5. 7	.	181

2 PETER		PAGE
1. 1	.	84
1. 9	.	171
1. 10	.	191
1. 12	.	230
1. 18	.	222
1. 19	.	47, 169, 228
2. 5	.	97
2. 14	.	47, 74
2. 22	.	155, 156, 238
3. 16	.	88

1 JOHN		PAGE
1. 3	.	143
1. 9	.	210
2. 19	.	148, 201
2. 24	.	69
4. 1	.	125
4. 2	.	229
4. 3	.	171
4. 16	.	68
5. 3	.	211
5. 10	.	171
5. 15	.	160, 168

2 JOHN		PAGE
7	.	229
8	.	50, 116
10	.	125

3 JOHN		PAGE
4	.	236
5	.	116
6	.	228

JUDE		REVELATION— <i>continued</i>		REVELATION— <i>continued</i>	
	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
1	103	3. 16	114	11. 18	118
5	230	4. 4	36	12. 4	114
		4. 9	168	12. 6	59
		5. 5	125	12. 7	106, 217, 218
		5. 7	143, 145	12. 9	233
		6. 6	125	13. 8, 12	237
		7. 1	36	14. 4	168
		7. 2	237	14. 8	135
		7. 3	125	14. 13	114, 248
		7. 9	237	14. 20	102
		7. 14	145	17. 3	65
		8. 1	168	18. 2	134, 135
		8. 4	75	18. 14	190, 192
		8. 5	143, 145	18. 22	192
		9. 6	190	19. 3	145
		9. 11	69, 233, 235	19. 10	178
		9. 12	58	20. 2	233
		9. 14	36	20. 4	130
		9. 20	210	20. 8	237
		10. 2	225	21. 12, 14	225
		10. 4	125	21. 13	73
		10. 10	111, 115	21. 21	105
		11. 5	187	21. 27	241
		11. 17	52, 145	22. 9	178

REVELATION	
1. 4	9
1. 5	9, 12
1. 16	36
1. 20	9
2. 2	56
2. 3, 5	52
2. 4	52
2 5, 16	75
2. 7	85
2. 13	12
2 26	69
2. 27	145
3. 2	114
3. 3	63, 143, 145
3. 5	104
3. 8	237
3. 15	200

(b) OLD TESTAMENT.

N.B.—The numbering of the chapters is according to the English Bible; where the LXX differs, the numbers are added in brackets. So with titles of Books.

	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
Gen. 1. 10	46	1 Sam. (1 K.) 1. 11	191	Ca. 8. 1	194
„ 3. 10	161	„ 9. 9	235	Isai. 5. 27	189
„ 4. 24	98	„ 13. 15	14	„ 14. 31	176
„ 6. 17	49	2 Sam. (2 K.) 18. 33	194	„ 28. 16	68
„ 8. 13	237	„ 20. 20	240	„ 33. 24	135
„ 21. 26	241	„ 21. 24	50	„ 53. 5	143
„ 24. 11	162	1 Chr. 11. 19	240	Jer. 9. 2	194
„ 43. 16	63	Job 22. 3	168	„ 31 (38). 33	107
„ 43. 23	240	„ 24. 12	88	Ezek. 26. 13	192
„ 45. 8	94	„ 30. 20	147	Dan. 10. 13, 20	217
Ex. 1. 16	54	„ 31. 31	198	Hos. 11. 1	138
„ 3. 14	228	„ 31. 35	194		
„ 32. 1	142	Ps. 6. 9	174		
Num. 11. 29	194	„ 32 (31). 3	147		
Deut. 23. 1	163	„ 120 (119). 3	194		
„ 28. 24 ff.	194	„ 141 (140). 1	147		
Jos. 1. 11	70	Prov. 3. 5	226		
„ 17. 13	76	„ 9. 12	88, 89		
Judg. 9. 29	194	„ 22. 7	88		
„ 9. 53	112	„ 27. 15	88		
Ruth 1. 9	194	Eccles. 2. 16	70		

APOCRYPHA	
Esth. 13. 3	198
„ 14. 3	54
2 Mac. 3. 16	16
„ 9. 24	194
„ 12. 4	167
4 Mac. 5. 13	198

(c) INSCRIPTIONS.

Archiv

Archiv für Papyrusforschung, ed. U. Wilcken.

	PAGE	PAGE	PAGE
iii. 129 . . .	14		

Audollent

Defixionum Tabellae, ed. Audollent (Paris, 1904).

no. 15 . . .	284	no. 92 . . .	195	no. 189 . . .	284
--------------	-----	--------------	-----	---------------	-----

BCH

Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique.

1888, p. 202 . . .	284	1902, p. 217 . . .	196	1903, p. 335 . . .	284
--------------------	-----	--------------------	-----	--------------------	-----

Cauer

Delectus inscriptionum Graecarum, propter dialectum memorabilium^s, ed. P. Cauer (Leipzig, 1888).

no. 32 . . .	214	no. 157 . . .	214	no. 220 . . .	214
47 . . .	214	171 . . .	214	264 . . .	178, 214
122-5 . . .	214	179 . . .	214	431 . . .	214
148 . . .	214				

Cooke

North Semitic Inscriptions, by G. A. Cooke (Oxford, 1903).

no. 110 . . .	286	no. 113 . . .	286
---------------	-----	---------------	-----

IMA

Inscriptiones Maris Aegaei, ed. von Gärtringen and Paton.

iii. 174 . . .	167	iii. 325 . . .	100	iii. 1119 . . .	51
----------------	-----	----------------	-----	-----------------	----

JHS

Journal of Hellenic Studies (Hellenic Society).

xix. 92 . . .	86	xxii. 369 . . .	7, 220	xxv. 63 . . .	239
xix. 299 . . .	98	xxiii. 85 . . .	240		

Letronne (or Letr.)

Recueil des inscriptions grecques et latines de l'Égypte, ed. Letronne (1842).

no. 117 . . .	159	no. 198 . . .	102	no. 557 . . .	240
149 . . .	60	221 . . .	240	vol. ii. p. 286 . . .	240
190 . . .	102				

Magn.

Die Inschriften von Magnesia am Maeander, ed. O. Kern (Berlin, 1900).

no. 47 . . .	52	no. 114 . . .	64	no. 215 . . .	198
--------------	----	---------------	----	---------------	-----

Michel

Recueil d'inscriptions grecques, ed. C. Michel (Brussels, 1900).

no. 32 . . .	64	no. 357 . . .	214	no. 694 . . .	46, 101, 214
41 . . .	82	370 . . .	216	1001 . . .	101, 214
54-6 . . .	214	417 . . .	214	1333 . . .	214
60 . . .	214	436 . . .	214	1409 . . .	55
182 . . .	214	585 . . .	88	1411 . . .	55
197 . . .	214				

OGIS

Orientalis Graecae Inscriptiones Selectae, ed. Dittenberger (Leipzig, 1903-5).

PAGE		PAGE		PAGE	
no. 17	64	no. 87	64	no. 435	101
41	216	90	102, 167, 216	665	121
54	105	219	238	710	78
56	78	383	21	751	150

Ramsay, C. and B.

Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia, by W. M. Ramsay, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1895, 1897).

ii. 380	289	ii. 472	240	ii. 535-8	240
391	289	477	239	537	234
392	240	485	238	559f.	240
394	289	497	48	565	56
		530	239		

Roberts-Gardner

Introduction to Greek Epigraphy, vol. II., The Inscriptions of Attica; ed. E. S. Roberts and E. A. Gardner (Cambridge, 1905).

p. 179	212	p. 258 (no. 97)	234
------------------	-----	---------------------------	-----

Viereck 80

Sermo Graecus quo Senatus Populusque Romanus . . . usi sunt, by P. Viereck (Göttingen, 1888).

pp. 12, 13, 21	101
--------------------------	-----

(d) PAPHYRI

Archiv (see under (c) above)

iii. 60	17	iii. 173	236
-------------------	----	--------------------	-----

BM

British Museum Papyri, ed. F. G. Kenyon (London, 1893, 1898, 1907). (See Addenda.)

Vol. i. nos. 1-138.

no. 18	52	no. 23	220	no. 42	240
20	167	41	52	130	236
21	196, 208				

Vol. ii. nos. 139 ff.

no. 177	286	no. 239	98	no. 401	239
220	234	301	195	417	70
233	169	336	80	970	17

BU

Griechische Urkunden, from the Berlin Museum.

Vol. i. nos. 1-361 (1895).

no. 16	244	no. 114	239	no. 225	234
18	220	136	146	226	220
31	60	151	229	243	220
36	220	163	144	297	248
46	220	164	220	303	240
48	179	183	227	321	220
69	75	195	220	326	59, 169, 187
98	230	197	177	361	231

BU—continued.

Vol. ii. nos. 362-696 (1898).

PAGE			PAGE			PAGE		
no. 362.	.	14	no. 457.	.	220	no. 607.	.	86, 168
366.	.	84	531.	.	208	623.	.	96
368.	.	84	537.	.	234	625.	177, 208, 220	
371.	.	84	546.	.	168	632.	.	159
395.	.	84	577.	.	60	651.	.	220
424.	.	168	592.	.	101	665.	.	219, 236
449.	.	86	595.	.	220			

Vol. iii. nos. 697-1012 (1903).

no. 731.	.	220	no. 830.	.	219	no. 948.	.	11
741.	.	196	836.	.	101	970	103, 159, 235, 236	
747.	.	220	845.	.	220	997.	.	60
775.	.	160	887.	.	75	998.	.	107
814.	.	142, 177	925.	.	236	1002.	.	60
822.	.	98	926.	.	54			

Vol. iv. nos. 1018 ff. (in progress).

no. 1013.	.	60	no. 1040.	.	236	no. 1053.	.	161
1015.	.	238	1041.	.	75	1055.	.	161
1031.	.	220	1044.	.	97	1057.	.	80
1033.	.	51	1050.	.	103	1059.	.	235
1036.	.	60	1052.	.	91	1079.	.	107, 178

Ch P*Greek Papyri from the Cairo Museum*, ed. E. J. Goodspeed (Chicago, 1902).

no. 3.	.	162	no. 4.	.	230	no. 15.	.	101
--------	---	-----	--------	---	-----	---------	---	-----

CPR*Corpus Papyrorum Rainert*, ed. C. Wessely (Vienna, 1895).

no. 4.	.	223	no. 25.	.	169	no. 156.	.	220
19.	.	212, 239	28.	.	127	237.	.	169
24.	.	127, 169						

Eudoxus

Papyrus of the astronomer Eudoxus, ed. Blass 78, 91

PFI*Florence Papyri*, ed. Vitelli and Comparetti (Lincei Academy: fasc. i., ii., Milan, 1905-).

no. 2.	.	76, 220	no. 5.	.	106	no. 24.	.	53
						50.	.	239

HI P*Heidelberg Papyri (mainly LXX)*, ed. G. A. Deissmann (1905).

no. 6.	.	196
--------	---	-----

KP*Papyri from Karanis*, ed. E. J. Goodspeed (Chicago, 1900).

no. 37.	.	60	no. 46.	.	72
---------	---	----	---------	---	----

LP*Papyri Graeci Musei antiquarii publici Lugduni-Batavi*, ed. C. Leemans (1843).

B.	.	195, 220	E.	.	159	U.	.	60, 237
O.	.	50	G.	.	45	W.	.	79, 195, 197, 245

MP

Papyri from Magdola, in *BCH* 1902 ff., ed. Lefebvre.

PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
no. 16 . . .	105	no. 20 . . .	105	no. 25 . . . 100, 239

Mithras Liturgy

Eine Mithrasliturgie, by A. Dieterich (Leipzig, 1903).

p. 12 . . .	54	p. 17 . . .	40
-------------	----	-------------	----

NP

Geneva Papyri, ed. J. Nicole, 2 vols. (1896-1906).

no. 1 . . .	229	no. 19 . . .	142	no. 53 . . .	55
7 . . .	208	47 . . .	101	67 . . .	80
16 . . .	220	49 . . .	228	69 . . .	80
17 . . .	193	51 . . .	188		

Par P

Paris Papyri, in *Notices et Extraits*, xviii. part 2, ed. Brunet de Presle (1865).

no. 5 . . .	228, 246	no. 26 . . .	60, 167, 168	no. 46 . . .	167
8 . . .	226	28 . . .	62	47 . . .	200
10 . . .	234	35 . . .	72	48 . . .	6, 53
13 . . .	231	36 . . .	107	49 . . .	17, 103, 193, 205
14 . . .	231	37 . . .	72	51 . . .	85, 121, 208
15 . . .	59, 73, 240	40 . . .	231, 244	60 . . .	46, 84
18 . . .	12, 168	42 . . .	179	62 . . .	46, 168
22 . . .	60, 62, 110	44 . . .	229	63 . . .	14, 61, 99, 198, 228

Path P

Papyri from Pathyris, in *Archiv* ii. 514 ff., ed. de Ricci.

no. 1 . . .	228
-------------	-----

PP

Flinders Petrie Papyri, ed. J. P. Mahaffy (in Proc. Royal Irish Acad., 3 vols., 1891-1905). (See Addenda.)

i. no. 13 . . .	168	ii. no. 19 . . .	228	ii. no. 37 . . .	98
-----------------	-----	------------------	-----	------------------	----

TP

Turin Papyri, ed. Peyron (1826).

no. 1 . . .	75, 103, 197,	no. 3 . . .	231	no. 8 . . .	231, 237
	229, 231, 246	5 . . .	159		

The following collections are (with one exception) from the publications of the Egypt Exploration Fund; the papyri were discovered and mainly edited by B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt:—

RL

Revenus Laws of Ptolemy and Philadelphus, ed. Grenfell and Mahaffy (Oxford, 1896).

col. 29 . . .	98	col. 38 . . .	103	col. 51 . . .	248
---------------	----	---------------	-----	---------------	-----

G

An Alexandrian Erotic Fragment, and other Greek Papyri, chiefly Ptolemaic, ed. Grenfell (1896).

no. 18 . . .	234	no. 30 . . .	223	no. 35 . . .	223
--------------	-----	--------------	-----	--------------	-----

GH

Greek Papyri, series II. (1897).

PAGE		PAGE		PAGE	
no. 14	54	no. 26	91, 223	no. 38	169
15	84	36	106, 159	46	48

OP

Oxyrhynchus Papyri.

Vol. i. nos. 1-207 (1898).

no. 6	70	no. 67	204	no. 99	84
34	169	69	220	105	169
41	106	71	199	113	160
60	199	82	220	119 . 28, 64, 234, 240	
		86	220	121	97, 208

Vol. ii. nos. 208-400 (1899).

no. 237. 168, 197, 213,		no. 265	45, 64	no. 286	281
220, 240		266	289	292	54, 79
240	195	275	220	295	123, 156
261	106	285	226	299	85

Vol. iii. nos. 401-653 (1903).

no. 413	175	no. 486	99	no. 526	195, 200, 210
471	281	488	104	527	60
477	68, 141	491	281	528	99, 142, 234
478	146	492	101	530	132, 200
482	142	496	159, 187	531	234
		523	103		

Vol. iv. nos. 654-839 (1904).

no. 654	130	no. 717	121	no. 738	170
658	99	724	103	742	76
708	105	725	228	744	123, 208
715	195	726	106, 281	745	91
716	78	727	230, 281	811	64
		736	170, 216		

FP

Fayûm Towns and their Papyri (1900).

no. 109	160	no. 118	101	no. 124	78
110	162	121	131	126	168
112. 128, 178, 223		122	101	130	169

AP

Amherst Papyri, part ii. (1901).

no. 30	97, 238	no. 93	168	no. 130	86
78	223, 231	99	246	135 17, 77, 208, 246 f.	
86	179	113	60	144	240

Tb P

Tebtunis Papyri (University of California Publications), part i. (1902).

no. 6	123, 169	no. 35	162	no. 64	235
12	103, 223, 234	38	46	69	107
13	181	41	231, 236	72	108, 236
14	99, 223	42	223	82	235
24	79	43	14	98	235
26	86	50	131	104	64, 241
27	78, 103 bis	58	86, 168, 223	105 79, 284, 235, 246	
28	169	59	223, 234	107	234
33	78	62	235	124	235
34	231, 232	63	97	230	72

(e) GREEK LITERATURE.

i. *Classical.*

Homer († x/viii B.C.)

PAGE		PAGE		PAGE	
<i>Iliad</i> i. 1 . . .	172	<i>Iliad</i> vi. 284 . . .	184	<i>Iliad</i> xxii. 349 . . .	98
i. 137 . . .	166, 239	vi. 459 . . .	185	xxiv. 38 . . .	xvii
i. 587 . . .	xvii			<i>Odyssey</i> i. 337 . . .	55

Pindar (v/B.C.)

Pyth. iv. 189 . . . 182

Aeschylus (v/B.C.)

<i>Prom. Vinc.</i> 268 f. . .	249	<i>Prom. Vinc.</i> 447 f. . .	76	<i>Persae</i> 981 . . .	97
358 . . .	245	956 f. . .	184		

Sophocles (v/B.C.)

<i>Antigone</i> 114 . . .	74	<i>Oedipus Tyrannus</i>		<i>Oedipus Tyrannus</i>	
542 . . .	98	236 . . .	78	1068 . . .	98
789 . . .	202	533 . . .	74	1199 . . .	84
<i>Oedipus Coloneus</i>		706 . . .	149	<i>Philoctetes</i> 300 . . .	178
155 . . .	179	1141 . . .	98	<i>Eris</i> 201 (Dindorf) . . .	97

Euripides (v/B.C.)

<i>Alceste</i> 386 . . .	134	<i>Ion</i> 771 . . .	184	<i>Medea</i> 213 f. . .	185
<i>Bacchae</i> 1065 . . .	115	<i>Iph. Taur.</i> 1092 . . .	222	822 . . .	248
<i>Hecuba</i> 1163 . . .	113	1359 . . .	58	1320 . . .	177

Aristophanes (v/B.C.)

<i>Acharn.</i> 484 . . .	227	<i>Ranae</i> 521 . . .	70	<i>Thesmophor.</i> 1108 . . .	188
<i>Pax</i> 291 . . .	161	618-622 . . .	247	<i>Aves</i> 1534 . . .	247
		721 . . .	227		

Hippocrates (v/B.C.)

Epidem. vii. 51 . . . 101

Herodotus (v/B.C.)

vi. 32 . . . 81 | vi. 46 . . . 101

Antiphon (v/B.C.)

Frag. M. 3. 67 . . . 227

Thucydides (v/B.C.)

iv. 54 . . . 227

[Xenophon] (v/B.C.)

De Republ. Athen.
II. 3 . . . 81

Xenophon (iv/B.C.)

Hellenica I. vi. 4 . . . 247 | III. II. 14 . . . 212

Plato (iv/B.C.)

<i>Alcibiades</i> 124A . . .	146,	<i>Apologia</i> 280 . . .	142	<i>Euthydemus</i> 276B . . .	229
	238	361 . . .	249	<i>Euthyphro</i> 14E . . .	98
<i>Apologia</i> 18B . . .	202	39A . . .	192	<i>Theaetetus</i> 144B . . .	144
20E . . .	122	<i>Crito</i> 52A . . .	71	<i>Protagoras</i> 312A . . .	192
21A . . .	122	44A . . .	141	<i>Republic</i> i. 337B . . .	177
		<i>Gorgias</i> 481A . . .	194		

Aeschines (iv/B.C.)

In Ctes. 71 . . . 245

Demosthenes (iv/B.C.)

Aristocrates 659 . . . 177 | *Meidias* 525 . . . 186

[Demosthenes] (†)

	PAGE	PAGE	PAGE
<i>Aristogeiton</i> 797	76		
Aristotle (iv/B.C.)			
<i>Poetics</i> 19	172		

ii. *Hellenistic.*

[For the main writers in this section see also Index III.]

Pseudo-Aristeas (iii/ii B.C. †) (Wendland's sections)

215 . . . 87

Polybius (ii/B.C.) (Hultsch's pages)

50 (l. 41)	85	1004 (xviii. 36)	247	1270 (xxxii. 12)	76
516 (v. 92)	207	1270 (xxxii. 10)	87		

Cicero (i/B.C.)*Ad Att.* vi. 5 . 178 f.**Dionysius Halicarnassensis** (i/B.C.)

x. 10 . . . 65

Philo Judæus (i/A.D.)

<i>De Posteritate</i>		<i>De Opificio Mundi,</i>	
<i>Coini</i> , § 145	100	§ 62 . . .	96

Flavius Josephus (i/A.D.) (Niese's sections)

<i>Antiq.</i> i. 29	237	<i>Antiq.</i> xiv. 317	101	<i>c. Apion.</i> i. 21	146
ii. 18	26	xx. 169	235	<i>Bell.</i> ii. 262	285
vii. 202	235				

Dionysius Thrax (i/A.D.)

154

Plutarch (i/A.D.)

p. 256D . . . 216 | p. 608B . . . 246 | p. 767 . . . 245

[Barnabas] (i/A.D.)

ii. 28 . . . 74 | v. 13 . . . 210

Clement of Rome (i/A.D.)*ad Cor.* 17 . . . 38 | *ad Cor.* 21 . . . 95**Ignatius** (ii/A.D.)*Eph.* cc. 3 and II 215**Justin Martyr** (ii/A.D.)*Apology* i. 22, 32,
44, 60, 62, ii. 2 143**Epistle to Diognetus** (ii/A.D. †)

c. 7 . . . 76 | c. 9 . . . 246

Aelian (ii/A.D.)*N.A.* viii. 12 79, 245**Arrian** (ii/A.D.)*Epictetus* ii. 2. 16 210 | iv. I. 39 . . . 247 | iv. I. 41 . . . 248**Lucian** (ii/A.D.)

<i>Dialogi Marini,</i>		<i>Dialogi Mortuorum,</i>		<i>Piscator</i> 6	
iv. 3	76, 87	xxiii. 3	xvii.		144

Marcus Aurelius (ii/A.D.)

vi. 42 . . . 76 | vii. 13 . . . 87 | viii. 50 . . . 185

	PAGE	PAGE	PAGE
Ascensio Isaiae (ii/A.D.)			
12	59		
Aquila (ii/A.D.)			
Gen. i. 1	18		
Clement of Alexandria (ii/A.D.)			
<i>Paedagogus</i> iii. 1	193		
Doctrina Apostolorum (ii/A.D. ?)			
i. 5	188		
[Clement] (iii/A.D. ?)			
<i>Homilies</i> iii. 69	177	<i>Homilies</i> xv. 8	80
John Chrysostom (iv/A.D.)			
ix. 259B	229	on Ro 5 ²⁰	207
Isocrates (Argument to—vi/A.D.)			
<i>Busiris</i>	212	<i>Areopagiticus</i>	212
Pelagia			
<i>Legende der M.</i>			
<i>Pelagia</i> , ed.			
Usener	242, 244,		
	245, 246, 247, 249		
Apocrypha			
in Preuschen's <i>Antilegomena</i> (ed. 1)			
<i>Gosp. acc. to Hebrews</i> , no. 4	4	<i>Ebionite Gospel</i> , no. 2b (p. 9)	17
(p. 4)	17	<i>Gospel of Peter</i> (p. 16)	35
			97
in Tischendorf's <i>Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha</i>			
<i>Acts of Philip</i> 36	97	<i>Acts of Thomas</i> 41	246
(p. 92)		(p. 224)	

iii. *Modern.***Abbott**

Songs of Modern Greece, by G. F. Abbott (Cambridge, 1900) (See p. 29 n.²)

p. 22, 26	121	p. 70	12	p. 222	119
42	85, 170	128 f.	102	224	162
44	106, 121	184	91	228	157
56	38	200	159		

Pallis (see p. 30 n¹.)

title	102	Mt 22 ¹¹	232	Lk 20 ¹⁶	240
Mt 11 ¹	17	Lk 6 ⁴²	232	Jn 10 ¹²	232

(f) **LATIN.****Cicero**

Pro Archia 23 242

Vergil

Eclogues vii. 16 218 | *Aeneid* vii. 125 18

Livy

ix. 1 58

Juvenal

iii. 60 f. 5

II. INDEX OF GREEK WORDS AND FORMS.

α : for αυ 47—α to η in Κουή—pure in Attic 33, 38, 244—α in MGr dialects 32, 243—α in Vocative 48 n.
 Ἀββά 10, 233
 ἀγαπητός 221
 ἀγαρεύω written ἐγγ- 46
 ἀγειν : 1st aor. 56, 76—action in future 149—ἀγόμεν 175, 177—ἀγε 171, 238—ἀγήροχα, etc. 154
 Ἀγούστος 47
 ἀγωνίζεσθαι : perfective compound 116—pres. imper. 174
 ἀδικεῖν voices 162
 ἀδύνατος 221
 ἀελ 233
 αι, ε : identity of sound 34, 51, 56, 199—caused *vv. II.* 35
 αἰεῖν voices 158 f.
 αἰεῖν pres. and perf. ptc. 222
 αἰσχύνεσθαι c. infin. 205
 αἰεῖν : voices 160—with ἵνα 207—and ἐρωτᾶν 66
 αἰφνίδιος or ἐφνιδ. 35
 ἀκατάπαστος 47, 74
 ἀκήκοα 154
 ἀκούειν : c. ἀκοῆ 14, 75—c. accus. and gen. 66, 235, 245—future forms 154—perfect 154
 ἀλαεῖς spelling 45
 ἀλείφειν voice 236
 ἀλλά and ἐι μή 241
 ἀλλήλους and ἑαυτοῦς 87, 157 n.
 ἄλλος and ἕτερος 79 f., 246
 ἄμα 99
 ἀμαρτάνειν future 155
 ἀμεινων 78
 ἀμφί disappearance of 100
 ἀμφότεροι : supplants ἀμφοῦ 57—of more than two 80
 -αν accus. ending 49
 -αν : in 2nd aor. 51—in perfect 37, 52—in imperfect 52
 -αν (not ᾶν) in infin. 53
 ἀν : history 165 f., 239—statistics for LXX and NT 166 f.—replaced by ἐάν 42, 166, 186, 234
 ἀν : iterative 167 f.—meaning “under

the circumstances” or “in that case” 166, 201—in *protases* = ἐάν 43, 167—dropped in compounds 163, 249—in compounds meaning *-sooner* 166, 168—with indic. 168—with δε 43, 240—with subjunctive 166, 168, 186—ὡς ἄν 167, 169—ἐι μήτι ἄν 169, 239—distinction of pres. and aor. subj. 186
 ἄν : in *apodoses* 166—tends to drop out 167, 198, 200 f.—esp. with ἐδει ἐ σίμ. 200—with indic. 106—with opt. 166, 198—in LXX 197—Potential Opt. with ἄν not found thus in NT 179, 197
 ἀν : in *questions* with optative 198 f.
 ἀνά : frequency 98, 100—distributive 100, 105—ἀνά μέσον 99, 100—ἀνά μέρος 100
 ἀναβαλεῖν with infin. 205
 ἀναγκάζειν in imperf. 129, 247
 ἀνάθεμα 46
 ἀνασί for -σελεῖ 45
 ἀναστᾶς pleonastic 14, 230
 ἀναστρέφειν in ethical sense, no Hebraism 11
 ἀνέωγα 154
 ἀνθ' ὧν 100
 ἀνοίγειν : ἠνόγην 2 aor. 56—intransitive perfect of 154
 ἀνομος c. gen. 236
 ἀντί : meaning 100—frequency 98, 100—with anarthrous infin. 81, 216—compared with ὑπέρ 105
 Ἀντίπας flexion of 12
 ἀξίος : with anarthrous infin. 203—with τοῦ c. infin. 216
 ἀξιούν : with infin. 205, 208—with δπως in papyri 208
 ἀξαι 1st aor. of ἄγω 56, 76
 ἀπάγγεσθαι reflexive 155
 ἀπαντᾶν : c. dat. 64—future 154
 ἀπάντησις 14, 242
 ἀπεκατεστάθην double augm. 51
 ἀπελπίζειν c. acc. 65
 ἀπέρχεται : meaning “arrive” 247—ἀπελθών pleon. 231

ἀπέχειν action 247
 ἀπό: frequency 98—outnumbers ἐκ 102
 —partitive 72, 102, 245—with ad-
 verbs 99—relations with ἐκ, παρά,
 ὑπό 237—agent after pass. 102, 246
 —enlargement of use 102, 237, 246—
 with καθάρως 102—with φοβείσθαι
 102—forces in composition 112, 247
 —c. nom. (δ ὄν) 9, (12)
 ἀπογράφεσθαι voice 162
 ἀποδημῆν pres. and aor. 130
 ἀποθνήσκειν: perfective 112, 114, 120
 —ὑπό τινος 156—future 155—for
 future 114, 120—action in pres. and
 aor. 112, 114—τέθνηκα 114, 147
 ἀποκαλύπτειν 136, 139 f.
 ἀποκρίνεσθαι voice and meaning 163
 ἀποκρίνεσθαι: aorist 39, 161—ἀποκρίθεις
 εἶπε 14, 131
 ἀποκρύπτειν: force of aorist 136, 139
 ἀποκτείνειν 114, 156
 ἀπόλλυσθαι: perfective in present 114
 —intrans. perf. act. 154—οἱ ἀπολλύ-
 μενοι 114 (*bis*), 127
 ἀπολούεσθαι voice 163
 ἀποστερεῖσθαι voice 162
 ἀποχωρεῖν ingressive force in present
 174
 ἀπρωεῖσθαι voice 157
 -αρ- = vocalic r 119 n.
 ἀριθμῶ = "carefully counted" 76
 ἀριστος 78 f.
 ἀρκετόν c. ἵνα 210
 ἀρμύζεσθαι voice 160
 ἀρπάζειν: flexion 56—future 155—per-
 fective in συν- 113
 ἀρραβίων spelling 45
 ἀρχεσθαι: pleonastic use of ἤρξατο 14 f.
 —present stem an old aorist? 119—
 c. inf. 205—c. partic. 228—ἀρξάμενος
 240—no perfective compounds 117
 -αρχος and -ης 48
 -ās nouns in, with gen. -ἄδος or ἄ 38
 -ᾶσαι in 2 s. pres. mid. 53 f.
 -αι 3 pl. perf. yielding to -αν 52 f.—
 ἦκασι 53
 ἀσπάζεσθαι: aoristic use of pres. 119
 —action of ἀσπασάμενος 132, 238
 ἀστέρες as accus. 36
 ἀσύνετος 222
 ἀσύνθετος 222
 ἀσφαλῆν accus. 49
 ἀτός for αὐτός 47
 αυ: pronounced αυ in late Greek 234—
 changed to ᾠ 47
 αὐτός: emphatic in nom. 85 f.—replac-
 ing ἐκεῖνος 86—with article, weaken-
 ing of, 91—αὐτός δ, δ αὐτός 91—
 αὐτοῦ gen. of place 73
 αὐτοῦς 37
 α(ὲ)χυμῆρός 47
 ἀφειρημένος 35

ἀφιδε et sim. 44
 ἀφιέναι: aoristic or iterative present
 119—ἀφένωνται history of form 38—
 relation to ἀφιένται 119—ἀφεις pleo-
 nastic 14—ἀφες independent and
 auxiliary 175 f.—c. ἵνα 175 f.—c.
 inf. 176—c. imper. 1st pers. 175—
 ἀφίεται, ἀφίησι 152—ἀφῆκα 119,
 137 n., 140, 145
 ἀφικνεῖσθαι function of perfective ἀπό
 in 247
 ἀφίξις later meaning of 26
 Ἀχαιοί prehistoric form of 184
 ἀχρι 169
 -άω verbs: relations with -έω 33, 37 (*bis*),
 53—subj. of 54—2 s. mid. -ᾶσαι 53
 β pronunciation 33
 Βάαλ gender of 59
 -βαίνειν: aorist 110—future mid. 155
 βάλλειν: action in pres. and aor. 109,
 130—ἐβλήθη timeless aor. 134—
 βλητέον 222
 βαπτίζεσθαι: voice 163—δ βαπτίζω
 127
 βασιλεύειν action in pres. and aor. 109,
 130
 βαστάζειν flexion 56
 βελτίων 78, 236
 βιάζεσθαι voice 163
 βλέπειν: β. ἀπό 107—β. μή 124, 178,
 193—βλέποντες βλέψετε 14, 76
 βλητέον 222
 βούλεσθαι c. inf. 205
 βούς 48
 γ pronunciation 33
 γαμῆν voices 159
 γέγονα: aoristic 145, 238, 239—
 = εἶμι? 146—γέγοναν 52 n.
 γέγραφα 154
 γελᾶν future mid. 154
 γένημα spelling 45
 γεννᾶσθαι 120
 γένεσθαι c. gen. and acc. 66, 245
 γίνεσθαι: orthography 47—γίνεται
 futural 120 (*bis*)—original action of
 pres. and aor. 109 f.—its imper. 130
 —development of constr. with ἐγένε-
 νετο 14, 16 f.—ἐγένετο with indic.
 16 f.—with καί and indic. 16 f., 70—
 ἐγένετο δε 16—ἐγένετο ἦλθε 12, 16
 —ἐγένετο c. inf. 16 f.—ἐγενήθη 139 f.
 —μή γένοιτο 194, 240, 249—γενά-
 μενος 51—γέγονα 52—intrans. perf.
 act. 154—aoristic 145, 238, 239—
 = εἶμαι? 146
 γινώσκειν: orthography 47—action of
 pres. and aor. 113—of perfect 148—
 future mid. 155—forms γνοί aor.
 subj. 55, 196—γνώη 193—relation to
 ἐπιγινώσκειν 113

γράφειν : form of root 110—perfect 154
—c. *iva* in Polybius and NT 207 f.
γυνή survival of vocative 71

δ pronunciation of 33

δέ with article as demonstrative 81

δεῖσθαι in petitions 173

δέον ἐστί 226

δεῦρο, δεῦτε 172

δεύτερος 96

δηλοῦν c. *iva* in papyri 208

διά : frequency 98, 104 f.—with acc.
and gen. 105 f.—with accus. only in
MGr 106—*with gen. contrasted with*
ἐκ, ὑπό 106—perfective action in
composition 112 f., 115 f., 118

διαγράφειν aor. and perf. 247 f.

διαλύειν voices confused 159

διαμερίζεσθαι voice 157

διαπορεύεσθαι 113

διαπραγματεύεσθαι 113

διαρρηγνύναι voices 157

διασαφύν c. *iva* in Polybius 207

διατηρεῖν 116

διαφέρειν c. gen. 65

διαφυγεῖν 112, 116

διαφυλάξαι 116

δίδοναι : not used in middle 153—forms
after *-ω* and *-δω* verbs 55—δοῖς, δοῖ
aor. subj. 55, 196—δωη 55, 193 f.,
196, 198—in LXX 194 n.—δῶ 55—
δώση 151—action in pres. and aor.
129—δόμεναι and δόμεν 207

διέρχεσθαι pres. used for future 120

διώκειν : compared with perfective 112,
116—action of aor. 116—future in
act. form 154

δοκεῖν 15

δόξα -ης 48

δράσσεσθαι c. acc. 65

δύνασθαι : flexion 55—δύνη 54—o. inf.
205

δυνατός c. infin. 203 f.

δύνειν no perfective 117

δύο : flexion 57—δέκα δύο 96, 246—
—ordinal 96—(ἀνά) δύο δύο 21, 97

δυσβάστακτος 56

δώδεκα 96, 246

e thematic vowel 171

e- augment 123, 129

e and αι : sounded alike 34, 51, 56,
199—caused *vv. ll.* 35

ἐάν for ἄν after δς, etc. 42 f., 49 n.,
166, 186, 234—history of 234—c.
indic. 168, 187 (δῖς)—with futuristic
subj. 185—*with dependent clauses*
185—*with μή as negative* 185, 187—
relations with εἰ 187—replaced by
εἰ . . . ἄν in illiterate Greek 169,
239—replaced by participial clause
229 f.

ἐάν c. inf. 205

ἐαυτόν : reciprocal in plural 87—re-
placed by ψυχή 87, 105 n.—ἐαυτοῦ
and ἰδῖος 87, 89—ἐαυτῶ (-οῖς) c. act.
compared with middle 157—ἐαυτοῦς
and ἀλλήλους 87, 157 n.

ἐβην 110

ἐγγαρεύω 46

ἐγγύς c. gen. and dat. 99

ἐγείρειν : with *εἰς* 71 f.—perfect and
aor. 137, 141—ἐγερθεῖς pleonastic
14—ἐγήγερται 137, 141—voices 163

ἐγνωκα 148—ἐγνων 113

ἐγώ : emphasis in nom. 85—replaced
by ἡμεῖς 86 f., 246

ἐδέετο 54

ἐδει : with dropped ἄν 200—c. *iva* 210
—app. replaced by ἦν 16

-έδετο 55

ἐδόθης history of suff. 161

ἐδολιοῦσαν 52

-έδοτο 55, 161

ἐθηκα 145

ει, ι, η, η, ο : approximating sounds
34, 41, 46 f., 51, 199 n.—caused
vv. ll. 35

εἰ : relations with ἐάν 187—*with indic.*
187—replaced by participial clause
230—*with imperf. indic.* 201—*with*
future 187—*with pres. indic. to*
express future conditions 187—*with*
past indic. 187—*with subj.* 187—
εἰ . . . ἄν in illiterate Greek 239—
with optative 196—*expressing a wish*
196—*in questions* 194—“to see if”
194—*εἰ οὐ* with indic. 171, 187, 200,
240—*εἰ μή* 171, 241—*εἰ μήτι ἄν* 169,
239

εἶδον : aor. 109, 111, 138 f., 141—
edited ἶδον 47

εἶδύτης 38

εἰκάς 96

εἰκόνας, 70, 235

εἰληφα aoristic ? 145, 154, 238

εἰμι Attic use as future 120

-ειν in pluperfect 53

εἰ μήν 46

εἶναι : flexion 55 f.—middle forms 33,
36 f., 55 f.—imperf. : ἦν (1st s.) 56,
ἦμην 56, 201—ἦν for ἦ 49, 168, 187
—ἦσθα and ἦσαν as subjunctive—
no aorist 110, 174, 201—future 16,
180—inf. c. μέλλειν 151, 204—im-
per. forms : ἴσθι 174, 180, 226—
ἔστω (ἦτω) ἔστωσαν 180—ἔστέ not used
180—*infin.* a dative 202.—Action
110—*εἶναι εἰς* 71—use of δ ἄν 228,
cp. 9 n.—imperf. and imper. in para-
phrases with participle 14 f., 225-
227, 249—*as copula understood*
183 f., 225—*with adjectives* 190, 182
—perhaps used for ἐδει 16

- είπειν* : has no present 111, 140—*είπας* 51—*σὺ εἶπας* 86—*εἶπεν* and *εἶλεγεν* 128
- εἶρηκα* aoristic 145
- εἶς* : frequency 62, 98—meaning 66, 72—*εἶς τὸ ὄνομα* 100—with *ἀπάντησιν* 14, 242—forming predicate with *εἶναι*, etc. 71 f., 76—in place of gen. and dat. 246—encroaches on *ἐν* 62 f., 66, 234 f., 245—replaced by *ἐν* 245—relation with *ἐπί* 68—with infin. anarthrous 81, 216—*εἶς τὸ* c. infin. 218–220
- εἶς* : as ordinal 95 f., 237—as indef. art. 96 f.—*ὁ εἶς* 97—*εἶς* and *τις* 97—distributive use 105—*εἶς τὸν ἕνα* reciprocal 246
- εἶπεν* 46
- εἶχαν* 52
- εἶωθα* 154
- ἐκ* : frequency 98—survival into MGR 102, 246—partitive 72, 102—of material 246—joined with adverbs 99—*σωθεὶς ἐκ* and *θεὸς ἐκ θεοῦ* 102—perfectivising 237—relations with *ἀπὸ* 102, 237—with *διὰ* (gen.) 106—with *παρὰ* and *ὑπὸ* 102, 237
- ἐκαθερίσθη*, 56.
- ἐκατόνταρχος* and *-ης* 48
- ἐκδικεῖν* action in pres. 180
- ἐκείνος* sometimes replaced by *αὐτός* 91
- ἐκλέγεσθαι* voice 157
- ἐκοιμήθη* 162
- ἐκρύβη* 156, 161
- ἐκτός* *εἰ μή* 187, 239
- ελαβον* 139 (*bis*), 145, 247
- ελαιών* or *ελαιῶν* 49, 69, 235
- ελάσσω* 79
- ἐλάχιστος* 79, 236—*ελαχιστότερος* 236
- ελεος* flexion 60
- ελευθεροῦν* action 149
- ελήλυθα* 154
- ελθών* pleonastic 14–16
- ἐλπὶς* 44
- ἐμός* *αὐδ μου* 40 f., 211
- ἐμπαίζειν* fut. 155
- ἐμπτεύειν* fut. 154
- ἐν* : statistics 62, 98—instrumental 12, 61, 104—of time 16—added to dative 75, 104—in anarthrous prepositional phrases 82, 236—miscellaneous uses 103 f., 107, 245—=*παρὰ* (c. dat.) 103—late Greek use of xvii, 103—*ἐν Χριστῷ* 68, 103—*ἐν ἐμοί* 103—*ἐν τοῖς* in the house of 103—*ἐν τῷ* c. infin. 14, 215, 249—relations with *εἶς* 62 f., 66 f., 76, 234 f., 245
- ἐνδημος* 105
- ἐνεγκεῖν* action 110. See *φέρειν*
- ἐνεδρεύειν* c. accus. 64
- ἐνεργεῖν* : c. accus. 65—voices 156
- ἐτήνοχα* 154
- ἐνοχος* c. gen. 39
- ἐντρέπεσθαι* c. accus. 65
- ἐνώπιον* 99
- ἐξαίφνης*, *ἐξέφνης* 35
- ἐξιστάται* action of aorist 134
- ἐξόν* : accus. abs. 74—*ἐξόν ἦν* 227—*οὐκ ἐξόν* 231 n.
- ἐξουθενεῖν* and *ἐξουθενοῦν* 56
- ἐξω*. See *ἔχειν*
- ἐοικα* 154
- ἐπάνω* 99
- ἐπει μὴ* 240
- ἐπέρχεσθαι* c. dat. 65
- ἐπεσθαι* : deponent 153—late use c. gen. 245
- ἐπί* : with three cases 63, 107—frequency 63 n., 98, 107—with adverbs 99—*ἐφ' ἀπαξ* 99—*ἐφ' ᾧ* 107—*ἐπί τὸ αὐτό* 107—perfectivising 113—with articular inf. in inscriptions 214—relation with *εἶς* 68
- ἐπιβαλὼν* 131
- ἐπιγινώσκειν* 113
- ἐπιθυμεῖν* : aorist 139—c. acc. and gen. 65—c. inf. 205.
- ἐπιτρέπειν* c. inf. 205.
- ἐπιφάνεια* 102 n.
- ἐπιχειρεῖν* c. inf. 205
- ἐποίησεν* and *ἐποίησε*, in sculptors' signatures, 109, 128
- ἐπος* 111
- ἐπτά* : for *ἐπτὰκις* 98, 107—arising from a gloss on *Σκευᾶς* ? 246
- ἐραυνῶν* orthography 46
- ἐργάζεσθαι* : perfective 113—pres. and aor. 116
- ἐρρέθη* 111
- ἐρρωσο* (*-σθε*) 176
- ἐρχεσθαι* : voice forms 154—*ἦλθον* 154 n.—*ἐλήλυθα* 154—possible relation to *ἀρχεσθαι* 119—followed by *dat. in-oommodi* 75, 245
- ἐρωτᾶν* : meaning 66—c. inf. or *ἴνα* 208
- es* accus. pl. in 33, 36, 37
- es* in perf. and 1st aor. 52
- εσαι* in 2 s. mid. 54
- ἔσεσθαι* : c. *μέλλειν* 114 n., 151, 205 n.—c. perf. part. 226
- ἐσθής* flexion 244
- ἐσθίειν* : flexion 54—why defective 111—its perfective 111, 116—future (*φάγομαι*) 155, 184
- ἐστάθη* 162 (*bis*)
- ἔσται* 56
- ἐστάναι* 154—*ἔστακα* 55—*ἔστηκα* 147 154, 238
- ἔστω*, *ἔστωσαν* 56, 180
- ἔστώς* pleonastic 14
- ἔσχηκα*. See *ἔχειν*
- ἔσχον* a 'point' word 110, 145, 247 f. See *ἔχειν*
- ἔτερος* 77—and *ἄλλος* 79 f., 246

ετι in a pres. imper. prohibition 125
 ετος 44
 εὐ ποιεῖν 228 f.—εὐ ποιήσεις "please"
 131—εὐ πράσσειν 228 f.
 εὐδοκεῖν : c. accus. 64—εὐδόκησα 134
 εὐλόγητος predicate without εἶναι 180
 εὐοδῶται 54
 εὐράμενος 51
 ἐφαγον 184 n. See ἐσθλαῖν
 ἐφ' ἐλπίδι 44
 ἐφην 110, 128
 ἐφιορκεῖν 234
 ἐφνίδιος 35
 ἐφυγον, ἐφευγον 116, 119
 ἐφυλαξάμην 159
 ἐφ' ᾧ 107
 ἐχάρην 161
 ἐχειν : action in pres. 110, 183—ques-
 tion between ἐχομεν and ἐχωμεν 35,
 110, 247, 249—εἶχαν 3 pl. imperf.
 52—action in aorist 110, 247 f.—
 ἐσχον ingressive in NT 145—ἐσχον
 ἀπό (παρά) σου 110, 246—ἐσχῆκα
 aoristic or genuine perfect 145, 238,
 248—future 150—c. infin. 205—ἐχων
 ἐστί 226—relation with ἀπέχειν 247
 ἐχρῆν without ἄν 200
 -έω and -άω verbs confused 33, 37 (*bis*),
 53
 ἔωκα 38 n.
 ἔωρακα relations with aorist 141, 143 f.
 ἔως : prep. 99—ἔως ὅτου 91—ἔως πότε
 107—conjunction c. subj. with ἄν
 dropped 168 f.
 F : in Theban *Ἔττω* 23—*κέρῃ* 244—
 effect surviving in Attic 38, 244—
 nothing to do with phenomena of
 irregular aspiration 44—dropped
 between vowels 47—in *Ἔφος* and
Ἐρήμα 111—in prehistoric form of
 Ἄχαιοί 184
 -ζειν verbs in, 33, 56
 ζεστός 222
 ζηλοῦτε subj. 54
 ζῆν : flexion 54—infin. used as in-
 declinable noun 215, 249.
 Ζυμύρα 45
 η from α 33, 38, 244
 η, η, ει, ι, οι : approximating pro-
 nunciation 34, 41, 199 n., 240—
 caused *vn. II.* 35
 ἦ : after positive adjective 236—after
 comparatives 101 n.
 ἠγέρθη : tense 137—voice 163
 ἠγγμαι perf. with pres. force 148
 ἦδειν 55, 201
 ἦδιστα elative 236
 ἠκαμεν, ἠκασι 53
 ἠλθον 138, 140, 154 n.

ἠλικός 93
 ἠλπικα perf. with pres. force † 147
 ἡμεῖς for ἐγώ 86, 246
 ἡμέρα Hebraistic locution 81
 ἡμην, ἡμεθα 56, 201
 ἦ μήν 46
 ἡμισιν indeclinable 50
 ἦν for ἡμην 56
 ἦ(ν), ἦσθα, ἦσαν quasi-subjunctive
 49 n., 168, 187
 -ην ending "strong" aor. pass. 161
 ἦροίην 56
 ἦξιούσαν 52
 ἦρατο use of 14, 15
 ἦρπάγην, ἦρπάσθην 56
 ἦσθα, ἦσαν quasi-subj. 168, 187
 ἦτω 56, 180
 ἦχος 60
 -ήω verbs almost disappeared from
 Κοινή 54
 -θ- and -τ- interchanged 38
 -θαι and -θε pronounced alike 35
 θαυμάσαι as ex. of voiceless inf. 203
 θεᾶσθαι 117
 θεωρεῖν 117
 θέλειν : c. ἴνα 179, 208, 248—c. subj.
 without ἴνα 185—c. inf. 248
 θεοδίδακτος 222
 θεός and θεά, 60, 244
 -θην aorist forms in 161
 θνήσκειν : action (in pres. and aor. 114
 —perfective 112—simplex obsolete
 except in perf. τέθηκα 114 (*bis*)—
 θνητός 222
 θυγάτηρ and θύγατερ as voc. 71
 ι sounds, two successive coalesce 45
 ι, η, η, ει, οι approximating sounds 34,
 46 f., 199, 240
 -ι- reduplicative, verbs with 109
 -ι irrational final 49
 ἰσθαι aoristic present 119
 ἰδεῖν 116, 117—has no pres. 111—aor.
 (see εἶδον) punctiliar or constative
 116 f., 138
 ἰδιος : relation to ἐάντου 87—90, 237,
 246—δ ἰδιος 90 f.—καθ' ἰδίαν 44
 ἰδον orthography 47
 ἰδοῦ : statistics 11 n.—"Hebraic" use
 of 11—καὶ ἰδοῦ 17, 233—οὐχ ἰδοῦ 244
 Ἰεροσόλυμα fem. and neut. 48, 244
 Ἰησοῦς flexion 49
 ἰκανός in Latinisms 20
 ἰλεως 240
 ἴνα : enlarged sphere in Western Hel-
 lenistic 41, 205, 211—in Polybius
 206 f.—in papyri 206, 208—in John
 206, 211, 249—c. *indic.* fut. 35—c.
subjunctive : elative use 206—209,
 249—replaces δπως 206—consecutive
 210, 249—as subject-clause 210 (*bis*)

- with nouns and adjct. 210—after verbs of commanding 178, 207 f., 217, 240—c. παρακαλεῖν 205—after ποιεῖν, 208—θέλειν 179, 185, 208, 248—ἄφες 175—as a form of imper. 176, 178 f., 210, 248—with delib. subj. 185—c. optative 196 f.—relations with infinitive 205 f., 240 f., 248—with articular infin. 220—τοῦ inf. 217—ἐς τό inf. 218 f.
- is, -iv for -ios, -iov 48 f., 244
- ισθι: frequency 180—with adjct. or partic. 226
- ισκω inceptive force of 120
- ιστάναι: orig. iterative 109—new presents ιστάνευ and στάνευ 55—voice forms 154, 162—ἔστακα 55—ἔστηκα 147, 238—ἔστηκα and στήκειν 238
- ιστε indic. or imper. 245
- ιστω 23
- κ, χ, interchanged 38
- κα: aoristic perfects in, 145, 238, 248—relation to strong perfect 154—added to passive aor. in MGr 142
- καθαρεύουσα. See Index III
- καθαρός ἀπό 102
- καθ' εἰς 105
- καθ' ἔτος 44
- καθέξεσθαι action 118
- καθῆσθαι: apparently pleonastic 241—no active 153
- καθ' ἰδίαν 44
- καθίζειν: action 118—καθίσαι 118—καθίσας pleonastic 14
- καθορᾶν 117
- καθότι with iterative ἄν 167
- καί: pronunciation in MGr 243—in place of hypotaxis 12—καί ἐγένετο 14, 16—καί γε with participle 230—replaced by κἄν 167
- καίπερ with participle 230
- καίτοι with participle 230
- καλόν ἦν with ἄν dropped 200
- καλῶς ποιεῖν: c. partic. 131—κ. ποιήσεις 178, 228
- κἄν 167, 169
- κατά: c. gen. and accus. 104—frequency 98, 104 f.—perfectivising compounds 111 f., 115, 117—in compounds dropped in repetition 115—in combination with adverbs 98—distributive 105—καθ' εἰς 105—καθ' ἔτος 44—καθ' ἰδίαν 44
- καταβαίνειν 118
- καταβαρεῖν c. accus. 65
- καταγωνισσάσθαι perfective 116
- καταδιώκειν perfective aor. 112, 116
- καταλαλεῖν c. gen. or in pass. 65
- καταλαμβάνειν act. and mid. 158
- καταλιπών pleonastic 14
- καταλύων pres. partic. conative 127
- καταμαθεῖν 117
- κατανοεῖν -νοῆσαι 117 (bis)
- καταντᾶν effective aor. 132
- καταπονεῖν passive 65
- κατάρατος: predicate without εἶναι 180—relation with καταηραμένος 221
- καταφαγεῖν: perfective 111, 116—continued by φαγεῖν 111 n., 115
- καταφεύγειν perfective in pres. and aor. 114, 116
- καταχεῖν: aor. κατέχευεν 55
- καταχρᾶσθαι c. gen. 245
- κατέναντι 99
- κατεργάζεσθαι 113, 116
- κατεσθlein: perfective 111—action of pres. stem 128—compound continued by simplex 111 n., 115
- κατηγορεῖν c. accus. in D 235
- κατηραμένος compared with κατάρατος 221
- κατισχύειν c. gen. 65
- κατ' οἶκον αὐτῶν 81
- καυθήσωμαι 151
- καυχᾶσθαι 53
- κέκτημαι 147—κεκῶμαι 54 n.
- κελεύειν c. infin. 205
- κέν, κέ in Homer 165 f.
- κεφαλή 85
- κιθών Ionic for χιτών 38
- κινδυνεύειν without perfective in NT 117
- κλαίειν ingressive aorist 131
- κλεῖς flexion 49
- κλέπτειν: future 155—ὁ κλέπτων and ὁ κλέπτης 127
- κληρονομεῖν c. accus. 65
- κοιμᾶν: survival of true passive † 162—force of aorist 136, 162
- Κοινή. See Index III
- κομίζειν future 155
- κομψῶς and comparative 248
- κόρη history of the Attic form 38, 244
- κράβατος spelling 244
- κράζειν: action of pres. and perf. stems 147—voice forms 154—perf. imper. in LXX 176
- κρατεῖν c. accus. and gen. 65, 235
- κράτιστος as a title 78
- κρείττων (κρείσσων) 78
- κρίμα 46
- κρύπτειν: voices 156, 161
- λαμβάνειν: flexion 56—future 155—εἰληφα aoristic 145, 238—action of λαβῶν 247—pleonastic λαβῶν 230—voice forms 154
- λαλεῖν: “Hebraic” locution ἐλάλησεν λαλῶν 14
- λανθάνειν c. participle 228
- λέγειν: action of pres. stem compared with aor. εἶπειν and ῥηθῆναι, with cognate nouns 111—λέγει Ἰησοῦς 121—relation of λέγειν and εἶπεν 128—

εἰποῦσα and *εἶπασα* in one verse 131
 —*εἶρηκα* possibly aoristic in Rev 145
 —*λέγειν ἵνα* in papyri 208
λάμψ gender 60
λογίζεσθαι no perfective in NT 117
λόγος compared with durative stem in *λέγειν* 111
λοιποῦ gen. of time 73
λοῦειν voices 155 f., 238 f.
λθεῖν : injunctive forms 165—*λθῶσαι* 202, 204
Ἄστρο flexion 48
 -*μ* in *λήμφομαι* 56
 -*μα* nouns 46
μακάριος predicate without *εἶναι* 180
μανθάνειν : action in pres. and aor. 117
 —its perfective 117—c. ptc. or inf. 229—c. *ἔτι* clause 229
μάχαιρα flexion 48
μάχεσθαι reciprocal middle 157
μέγιστος nearly obsolete 78
μείζων : flexion 49, 50—as superlative 78—*μειζότερος* 236
μέλλειν : no perfective in NT 117—c. pres. and aor. infin. 114—c. fut. infin. 114, 157, 205 n.
μέν with article as demonstrative 81
μετά : c. gen. and accus. only 104—106—frequency 98, 105—a Semitism in *ποιεῖν* and *μεγαλύνειν* *ἔλεος* *μετά*? xvii, 106, 246 f.—in *πολεμεῖν* *μετά*? 106, 247—relations with *σύν* 106—*μετά* *χαρᾶς* 249
μετρεῖν : perfect 248
μέχρι and *μέχρι οὐ* as conjunction with *ἄν* dropped 169
μή : history of 169—171, 239—difference from *οὐ* 169 f.—*οὐ μή* see *οὐ*—often = “perhaps” 188, 192 f.—in questions 170, 185, 192 f., 194, 239—in warnings 178, 184, 248—expresses prohibition 169, 192 f., 247—in relative sentences 171, 239
μή : with *indic.* 170 f.—pres. and perf. 192 f.—future 177 f., 185, 188, 193, 240, 248—after *εἰ* in protases 171, 241—after *ὅπως* with fut. [not in NT] 185—after *βλέπετε* 193—after causal *ὅτι* 171, 239—*μήποτε* 193—in questions 170—*μήτι* in questions 170—with *indic.* *irrealis* 200—*ἐπει* *μή* in papyri 240—in cautious assertions 192 f.
μή : with *imperative*, pres. 2 p. in prohibitions 122—126, 247—after *ὅρα* 124—aorist 3 p. (not with 2 p.) 173, 174
μή : with *subjunctive*, pres. 1st p. pl. 177—after *ἐκτός* *εἰ* 187, 239—aorist 2 p. in prohibitions 122—126, 173, 178, 185, 188 (*bis*)—3 p. 178, 184,

188—with volitive or deliberative subj. 184—in questions with deliberative subj. 185—in cautious assertions (aor.) 188—after *ἕάν* 185, 187, 241—after *ἵνα* 178—after *ὄρα*, *βλέπε*, etc. 124, 178—in commands after *ἵνα* in papyri 178 f.—*εἰ μήτι* *ἄν* 169, 239
μή : with *optative* 179, 193 f., 196—*μήποτε* 199—*μή γένοιτο* 194 f., 240, 249
μή : with *inf.* 170, 239—after verbs *cog.* *et dic.* 239
μή : with *partic.* 25, 170, 184, 229, 232 f., 239—imperatively 180—in *orat.* *obl.* 239
μή *ὅτι*, *μή* *ὅτι* *γε* in papyri 240
μήποτε : c. *indic.* 193—c. *opt.* 199—c. subj. 194
μήπως c. *indic.* 248
μήτι c. *indic.* in questions 170—*μήτι* *γε* 240
 -*μ* verbs in, invaded by -*ω* forms 33, 38, 55 f.
μισγεῖν, *μεγνῶναι*, no perfective in NT 117
Μύρα flexion 48
 -*ν* : movable 45—irrational final 49—added to 3rd decl. accus. sing. 49
ναῦς obsolete in vernacular 25 f.
νίπτεσθαι force of middle 155, 156
νοεῖν and *κατανοεῖν* 117
νοῦς flexion 48
Νυκτός gen. of time 73
Νύμφαν accus. of *Νύμφᾶ*, not *Νυμφᾶς* 48
ξενίζεσθαι c. dative 64
ο, *ω* : pronounced alike 35 (*quater*)—confusion of *ο*, *ω* 35 n., 244, 248
ὁ *καί* with alternative name 83
ὀδυνᾶσαι 53
οι, *η*, *ι*, *υ*, *ει* approximating sounds 34, 199 n., 240
οἶδα : flexion 55—relation to *εἶδον* 109—absence of aorist 201—a “present perfect” 147 f.—strong perfect 154—*ιστε* *indic.* or *imper.*? 245—c. *partic.* or *infin.* 229—c. *ἔτι*-clause 229
οικεῖος in Josephus 88 f.
οικοδομημένη 51
οἶκος : *ἐν οἴκῳ* 82—*κατ’ οἶκον* 81
 -*οῖν* in *infin.* 53
οἶος double use of, 93
ὀλίγος 44
ὀλλύναι aor. and perfect 147
ὀμολογεῖν : with *ἐν* 104—with *ptc.* or *acc.* and *infin.* 229—with *ἔτι*-clause 229
ὀνάμην 195

ὄνομα : c. *ἐν* and *ἐπί* 68—c. *ἐς* 100
ὄπισθ 99
ὄποιος double use of 93
ὅποτε "when" 168
ὅπου with *ἄν* 167, 168, 186
ὄπωπα 111
ὄπως : representing main purpose, followed by artic. inf. 220—with future imperatively 177—c. fut. with *μή* for *οὐ* 185—with optative in Atticists 197—replaced by *ἵνα* with subj. 177 n., 178, 206 f.
ὄραν : why defective 110 f.—has no aorist 111 (see *ἰδεῖν*)—perfect (*ἔώρακα*) durative 111—future mid. (*ὀψομαι*) 155—its compound with *κατά* 117—*δρα μή* 124, 178, 193
ὀργίζεσθαι : no perfective 117, 118—constative aor. not in NT 118
ὀρνιξ 45
ὀρθρου βαθέως gen. of time 78
ὄς : replaced by *τίς* 21, 93—for *δοτις* 91 f.—in indirect question 93—attraction 93—reinforced with demonstrative 13, 94 f., 237, 249—*ὄς ἔάν* 42, 234—*ὄς ἄν* with aor. subj. 186—with future † 240
-οσαν imperf. and 2nd aor. 52 n.
ὄσος : double use of 93—c. *ἄν* 16
ὄσπερ 92
ὄστέων 33, 48
ὄστις : limited use of 91 f.—use by Luke and Matt. 92—for classical *ὄσπερ* 92—replaced by *τίς* 93—*ἔως δτου* 91
ὄταν : "when" instead of "whenever" 168, 248—c. indic. 168, 239—c. subj. originally futuristic 185—c. pres. and aor. subj. 186
ὄτι : for *τί* in direct question 94—with finite verb replacing accus. and infin. 211, 213—replacing participle 229—like *ὥστε* † 209 f.—consecutive 249—replaced by *ὡς* and *πῶς* 211—*ὄτι μή* 171, 239—*ὄτι οὐ* 171—*μή ὄτι* 240—*οὐχ ὄτι* 240—*ὡς ὄτι* 212
οὐ, οὐκ, οὐχ : relation to *μή* 169—171—negatives a fact 232—or a single word 171, 232—in LXX translating *אֵל* 189, 232—in questions 170, 177—with futuristic subj. originally 184—c. *indic.* 170—*el* *οὐ* in simple conditions 171 (*ter*), 187, 200, 240—in unfulfilled conditions (indic. irrealis) 200—with future 177—imperative use in questions 177—c. *optative* 197—c. *participle* 25, 171, 230—232—in relative sentences 171
οὐ μή : statistics 35, 187—192—weakened force of 39—connected with "translation Greek" 39, 188 f., 191 f.—in words of Christ 191 f.—is it an

emphatic negative † 39, 188—190, 192—in LXX translating *אֵל* 189—is *οὐ* in *οὐ μή* separate from *μή* † 188, 249—in questions 189—c. future 190—c. aor. subj. 190—in relative clauses 189
οὐαι : without verb 180—with *ἀπό* 246
οὐδέν replacing *οὐ* 170
οὐθεῖς and *οὐδέεις* 56
-οὐν infin. 53
-οὐς -οῦδος nouns 38
-οῦσαν 3 pl. imperf. 52
-οῦσθε and *-οὔτε* subj. 54
οὐχ before words with smooth breathing 44, 244
οὐχ ὄτι 240
ὄφελον 200 f.
ὄφθαλμός Hebraistic locution with 81
ὄψέ c. gen. 72 f.
ὄψησθε 151
ὄψομαι 155
-ὄω verbs : infin. 53—3 pl. imperf. 52—pres. subj. 54
παθητός 222
παιδιον : illiterate *παιδιν* 48—*παιδια* meaning 170 n.
παῖς use of voc. 235
πάλαι with present rendered by our perf. 119
παρά : with gen. dat. acc. 63, 106—frequency 98, 106—with *δαίτω* almost entirely of persons 103, 106—with *accus.* after positive for comparison 236—with *gen. oi παρ' αὐτοῦ* 106 f.—close to *ἀπό, ἐκ, ὑπό* 237—encroached upon by *ἀπό* 102, 246—force in composition 247
παραβολέεσθαι c. dative 64
παραγγέλλειν : aoristic pres. 119—c. *ἵνα* 207
παραινεῖν c. infin. 205
παρακαλεῖν c. infin. and *ἵνα* c. subj. 205, 208 n.
παραπίπτειν 247
παραπλήσιον 99
παρασκευάζεσθαι force of middle 156
παρελάβωσαν 52
παρέχειν irreg. middle 248
παριστάνειν pres. and aor. 129
πᾶς : "Hebraistic" 245 f.—after *ἀνευ, χωρὶς* 246
πᾶσχευ voice forms 154
πατήρ : anarthrous 82 f.—vocative 71, 245
πειθαρχεῖν c. dat. and gen. 64
πεῖθειν : differentiation of tenses 147—voice forms 154—*πέπεισμαι* as a *perfectum praesens* † 147—active and middle 158
πεῖν : for *πεῖν* 44, 45—as indeclinable noun with *εἰς* 81, 216 249

πειράζω c. infin. 205
 πείσαι 54
 πέποιθα 147 (*bis*), 154
 πέπονθα 154
 πέπρακα aoristic 145
 περί: c. gen. and accus. 104 f.—no longer with dative 105 f.—frequency 98, 104 f.—relations with ἀμφί 100—
 —with ὑπέρ 105—
 —with articular infin. in inscriptions 214
 περιπατεῖν translating ἴην in ethical sense 11
 πεσοῦμαι 155
 πεφίμωσο 176
 πίνειν: πείν 44 f., 81, 216—πείσαι 54—
 —future an old subj. 184—fut. middle 155
 πιπράσκειν aoristic perfect, 145
 πίπτειν: action in aorist 134—fut. middle 155
 πιστεύειν constructions 67 f., 235
 πλείστος: generally elative 79—used for comparative in D 236
 πλείω indecl. 50
 πλεονεκτεῖν c. accus. 65
 πλὴν 86, 171, 241
 πλήρης indecl. 50, 244
 πλοῦτος flexion 60
 ποδήρην accus. 49
 ποίας gen. of place 73
 ποιεῖν: imperfect and aorist action 109, 128 (see ἐποίησεν)—with noun instead of middle 159—μή ποιεῖ 124—126, 247—
 —μή ποιήσης 125, 173, 177 f.—c. ἡνα 208—καλῶς ποιεῖν c. partic. 131, 173, 228 f.
 ποῖος relations with τίς 95
 πολεμῆν: case government 64—
 —with μετά 106, 247
 πορεύεσθαι: active obsolete 162—
 —πορευθεῖς pleonastic 231—in ethical sense 11 n.
 ποταπός meaning and history 95
 πρότερος replaced by τίς 77
 τοῦ gen. of place 73
 πραγματεύεσθαι with its perfective 118
 πράσσειν: σσ or ττ 25, (45)—no perfective in NT 117—
 —εἰ πράσσειν 228 f.
 πρῆν: with and without ἄν 169—replaced by πρὸ τοῦ c. infin. 100—
 —c. infin. 169 n.—
 —c. subj. 169—
 —c. optative 169, 199
 πρὶν ἢ: c. optative 169 n.—
 —πρὶν ἢ ἄν c. subj. 169—
 —c. infin. 169 n.
 πρὸ: frequency 98, 100—
 —πρὸ τοῦ c. infin. 100, 214—
 —without ἄν 169—
 —a seeming Latinism 100 f.—
 —πρὸ ἐτών δεκαεσσάρων 101 f.
 πρὸς: with gen., dat., accus. 106—
 —almost confined to accus. in NT 63, 106—
 —frequency 63, 98, 106—
 —in LXX 106—
 —πρὸς τό c. infin. 218, 220—

statistics 218—in papyri 220—final force 218, 220
 προσέχειν: c. dative 157—introducing a prohibition 193—
 —c. ἡνα 208 n.—
 —c. ἀπό 102 n.
 προσκαλεῖσθαι force of middle 157
 προσκυνεῖν c. dat. and accus. 64, 66, 245
 προστίθεσθαι: c. dat. 67—
 —c. infin. 233
 προσφάγιον meaning 170 n.
 προσφέρειν: alleged aoristic action of pres. stem 129, 238, 247—
 —perfect and imperf. 129
 προσφωνεῖν c. dat. and accus. 65
 πρόσωπον Hebraic 14, 81, 99 f.
 πρότερος relations with πρῶτος 79, 107
 πρῶτος: with gen. for πρότερος 79, 245—
 —as ordinal partly replaced by εἰς 95 f., 237—
 —in LXX 107—
 —πρώτιστα 236
 πῶποτε with perfect 144
 πῶς: encroaches upon ὡς 211—
 —used for ὅτι 211
 -ra- = vocalic r 119 n.
 -rā nouns in, 38, 48
 ρεῖν: not used in middle 153—
 —fut. mid. replaced by active 154
 ῥήμα 111
 -ρρ-, -ρσ- 45
 -σ- in infin. and indie. aorist 204
 -σσ- and -ττ- 25, 45
 -σαι in 2 s. mid. pres. and fut. 53 f.
 -σαν 3rd plural in, 33, 37 (*ter*), 52
 σήπειν: voice forms 154—
 —σέσηπα 154
 -σθωσαν in imper. 53
 Σκευῆς 246
 σκόπει μή in warnings 184 f., 192
 σκύλλειν: meaning 89—
 —voices 156
 -σο 2 pers. ending 161
 σπᾶν voices 157
 σπείρης 38, 48
 σπουδάξω: future 154—
 —c. infin. 205 f.
 —c. ἡνα in Polybius 206
 στήκειν: from ἔστηκα 238
 στοιχεῖν 11
 στόμα in "Hebraic" locutions 99
 σύ: emphasis in nom. 85 f.—
 —σὺ εἶπας εἰ σὺν. 86
 συγγενής flexion 49, 244
 συγκαλεῖν voice 237
 συμβουλευέσθαι force of middle 157
 συμπαραλαμβάνειν: pres. and aorist action 130—
 —aorist ptc. 133
 συμπληροῦσθαι durative pres. 233
 συμπόσια συμπόσια 97
 συμφέρειν with subject ἡνα-clause 210
 σύν: frequency 98—
 —relations with μετά 106—
 —c. accus. by Aquila 13—
 —with gen. in papyri 64—
 —perfectivising compounds 112 f., 115 f., 148
 συναίρειν act. and middle with λόγον, 160

συναλλάσσειν 129
 συνάντησις 14 n., 242
 συναρπάζειν 113
 συνέβη constr. 17, 110
 συνεργεῖν c. accus. 65
 συνέρχασθαι 113
 συνετός 222
 συνθέσθαι 222
 συνπ-. See συμ-
 συντελεῖν 118
 συντηρεῖν 113, 116
 σύστημα 46
 σφυρί 45
 σχῆσω 150 (*dis*)
 σφίσεσθαι: tenses 127—durative 127,
 150—οι σφίζομενοι 127
 σωτήρ 84

 ταμείον 44 f.
 τάσσειν c. infin. 205
 -τατος superl. ending 78
 τέθνηκα perfect of ἀποθνήσκειν 114 n.,
 147
 τελεῖν: action 118—pres. and aorist
 action 130—its perfective συντελεῖν
 118
 τελευτᾶν: "registering" present 120—
 aor. with ἔριτι 140
 τέξομαι fut. mid. 155
 -τέος verbal in 222
 τεσσαράκοντα 45 f., 244
 τέσσαρες: orthography 45 f., 56, 244—
 accus. 33, 36, 55, 243
 τεσσαρεσκαιδέκατος 96
 τέτ(ε)υχα 56, 154
 τηρεῖν perfective 113, 116
 τιθέσθαι: voices 237—relation of τίθημι
 and τίθεμαι 152
 τίκτειν: pres. and aorist 126 f.—future
 155
 τίνες, τινές 36
 τίς: replaces πρότερος 77—become τί
 (indecl.) 95, 244—used as relative
 21, 93
 τίς: supplanted by εἰς 97 f.—with
 negative 246
 -τος verbal in 221 f.
 τοῦ: c. infin., perhaps Ionic 205—an
 adnominal gen. 216—statistics of
 216 f.—normal use telic 216—so fre-
 quently by Luke 216 f.—purpose
 rare or absent in Paul 217—use in
 papyri 219 f.—after verbs of com-
 manding 217—final force weakened
 207—use parallel with ἵνα 207, 217
 —="so as to" in Paul 218
 τοῦ λοιποῦ gen. of time 73
 τρέπειν, τραπεῖν 110, 119 n.
 -ττ- and -σσ- 25, 45
 τυγχάνειν: flexion 56—voice forms 154
 —τυχόν accus. abs. 74—ούχ ὁ τυχών
 231 n.—α. partic. 228

τυχόν "perhaps" 74
 -τωςαν in imper. 53

υ (*F*) dropped between vowels 47
 υ, η, η, ι, α, ει approximating sounds
 34, 240
 ὕγεια, ὕγια 38, 45
 -υια flexion of perf. ptc. in 38, 48
 ὑμέτερος 40 n.
 ὑμῶν: position of 40 n.—ousts ὑμέτε-
 ρος 40 n.
 ὑπαντᾶν c. dat. 64
 ὑπάντησις 14 n.
 ὑπέρ: frequency 98, 104 f.—predomi-
 nantly gen. 105—often="about"
 105—in commercial "to" 105—rela-
 tions with περί and ἀντί 105—with
 accus. 105, 237—in compound
 adverbs 99
 ὑπεράνω 99
 ὑπό: c. dative 63, 105 f.—frequency
 98, 104 f.—compared with διὰ (gen.)
 106—encroached upon by ἀπό 102—
 relations with ἀπό, ἐκ, παρά 237—
 ἀποθνήσκειν ὑπό τιως 156—in com-
 pound adverbs 99
 ὑποκάτω 99
 ὑποτάσσεσθαι: middle or pass. 163—
 future 149, 163
 ὑποτρέχειν c. accus. 65

 φαγεῖν see ἐσθlein—as indecl. noun 249
 φάγεσαι 54
 φάγομαι 155, 184 n.
 φαίνεσθαι: action in future 150—with
 ptc. 228
 φάνας: punctiliar 128—ἐφη 110, 128
 φέρεν: why defective 110—no aorist
 action 110—in imperf. 129, 238—
 aoristic (†) use of pres. stem 129, 238
 —force of perfect ἐνήνοχα 154—
 relation between φέρουσι and φέρων
 224
 φεύγειν: and its perfective 112, 116—
 pres. and aorist action 115 f., 119—
 future middle 155
 φιμούσθαι perfect and aorist imper. 176
 φοβείσθαι: active obsolete 102 n., 162
 —action in future 150—with ἀπό
 102, 104 n.—with μή 184 f., 193—
 with μήπως 248—with infin. 205
 φροντίζειν c. ἵνα or infin. 206 f.
 φυλάσσειν: action in aorist 116—its
 perfective 116—force of middle 157,
 159
 φυσιοῦσθε subj. 54

 χαίρειν: pres. and aor. action 129—
 voice 161—pronunciation of χαίρει
 34—epistolary use 179 f., 245
 χάρις flexion 49
 χεῖν, future 184

χειμῶνος gen. of time 73

χείρ: accus. χεῖραν 49—διὰ χεῖρός 100
—in "Hebraic" locutions 99 f.

χειριστός: in papyri 236—not in NT 78

χείρων strictly comparative in NT 78

χορηγεῖν c. accus. 65

χράσθαι: flexion 54—voice 158—action
in aorist 247—c. accus. 64, 245—c.
instrumental 64, 158

Χριστός Paul's phrase ἐν X. 68

χρόνος instrumental dat. of duration
75, 148

χρυσός flexion 33, 48

-χύνειν 45

χωρεῖν: future 155—infm., future and
aor. 205 n.

ψυχή periphrasis for εἰαυτόν 87, 105 n.

ν, ο pronounced alike 35 (*bis*), 244, 249

-ω and -ῶ verbs, from -μι 33, 38

ῶ in classical and Hellenistic Greek
71

ῶραν point of time 63, 245

ὡς: c. indic., with ἄν 167—with ὅτι
212—in papyri 212—for ὅτι replaced
by πῶς 211—c. subj. 185, 249—
with ἄν 167—without ἄν 249—c.
optative, in LXX 196—in Josephus
etc. 197—c. infm., ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν
204 n.

ὥστε: statistics 209—"and so" or
"therefore" 209 f.—difference be-
tween indic. and infm. 209—with
indic. consecutive rare 209, 210—
c. imperative 209—c. subj. 209—c.
infm. 209—expresses purpose 207,
210—Tatian's misreading of it
249

ὠφθην 111. See ὠφᾶν

MODERN GREEK.

	PAGE		PAGE
άν ύψ	167	καθείς, καθένas each	105
άπό c. acc.	102, 245	καί, κι'	12
άποκρίθηκα	39	κάμνω (aor. έκαμα) ταις	159
άς = άφes	175, 176	κάν	167
-άς gen. άδος, nouns in	38	κάτι	244
αύτός, Pontic άτός	47, 91	μέ = μετά	106
άχ (Έπιrot) = έξ	102	μέρα = ήμέρα	235
βάθρακος	38	μη(ν) c. subj.	122, 170
βρήκα = εβρηκα	142	μη γένοιτο	194, 240, 249
γενάμενος	51	μήπως	248
γα νά in order that	159	νά = να	157, 159, 176, 205
δαμονίζω	162	δρνίχ = δρνις (Pontic)	45
δέν = ούδέν	170, 232	-ους gen. -ούδος, nouns in	38
δένοντας indecl. pres. partic.	60	όχ (Έπιrot) = έξ	102
διά c. acc.	106	παιδιά (pl. of παιδί child)	170
έβδάσταξα	56	παρά compounded	247
έδέθηκα	142	πάσα	244
είπουμε 1. pl. subj. of είπα	185	'πής = είπης	176
έκ	102, 246	ποιός interrogative	95
έλεγε and είπε	128	πολεμώ μέ	106, 247
ένas = είς	96	πού relative (indeclinable)	94
έπαψα = έπαυσα	234	σάν (= ώς άν) when, as	17, 167
έρευνα	46	σαράντα (σεράντα) forty	46, 234
έστάθηκα, έστήθηκα	162	στέκω = στήκω	162, 238
έσύ = σύ	234	στήνω = ιστάνω	55, 162
εβρηκα	142	στό(ν) dat. of ό (= εις τόν)	63
έφερα aor. of φέρνω = φέρω	129	συνέβηκε = συνέβη	17
(έ)φέτο = έφ' έτος	44	τετράδη Wednesday	96
έφθασα	247	φέρνω	129
ήρθα = ήλθα	12	χύννω (Cypriote)	45
θά, θενά auxil. forming future 179, 185		ώς = έως	249
ιδιος	91	ώς τότε	107
-ις, -ιv nouns in	48 f., 244		

III. INDEX OF SUBJECTS.

- N**—see *Sinaiticus*
A—see *Alexandrinus*
 Ablative case: lost in prehistoric Greek
 61—as a part of the genitive 72—
 alleged Latinisms 101 f.
Ablaut 152
 Absolute: genitive 12, 74, 236—accu-
 sative 74
 Accent (stress): differentiating voices
 152, 238—distinguishing words 237
 Accusative: and infinitive 16 f., 211 f.,
 229—pl. in *-es* 36—sg. in *-y* 49—3rd
 decl. and mixed 49—terminal 61—
 with prepositions, compared with dat.
 and gen. 62—with *eis*, encroaching
 on *en* c. dat. 62 f., 234 f.—with other
 preps. supplanting dat. 63—for point
 of time 63—specification 63—en-
 croaching on other cases as object
 case with verbs—on dat. 64, 65—on
 gen. 64 f., 235—with verbs formerly
 intransitive 65—internal or adverbial
 65, 93—how far the old distinctions
 of cases still hold here 66—constr.
 of *πιστεύω* 67 f., 235—with *eis* re-
 placing a predicate 71 f.—absolute
 74—substituted for nominative c.
 inf. 212—mixed with *ετι* construc-
 tion 213
 Achaian-Dorian *Κωρη* 37
 Action-form, verbal 108–118, 221 *al*—
 see *Aorist*, *Perfect*, *Present*, *Future*;
Linear, *Punctiliar*, *Perfective*, *Con-*
stative, *Iterative*, *Ingressive*, *Effective*.
 Active Voice 152 ff.—see *Middle*
 Acts: relations of first and second part
 11, 216, 235—unity with Lk 14, 217
 —the “We”—document 217—see
Luke
 Adjectives: pronominal 40, 79 f., 87–
 91—indeclinables 50—“Duality”
 77 f.—comparison 78 f.—position,
 with article and noun 84—interjec-
 tional 181 f., 240—verbal 221 f.
 Adverbs: prepositions *κατά* and *ἀνά*
 used as 105—in composition 112
 Aelian 25, 79
 Aeolic 37, 38, 44, 214—cf *Lesbian*
 Aeschylus 215—see *Index I (e)*, p. 263
 Agent: *ἀπό* for *ὑπό* expressing 102, 246
 Agent-nouns 127
 Agrapha 130, 171, 191
 Ahikar, Story of 238 f.
Aktionsart—see *Action-form*
 Alexander the Great 7, 30
 Alexandrian Greek 40, 52
 Alexandrinus, Codex 36, 47, 54, 76,
 191, 194, 240 *al*
 Alkman, 24
a-text 42, 53, 175, 176, 190, 225
 American RV 180
 Ammonius 160
 Anabasis, effect of the expedition on
 Greek dialects 31
 Anacoluthon 58, 69, 95, 180, 223, 224,
 225, 234
 Analogy-formations 37, 38, 44, 48, 49,
 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56
 Anaphoric article 83
 Anarthrous: infinitive with preposi-
 tions 81, 216—prepositional phrases
 81 f., 236—nouns in “headings” 82
 —use of nouns with qualitative force
 82 f.—proper names 83—adjective
 clauses 83 f., 236—*infin.*, statistics
 241
 Aorist: subjunctive c. *οὐ μή* 35, 190—
 endings 51 f.—action-form 109–111,
 113, 115–118, 129 f., 132, 238—
 subjunctive, closely connected with
 fut. indic. 120, 149, 240—indicative,
 compared with imperfect 128 f.—
 partic. 130–134, 227, 238—timeless
 uses 134—as past indefinite 134 f.,
 135–140—expressing *immediate* past
 134 f., 139, 140—epistolary 135—
 gnomic 135—English rendering 135–
 140—compared with perfect 141–146
 —passive and middle 161 f.—subjunc-
 tive after compounds of *ἀν* 166, 186
 —no longer used with *ἀν* iterative
 167—imperative, tone of 173, 189—
 3rd person in prohibition 174 f.—con-
 trasted with imperatival pres. partic.
 180—in unrealised condition, wish,
 or purpose 200 f.

- Aoristic:** presents 119, 247—*φέρω* 129, 238, 247—perfects 141-146, 238, 248
- Apocalypse:** grammatical level 9—use of cases and neglect of concord 9, 60—bearing of grammar here on criticism 9 f.—use of *ἰδοῦ* 11—possible acc. pl. in *-es* 36, and sg. 3rd decl. in *-av* 49—person-endings 52—nominative 69—prohibitions 124—**aoristic perfects** 145—*οὐ μή* 191, 192—*τοῦ* c. inf. 217, 218—does not confuse *εἰς* and *ἐν* in local sense 234—small use of compound verbs 237
- Apocrypha, RV of 198**
- Apotheosis** 84
- Appian:** dative 63—optative 197
- Aquila** 13—see Index I (e), p. 264
- Aramaic:** influences on Greek in NT 3, 13, 14, 15, 18, 75, 95, 103, 104, 124, 174, 189, 224, 226 f., 230 f., 235, 236, 240, 242—periphrastic imperfect 14, 226 f.—speech of Paul 7—of Jesus 8—of John 9—diction in Luke 14-18—ordinals 96—tenses 139—participle 182—periphrastic imperative 226 f.—see under *Hebraisms and Over-use*
- Arcadian** 38
- Archimedes** 51
- Aristophanes** 215—see Index I (e), p. 263
- Arrian,** optative in 197—see Index I (e), p. 264
- Article:** use by foreigners 21, 236—general “correctness” of NT Greek 81—as relative and as demonstrative 81—dropped between preposition and infin. 81, 216—these three Ionic uses absent from NT 81—alleged Hebraisms 81 f., 236—correlation 81 f.—anarthrous prepositional phrases 82, 236—dropped in sentences having the nature of headings 82—words specially affecting anarthrous form 82—qualitative force of anarthrous words 82 f.—with proper names 83—used with the parent’s name in gen. 83, 236—with names of slaves and animals 83—*ὁ καὶ Παῦλος* 83—colloquial style drops art. before adjective adjuncts 83 f., 236—misplacement of adjective 84—*τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ σωτήρος ἡμῶν*, papyrus parallels 84—complex adjectival clause between art. and noun 236
- Articular Infinitive:** *ἐν τῷ* in translation 14, 215, 249—bearing on history of *Κοινή* 34, 213-215—rare anarthrous use with prepositions 81, 216—appropriate to rhetoric 189, 213, 215—statistics for classical and later Greek 213, 215—for NT 213, 216—for Greek Bible 241—citations from dialect inscriptions 214—essentially literary, specially Attic 214 f.—use with dependent gen., as if a full noun 215—*τοῦ* c. inf., without preposition, its original adnominal use 216—telic force in Thucydides and in NT 216—usage of the several NT writers in this respect 217—Paul’s tendency to drop telic force 217—parallelism with *ἵνα* 217—explanatory infin. 218—*πρὸς τὸ* and *εἰς τὸ*, how far remaining telic 218 f.—papyrus citations for *τοῦ*, *εἰς τὸ*, *πρὸς τὸ* c. inf. 219 f.—belongs mainly to higher educational stratum 220.
- Articular Nominative** in address 70, 235
- Articular Participle** 126 f., 228
- Asia Minor:** characteristics of Greek 38, 40 f., 205, 211
- Aspiration** 44, 234, 236, 244
- Assimilation of Cases:** after verbs of naming 69, 235—omitted with gen. abs. 74, 236
- Asyndeton** 17, 181
- Attendant Circumstances,** participle of 230
- Attic:** literary supremacy 24—its earliest use in prose 25—grammar of inscriptions 29—Xenophon 31—language of the lower classes in Athens 31—the basis of literary *Κοινή* 32—how much did it contribute to the vernacular *Κοινή*? 33 f., 41, 214 f.—nom. pl. as accus. 37—*κεκτώμαι* and *μεμνώμαι* 54—*κατέχεα* 55—revival of the dual 57—parenthetic nominative 70—use of vocative, divergent from Hellenistic 71—historic present 121—the Orators, forms of prohibition 124, use of imperative 172—alleged ex. of aoristic perfect 146, 238—linear and punctiliar futures 150—active verbs with future middle 154 f.—*ἀπεκρινάμην* 161—optative in conditional sentences 196 f.—imperfect in unfulfilled condition 201—*ὅπως* and *ἵνα* 206—*ὥς ἴδρι* 212—articular infin. mainly due to Orators 213-215—nom. for acc. in long enumerations 234—see under the Attic writers’ names and in Index I (e), p. 256
- Atticism** 5, 22, 24 f., 26, 170, 197, 206, 211, 239
- Attraction of Relative** 92 f.
- Augment** 51, 128, 129
- Authorised Version** 93, 98, 112, 128 f., 136-140, 189
- Auxiliary ἄφες** 175 f.

- B—see *Vaticanus*
 β-text 42, 53, 224—see under *Sinaiticus* and *Vaticanus*
 Bezae, Codex 16, 38, 42, 50, 55, 56, 58, 69, 73, 80, 94, 96, 107, 114, 124, 131, 161, 171, 228, 233, 235, 236, 240, 241, 242 *al*—see under *δ-text*
 Biblical Greek, 2-5, 18, 99
 Bilingualism: in Rome 5—illustrated from Wales 6 f., 10 f.—in Egypt 6—in Lystra 7, 233—in Palestine 7 f., 233
 Boeotian 33, 34, 55, 214
 Bohairic 225
 Brachylogy, with *ἀλλὰ* 241
 Broken continuity, perfect of 144, 145, 148
 Byzantine period 83, 96, 168, 197
- Cappadocian—see *Pontic*
 Cardinals: encroachment on ordinals 95 f., 237—simplification of the “teens” 96—uses of *εἰς* 96 f.—repetition for distributive 97
 Cases: in Rev 9—history 60-76, 234-236—with prepositions 100-107, 237—see under the several Cases.
 Catholic Epistles, use of compound verbs 237—see under *First Ep. of Peter*, *James*, *Second Ep. of Peter*
 Causal Participle 230
 Cautious assertion 188, 192 f.
 Chance in the Bible 219
 Christians, ethics of average early 126, 238
 Chrysostom, on ecclastic *ἴνα* 207—see Index I (e), p. 264
 Clement of Rome 95—see Index I (e), p. 264
 Colloquial—see under *Vernacular*
 Common Greek: takes place of “Hebraic” in definition of NT Greek 1—a universal language 5 f., 19—materials for study 22 f.—literary *Κοινή* (q.v.)—papyri, inscriptions, MGr 27-30—unification of earlier Greek dialects 30—foreshadowings of this during v/iv B.C. 21—completed in time of Alexander 31 f.—decay of the old dialects 32—their relative contributions to the resultant *Κοινή* 32-34, 36 f., 214 f.—pronunciation 34 f. how far was *Κοινή* homogeneous? 19, 38-41—dialects in (q.v.)
 Comparison of adjectives and adverbs 77-79, 236
 Complementary Infinitive 204
 Compound Prepositions 99
 Compound Verbs: cases with 65—perfective action 111-118, 237—repeated without preposition 111, 115—statistics 237
- Conative action 125, 127, 128 f., 147 173 f., 186, 247
 Concessive Participle 230
 Concord 9, 28, 59 f., 182, 244
 Conditional Sentences: pluperfect in 148—apodosis with *ἄν* 166 f., 196, 197-199, 200 f.—*ἔάν* c. indic. 168, 187—*εἰ μήτι ἄν* 169—*εἰ μή* in unfulfilled condition, *εἰ οὐ* in simple 171, 200, 240—futuristic subj. with *ἔάν* 185—its future-perfect sense in aor. 186—lessened difference between *εἰ* and *ἔάν* 187, 240—these almost exclusively confined to their proper moods 187—*εἰ* c. deliberative subj. 187—differentia of *εἰ* and *ἔάν* in future conditions 187—use of optative 195, 196, 197 f.—unfulfilled conditions 199-201—participle in protasis 229 f.
 Conjugation-stems 109 f., 120
 Conjunctions: with *ἄν* (*ἔάν*) 166, 264—*ἀλλὰ* “except” 241
 Conjunctive participle 230
 Consecutive clauses: infinitive alone 204, 210—*ὥστε* with indic. and with infin. 209 f.—expressed by *ἵνα* 210—by *τοῦ* c. infin. 218
 Constative action 109, 111, 113, 115-118, 130, 133, 145, 174
 Construct state (Semitic) 236
 Contingent *ἄν* 166, 198, 200
 Contract Verbs, 37, 52-54, 55, 234
 Contraction of *i* sounds 45, 55
 Correlation of Article 81 f.
 Oretan 214, 233—see *Gortyn*
 Criticism, contributions of grammar to 9 f., 40 f.
 Culture—see *Education*
- D—see *Bezae*
 Dative: lost in MGr 60, 63—obsolescent in *Κοινή* 62—decays through a period of over-use, esp. with *ἐν* 62—statistics with prepositions 62 f.—confusion of *εἰς* and *ἐν* 63, 66, 234 f.—decay of dative uses with *ὄρω* and *ᾤρω* 63—with *ἐπί*, distinct meaning lost 63, 107—accus. begins to express point of time 63—reaction, as in extension of dative (instrumental) of reference 63, 75, and in some transitive verbs taking dative 64—verbs beginning to take accus. or gen. instead of dat. 64—illiterate uses of gen. and acc. for dat. 64—some improbable citations from early inscriptions 64—with *προσकुεῖν* 64, 66—with some compound verbs 65—with *πιστεύειν* 67 f.—*incommodi* 75—syncretism with locative 75 f., 104—with instrumental 75—exten-

- sion of time and point of time thus both given by dative 75 f.—sociative instrumental 75—instrumental used in translating Hebrew infin. abs. 75—this and use of participle compared with classical uses and with LXX 76—various uses of *ἐν* 103 f.—dat. of person judging 104—common uses of dat. and loc. in Greek and Sanskrit 104—*ἐν* added even to instrumental dative 104—*ὁμολογεῖν ἐν* 104—*μετά, περί, ὑπό* no longer c. dat. 105—one or two exceptions with *ὑπό* 105—*πρός* c. dat. common in LXX, rare in NT 106—*ἐπι* indifferently with the three cases 107—*ἐφ' ᾧ* 107—dative of reflexive approximates to force of the Middle 157—*χρᾶσθαι* with instrumental 158—dat. or loc. of a verbal noun makes the Infinitive 202-204—articular infin. (*q.v.*)
- Days of week and month 96, 101, 287
- De-aspiration—see *Psilosis*
- Defective Verbs 110 f.
- Definite nouns, in Semitic 236
- Definition, gen. of 73 f.
- Deliberative Subjunctive 171, 185, 187, 194
- §-text 14, 44, 45, 53, 181, 233, 234—see under *Bezae*
- Delphian, 36, 37, 52, 55, 214
- Demonstrative: article as 81—*αὐτός* and *ἐκεῖνος* 91
- Demosthenes 213—see Index I (*e*), p. 263
- Denial and Prohibition, with *οὐ μή* 187 f.
- Deponents 153 f., 161 f.
- Dialects in ancient Hellas 23 f., 30-34, 36-38, 41, 213 f.—see under *Attic, Ionic, etc.*
- Dialects in *Κοινή* 5 f., 19, 28 f., 38-41, 47, 91, 94, 205, 209, 211, 241, 243, 249
- Digamma 23, 88, 44, 47, 111, 244
- Diodorus, optative in 197
- Diphthongs: pronunciation 33, 34 f.—augment 51
- Dissimilation 45
- Distributive numerals 97
- Doric, 33, 41, 45, 48, 51, 101, 214
- Double comparative and superlative 236
- Dual 57 f., 77 f.
- Duality 77-80, 100
- Durative action—see *Linear*
- Dynamic Middle 158
- Ecbatic *ἴνα* 206-209
- Education, varieties of: in NT writers 8 f., 23, 44, 50, 52, 60—in papyri, etc. 4, 6 f., 9, 28, 44, 47, 49, 50, 51, 52—see under *Illiteracy*; also under *Apocalypse, Mark, Luke, Paul, Hebrews, etc.*
- Effective action 109, 113, 130, 149
- Egypt, bilingualism in, xvii f., 6, 242
- Elativē 78, 79, 236
- Elia, dialect of 178, 214
- Elision 45
- Ellipsis 178, 180, 181, 183, 190
- Emphasis: in pronouns 85 f.—imperfect and aorist differing in 128—possible cause of original voice-differentiation 152, 238—on subject, brought out by English preterite 140—degree of, in *οὐ μή* construction 188-190—of *οὐ* c. partic. 232—differentiating words of full or attenuated meaning 237
- English, Hellenistic illustrated from 19, 39, 58, 71, 77, 79, 82, 85, 89, 92, 94, 96, 98, 99, 111, 112, 135-140, 144, 150 f., 171 f., 182, 184, 185, 189, 195, 203, 206, 218, 221 f., 229, 236, 243
- Epexegetic infinitive 217, 218, 219
- Epimenides 233
- Epistolary aorist 135—formulae 28, 176, 180
- Euripides 215—see Index I (*e*), p. 263
- "Exhausted" *αὐτοῦ* and *ἰδὸς* 87-90, 237
- Final clauses: weakened telic force of *ἴνα* 178, 205-210, 240 f., of *ταῦθ* c. infin. 207, 216-218, of *εἰς τό* c. infin., in Paul 219—originated in volitive, with parataxis 185—final optative with *ἴνα* 196 f.—*ὥστε* c. infin. used for purpose 207—*ταῦθ* c. infin. 216-218—*πρός τό* and *εἰς τό* c. infin. 218-220—use of participle 230
- Final *ε* and *ν* 49, 168, 187
- First Epistle of Peter: prohibitions 124—preference for aorist imperative 174—for imperatival participles 181—*οὐ . . . αὐτοῦ* improbable in such good Greek 237
- Fluellen 10 f.
- Fourth Book of Maccabees, Atticising in 166, 197
- Fourth Gospel and Apocalypse 9 f.
- French idioms in English 13
- Frequency, relative, of prepositions 62 f., 98, 100, 102, 105, 106 f.
- Frequentative verb, 114
- Future: c. *ἴνα* 35—c. *οὐ μή* 35, 190—c. *ἐφ' ᾧ* 107—in Indo-Germanic verb 108—compared with futural present 120—history of its form 149—links with subjunctive 149, 184, 187, 240—action mixed 149 f.—English rendering 150 f.—volitive

and futuristic uses 150 f.—its moods 151—Middle in active verbs 154 f.—Passive with middle force 161—used for imperative 176 f.—ditto with *δπως* 177—rarely with *μη* in prohibition 177—in warning with *μη* 178—c. *el* 187—c. *μη* in cautious assertion 193—optative 197—infinitive 204 f.—participle 230
 Future Conditions: with *εδω* 185—with *ελ* 187—"less vivid form" 196, 199
 Futuristic: future 150, 177—subjunctive 184, 185, 186, 192, 240

Gender 59 f.

Genitive: absolute 12, 74, 236—verbs with 65, 235—with *ἀκούειν* and *γέσθαι* 66—syncretism with ablative 72—objective and subjective 72—partitive 72 f., 102—with *ὅψε* 72, 73—time and place 73—definition 73 f.—Hebraism here 74—after negative adjective 74, 235 f.—prepositions with 100–102, 104–107, 237—of material 102

German, illustrations from 94, 96

Gerundive in *-ρέος* 222

Gnomic aorist 135, 139—present 135—future 186

Gortyn Code 214—cf *Cretan*

Gothic 78, 181, 224

Grammar and literary criticism 9, 40 f., 205, 211

Grammatical and lexical Semitism 12
 Greece, physical conditions of 23 f.

Headings, anarthrous 82

Hebraism: in theory of NT Greek 1–3—in Rev 9—use of *ἐν* xvii, 11 f., 61, 103—of Gallicisms in English 13—*ἐν τῷ* c. inf. 14, 215, 249—in Lk 14–18—tested by MGr 17, 94—*εἰς* predicate 72, 76—articlar nom. in address 70, 235—gen. of definition 73 f.—gen. abs. 74—dat. or partic. for infin. abs. 75 f.—use of article 81, 236—redundance of pronouns 85—*ψυχῆ* used for reflexive 87, 105—relative with superfluous demonstrative 94 f.—*εἰς* as ordinal 95 f.—and as indef. art. 96 f.—distrib. num. 21, 97—illustrated by AV 98—*ἐνώπιον* 99—compound prepositions 99—*ἀποκριθεὶς εἰπὲρ* 131—active for middle 158—infin. for imper. 180—Hebrew teleology and final clauses 219—*nom. pendens* c. partic. 225—periphrastic tenses 226 f.—freedom of Mk from 242—cf under *Over-use*
 Hebraist school of NT interpretation 2 f., 12, 223, 242

Hebrew: how far known in Palestine

8, 233—NT (Delitzsch) 104, 163—tenses 108

Hebrews, Epistle to: did author know Aramaic? 10—Greek style of 18, 20, 118, 129, 232, 237—grammatical points in 62, 129, 182, 211, 217, 218 f., 231, 237

Hebrews, Gospel of 17—see Index I (e), p. 265

Hellenistic 2—see *Common Greek*
 Heracleon 104

Herculaneum, papyri from, 27, 43

Hermogenes 172

Herodian: cases in 63—optative 197

Herodotus 51, 62, 81, 91, 101, 214, 215—see also Index I (e), p. 263

Heteroclisia 48, 60

Hiatus 92, 117

Historic Present, 120 f., 139

Homer: the Achæans of 24—forms found in 55—syntax 121, 135, 147, 161—the Athenians' "Bible" 142—blamed by Protagoras for use of imperative 172—see Index I (e), p. 263

Hypotaxis—see under *Parataxis*

Ignatius 215

Illiteracy 28, 36, 43, 49, 56, 78, 87, 93, 142, 169, 189, 220, 237, 238, 239

Imperative: endings 53—of *εἶμι* 56, 174—present, compared with aor. subj. in prohibition 122–126—tenses compared generally 129 f., 173 f., 176, 189, 238—prehistoric use 164—formal history, 165, 171 f.—tone of 172 f., 175—prominence of in NT 173—aorist appropriate in prayer 173—in 3rd person 174 f.—expressions for 1st person 175 f.—auxiliary *ἄφες* 175 f.—perfect 176—substitutes for 176–182, 203, 223, 241, 248

Imperfect 128 f.—in unreal indic. 200 f.—replaced by periphrasis 226 f.—see *Present stem*

Impersonal plural 58 f.—verbs 74, 226

Improper Prepositions 99

Inceptive action of *-ισκω* suffix 120

Incommodi, Dativus 75

Indeclinable: Greek proper name not to be taken as 12—*πλήρης, ἡμῶν* and comparatives in *-ω* 50

Indefinite Article 96 f.

Indicative: alone may have inherent time-connotation 126, 128, 129—imperfect 128 f.—aorist, used of immediate past 135, 140—rendering of aorist in English 135–140—*γέγονα* not aoristic in NT 145 f., 238—pluperfect 143—future 149–151—as *modus irrealis* 164, 199–201—with *δν* 166 f., 200 f.—with *δταν, δπου δν, δσα δν εδω* 168, 239—negated by *οὐ* 170 f.

- but *μή* not entirely expelled 170 f., 239 f.—negatived questions 170—future used for command 176 f., 240—future with *ὅ* *μή* 190—c. *μή* in cautious assertions 192 f.—imperfect for present time in unfulfilled condition, wish, and purpose 200 f.—replaced by participle 222–224—periphrasis 225–227
- Indirect Questions 196, 198 f.
- Indo-Germanic: dual in 57 f.—numerals 58—cases 61, 72, 75—verb system 108 f.—*Aktionsart* 109 f.—perfectivising by means of composition 111 f.—aorist-present in 119—augment and the final *-i* in primary tenses 128—was there a future in? 149—future participle 151—voice, its rationale in 152, 238—no separate passive 152—verbs with no middle 153—strong perfect without voice distinction 154—passive use of middle already developing in 156—Greek weak aorist passive developed from middle person-ending *-thēs* 161—differentia of the imperative 164, 171 f.—glottogenic theories of subjunctive and optative 164—the injunctive 165—the two negatives 169—jussive subjunctive in positive commands 177 f.—origins of the infinitive 202 f.—its deficiency in voice 203, and tense 204—verbal adjectives and participles 221 f.—closeness of 3 pl. act. in *-ont(i)* to the participle 224
- Infinitive: c. *ἐν* *τῷ* 14, 215—forms in contract verbs 53—future 151, 204 f.—for imperative 172, 179 f., 203—articular (*q.v.*) 189, 213–220, 240—verb and noun 202—its origins 202–204—comparisons with Sanskrit, Latin, English—202–204, 207, 210—development of voice 203, and of tense 204—case-uses traced 203 f., 207, 210—*anarthrous* expressing purpose 204, 205, 207, 217, 240 f.—consequence 204, 210—complementary 204—limitative 204—relations with *ἵνα* c. subj. 205–209, 210 f., 240 f.—with *ὥστε* final 207, 210—alleged Latinism 208—consecutive with *ὥστε* 209 f.—relations with *ὥστε* c. indic. 209 f., and with consecutive *ἵνα* 210—subject and object 210 f.—*accus. and infin.* compared with *ὅτι* clause 211—*accus. tending to replace regular nom.* 212—not Latinism 212 f.—mixture of *acc. c. inf.* and *ὅτι* construction 213—statistics 241
- Ingressive action 109, 116, 117, 118, 130, 131, 145, 149, 174
- Injunctive mood 165
- Inscriptions: *Κοινή* 6, 23, 28 f.—classical, 23, 214—see Index I (c), pp. 258 f.
- Instrumental case 61, 75, 104, 158—use of *ἐν* 12, 61 f., 75, 104
- Interjectional character of *voc.* and *imper.* 171 f.—of *infin.* in imperatival sense 179, 203—of *partic. or adj.* used imperatively 180 f., 240—prepositional clauses 183 f.
- Internal accusative 65, 93
- Interrogative: confused with relative 93 f.—*ποιός* and *τίς*, *ποταρός* 95—command 184
- Intransitive: verbs becoming transitive 65, 162—use of strong perfect 147, 154—tendency of strong aorist 155
- Ionic 33, 37 f., 41, 43, 44, 48, 51, 55, 57, 81, 101, 195, 205
- Ireland, bilingualism in 7
- Irrational final *ι* and *υ* 49, 168, 187
- Isolation of Biblical Greek 2, 3
- Itacism 34 f., 47, 56, 199, 239, 240
- Iterative action 109, 114, 125, 127, 128, 129, 173, 180, 186, 248—use of *ἄν* 166, 167, 168
- James: *Ἰδοὺ* in 11—prohibitions 126—use of Middle 160
- Jerome 181
- Jewish Greek 2 f., 19—see *Hebraism* and *Aramaic*
- John: Greek of Gospel and Apocalypse 9—place of writing 40 f., 211—use of historic present 121—prohibitions 124, 125, 126—*μή* in questions 170, 239—periphrastic tenses 226, 227—compound verbs 237
- Josephus 2, 23, 25, 62, 89, 121, 146, 189, 197, 233, 235—see Index I (e), p. 264
- Jussive subjunctive 173, 208—see *Volitive*
- Justin Martyr 8, 143, 233—see Index I (e), p. 264
- Καθαρεύουσα* 26, 30—of *Atticism*, *Literary Κοινή*
- Klepht ballads—see Index I (e), p. 265
- Κοινή* 23—see *Common Greek*
- Laconian—see *Sparta*
- Late Greek 1
- Latin: Bible 5, 72, 106, 129, 132, 240—Paul speaking 21, 233—cases 61—use of *ue* for *I* 87—parallels with Greek, etc. 112, 158—the Middle 153—subj. and indic. in cause-clauses 171—jussive subj. 177—prohibition 178—*quin redeamus?* 184—optative in indirect question 199—verbal

- nouns 202—infinitive 204—*ut* clauses 206—their weakened final force 207 f.—verbal adj. turned into participle 221—participle and adj. in *-bilis* 222—parallels to use of participle for indic. or imper. 223 f., 241—poverty in participles 229 f.
- Latinisms 18, 20 f., 71, 75, 100–102, 142, 208, 212 f., 247
- Lesbian—see *Aeolic*
- Lewis Syriac 53, 65, 72, 248
- Lexical notes: *eis* ἀπάντησιν 14—*ναὺς* 25 f.—*ἀφιξίς* 26—*ἐρωτᾶν* 66—*σκύλλειν* 89—*ἐνώπιον* 99—*ἐπιφανής*, *ἐπιφάνεια* 102—*ἐπιβαλόν* 131—*ἀποκόψονται* 163, 201—*προσφάγιον* 170—*κραιδία* 170—*προστίθεσθαι* 232—*εἰκόνας* 235
- Lexical: studies of Deissmann 4—Hebraisms 11, 12, 46, 233
- Limitative infinitive 204
- Linear action 109, 110, 111, 114, 117, 119, 120, 125, 126, 127, 128, 147, 149 f., 173, 174, 175, 180, 183, 186, 233
- Literary element in NT 20, 25 f., 26, 55, 106, 147 f., 204, 211—see under *Hebrews, Paul, Luke*
- Literary *Καυή* 2 f., 21, 22 f., 24–26, 62 f., 64, 88, 118, 194, 197, 211—its analogue in MGr 21, 26, 30—element in inscriptions 29—see *Atticism*
- Lithuanian: alleged Latinising gen. found in 101—future in *-sui* 149
- Local cases 60 f.
- Localising of textual types 41
- Locative 61, 75, 104, 202 f.
- Logia* 15, 104, 124, 126, 189, 191
- Lord's Prayer 10, 173
- Lost cases 61
- Lucian 25, 170, 197, 227—see Index I (e), p. 264
- Luke: did he know Aramaic? 10, 15, 104—style 11, 18, 20, 232—Hebraism in 13–18—unity of Lucan writings 14, 217—preserving words of source 15, 18, 106, 237, *contra* 159, 242—construction of *ἐγένετο* for *ἦν* 16 f., 70, 233—was “Hebrew’s Gospel” a source? 26—misusing a literary word? 26—recalling Homer? 26—use of *ὁ* 71—projected third treatise? 79—use of “dual” words 79 f.—*δοῦναι* 91 f.—pres. for aor. imper. 119—historic pres. 121—prohibitions 124—iterative *δύ* 167 f.—optative 165, 195, 198 f.—“correct” use of *πρὶν* 169, 199—preference for pres. imper. compared with Mt 174—*ἀρχόμενοι* 182, 240—*οὐ μή* 190 f.—hymns in, their use of infin. 210—acc. c. inf. 211—*τοῦ* c. inf. 216 f.—literary survival of *ὁ* c. partic. 232—his two editions 233—*ἐλαίων* 69, 235—artic. nom. of address 235—*εὐχάριστος* 236—compound verbs 237—see *Acts*
- LXX—see *Septuagint*
- Lycæonian 7 f., 233
- Lystra—see *Lycæonian*
- Magnesia 29, 38, 43
- Manuscripts of NT, orthography tested 42–56
- Marcion 114
- Mark: uncultured Greek 50, 53, 71—dative 62—*eis* and *ἐν* 62—the Middle 159—*δταν*, etc. c. indic. 168—subj. in comparisons 185—fut. c. *οὐ μή* 190, 191—optative 195—compound verbs 237—rich in Aramaism 242
- Matthew: improves Greek of his source 15, 124, 159, 200, 237, 242—*καὶ ἰδοὺ* 17—historic present 121—prohibitions 124—*αοριστὶν* 137–140—*αοριστικὰ γέγονα* 146—preference for aor. imper. in Sermon on the Mount 174, (119)—*οὐ μή* 190, 191,—*τοῦ* c. inf. 216—superlative *εὐχάριστος* 236—compound verbs 237
- Middle: of *εἶμι* 36 f., 55 f.—with and without expressed personal pronoun (gen. or dat.) 85, 157, 236 f.—primitive differentia 152, 238—in Sanskrit, Latin, and Keltic 153—“Deponents” 153—links with the strong perfect 154, and with future 154 f.—how far reflexive 155 f., 238—evolution of a passive 156—compared with English verbs that are both transitive and intransitive 156 f.—paraphrased by reflexive in dative case 157—typical *exx.* 157—reciprocal 157—dynamic 158—mental action 158—differences between Attic and Hellenistic 158 f.—“incorrect” uses in NT and papyri 159 f.—Paul not implicated 160—*αἰεῖν* and *αἰεῖσθαι* 160 f.—middle and passive aorists 161 f.—verbs in which active became obsolete, or was recoinced out of a deponent 162—common ground between middle and passive 162 f.
- Misplacement of article 84
- Misuse of old literary words 26
- Mixed declension 49
- Modern Greek: *καὶ* in place of *ὑποταξίς* 12—used as a criterion against Semitism xviii, 17, 94—study comparatively recent 22, 29—dialects in 23 (see *Pontic* and *Zaconian*)—the written language (see *Atticism* and *καθαρεύουσα*)—use of the modern vernacular in NT study 29 f.—versions of NT 30 (see Index I (e), p. 265)—Ionic forms in 38—parti-

eiple now indeclinable 60, 225—gender changes 60—the dative obsolete 60, 63—vocative 71—article as a relative 81—redundant personal or demonstrative pronoun 85, 94—relative 94—interrogative 94, 95—cardinals as ordinals 96—indefinite article 96—distributives 97—supports Purdie's thesis on the constative 115—present tense for our perfect, with words of duration 119—historic present alternating with aorist 121, 139—pres. and aor. subj. in prohibition 122—imper. in prohibition 122, 164—imperf. and aor. compared 128 f.—idiom of ἐξέστη 134—gnomic aorist 135—the perfect obsolete 141 f.—use of Middle 156, 157—new active verbs 162—subj. for relics of *ἄν* 167—negatives 169, 170, 232—auxiliaries forming imperative 175 f., 178, and future 179, 185—sole survival of optative 194, of learned origin 240—infinitive obsolete, except in Pontic (*q. v.*) 205—early date of its characteristics illustrated 233 f.—periphrastic future 234, 240—the parenthetic nominative 235—see Index I (*c*), p. 265, and II, p. 269
Modus irrealis 164, 199–201
 Moeris 46, 55
 Month, numerals for days of 96
 Moods: common subjective element 164—other common ground 165—*ἄν* in connexion with 165–169—negatives (*q. v.*) 169–171 *al*—see under *Imperative, Injunctive, Optative, Subjunctive*, and *Modus irrealis*
 Mystical *ἄν* of Paul 68, 103
 Narrative, tenses in 135
 Nasal in word-endings 45, 49
 Negative adjective c. gen. 74, 235
 Negatives: in Atticists 25—in NT and papyri 39, 169–171, 177, 184, 185, 187–194, 200, 229, 231 f., 239, 240
 Neuter plurals 57 f.
 "Neutral" text—see *β-text*
 New Testament, how far its diction peculiar 19 f., 67 f.
 Nominative: as receiver of unappropriated uses 69—name-case unassimilated 69, 235—*nominativus pendens* 69, 225—parenthetic in time expressions and *εἰκόβες* 70, 235—articular in address 70 f., 235—replaced as predicate by *εἰς* c. acc. 71 f.—personal pronouns not always emphatic 85 f.—for accus. as subject to infin. 212 f.
 Nonthematic present stems 38, 55
 North-West Greek 33, 36 f., 55

Nouns: in *-ῶ* and *-ῶα* 38, 48—heteroclisus 48, 60—contracted 48—in *-οῦ* passing into 3rd decl. 48—in *-ις*, *-ιν*, from *-ιος* and *-ιων* 48 f.—mixed declension 49—accusatives with added *-ν* 49—number 57–59—gender 59 f.—breach of concord 59 f.—case 60–76, 234–236
 Number: disappearance of dual 57 f., 77 f.—neuter plural, history and syntax of 57 f.—"Pindaric" construction 58, 234—impersonal plural 58 f., 163—*ἡμεῖς* for *ἐγώ* 86 f., 246
 Numerals: *εἰς* as an ordinal 95 f., 237—ordinals in MGR 96—simplified "teens" 96—*εἰς* as indefinite article 96 f.—*ὁ εἰς* 97—repeated to form distributives 97—*εὐδοοῦν Νῶε* in AV 97 f.—*ἐβδόμηκοστάκις ἐπτά* 98

Object clauses 210–213

Objective Genitive 72, 236

Ὁμολομένη 26

Omission of *ἄν* 194, 198, 200 f.

Optative: in Lucian 25—*δῶν* 55, 193 f.—future 151, 197—origin 164 f.—with *ἄν* 166, 198—after *πρὶν* 169, 199—in command 179—in LXX 194—compared with subj., and with future 194—optative proper 194–197—compared with English survivals 195—in hypothesis 196—differentia of optative conditional sentences 196, 198, 199—in final clauses 196 f.—Atticisers ignorant of sequence 197—misuses in Byzantine Greek 197—potential optative 197–199—attended by *οὐ* and *ἄν* 197—a literary use, but not yet artificial 197—omission of *ἄν* 198—in indirect questions, contrasted with Latin 198 f.—Luke observes sequence 199—*itacism* in late period hastens decay 199, 239, 240

Oratio obliqua 142, 144, 151, 196, 228, 239

Ordinals: use of *εἰς* 95 f., 237—simplified "teens" 96

Origen 139, 169, 247

Orthography: Attic basis 34—a test of *provenance* of MSS 41—correspondence of NT and papyri 42–56

Over-use of vernacular locutions agreeing with Semitic 11, 14, 21, 39, 61, 72, 74, 95, 99, 215, 226, 235, 242

Oxyrhynchus *Logia* 3, 51, 121, 180, 191 f.—MS of Heb 190, 224

Pagan phraseology 84, 102

Papyri: non-literary, their importance brought out by Deissmann 3 f.—education of writers 4 *al* (see *Edu-*

- cation* and *Illiteracy*)—compared with inscriptions 6, 28—remarkable anticipation by Brunet de Presle 6 f.—their character and use 27 f.—exceptions to their general agreement with NT 39, 46, 53—see Index I (d), pp. 252-255
- Parataxis 12, 178, 185, 193
- Parenthetic nom. in time-expressions 69, 235, 245—in descriptions 69
- Participle: pleonastic by Semitism 14, 230, 241—negatives with 25, 229, 231 f., 239—tendency towards indecl. 60—in gen. abs. 74—translating Hebrew inf. abs. 76—present with article 126 f., 228—aorist of coincident or identical action 130-134, 238—that of subsequent action denied 132-134—with *ἄν* 167—for imperative 180-183, 223, 240—for optative 182—overdone by Josephus 189—for indic. 222-225, 241—in periphrastic tenses 226 f.—complementary 228 f.—contrasted with partic. in Latin and English 229—conditional 229 f.—conjunctive, concessive, causal, final, temporal, and attendant circumstances 230—alleged Aramaism 231
- Partitive Genitive: largely replaced by *ἀπό* or *ἐκ* c. abl. 72, 102—possibly with *ὅψι* 72—as subject of a sentence 73, 223
- Passive: no separate forms in Indo-Germanic 108, 152, 156—invasades middle in Greek, Latin and elsewhere 153—evolved from intransitive 156—only partially differentiated in aorist and future 161 f.—common ground with middle 162 f.—replaced largely in Aramaic by impersonal plural 163—not definitely attached to the verbal adjective 221 f.
- Past time 108, 119, 128, 129
- Paul: spoke Greek 7, 19, Latin † 21, 233, Aramaic 7, 10—limited literary phraseology 20—his *ἐν Χριστῷ* 68, 103—use of *οὗ* for *ἰ* 86 f.—use of *between* 99—prohibitions 124-126—perfect 145, 238—middle 160—iterative *ἄν* 167, 168—prefers present imperative 174—imperative participle 181—*οὐ μή* 190—optative 195—acc. et inf.—211—*τοῦ* c. inf. 217—*πρὸς τὸ* and *εἰς τὸ* c. inf. 218 f.—periphrastic tenses 226, 227—*οὐ* c. partic. 232—*ἐλαχίστος* and *ἐλαχιστότερος* 236—compound verbs 237—*μή* in questions 239—*μήτις* 240
- Perfect: action 109, 111—in English, its double force 136
- Perfect: for event on permanent record 129, 142, 143 f.—vivid use for event yet future 134—compared with aorist 140 f.—increasing use in vernacular 141—may be used with a point of time 141, 146—decayed in mediæval Greek 141 f.—obsolete in MGr 141 f.—Latin not responsible 142—characteristic use in Heb 142, 143 f.—combined with aorist 142 f., 238—genuinely aoristic uses possible in Rev 143, 145—broken continuity 144, 145—*εσχηκα* 145, 238—*πέπρακα* 145—*γέγονα* 145 f., 239—with present meaning 147, 176, 238—*κέκραγα* 147—*ἤγγημαι* literary in Ac 148—strong perfect normally intransitive 154—originally voiceless 154—imperative 176—periphrastic forms 176, 226, 227
- Perfective verbs 111-118, 128, 135, 176, Pergamum 29, 38 [237, 247]
- Periphrasis 226 f., 249—see under *Participle*, and the several tenses
- Person-endings 51-54, 152, 154
- Personal Pronouns: alleged Semitism 84 f., 94 f.—emphasis in nominative 85 f.—*ἡμεῖς* for *ἐγώ* 86 f.
- Perspective, action in—see *Constativæ*
- Philo 2, 96—see Index I (e), p. 264
- Phrygian Greek 56—see Index I (e), p. 259
- Phrynichus 39, 194
- Pictorial imperfect 128
- Pindar 214—see Index I (e), p. 263
- Pindaric construction 58, 234
- Place, genitive of 73
- Plato 62, 213, 215—see Index I (e), p. 263
- Pleonasm 14-16, 85, 94 f., 230, 237, 241
- Pluperfect: endings 53—action 113, 148—in conditional sentences, 201
- Plural—see *Number*
- Plutarch: optative 197—*οὐ μή* 239—see Index I (e), p. 264
- Polybius 14, 21, 23, 25, 30, 39, 62, 85, 92, 115-118, 197, 206 f., 247—see Index I (e), p. 264.
- Pontic dialect of MGr 40, 45, 47, 94, 180, 205
- Point action—see *Punctiliar*
- Popular etymology 96
- Position of article 83 f.
- Potential 165, 197-199
- Prayer: the Lord's 10, 173—absence of *ὦ* in 71—Jn 17, use of aorist in 137—aorist imper. appropriate to 173—optative in 195
- Predicate, with *εἰς* 71
- Prepositional clause, anarthrous and articular, 81 f., 236
- Prepositions: added to local cases in

- Greek 61—extended use in Hellenistic, not due to Semitism 61 f.—statistics for classical and post-classical historians 62 f., and for NT 62 f., 98—in composition with verbs 65, 111–118, 128, 237—replacing partitive gen. 72—“Hebraic” phrases 81 f.—dropping of article between prep. and infin. 81, 216—tendency to drop article after 82, 236—combinations with adverbs 99—Semitism 99 f.—with one case 100–104—alleged Latinisms 100–102—over-use paving the way for extinction 103 f.—with two cases 104–106—statistics 105—with three cases 106 f.—adverbs in essence 112—dropped when compound is repeated soon after 115—compounds tend to be used instead of punctiliar simplex 115–118—Polybius using compounds to avoid hiatus 117—NT writers use them less than the *litterateurs* 118—with articular infinitive 216, 218–220, 241—see Index II under the several Prepositions
- Present stem: twenty-three Greek varieties of 109—its linear action 109, 110, 111, 114, 117, 119, 120, 125, 126, 127, 128, 147, 149, 173, 174, 175, 180, 183, 186—iterative action 109, 114, 119, 125, 127, 128, 129, 173, 180, 186, 233—verbs defective in 110 f.—in perfectivised verbs 113 f.—punctiliar action 119 f., 238—contrasted with aorist in prohibitions 122–126—conative action 125, 127, 128 f., 147, 173 f., 186—timeless articular participle 126 f.—statistics with *ἄν* 166—imperative, compared with aorist 173 f., 238—quasi-ingressive in *ἀποχωρεῖν* 174—subjunctive in warning clauses 178—subjunctive with compounds of *ἄν*, compared with aorist 186—participle in periphrasis 227—special uses of *ὁ ἄν* 228—see *Imperfect* and *Present tense*
- Present tense: for future time 114, 120, 167—with *ἔδωκεν*, etc., rendered by our perfect 119—for past time (historic present) 120–122, 139—see *Present stem*
- Prohibition: distinction of present and aorist in 122–126—not originally expressed by imperative, nor now in MGr 164—use of injunctive 165—negative in 169, 187 f., 192—in same category as commands 173—*ὅ μὴ* 187 f.—must be treated here with denial 187 f.
- Pronouns: possessive 40—duality 77, 79 f.—personal 84–87—reflexives 87—unemphatic *ἐαυτοῦ* and *ἑαυτοῦ* 87–90, 237—*ὁ ἑαυτοῦ* 90 f.—*αὐτοῦ* *ὁ* and *ὁ αὐτοῦ* 91—relatives 91–95—interrogatives 93 f., 95
- Pronunciation 28, 33–36, 240, 243, 244—see *Itacism*
- Proper names and Article 83, 236
- Prophecy, use of *shall* in 150 f.
- Protagoras 172
- Psilosis 33, 38, 44
- Punctiliar action 109–111, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 126, 129–131, 135, 145, 149, 173, 174, 186, 222, 247
- Purist school of NT grammarians 3, 242
- Purists in MGr 26, 30, 243—of *Atticism*
- Purpose—see *Final clauses*
- “Q”—see *Logia*
- Qualitative use of anarthrous noun 82 f.
- Quantity, levelling of 84
- Questions: with *μήτε* 170—with *ὅ* 170, 177—with *μή* 170, 192 f., 239—indirect, in optative 196
- Quotations from classical Greek 45, 81, 156, 233, 238 f.
- Quotations from OT 11, 16, 52, 124, 174, 188, 190, 192, 224, 235—see Index I (b), p. 257
- Reciprocal Middle 157
- Reciprocal Pronoun, *ἐαυτοῦ*; used for 87
- Reduplication 109, 142, 145
- Reference, dative of 63, 75
- Reflexive Middle 155–157, 163
- Reflexives: no distinction for persons in plural 87—this confusion illiterate in singular 87—used for *ἄλλήλους* 87—replaced by Semitic use of *ψυχῆ* 87—unemphatic *ἐαυτοῦ* 87–90
- Relative time 148
- Relatives: pleonastic demonstrative with 85, 94 f., 237—*ὅστις* 91–93—attraction 92 f.—confused with interrogatives 93 f.—with *ἄν* (*ἐάν*) 166, 234—relative sentences, *μή* in 171, 239—relative clauses replaced by articular participle 228
- Religion: technical language 18—conservative phraseology 20
- Repetition, making distributives and elatives 97
- Reported speech—see *Oratio obliqua*
- Result clauses—see *Consecutive*
- Resurrection, voice of the verbs applied to 163
- Revelation—see *Apocalypse*
- Revised Version of NT: quoted or discussed 20, 50, 69, 72, 75, 90, 91,

- 116, 117, 128, 129, 132, 136-140, 148, 163, 175, 184, 189, 225, 229, 231, 241—margin 65, 66, 75, 78, 98, 137, 148, 163, 221, 222—the First Revision 83, 156, 180
- Rhetoric, rules for command in 172
- Rome, Greek used at 5, 242
- Sahidic 80
- Sanskrit: survival of Indo-Germanic cases 61—locative of indirect object 104—*aorist* of "thing just happened" 135—future in *-syāmi* 149—grammarians' names for active and middle 153—2 sing. mid. secondary suffix *-thās* compared with Greek weak *aorist* passive 161—survival of the injunctive 165—imperative suffix *-tāt* 172—Vedic subjunctive makes in Epic a 1st person imperative 175—Vedic infinitives 203—classical ditto 204—infinitive parallel with *sequimini* 224—parenthetical nominative in time-expression 235—active and middle forms differentiated by *Abhaut* 238
- Scotch parallel to *ἄν* 166, 239
- Second Epistle of Peter 78, 98, 171, 238 f.
- Semitism—see *Aramaic* and *Hebraism*
- Septuagint: "translation Greek" of 2 f., 13—Justin Martyr's dependence on 8, 233—*εἰς ἀπάντησιν* in 14—constructions of *ἐγένετο*=*ἦν* 16 f.—extent of Luke's imitation 18—Hebraisms from this source to be carefully distinguished from Aramaisms 18—3rd pl. in *-σαν* 33, 56—indecl. *πλήρης* 50—gender of *Βαβυλῶν* 59—*ἀθη* for *ἡ* 59—*πιστεύειν* 67 f.—parenthetical nominative 70—violent use of gen. abs. 74—renderings of the Hebrew infin. abs. 75 f.—"exhausted" *ἴδιος* and *ἐαυτοῦ* 88—redundant demonstrative after relative 95, 237—"77 times" 98, 107—uses of *ἐν* 103—*περί* c. dat. 105—*πρός* c. dat. and gen. 106—*πρῶτος* 107—historic pres. 121—*ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν* 131—semi-aoristic perfect 142—*aorist* and perfect together 143—*κέρραγα* and *κράζω* 147—*κοιμᾶν* active 162—*ἀποκεκομμένος* 163—statistics for *ἄν* 166—perf. imper. 176—subj. used for future 185—*οὐ μή* 188, 191 f.—*δῶν* optative 194—*εἰ* c. opt. 196—optative disappearing in final clauses 197—potential opt. 197 f.—*δφελον* 201—articular infin. 220, 241—participle for indicative 224—partic. c. *εἰμι*, disproving Aramaism 226—*ἦ* c. partic. translated with *οὐ* 232—*ἐάν* for *ἄν* 234—articular nom. in address 235—*μπα* for *πρώτη* 237—statistics for infin. 241—Mk little influenced by 242—see under *Quotations*, and Index I (b), p. 250
- Sequence, rules of: Luke observes with *πρὶν* 169, 199—breach of 197—in indirect question 199
- Sermon on the Mount, respective proportions of *aorist* and present imper. in Mt and Lk 174
- Sextus Empiricus 52
- Shall* and *Will* 150 f.
- Simple conditions 173
- Sinaiticus, Codex 34, 35, 38, 42, 45, 47, 52, 53, 55, 65, 90, 133, 181, 190 *al*
- Slavonic: perfective compounds 111—future from that in *-syō* (obsolete) 149—cf *Lithuanian*
- Sophocles 215—see Index I (c), p. 268
- Sources for study of *Κοινή* 22 f., 27-30
- Sparta 24, 32
- Spoken Greek—see *Vernacular*
- Style, in Luke and Heb (g.v.) 18
- Subjective genitive 72, 236—moods 164—negative 169 f.
- Subjunctive: itacistic confusions with indicative 35—forms in contract verbs 54—*δωη* 55, 193 f., 196—origin 164—relation to injunctive 165—after compounds of *ἄν* 166, 186, 239, 240—after *πρὶν* (ἦ) *ἄν* 169—after *εἰ μήτι* *ἄν* 169, 239—negatives 170, 184 f., 187 f., 190, 192—1st person volitive used to supplement imperative 175, 177—ditto in 2nd and 3rd person 177 f.—volitive in positive commands 177 f.—c. *ἴνα* as an imperative 177 f.—its tone in command 178—with *μή* in warning 178, 184—present allowed here 178—classified 184—volitive 184 f.—deliberative 184, 185—futuristic 184, 185, 186, 192, 240—future indic. trespasses on all three 184 f., 240—volitive clauses of purpose 185 (see *Final*)—futuristic with *ἐάν* and *δρα* (g.v. in Index II), etc. 185—in comparisons 185 f.—tenses of 186—with *εἰ* 187, 239—has excluded optative from final clauses 196 f.—c. *ἴνα* has become equivalent of infin. 205 (see *ἴνα* in Index II)
- Subsequent action, alleged aor. partic. of 132-134
- Suffixes—see severally in Index II
- Superfluous words—see *Pleonasm*
- Superlative 78 f., 236
- Syncretism of cases 61, 72, 104—of tenses in English 135
- Synoptic question, grammatical points in 15-18, 71, 95, 103, 104, 105, 124,

- 174, 175, 189-192, 224, 226 f., 231, 236, 241, 242—see under *Matthew, Mark, Luke*
- Syntax: alleged Semitisms in 12 f.—Latinisms 21
- Syriac 104, 241, 244—see *Lewis*, and cf *Aramaic*
- Syriac Recension 42, 53—see *a-text*
- Teleology 219
- Telic—see *Final clauses*
- Temporal Participle 230
- Tenses: connexion with time unoriginal 108 f., 119—with *εἰ* 166, 186—in conditional sentences 166, 201—in infinitive 204—in verbal adjective 221—see under the several Tenses
- Tertullian 69
- Textual Criticism: pronunciation bearing on 34-36—*α*, *β* and *δ* text (*q.v.*)—see also under *Alexandrinus, Bezae, Sinaiticus, Vaticanus*, etc.
- "Textus Receptus"—see *a-text*
- Thematic vowel 171
- Thucydides 25, 62, 215, 216—see Index I (*ε*), p. 263
- Time: cases expressing 63, 70, 72, 73, 75—connexion with tense unoriginal 108 f., 119—expressed by augment, and possibly by suffix *-ι* 123—the perfect accompanied by mark of 141
- Timelessness: participles 126 f., 134—perfect and aorist 134
- Traditional spelling 85 f.
- "Translation Greek" 4, 18, 39, 59, 76, 102, 104, 105, 106, 188 f., 237, 240, 242, 248—see *Hebraism* and *Aramaic*
- Translations of NT: Latin, Syriac, Sahidic, Bohairic, Gothic (*q.v.*)—Hebrew (Delitzsch) 104, 163—MGr (Pallis and E.F.B.S.) 22, 30—see Index I (*ε*), p. 265
- Uncontracted vowels 38, 48, 54 f., 234
- Unemphatic pronouns 85—*ἐναυροῦ* and *ἑἰς* 87-90
- Unfulfilled condition 171, 196, 199-201—wish 200—purpose 201
- Unification of Greek dialects 30
- Uniformity of *Κοινή* 5 f., 19, 38-41
- Universal language, Greek as a 5 f., 19, 28 f., 31
- Vase-inscriptions, Attic 31, 33
- Vaticanus, Codex 34, 35, 38, 42, 47, 52, 53, 54, 80, 90, 97, 131, 133, 159, 169, 181, 190, 244 *al*—see *β-text*
- Verba dicendi et cogitandi* 239
- Verbal adjectives 221 f.
- Verbs: forms 38, 51-56—in *μ* (see *Nonthematic*)—number 58 f.—transitive and intransitive 64, 65 (*q.v.*)—cases governed by 64-68—*Aktionsart* 108-118, 221 *al* (see *Action-form*)—defectives 110 f.—compounds (*q.v.*)—tenses 119-151 (see under the several tenses)—voice (*q.v.*) 152-163—moods (*q.v.*) 164-201—infinitive and participle (*q.v.*) 202-232
- Vernacular Greek 1, 4 f., 22-41, 83, 85, 183, 234, 239 *al*
- Vocative: not strictly a case 60—relations with articular nominative of address 70 f., 235—few forms surviving 71—anarthrous nominative tends to supplant it 71—progressive omission of *εἰ* 71—like imperative, is an interjection 171
- Voice 152-163, 221, 238 f.—see *Middle Passive, Active*
- Volitive future 150, 151, 177—subjunctive 175, 177 f., 184 f.—see under *Future and Subjunctive*
- Vulgate—see *Latin*
- Wales, bilingualism in 7 f., 10 f.
- "We"-document 217—see *Acts*
- Week, days of 96, 237
- "Western" Text—see *δ-text*
- Wish: optative in 195—unrealised 200 f.—ditto in future with *δφελον* 201
- World-language—see *Universal*
- Wulfila—see *Gothic*
- Xenophon: fore-runner of Hellenism 31—grammar of 62—see Index I (*ε*)
- Xenophon, pseudo- 25—see Index I (*ε*)
- Zaconian, 32, 249
- Zeugma 241

(b) OLD TESTAMENT.

	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
Gen. 3. 20 . . .	235	2 Sam. (2 K.) 19. 28	13	Isai. 31. 4 . . .	185
„ 38. 25 . . .	93	Job 21. 24 . . .	50	„ 37. 38 . . .	244
Num. 21. 14 . . .	235	Isai. 7. 2 . . .	185	„ 63. 2 . . .	50
1 Sam. (1 K.) 20. 3	245	„ 17. 11 . . .	185	Jer. 42 (49). 22	245

APOCRYPHA.

Wis. 7. 14 . . .	245	Wis. 12. 2 . . .	67	Esth. 14. 17 (C. 28)	13
------------------	-----	------------------	----	----------------------	----

(c) INSCRIPTIONS.

Syll.

Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum, iterum ed. W. Dittenberger (Leipzig, 1898, 1900, 1901).

no. 356 . . .	167	no. 540 . . .	240	no. 734 . . .	76
364 . . .	64	549 . . .	240	737 . . .	55
376 . . .	121	578 . . .	46	807 . . .	14, 144
385 . . .	107	653 . . .	46, 80, 101,	850 . . .	107
537 . . .	240		214, 245	928 . . .	227
538 . . .	240	656 . . .	121	930 . . .	81

JHS xxii. 358 . . .	244	BCH xxiv. 339 . . .	244
---------------------	-----	---------------------	-----

(d) PAPYRI AND OSTRAKA.

BM

Vol. iii. (1907—cited by pages).

p. 1 . . .	76	p. 131 . . .	249	p. 136 . . .	58, 228
105 . . .	76				

BU

Vol. i.

no. 5 . . .	240	no. 11 . . .	240	no. 180 . . .	101
-------------	-----	--------------	-----	---------------	-----

Vol. ii.

530 . . .	240
-----------	-----

Vol. iii.

798 . . .	246
-----------	-----

Par P

no. 43 . . .	86	no. 47 . . .	200	no. 58 . . .	55
--------------	----	--------------	-----	--------------	----

PP

Vol. iii.

no. 28 . . .	107	no. 56 . . .	46	no. 65 . . .	46
43 . . .	234				

OP

Vol. iii.

no. 466 . . .	244
---------------	-----

Vol. iv.

no. 743 . . .	194
---------------	-----

Tb P

Vol. i.

no. 16 . . .	xvii, 246	no. 61 . . .	244
--------------	-----------	--------------	-----

Vol. ii. (1907—nos. 285—689)

no. 283 . . .	249	no. 333 . . .	168, 198	no. 412 . . .	159
309 . . .	228	357 . . .	97	413 . . .	237
314 . . .	76	391 . . .	239	414 . . .	177, 178
315 . . .	76	408 . . .	178	526 . . .	240

Hb P

Hibeh Papyri, vol. i. (ed. Grenfell and Hunt, 1906—all iii/b.c.).

PAGE		PAGE		PAGE	
no. 30	99	no. 51	234	no. 77	244
41	176	56	123	78	168
42	76	59	185	96	234
44	246	60	177	168	177
45	129, 177, 247				

EP

Elephantine Papyri, ed. O. Rubensohn (Berlin, 1907—all iv or iii/b.c.).

no. 11	144	no. 13	86
------------------	-----	------------------	----

LI P

Papyrus grecs, from the *Institut Papyrologique de Université de Lille*; ed. P. Jouguet (tome i. fasc. 1, 2, Paris, 1907-8).

no. 1	130, 178
-----------------	----------

Lp P

Griech. Urkunden der Papyrussammlung zu Leipzig, ed. L. Mitteis, vol. i. (Leipzig, 1906).

no. 41	150, 159
------------------	----------

Rein P

Papyrus Th. Reinach (Paris, 1905).

no. 7	200
-----------------	-----

Str P

Strassburg Papyri, ed. Fr. Preisigke, vol. i. part 1, 1906.

no. 22	76
------------------	----

Ostr

Griechische Ostraka, by Ulrich Wilcken. 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1899.)

nos. 1-900	243 f., 246	no. 240	245	no. 927	245
----------------------	-------------	-------------------	-----	-------------------	-----

Mélanges Nicole

Studies, largely papyrological, in honour of Prof. Jules Nicole, Geneva, 1905.

p. 184	244	p. 185	244	p. 281	246
------------------	-----	------------------	-----	------------------	-----

INDEX III.

- Aorist : action-form, 247—expressing immediate past 247—compared with perfect 247 f.
- Aramaic : in Egypt xvi f., 242—infin. for imper. 248
- Attic : treatment of α 244
- Bezae, Codex 56, 244, 249
- Bilingualism 243
- Compound verbs, not confined to literary Greek 237
- Dative : *ethicus* 76—*commodi* 76—illiterate use of gen. for, 245
- Education, varieties of 244
- “ Exhausted ” $\theta\iota\omicron\varsigma$ 246
- Final clauses : weakened *iva* 249
- Genitive : with $\delta\kappa\omicron\upsilon\epsilon\iota\omega$ and $\gamma\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ 245—partitive 245—*els* supplying for possessive 246
- Hebraism : $\epsilon\omega\varsigma \omega\tau\omicron\tau\epsilon$ 107— $\beta\lambda\epsilon\pi\omega\upsilon\alpha\iota$ 107— $\iota\omicron\tau\epsilon \gamma\iota\omega\sigma\kappa\omicron\upsilon\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ 245—use of $\omega\alpha\varsigma$ with negative 245 f.
- Imperfect 243
- Infinitive : for imperative 243—purpose (anarthrous) 249—relations with *iva* 248—in MGr 249

John : use of *ἵνα* 206, 249

Καθαρεύουσα 243, 245, 246

Κωνή : periods in 41, 45, 48—history of name 243

Α, Codex 234

Lexical notes : *εἰς ἀπρότησιν* 242

Literary element in NT 245

Luke : accurate use of *ἡ θεός* 60, 244

Middle : "incorrect" uses 248

Modern Greek : versions of NT 243—*ἡσά* 244—*ἀπό* 245—*τις* 246—survivals 249

Ostraka 243 ff., 283

Partitive gen., replaced by *ἀπό* 245

Paul : literary use of *ἵνα* ? 245—use of perfect 248—Hebraism in ? 245

Perfect : in reff. to Scripture, in Paul 248 combined with aor.—*ἔσχηκα*—248

Plautus 202

Prepositions, replacing partitive 245

Present stem : punctiliar 247—imperative compared with aorist 247

Pronunciation of *η*, *η*, *ει* 41

Revised Version 245

Septuagint : flexion of *-οῦ* nouns, etc. 48—acc. in *-αν* in 3rd decl. 49—*ἐκα-*

θελισθη 56—*οὐθεῖς* and *οὐδέεις* 56—3 pl. opt. in *-σαν* 56—uses of *ἐν* 245

Subjunctive, futuristic 249

Symmachus 245

Textual Criticism : pronunciation bearing on 244—relations of B and D 244, 249

Time, cases expressing 245

Tobit, uses of *ἐν* 245

A GRAMMAR OF
NEW TESTAMENT GREEK

BY
JAMES HOPE MOULTON

M.A., D.LIT., D.D., D.C.L.
D.THEOL. (BERLIN AND GRÖNINGEN)

VOL. IV
STYLE

BY
NIGEL TURNER
B.D., M.Th., Ph.D.

**A Grammar of
New Testament Greek
J. H. Moulton,
Volume II**

J. H. Moulton

T&T CLARK

**A GRAMMAR OF
NEW TESTAMENT GREEK**

This page intentionally left blank

A GRAMMAR OF
NEW TESTAMENT GREEK
J. H. MOULTON

VOLUME II

ACCIDENCE AND WORD-FORMATION
WITH AN APPENDIX ON
SEMITISMS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

J. H. MOULTON
W. F. HOWARD



T & T CLARK INTERNATIONAL
A Continuum imprint
LONDON • NEW YORK

T & T Clark
A Continuum Imprint

Continuum
The Tower Building
11 York Road
London SE1 7NX, UK

15 East 26th Street
New York 10010
USA

www.continuumbooks.com

Copyright © T&T Clark Ltd, 1963

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of T&T Clark Ltd.

Latest impression 1996
Reprinted 2003, 2004

ISBN 0 567 01012 0

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Printed and bound in Great Britain by Biddles Ltd, *www.biddles.co.uk*

PREFACE TO VOLUME II.



At last, with the publication of Part iii., the second volume of Moulton's *Grammar of New Testament Greek* is brought to a close. The reader may be reminded that before sailing for India in October 1915 Dr. Moulton had finished the MS of Parts i. and ii., and had already written the important chapter upon Word-Composition for Part iii. His intention was to complete Part iii. with a chapter on Word-Formation by Suffixes, and to enrich the volume with an introductory chapter on New Testament Greek, which would lead up to an Appendix on Semitisms in the Greek Testament. In writing this Appendix he counted on the collaboration of his colleague the Rev. C. L. Bedale, a Semitic scholar of real distinction and great promise. Dr. Moulton died in the Mediterranean in April 1917, a victim of the ruthless submarine campaign. Mr. Bedale died in a military hospital at Cambridge on 8th March 1919.

The editor, a former pupil of Dr. Moulton at Didsbury College, who had also worked under his guidance as a research student in Hellenistic Greek at Manchester University, was entrusted with the responsible duty of completing this volume and seeing it through the press. Part i. appeared in 1919, Part ii. in 1921. Meanwhile death had removed another worker whose tireless industry and unslumbering vigilance were well known to other toilers in this field. How sorely the editor has missed the help of Mr. Henry Scott may be gauged by comparing the number of misprints in Part ii. with the few corrections to be made in Part i., which owed so much to his careful reading of the proofs. Beyond writing the last thirteen

pages of the Introduction, the editor's responsibility in preparing the first two parts for publication was limited to the verification or insertion of numerous references and the less important though exacting labours of proof-correction.

It is in the third part which now appears that the reader will recognise the immeasurable loss which this Grammar has suffered through the death of its brilliant author. Happily the chapter on Word-Composition can be printed almost exactly as it left the writer's hands. Every student of New Testament lexicography will be grateful for this last gift of a great philologist. In passing to the chapter on Suffixes, the reader cannot fail to notice an abrupt change. No one is more acutely conscious of the reader's loss than the editor himself. In all matters of comparative philology, Dr. Moulton wrote with the authority of a master. The editor can only claim to have exercised the diligence of the scribe. He gladly acknowledges his debt to two writers in particular where many might be named. The late Karl Brugmann's compendious *Vergleichende Grammatik* has been in constant use, and his *Griechische Grammatik* (edited by Albert Thumb in Iwan Müller's *Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*) has been a close companion for years past. Grateful acknowledgment is also made to Professor Albert Debrunner, formerly of Bern, now of Jena, for his useful manual in Max Niedermann's *Sprachwissenschaftliche Gymnasialbibliothek*, as well as for his contributions to the *Indogermanische Forschungen*. Other debts are freely acknowledged throughout the chapter.

The discussion about the Semitic element in the Greek of the New Testament has passed into a new phase since Dr. Moulton projected his Appendix in conjunction with Mr. Bedale. This is chiefly due to three great Semitic scholars who have challenged the accepted theory regarding the original language in which the Acts, the Apocalypse, and the Fourth Gospel were written. Professor Torrey's brilliant work on the Composition and Date of Acts appeared in 1916, but the editor first met with it while

on a visit to America shortly after the war, when the first part of the Grammar had already passed through the press. Archdeacon Charles had already impressed Dr. Moulton by some of his arguments in *Studies in the Apocalypse*, but the exhaustive examination of the grammar of Revelation came before the public with the issue of the International Critical Commentary upon that book in the autumn of 1920. The lamented Professor Burney's *Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel* appeared in the summer of 1922. These books have aroused learned discussion among both Hellenists and Semitists, and the time has come for a critical survey of this entire field in its bearing upon the Grammar of New Testament Greek. If some readers are disposed to lament the long delay in completing the publication of this volume, others will be thankful that it has been possible to take full account of the most important literature since Wellhausen's *Einleitung*, including the revised edition of Radermacher's *Neutestamentliche Grammatik* and the valuable linguistic studies by the eminent Semitist Père Lagrange, in his Commentaries on Luke (1921), Matthew (1923), and John (1925).

Another feature in the Appendix deserves special mention. When the MS had already gone to the publisher in the spring of 1927 the editor had the good fortune to read a thesis by Dr. R. McKinlay, dealing with Semitisms in the New Testament in the light of later popular Greek. It is to be hoped that this valuable work will soon find a publisher. Meanwhile, by the kindness of the author, the editor has been allowed to insert within square brackets an allusion to this work wherever Dr. McKinlay has proved that an alleged Semitism is an established construction in either Medieval or Modern Greek. The actual evidence will be forthcoming when the thesis is published.

A word may be permitted with regard to the Indices. Limits of space forbid the registering of every Greek word that occurs in this volume. But prepositional compounds will generally be found by consulting the index under the prepositions, and

most other words can be traced under the suffix heading. Words about which special information is given and those which occur more than once in the book are included to facilitate cross-reference. The index of papyrus citations has been prepared with special care. Almost without exception these quotations have been made from the original collections. For the benefit, however, of those students who have not access to the principal collections, the editor has provided a list of all the citations which can be consulted in the well-known selections edited by Wilcken, Mitteis, Milligan, and Witkowski.

It now remains to acknowledge with warmest gratitude the help so generously given by friends. From the first Professor Milligan has put his great knowledge and experience at the editor's disposal, and has encouraged him in many ways. The late Mr. Henry Scott read the proofs of Part i. with minute care. Mr. E. E. Genner, Fellow of Oriël, was kind enough to read the first proofs of Part iii. Numerous footnotes testify to his learned suggestions, but it would be impossible to indicate the extent of his ungrudging kindness. He not only discovered many misprints that might have escaped the editor's eye, but he also saved him from careless blunders of a more serious kind. Only those who have had experience of the unselfish help so freely given by this most accurate of scholars can guess how deep is the obligation under which both editor and reader stand to Mr. Genner. Three Handsworth colleagues, the Rev. Dr. W. F. Lofthouse, the Rev. Henry Bett, and the Rev. C. R. North, with all their customary kindness, have read through the page proofs and ensured greater accuracy, and Mr. North has also helped where the pointing of Aramaic words was in doubt. It is a special delight to record this assistance given by one who laid the foundations of his wide Semitic scholarship under the inspiring teaching of Charles Bedale.

No words can express the editor's grateful sense of the generous encouragement and the patient forbearance shown by the publishers, Messrs. T. & T. Clark whose disinterested service

to the cause of biblical scholarship has long been a tradition throughout the theological world. Gratitude is also due to Messrs. Morrison & Gibb, for their skill and care, as well as for their patience, in setting and resetting the type at all the tedious stages by which this volume has passed through the press.

Whatever be the imperfections in the pages for which the editor himself is solely responsible (*i.e.* pp. 22-34 and 332-543), he desires to express his humble gratitude for the privilege that has fallen to him of preparing this legacy of his beloved teacher for the press, and of making it available by means of cross-references and indices as a standard work of reference for all students of the Greek Testament.

W. F. HOWARD.

HANDSWORTH COLLEGE,
July 1923.

This page intentionally left blank

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	1
PART I. SOUNDS AND WRITING.	
THE ALPHABET	37
Classification of Sounds	40
Pronunciation	41
MODERN PRINTED GREEK. Punctuation	46
SOUNDS AND ORTHOGRAPHY—	
Accentuation	51
Syllabification	60
Elision	61
Crisis	63
Vowels	64
Prothesis	89
Contraction	89
Syncope	92
Pronunciation of the Vowels	93
Aspiration	97
Single and Double Consonants	101
Intrusive Consonants	103
Liquids and Nasals	103
Sibilants	106
Gutturals	108
Labials	109
Dentals	110
Movable Letters	112
PART II. ACCIDENCE.	
DEFINITE ARTICLE	117
NOUNS—	
First Declension	117
Second Declension	120

	PAGE
Metaplasms and Heteroclisia	124
Third Declension	128
Declension of Semitic Names	143
Declension of Non-Semitic Names	150
Miscellaneous Foreign Words and Irregular Flexions	152
Latin Nouns	155
ADJECTIVES	155
ADVERBS	163
Comparison of Adjectives and Adverbs	164
NUMERALS	167
PRONOUNS	178
VERBS	182
Conjugation and Tense Stems	183
Augment and Reduplication	188
A. Present Stems—	
(a) Thematic—	
Active Voice	193
Middle and Passive Voices	197
(b) Unthematic—	
Active Voice	201
Middle and Passive Voices	205
B. Strong Aorist Stem—	
Active Voice	208
Middle Voice	212
Passive Voice	213
C. Weak Aorist Stem—	
Active Voice	215
Middle Voice	216
Passive Voice	217
D. Future Stem—	
Active and Middle Voices	218
Passive Voice	219
E. Perfect Stem—	
Active Voice	220
Middle and Passive Voices	223
F. Verbals	224
LIST OF VERBS	224

PART III. WORD-FORMATION.

	PAGE
WORD-COMPOSITION	268
NOUNS. Classification—	
I. Co-ordinative Compounds	269
II. Iteratives	270
III. Dependent Determinatives	271
IV. Descriptive Determinatives	276
V. Possessive Compounds	283
VI. Verbal Compounds	288
VII. Compounds based on Prepositional Phrases	291
PREPOSITIONS—	
I. Praeverbia	293
II. Proper Prepositions	294
1. 'Αμφί; 2. 'Ανά; 3. 'Αντί; 4. 'Από; 5. Διά;	
6. Εἰς; 7. 'Εν; 8. 'Εξ; 9. 'Επί; 10. Κατά;	
11. Μετά; 12. Παρά; 13. Περὶ; 14. Πρὸ;	
15. Πρός; 16. Σύν; 17. 'Υπέρ; 18. 'Υπό.	
III. Improper Prepositions	328
WORD-FORMATION BY SUFFIXES—	
NOUNS AND ADJECTIVES	332
Formative Suffixes	333
A. Vowel Suffixes	334
B. Nasal Suffixes	350
C. Liquid Suffixes	360
D. Suffixes with Labial Stops	364
E. Suffixes with Dental Stops	364
F. Suffixes with Guttural Stops	376
G. Stems in -σ-	381
VERBS—	
Class I. Person suffixes added to the root	381
" II. With formative suffix in -ν-	382
" III. With formative suffix in εο : εε	382
" IV. Suffixes in σκο : σκε	383
" V. Suffixes in το : τε	383
" VI. Suffixes in θο : θε	383
" VII. Suffixes in γο : γε	383
i. Vocalic γο- presents	383
Verbs in 1. -άω; 2. -έω; 3. -όω; 4. -ίω;	
5. -ύω; 6. -εύω.	

	PAGE
ii. Consonantal <i>yo-</i> presents	400
<i>A.</i> Verbs in 1. <i>-αίρω</i> ; 2. <i>-ύνω</i>	401
<i>B.</i> Verbs in 1. <i>-αίρω</i> ; 2. <i>-είρω</i> ; 3. <i>-ύρω</i>	402
<i>C.</i> Verbs in 1. <i>-πρω</i> ; 2. <i>-σσω</i>	403
<i>D.</i> Verbs in <i>-ζω</i>	404
1. <i>-άζω</i> ; 2. <i>-ίζω</i> ; 3. <i>-ύζω</i> ; 4. <i>-έζω</i> ; 5. <i>-όζω</i> .	
APPENDIX—SEMITISMS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT	411
INDEX I.—QUOTATIONS. (a) New Testament	487
(b) Old Testament	501
(c) Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of Old Testament	502
(d) Early Christian Writings	502
(e) Inscriptions and Ostraca	503
(f) Papyri	506
(g) Greek Literature	512
(h) Latin	516
" II.—WORDS AND FORMS. (a) Greek	517
(b) Modern Greek	533
(c) Hebrew and Aramaic	534
" III.—SUBJECTS	536

ABBREVIATIONS.



THE abbreviations for papyri and inscriptions are given in Index I (e) and (f), pp. 503-512 below, with the full titles of the collections quoted.

References are to pages, unless otherwise stated.

- Abbott *JV*=*Johannine Vocabulary*, by E. A. Abbott. London, 1905.
AJP=*American Journal of Philology*. Baltimore, 1880 ff.
AJT=*American Journal of Theology*. Chicago, 1897 ff.
Allen Comm. Matt.=*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel acc. to St Matthew*, by Willoughby C. Allen. 3rd ed. Edinburgh, 1912. (See *ICC*.)
Allen Comm. Mark=*The Gospel acc. to St Mark, with Introduction and Notes*, by Willoughby C. Allen. (The Oxford Church Biblical Commentary), London, 1915.
Archiv—see Index I (e).
Audolent—see Index I (e).
Bauer *HNT*=*Das Johannesevangelium erklärt* von Walter Bauer. 2te Aufl. Tübingen, 1925. (See *HNT*.)
Bauer *Lex.*=*Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur*, von Walter Bauer. Giessen, 1924-28.
Beginnings of Christianity=*The Beginnings of Christianity*, Pt. I., *The Acts of the Apostles*. Edited by F. J. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake. London, vol. i, 1920; vol. ii, 1922; vol. iii, 1926.
Berl. Phil. Woch.=*Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift*.
Bl-D, or Blass-Debrunner=*Friedrich Blass' Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*, bearbeitet von A. Debrunner. Göttingen, 4te Aufl. 1913, 5te 1921.
Blass Gr.=*Grammar of NT Greek*, by F. Blass. English tr. by H. St J. Thackeray. 2nd ed. London, 1905.
Blass Philology=*Philology of the Gospels*, by F. Blass. London, 1898.
Blass Pron.=*Pronunciation of Ancient Greek*. English tr. by Parton, 1890.
Boisacq=*Dictionnaire Étymologique de la Langue Grecque*, par Émile Boisacq. Heidelberg and Paris, 1907-16.
Bonhöffer=*Epiktet und das Neue Testament*, von Adolf Bonhöffer. Giessen, 1911.
Bornhäuser=*Die Bergpredigt. Versuch einer zeitgenössischen Auslegung*, von Karl Bornhäuser. Gütersloh, 1923.
Bousset—see *SNT*.

- Brugmann *Dem.* = *Die Demonstrativpronomina der indogerm. Sprachen* von K. Brugmann. Leipzig, 1904.
- Brugmann *Dist.* = *Die distributiven u. d. kollektiven Numeralia der idg. Sprachen*, von K. Brugmann. Leipzig, 1907.
- Brugmann *Gr.*⁴ or Brugmann-Thumb = *Griechische Grammatik*, von Karl Brugmann. 4te vermehrte Aufl., von Albert Thumb. München, 1913.
- Brugmann *Grd.*² = *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogerm. Sprachen*, von K. Brugmann u. B. Delbrück. Strassburg. 2te Aufl. i., 1897; ii. i, 1906; ii, 1911; iii, 1913-16. (For Syntax see under Delbrück.)
- Brugmann *KVG* = *Kurze vergleichende Grammatik der idg. Sprachen*, von Karl Brugmann. Strassburg, 1904.
- Buck *Gr. Dial.* = *Introduction to the Study of the Greek Dialects*, by C. D. Buck. Boston, 1910.
- Burkitt *Ev. d. M.* = *Evangelion da-Mepharreshe*, collected and arranged by F. C. Burkitt. Cambridge, 1904.
- Burkitt *Gosp. Hist.* = *The Gospel History and its Transmission*, by F. C. Burkitt. 3rd ed. Edinburgh, 1911.
- Burkitt *Syr. Forms* = *Syriac Forms of NT Proper Names*, by F. C. Burkitt. London, 1912.
- Burney *Aram. Orig.* = *The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel*, by C. F. Burney. Oxford, 1922.
- Burney *Poetry* = *The Poetry of our Lord. An Examination of the Formal Elements of Hebrew Poetry in the Discourses of Jesus Christ*, by C. F. Burney. Oxford, 1925.
- Burton *Gal.* = *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians*, by E. De Witt Burton. Edinburgh, 1921. (See *ICC*.)
- Cadbury *AJT* = *Luke—Translator or Author?* by H. J. Cadbury. (Reprint from *AJT* (see above), xxiv, No. 3, July 1920.)
- Cagnat*—see Index I (e).
- Capes *Ach. L.* = *The History of the Achaean League as contained in the remains of Polybius*, edited with introduction and notes by W. W. Capes. London, 1888.
- CBE* = *Cambridge Biblical Essays*, ed. H. B. Swete. London, 1909.
- CGT* = *Cambridge Greek Testament*.
- Chandler = *A Practical Introduction to Greek Accentuation*, by H. Chandler. 2nd ed. Oxford, 1881.
- Charles *Asc. Isai.* = *The Ascension of Isaiah*, translated from the Ethiopic Version, by R. H. Charles. London, 1900.
- Charles *Enoch* = *The Book of Enoch*, ed. by R. H. Charles. Oxford, 1893.
- Charles *Revelation* = *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Revelation of St John*, by R. H. Charles. 2 vols. Edinburgh, 1920. (See *ICC*.)
- Charles *Studies* = *Studies in the Apocalypse*, by R. H. Charles. Edinburgh, 1913.
- Charles *Test. XII Patr.* = *The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, ed. by R. H. Charles. Oxford, 1908.

- Charles—see also under *OA*.
- Chrest.*—see Index I (*f*).
- Cl. Phil.*—*Classical Philology*. Chicago.
- Cobet *NT Vatic.*—*Novum Testamentum Graece ad fidem codicis Vaticanis restitutum*, ab A. Kueno et C. G. Cobeto, cum praefatione Cobeti. Leiden, 1860.
- Conybeare and Stock *Sel.*—*Selections from the Septuagint*, by F. C. Conybeare and St G. Stock. Boston, 1905.
- CQ*—*Classical Quarterly*. London, 1907 ff.
- CR*—*Classical Review* (London, 1887 ff.). Especially reference is made to J. H. Moulton's collection of forms and examples from the papyri in *CR* xv, 31–38 and 434–442 (Feb. and Dec. 1901), and xviii, 106–112 and 151–155 (March and April 1904).
- Crönert *Mem.*—*Memoria Graeca Herculanensis*, by W. Crönert. Leipzig, 1903.
- DAC*—*Dictionary of the Apostolic Church*, ed. by J. Hastings. 2 vols. Edinburgh, 1915, 1918.
- Dalman *Gr.*²—*Grammatik des Jüdisch-Palästinischen Aramäisch*, von Gustaf Dalman. 2te Aufl. Leipzig, 1905.
- Dalman *WJ*—*The Words of Jesus*, by G. Dalman. Eng. ed. tr. D. M. Kay. Edinburgh, 1902.
- Dalman *Wörterbuch*—*Aramäische-neuhebräisches Handwörterbuch zu Targum, Talmud und Midrasch*, von Gustaf H. Dalman. 2te Aufl. Frankfurt a. Main, 1922.
- DB*—*Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. by J. Hastings. 5 vols. Edinburgh, 1898–1904.
- Debrunner-Blass—see *Bl-D*.
- Debrunner *Wortb.*—*Griechische Wortbildungslehre*, von Albert Debrunner. Heidelberg, 1917.
- Deissmann *BS*—*Bible Studies*, by G. A. Deissmann. Eng. ed., including *Bibelstudien* and *Neue Bibelstudien*, tr. by A. Grieve. Edinburgh, 1901.
- Deissmann *In Christo*—*Die neutestamentliche Formel "in Christo Jesu,"* von G. A. Deissmann. Marburg, 1892.
- Deissmann *LAE*—*Light from the Ancient East*. Eng. tr. by L. R. M. Strachan. London, 1910. 2nd ed. (4th Germ. ed.), 1927.
- Deissmann *Paul*—*St Paul, A Study in Social and Religious History*. Eng. tr. by L. R. M. Strachan. London, 1912. 2nd ed., Eng. tr. (of 4th Germ. ed.) by W. E. Wilson, 1926.
- Delbrück—*Vergleichende Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*, von K. Brugmann und B. Delbrück. Bde III–V, *Syntax*, von B. Delbrück. Strassburg (i) 1893, (ii) 1897, (iii) 1900. (Large Roman numerals indicate the volume number in the whole Grammar; small Roman numerals in brackets give the volume in Delbrück's *Syntax*.)
- DLZ*—*Deutsche Literaturzeitung*. Leipzig.
- G. R. Driver *Orig. Lang.*—*The Original Language of the Fourth Gospel*. A criticism of Dr Burney's thesis, by G. R. Driver. (Reprinted from the *Jewish Guardian*, Jan. 5 and 12, 1923.)

- S. R. Driver *Tenses*=*A Treatise on the Use of the Tenses in Hebrew*, by S. R. Driver. 3rd ed. Oxford, 1892.
- EBi*=*Encyclopædia Biblica*, ed. by T. K. Cheyne and J. S. Black. 4 vols. London, 1899-1903.
- EGT*=*Expositor's Greek Testament*, ed. by W. Robertson Nicoll. 5 vols. London, 1897-1910.
- Eranos*=*Eranos. Acta philologica Suecana*. Upsala.
- Expos*=*The Expositor*, ed. by W. R. Nicoll, afterwards by James Moffatt. London, 1875-1925. (Cited by series, volume and page.)
- Exp T*=*The Expository Times*, ed. by J. Hastings, afterwards by A. W. and E. Hastings. Edinburgh, 1889 ff.
- Field Notes*=*Notes on the Translation of the New Testament*, by Frederic Field. Cambridge, 1899.
- Fraenkel *Geschichte d. Nom. Ag.*=*Geschichte der griechischen Nomina agentis auf -ῥήρ, -ρωρ, -ρης(-ρ)*, von Ernst Fraenkel. Strassburg, 1910, 1912.
- Fraenkel *ZVS*=(1) Zur Geschichte der Verbalnomina auf -σῖο-, -σῖα. (2) Beiträge zur Geschichte der Adjectiva auf -τικός. Göttingen, 1913. (For *ZVS* see below.)
- G and H—see P Oxy in Index I (f).
- Gea-K (or G-K)=*Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, ed. by E. Kautzsch. Eng. tr. by Collins and Cowley. Oxford, 1910.
- Gildersleeve Studies*=*Studies in Honor of Basil L. Gildersleeve*. Boston, 1902.
- Giles *Manual*²=*A Short Manual of Comparative Philology for Classical Students*, by P. Giles. 2nd ed. London, 1901.
- Goodwin *Gr. Gr*²=*A Greek Grammar*, by W. W. Goodwin. 2nd ed. London, 1894.
- Goodwin *MT*=*Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb*, by W. W. Goodwin. 3rd ed. London, 1889.
- Gregory *Prol.*—see under Ti.
- Guillemard=*Hebraisms in the Greek Testament*, by W. H. Guillemard. Cambridge, 1879.
- Harnack *Luke*=*Luke the Physician*, by A. Harnack. Eng. tr. by J. R. Wilkinson. London, 1907.
- Harnack *Sprüche*=*Sprüche und Reden Jesu*, von A. Harnack. Leipzig, 1907.
- Harnack *Sayings*=*The Sayings of Jesus*. Eng. tr. by J. R. Wilkinson. London, 1908.
- Harris *Codex Bezae*=*A Study of Codex Bezae*, by J. Rendel Harris. Cambridge, 1891.
- Harris *OPJ*=*The Origin of the Prologue to St John's Gospel*, by Rendel Harris. Cambridge, 1917.
- Harris *Testimonies*=*Testimonies*, by Rendel Harris, with the assistance of Vacher Burch. Cambridge, pt. i, 1916; pt. ii, 1920.
- Harsing=*De Optativi in Chartis Aegyptiis Usu*, by Carl Harsing. Bonn, 1910.

- Hatzidakis=*Einleitung in die neugriechische Grammatik*, von G. N. Hatzidakis. Leipzig, 1892.
- Haupt=*Die Gefangenschaftsbriefe* (Meyers Kommentar ü. d. NT), von Erich Haupt. Göttingen, 1902.
- Hawkins *HS*=*Horæ Synopticæ*, by J. C. Hawkins. 2nd ed. London, 1909.
- Heinrici=*Die Korintherbriefe* (Meyers Kommentar), von G. Heinrici. Göttingen, 1896.
- Heinrici Studien*=*Neutestamentliche Studien Georg Heinrici dargebracht*. Leipzig, 1914.
- Helbing *Gr.*=*Grammatik der Septuaginta: Laut- und Wortlehre*, von R. Helbing. Göttingen, 1907.
- Herwerden *Lex.*=*Lexicon Graecum suppletorium et dialecticum*. 2nd ed., 2 vols. Leiden, 1910.
- Hirt *Gram.* or *Hbd.*=*Handbuch der Griechischen Laut- und Formenlehre*, von Herman Hirt. Heidelberg, 1902.
- Hobart=*The Medical Language of St Luke*, by W. K. Hobart. Dublin, 1882.
- HNT*=*Handbuch zum Neuen Testament*, herausgegeben von Hans Leitzmann. Tübingen, 1907.
- H.-R.*=*A Concordance to the Septuagint*, by E. Hatch and H. A. Redpath. Oxford, 1897.
- HTR*=*Harvard Theological Review*. Cambridge, Mass., 1908 ff.
- ICC*=*The International Critical Commentary*. Edinburgh.
- IF* or *Idg F*=*Indogermanische Forschungen*, ed. formerly by K. Brugmann and W. Streitberg. Strassburg, 1892 ff.
- IG, IGSI, IMæ*—see Index I (e).
- James *Lang. of Pal.*=*The Language of Palestine and Adjacent Regions*, by J. Courtney James. Edinburgh, 1920.
- Jannaris *Gr.*=*A Historical Greek Grammar*, by A. N. Jannaris. London, 1897.
- JBL*=*Journal of Biblical Literature*. New Haven, Conn.
- JHS*—see Index I (e).
- Johannessohn *Kasus u. Präp.*=*Der Gebrauch der Kasus und der Präpositionen in der Septuaginta*, von Martin Johannessohn. Teil i. Berlin, 1910.
- JTS*=*Journal of Theological Studies*. Oxford, 1900 ff.
- Kaibel—see Index I (e).
- Kautzsch *Gr.*=*Grammatik des Biblisch-Aramäischen*, von E. Kautzsch. Leipzig, 1884.
- K.Bl. and K.G.—see Kühner.
- Kennedy *EGT*=*The Epistle to the Philipians*, ed. by H. A. A. Kennedy in the *Exp. Greek Testament*, vol. iii. London, 1903.
- Kennedy *Sources*=*Sources of NT Greek*, by H. A. A. Kennedy. Edinburgh, 1895.
- Kieckers—see p. 9 n.¹.
- Knowling=*The Acts of the Apostles*, ed. by R. J. Knowling in the *Exp. Greek Testament*, vol. ii. London, 1900.

- Kretschmer *Einl.* = *Die Einleitung in die Geschichte der griechischen Sprache*, von P. Kretschmer. Göttingen, 1896.
- Kretschmer *Entstehung* = *Die Entstehung der Koine* (Sitzungsberichte d. Wien. Akad., 1900).
- Kretschmer *Vaseninschriften* = *Die griech. Vaseninschriften ihrer Sprache nach untersucht*. Gütersloh, 1894.
- Kühner or K.Bl., K.G = *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*, von R. Kühner. 3te Aufl., Elementar- und Formenlehre, von F. Blass, i, ii. Hannover, 1890-92. Satzlehre, von B. Gerth, i, ii, 1898, 1904.
- Kuhring = *De Praepositionum Graec. in Chartis Aegyptiis Usu*, by W. Kuhring. Bonn, 1906.
- KZ = *Kuhns Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung*. Berlin and Gütersloh, 1852 ff.
- Lagrange *S. Matt.* = *Évangile selon Saint Matthieu* (Études Bibliques), par Le P. M.-J. Lagrange. Paris, 1923.
- Lagrange *S. Marc.* = *Évangile selon Saint Marc* (Ét. Bibl.). Paris, 1920.
- Lagrange *S. Luc.* = *Évangile selon Saint Luc* (Ét. Bibl.). Paris, 1921.
- Lagrange *S. Jean.* = *Évangile selon Saint Jean* (Ét. Bibl.). Paris, 1925.
- Lake *Cod. Sin.* = *Codex Sinaiticus Petropolitanus*. With Introduction by Kirsopp Lake. Oxford, 1911.
- Law = *The Tests of Life. A Study of the First Epistle of St John*, by R. Law. Edinburgh, 1909.
- Lewy *Fremdwörter* = *Die Semitischen Fremdwörter im Griechischen*, von H. Lewy. Berlin, 1895.
- Lietzmann *HNT* = *Handbuch zum NT*, iii. 1. Römerbrief, I. u. II. Korinther-, Galaterbrief, erklärt von Hans Lietzmann. Tübingen, 1906 ff.
- J. Lightfoot *Hor. Hebr.* = *Horae Hebraicae et Talmudicae*, by John Lightfoot (1658). Oxford, 1859.
- J. B. Lightfoot *Ep. Ign. ad Polyc.* = *The Apostolic Fathers*, by J. B. Lightfoot, part ii, 3 vols. 2nd ed. London, 1889.
- Lightfoot *Fresh Revision* = *On a Fresh Revision of the English New Testament*, by J. B. Lightfoot. London, 1891.
- Lightfoot *Notes* = *Notes on Epistles of St Paul from Unpublished Commentaries*, by J. B. Lightfoot. London, 1895.
- Lindsay = *The Latin Language*, by W. M. Lindsay. Oxford, 1894.
- Lipsius *Gr. Unt.* = *Grammatische Untersuchungen über die bibl. Gräcität*, von K. H. A. Lipsius. Leipzig, 1863.
- Lob. *Paral.* = *Paralipomena Grammaticae Graecae*, by C. A. Lobeck. Leipzig, 1837.
- Lob. *Phryn.* = *Phrynichi Ecloga*, ed. C. A. Lobeck. Leipzig, 1820.
- Lohmeyer *HNT* = *Handbuch z. NT*, iv. 1. Die Offenbarung des Johannes, erklärt von Ernst Lohmeyer. Tübingen, 1926.
- LS = *A Greek-English Lexicon*, by H. G. Liddell and R. Scott. 8th ed. Oxford, 1901. (The new LS = a new edition, revised and augmented throughout by Henry Stuart Jones. Oxford, 1925.)

- Margolis Gr.**—*A Manual of the Aramaic Language of the Babylonian Talmud.* Grammar, Chrestomathy and Glossaries, by Max L. Margolis. München, 1910.
- Marti Gr. (or K. Gr.)**—*Kurzgefasste Grammatik der Biblisch-Aramäischen Sprache,* von Karl Marti. 4te Aufl. Berlin, 1911.
- Mayor Comm. James**—*The Epistle of St James.* The Greek text with introduction, notes and comments, by J. B. Mayor. 3rd ed. London, 1910.
- Mayor Comm. Jude and 2 Pet.**—*The Epistle of St Jude and the Second Epistle of St Peter.* Greek text with introduction, notes and comments, by J. B. Mayor. London, 1907.
- Mayser Gr.**—*Grammatik der gr. Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit,* von E. Mayser. Leipzig, i. 1906; ii. 1. Berlin u. Leipzig, 1926.
- McKinlay**—*Semitisms in the New Testament in the Light of Later Popular Greek.* Unpublished thesis by R. McKinlay.
- McNeile Comm. Matt.**—*The Gospel acc. to St Matthew.* The Greek text with introduction, notes and indices by A. H. McNeile. London, 1915.
- Meisterhans²**—*Grammatik der attischen Inschriften,* von K. Meisterhans. 3te Aufl. von E. Schwyzer. Berlin, 1900.
- Mélanges Nicole**—see Index I (e).
- Melcher**—*De Sermone Epicteteo quibus rebus ab Attica regula discedat,* by P. Melcher. Halle, 1906.
- Merx**—*Die vier kanonischen Evangelien nach ihrem ältesten bekannten Texte,* von Adalbert Merx. Berlin, 1902–11.
- Meyer Gr.**—*Griechische Grammatik,* von Gustav Meyer. 3te Aufl. Leipzig, 1896.
- Milligan Selections**—see Index I (f).
- Milligan Thess.**—*St Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians,* the Greek text, with introduction and notes, by G. Milligan. London, 1908.
- Mitteis Papyruskunde.**—*Grundzüge und Chrestomathie der Papyruskunde,* II. i., ed. L. Mitteis. See under Wilcken, also Index I (f).
- Moeris**—*Moeridis Lexicon Atticum,* ed. J. Pierson. Leiden, 1759.
- Moffatt ICC**—*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews,* by James Moffatt. Edinburgh, 1924.
- Moffatt Introd.**—*Introduction to the Literature of the NT.* Edinburgh, ed.² 1912, ed.³ 1918.
- Moffatt NT**—*A New Translation of the NT.* 3rd ed. London, 1914.
- Monro Hom. Gr.**—*A Grammar of the Homeric Dialect,* by D. B. Monro. 2nd ed. Oxford, 1891.
- Moulton Christian Religion**—*The Christian Religion in the Study and the Street,* by J. H. Moulton. London, 1918.
- Moulton Einl.**—*Einleitung in die Sprache des Neuen Testaments.* (Translated, with additions, from Proleg.³) Heidelberg, 1911.
- Moulton Prol. or Proleg.³**—*A Grammar of NT Greek,* by James Hope Moulton. Vol. i, Prolegomena. 3rd ed. Edinburgh, 1908.
- Nachmanson Beitr.**—*Beiträge zur Kenntnis der altgriechischen Volkssprache,* von E. Nachmanson. Upsala, 1910.

- Nachmanson *Magn.* = *Laute und Formen der Magnetischen Inschriften*, von E. Nachmanson. Upsala, 1903.
- Nägeli = *Der Wortschatz des Apostels Paulus*. Beitrag zur sprachgeschichtlichen Erforschung des Neuen Testaments, von Theodor Nägeli. Göttingen, 1905.
- Nöldeke *Beitr.* = *Beiträge z. semit. Sprachwissenschaft*, von Theodor Nöldeke. Strassburg, 1904.
- Nöldeke *Syr. Gr.*² = *Kurzgefasste syrische Grammatik*, von Theodor Nöldeke. 2te Aufl. Leipzig, 1898.
- Norden *Agnostos Theos* = *Untersuchungen zur Formengeschichte religiöser Rede*, von Eduard Norden. Leipzig, 1913.
- Norden *Ant. Kunstprosa* = *Die antike Kunstprosa vom VI Jahrhundert v. Chr. bis in die Zeit der Renaissance*, von E. Norden. 2 Bde. Leipzig, 1915.
- O(xford) *A(pocrypha)* = *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English*, ed., in conjunction with many scholars, by R. H. Charles. 2 vols. Oxford, 1913.
- OCT (Oxford Classical Texts) = *Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis*.
- OGIS—see Index I (e).
- OHL (or *Oxf. Heb. Lex.*) = *Hebrew and English Lexicon of the OT*, ed. by F. Brown, S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs. Oxford, 1906.
- Ottley *Isaiah* = *The Book of Isaiah acc. to the Septuagint*, trans. and ed. by R. R. Ottley. 2 vols. 2nd ed. Cambridge, 1909.
- Oxford Studies* = *Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, ed. by W. Sanday. Oxford, 1911.
- Parry = *The Pastoral Epistles*, with introduction, text and commentary, by R. St J. Parry. Cambridge, 1920.
- Peake's Commentary* = *A Commentary on the Bible*, ed. by Arthur S. Peake. Edinburgh, 1919.
- Pelagia* = *Legenden der heiligen Pelagia*, ed. H. Usener. Bonn, 1879.
- Petersen *Gr. Dim.* = *Greek Diminutives in -ION*. A Study in Semantics, by Walter Petersen. Weimar, 1910.
- v. d. Pfordten = *Zur Geschichte der griechischen Denominativa*, von H. F. von der Pfordten. Leipzig, 1886.
- Preisigke *Ostr.* and *Sammelb.*—see Index I (e).
- Prellwitz = *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der griechischen Sprache*, von Walther Prellwitz. Göttingen, 1892.
- Psichari = *Essai sur le Grec de la Septante*, par Jean Psichari. (Extrait de la *Revue des Études juives*, Avril 1908.) Paris, 1908.
- Radermacher *Gr.* = *Neutestamentliche Grammatik (HNT i. 1)*, von L. Radermacher. Tübingen, 1911. 2te Aufl., 1925.
- Ramsay *C. and B.*—see Index I (e).
- Ramsay *Paul* = *Paul the Traveller and Roman Citizen*, by W. M. Ramsay. 3rd ed. London, 1897.
- Ramsay *Teaching of Paul* = *The Teaching of Paul in the Terms of the Present Day*. London, 1913.
- REGr = *Revue des Études grecques*. Paris, 1888 ff.

- Reinhold=*De Graecitate Patrum*, by H. Reinhold. Halle, 1898.
- Riddell=*A Digest of Platonic Idioms*, by J. Riddell (in his edition of the *Apology*). Oxford, 1867.
- R. McK.—see under McKinlay.
- Roberts=*Introduction to Greek Epigraphy*, by E. S. Roberts. Cambridge, 1887.
- Robertson Gr.=*Grammar of the Greek Testament in the Light of Historical Research*, by A. T. Robertson. New York, 1914. 3rd ed., 1919.
- Rosberg=*De Praepositionum Graecarum in Chartis Aegyptiis Ptolemaeorum Aetatis Ueu.* C. Rosberg. Jena, 1909.
- Rouffiac=*Recherches sur les caractères du grec dans le Nouveau Testament d'après les inscriptions de Priène*, par Jean Rouffiac. Paris, 1911.
- Rudberg=*Neutestamentliche Text und Nomina Sacra*. Upsala, 1915.
- Rutherford, Gram.=*First Greek Grammar*, by W. G. Rutherford. London, 1907.
- Rutherford NP=*The New Phrynichus*, by W. G. Rutherford. London, 1881.
- Sanders=*Facsimile of the Washington Manuscript of the Four Gospels in the Freer Collection*, with an introduction by H. A. Sanders. Michigan, 1912.
- Sandys and Paley=*Select Private Orations of Demosthenes*. Cambridge, 1875. 3rd ed., 1898.
- Scham=*Der Optativgebrauch bei Clemens von Alexandrien*, von Jakob Scham. Paderborn, 1913.
- Schmid Attic.=*Der Atticismus in seinen Hauptvertretern von Dionysius von Halikarnass bis auf den zweiten Philostratus*, von W. Schmid. 4 Bde und Register. Stuttgart, 1887-97.
- Schmidt Jos.=*De Flavii Josephi Elocutione*, by W. Schmidt. Leipzig, 1893.
- Schrade=*Reallexikon der indogermanischen Altertumskunde*, von O. Schrade. Straassburg, 1901.
- Schubart=*Einführung in die Papyruskunde*, von W. Schubart. Berlin, 1918.
- Schulthess *Das Problem*=*Das Problem der Sprache Jesu*, von F. Schulthess. Zürich, 1917.
- Schulthess ZNTW (see below)=*Zur Sprache der Evangelien*. Giessen, 1922.
- Schwyzler=*Grammatik der pergamenischen Inschriften*, von E. Schweizer (since Schwyzler). Berlin, 1898.
- Scrivener *Codex Bez.*=*Bezae Codex Cantabrigiensis*, ed., with a critical introduction, annotations and facsimiles, by F. H. Scrivener. Cambridge, 1864.
- Scrivener *Collation*=*A full Collation of the Codex Sinaiticus with the Received Text of the NT*, by F. H. Scrivener. Cambridge, 1864. 2nd ed., 1867.
- SH=*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans (1CC)*, by W. Sanday and A. C. Headlam. 5th ed. Edinburgh, 1902.

- Sharp *Epict.* = *Epictetus and the New Testament*, by D. S. Sharp. London, 1914.
- Simcox—*The Writers of the New Testament*, by W. H. Simcox. 2nd ed. London, 1902.
- Smith *L and L of Paul* = *The Life and Letters of St Paul*, by David Smith. London, 1919.
- SNT* = *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, herausgegeben von Johannes Weiss. 3te Aufl. Göttingen, 1917. (Gal. 1 u. 2 Kor. erkl. von W. Bousset.)
- v. Soden, *Die Schriften* = *Die Schriften d. Neuen Testaments in ihre ältesten erreichbaren Textgestalt*, hergestellt von Hermann Freiherr von Soden. 4 Bde. Berlin, 1902–13.
- Solmsen *Gr. Wortf.* = *Beiträge zur Griechischen Wortforschung*, von Felix Solmsen. 1te Teil. Strassburg, 1909.
- Sophocles *Lex.* = *Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods*, by E. A. Sophocles. Boston, 1870.
- Souter *Lex.* = *A Pocket Lexicon to the Greek New Testament*, by Alexander Souter. Oxford, 1917.
- Stahl *Synt.* = *Kritisch-historische Syntax des griechischen Verbums der klassischen Zeit*, von J. M. Stahl. Heidelberg, 1907.
- Stephanus *Thes.* = *Thesaurus Graecae Linguae*, ab Henrico Stephano constructus. 5 vols. Paris, 1572.
- Stevenson *Gr.* = *Grammar of Palestinian Jewish Aramaic*, by W. B. Stevenson. Oxford, 1924.
- Sütterlin = *Zur Geschichte der Verba Denominativa im Altgriechischen*, 1te Teil: die Verba Denominativa auf -άω -έω -όω, von Ludwig Sütterlin. Strassburg, 1891.
- Syll.*—see Index I (e).
- Thackeray *Gr.* = *A Grammar of the OT in Greek*, i, by H. St J. Thackeray. Cambridge, 1909.
- Thackeray *Schweich Lectures* = *The Septuagint and Jewish Worship*. London, 1922.
- ThLZ* = *Theologische Literaturzeitung*. Leipzig, 1876 ff.
- Thompson *Palaeography* = *Handbook to Greek and Latin Palaeography*, by E. Maunde Thompson. 2nd ed. London, 1894; 3rd ed., 1913.
- Thumb—see Brugmann *Gr.*⁴
- Thumb *Dial.* = *Handbuch der griechischen Dialekte*, von A. Thumb. Heidelberg, 1909.
- Thumb *Handb.* = *Handbook of the Modern Greek Vernacular*, by A. Thumb. Translated from the second German ed. by S. Angus. Edinburgh, 1912.
- Thumb *Hellen.* = *Die griechische Sprache im Zeitalter des Hellenismus*, von A. Thumb. Strassburg, 1901.
- Thumb *Sp. Asper* = *Untersuchungen über d. Spiritus Asper im Griechischen*, von A. Thumb, Strassburg, 1889.
- Ti = *Novum Testamentum Graece*, by C. Tischendorf. Editio octava critica maior. 2 vols. Leipzig, 1869–72. Also vol. iii, by C. R. Gregory, containing *Prolegomena*, 1884.

- Torrey CDA=*The Composition and Date of Acts*, by C. C. Torrey. Camb. Mass., 1916.
- Torrey, C. H. *Toy Studies*=*The Translations made from the original Aramaic Gospels*, by C. C. Torrey. (See C. H. *Toy Studies*.)
- Torrey HTR=*The Aramaic Origin of the Gospel of John*. (See HTR.)
- C. H. *Toy Studies*=*Studies in the History of Religions presented to Crawford Howell Toy*. New York, 1912.
- Valaori=*Der delphische Dialekt*, von J. Valaori. Göttingen, 1901.
- Veitch=*Verbs Irregular and Defective*, by W. Veitch. Oxford, 1887.
- Viereck SG—see Index I (e).
- Viteau *Étude sur le grec du Nouveau Testament*, par J. Viteau. i, Paris, 1893; ii, 1896.
- Vocab.=*The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament illustrated from the Papyri and other non-literary sources*, by J. H. Moulton and G. Milligan. London, 1914.
- Vogeser=*Zur Sprache der griechischen Heiligenlegenden*, von J. Vogeser. München, 1907.
- Völker=*Papyrorum gr. Syntaxis Specimen*, von F. Völker. Bonn, 1900.
- W¹, W²—see Wellhausen.
- Wackernagel *Hellen.*=*Hellenistica* (Einladung zur akadem. Preisverkündigung), von Jacob Wackernagel. Göttingen, 1907.
- Wackernagel *Vorlesungen*=*Vorlesungen über Syntax*. Erste Reihe. 2te Aufl. Basel, 1926; zweite Reihe, 1924.
- Wakle *Lat. Etym. Wort.*=*Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, von A. Wakle. Heidelberg, 1906. 2te Aufl., 1910.
- J. Weiss=*Der erste Korintherbrief* (Meyers Kommentar), von Johannes Weiss. Göttingen, 1910.
- Wellhausen=*Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien*, von J. Wellhausen. Berlin, 1te Aufl. (W¹), 1905; 2te Aufl. (W²), 1911.
- Wellhausen *Das Evangelium Matthaei*. Berlin, 1904.
- Wellhausen *Das Evangelium Marci*. Berlin, 1903.
- Wellhausen *Das Evangelium Lucae*. Berlin, 1904.
- Wellhausen *Das Evangelium Johannis*. Berlin, 1908.
- Wendland=*Die urchristlichen Literaturformen*, von Paul Wendland. (HNT I. 3.) 2te Aufl. Tübingen, 1912.
- Wernle=*Die synoptische Frage*, von Paul Wernle. Freiburg i. B., 1899.
- Wessely *Studien*=*Studien zur Palaeographie und Papyruskunde*, herausgeg. von C. Wessely. Leipzig, 1901.
- Wessely *Zauberpap.*=C. Wessely, *Griechische Zauberpapyri von Paris und London*. See Index I (f), under P Par 574.
- Wetstein=*Novum Testamentum Graecum*, by J. J. Wetstein. 2 vols. Amsterdam, 1751.
- WH=*The New Testament in the Original Greek*, by B. F. Westcott and F. J. A. Hort. Vol. i, Text (also ed. minor); vol. ii, Introduction. Cambridge and London, 1881; 2nd ed. of vol. ii, 1896.
- WH *App*=Appendix to WH, in vol. ii, containing Notes on Select Readings and on Orthography, etc.

- Wilamowitz *Lesebuch*=*Griechisches Lesebuch*, von U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff. i. Text; ii. Erläuterungen. 3te unveränd. Aufl., 1903; 7te unveränd. Aufl., 1920. Berlin.
- Wilcken *Papyruskunde*.=*Grundzüge und Chrestomathie der Papyruskunde*, I. i, ed. U. Wilcken. See under Mitteis, also Index I (f).
- Wilcken—see *Archiv* and *UPZ* in Index I (e) and (f).
- Windisch=*Der zweite Korintherbrief* (Meyers Kommentar), von H. Windisch. Göttingen, 1924.
- Witk.—see Index I (f).
- WM=*A Treatise on the Grammar of New Testament Greek, regarded as a sure basis for NT Exegesis*, by G. B. Winer. Translated from the German, with large additions and full indices, by W. F. Moulton. 3rd ed. Edinburgh, 1882.
- Wright *Comp. Gr. Gram.*=*Comparative Grammar of the Greek Language*, by Joseph Wright. Oxford, 1912.
- WS=*G. B. Winers Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Sprachidioms*. 8te Aufl. neu bearbeitet von P. W. Schmiedel. Göttingen, i. Teil, 1894; ii. Teil, erstes Heft, 1897; zweites Heft, 1898.
- Zahn=*Introduction to the NT*, by Theodor Zahn. Eng. tr. of 3rd ed. Edinburgh, 3 vols., 1909.
- Zahn *Matthäus*=*Das Evangelium des Matthäus, ausgelegt von Theodor Zahn*. Leipzig. 1te Aufl. 1903, 4te Aufl. 1922.
- ZNTW=*Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*. Giessen. 1900 ff.
- ZVS=*Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung auf dem Gebiete der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Begründet von A. Kuhn. Göttingen.

Signs:

For † see pp. 225 and 334.

For *, †, ‡ see p. 292.

ADDENDA ET CORRIGENDA.



- Page 10, line 11, *after Luke, insert* (12³⁰).
- „ 16, line 14, *read* Aramaic.
- „ 19, n.³ line 3 *ab imo, read* Lietzmann.
- „ 22, line 4, *read* 1 Co 15³⁴.
- „ 22, line 17, *after Ephesians read* (4³⁰, 5⁵).
- „ 44, § 25, inset title, *under Consonants, insert* Mutes.
- „ 57, line 8, *before Moeris insert* See p. 209 n.¹ ;
- „ 70, line 20, *after WS 47 f., insert also* Charles *Rev. (ICC) i. 216.*
- „ 82, line 2 *ab imo, for indicio read iudicio.*
- „ 91, line 10, *for* § 53 *read* § 52.
- „ 99, n.¹ line 2 *ab imo, first word, read* that.
- „ 100, line 6, *for* § 76 *read* § 77.
- „ 103, line 13, *read* Grd.³ I. 827.
- „ 103, line 18, *after λήμψομαι insert* (p. 106), *after σφυδρόν* (p. 112).
- „ 121 C. (b), *read* Ἰλαως *survives in NT only in the nom. sing (but see* Clem *ad Cor. passim).*
- „ 130, line 5 *ab imo, for* (=i. 109–88) *read* (=i. 166–88).
- „ 131, line 10 *for* -ὄς *read* -ύς.
- „ 131, (3) (b) line 2, *read* association.
- „ 135 (b) line 4, *read* (=·p· σι).
- „ 135, line 10 *ab imo, read* ἔστιν.
- „ 172 (b) Arrangement should be in italics.
- „ 173 (4) line 2, *for* χιλιάδες *read* χιλιάδες.
- „ 175, line 11, *for* τείσaris *read* τείσσερις.
- „ 176, line 3, *after Appendix, insert* p. 439.
- „ 176, line 8 *ab imo, Fractions should be in italics.*
- „ 177 (b) last line, *read* Tob 10¹⁰ B.
- „ 192 7. line 6, *insert* comma *after* (ἀπὸλογος).
- „ 192 8. line 2, *insert* bracket) *after* ulcus.
- „ 192 n.⁶, line 2, *read* Jer 43(36)³⁶.
- „ 193 9. line 3, *read* ἔpp.
- „ 198, line 8, *read* Hermas *Vis. iii. 10*⁷.

- Page 199, line 3 *ab imo*, read φιλόμεθα.
- „ 204, line 8, insert 3 under 1 and 2.
- „ 207, line 18, for τιθῆ read τιθῆ.
- „ 210. Subjunctive. In 2 sg. read δῶς, σοῖς.
- „ 219, line 16, after see insert p. 216.
- „ 223, line 22, after Hermas insert Mand. xii. 5^a.
- „ 225, line 10 *ab imo*, for -οσα read -υσα.
- „ 226 αἰρέω, 3rd col. read ἡρέθη.
- „ 231 βούλομαι, for (II. a) read (I. a).
- „ 232, after δέομαι insert (I. a).
- „ 234, *Fειδ, last col., for ἦδειν read ἦδει.
- „ 235, *Fεικ for present read perfect.
- „ 235, ελαύνω COMP., for ἄπ- read ἔπ-.
- „ 238, line 4, for ἐρωτήθω read ἐρωτήσω.
- „ 239, after ζωγρέω insert (VII.).
- „ 241, between lines 7 and 8 insert λάομαι *lea.*
- „ 241, line 21, delete hyphen before ἴστημι.
- „ 242, line 15, after κάθημαι insert (For flexion see § 87.).
- „ 242, between lines 19 and 20 insert κάθημαι *sit (be seated)*.
- „ 242, line 20, after καθίζω insert (VII.).
- „ 243, line 10 *ab imo*, after κεράννυμι for (I. β) read (II. β).
- „ 243, foot, insert κηρύσσω *proclaim.*
- „ 244, between lines 21 and 22 insert κλέπτω *steal.*
- „ 246, line 3 *ab imo*, read -λημπτός †.
- „ 247, λείπω 3rd col., read ελείφθη.
- „ 249, line 14, delete hyphen before μίγνυμι.
- „ 254, transfer πιμπρημι to between lines 22 and 23.
- „ 254, transfer -πιπλάω to between lines 27 and 28.
- „ 255, between lines 9 and 10 insert πληθύνω *increase.*
- „ 257, line 6, for ῥήξω read ῥήξω.
- „ 259, line 12 *ab imo*, read *turn.*
- „ 260, line 7, σχίζω. COMP. δια- not confirmed.
- „ 260, line 27, τάσσω. COMP. ἐν- not confirmed.
- „ 262, line 5 *ab imo*, for ἔφᾶνα read ἔφᾶνα.
- „ 263, lines 20, 21, transfer φείδομαι to between lines 10 and 11.
- „ 266, line 3 *ab imo*, for -έωσα read -ίωσα.
- „ 276. Good examples of K.D. cpds. are πρωτοπολίτης P Oxy i. 41^a, and προβατοκτηνοτρόφοι P Ryl ii. 73^b (33-30 B.C.) and note.
- „ 470, line 9. Possibly we should add a third class (c) ἵνα for ὅτι (=η). So Archd. Allen attempts to explain the hard saying in Mk 4¹² (*Comm. Mark*, p. 80). But it is simpler, with Lagrange, to take ἵνα as equivalent to ἵνα πληρωθῆ in introducing the citation.

A GRAMMAR OF NEW TESTAMENT GREEK.

VOLUME II.



INTRODUCTION.

§ 1. A BOOK which has already offered Prolegomena at considerable length and furnished with plenty of detail does not seem to need an Introduction when the systematic presentation of grammatical material is at last about to begin. But there are very cogent reasons for procedure which may fairly enough be charged with cumbrousness. To begin with, my *Prolegomena* appeared in 1906, and much has to be added from the accumulations of a decade. The papyri and other sources have provided abundance of fresh material from which I could now enlarge the book much beyond the scale of the latest English or German edition. We have now the advantage of discussion upon the views of New Testament Greek grammar which Deissmann's pioneer studies in the vocabulary prompted. Without repeating what has been examined at length in the first volume, I may now apply the results to subjects which must be placed in their right light before we can fill up the outline of Hellenistic grammar as it appears in the New Testament. I shall not tarry to repeat from Winer the history of earlier research in the subject: there is enough to do in delineating the conditions as we read them to-day.¹

1. NEW TESTAMENT GREEK AS A UNITY.

§ 2. That NT Greek is in general the colloquial *lingua franca* of the early Roman Empire has been made clear by the facts presented already, and we need not even summarise

¹ Many of the subjects discussed in this Introduction were sketched in the paper on "NT Greek in the light of modern discovery," in *Cambridge Biblical Essays* (ed. Swete, 1909).

the case. With all the difference that there is between the writers of the NT, we can say of them collectively that they stand apart from literary Hellenistic monuments, the LXX excepted, in eschewing vocabulary, grammar and style which belonged to the artificial dialect of books, and applying to literary use the spoken Greek of the day. Their differences are comparable with those we notice between English speakers of varying degrees of education. Except for literal, and to some extent conventional translations, the NT contains no element which would strike contemporary Greeks as the archaic English of AV or RV strikes us to-day.

§ 3. The first impulse to this use of the *lingua cottidiana* comes from the LXX. The Pentateuch, earliest and most important section of the Greek OT, quoted in NT so frequently as to show us at once how commanding was its influence, consists generally of good and easy vernacular Greek. In the day when it was made the tendency to Atticism had hardly begun to taint Greek literature. Literary Hellenistic was not colloquial in style, but it was no artificial dialect. Despite Aristeeas, the LXX was not produced for learned consumption. The Greek OT, like the NT, was meant from the first to be the people's book. When, therefore, evangelists began to write down their story, or Christian preachers to compose informal pastorals for their Churches when far away, there was a precedent ready for their use of the popular speech. It was vital that they should write in language which would enable them to reach the widest audience at once. They could have used the literary dialect, some of them, at any rate. But Paul used the tongue of the unlearned for the same reason as John Wesley did: simple language is very easy for men whose one desire is to be clear and get their message home. Two centuries later Clement of Alexandria was Atticising for the same motive that made Paul Hellenise. Cultured people then would not read a book written in the vulgar tongue, and Clement was eager "by all means to gain some." In the same spirit the apostles wrote as they spoke, that all might hear and understand. Their Greek represents, from the literary historian's point of view, the greatest of those revolts against artificialism which

have recurred through the ages and kept true literature alive. Just because Attic was the finest instrument human thought has ever played upon, the Epigoni tried to honour it by destroying the reality that gave it tone. The living daughter-speech was with them, tuneful and rich in all resources of expressiveness, though the foreign strain in her parentage had brought in some new intonations and lessened the delicate refinement of the mother-tongue. The taste of an age that could not understand refused to listen to the fresh young voice, and preferred to grind out ancient records on a gramophone. The Greeks are doing it still to-day, garnishing the mummy of the past instead of cultivating the rich resources of the present. Against this and every other such outrage on the spirit of literature the New Testament makes its protest. Only nature can give the touch which stamps the highest literature, and every book of the New Testament bears this mark beyond cavil. The Apocalypse is perhaps the extreme case. Its grammar is perpetually stumbling, its idiom is that of a foreign language, its whole style that of a writer who neither knows nor cares for literary form. But just because the weird dialect is the native speech of its author, if he must use Greek, we accept it without apology; and no anthology of the rarest gems in human literature could be complete without contributions from its pages.

§ 4. We shall have to differentiate presently between writers of very unlike culture and style, but a few summary words must be ventured as to the fitness of the Hellenistic vernacular as a medium for expressing what evangelists and apostles had to say. How does it compare with the languages which lie nearest, by nature or by circumstance? Take first Semitic, in a dialect of which the NT might so easily have been written, since all its authors (except probably Luke and the author of *Hebrews*) counted Aramaic as their mother-tongue. The narrative parts, and such a book as the Apocalypse, would have suffered little. Lost Aramaic originals lie behind a fair proportion of these documents; and if these treasures had survived, those familiar with the language might well have found them no less simple, forceful and vivid than the Greek which has supplanted them. It is

in the hortatory and doctrinal parts that the special advantage of Greek appears. Equally capable of simplicity, it is capable of subtlety and precision beyond any Semitic dialect, and has a far wider range. We cannot imagine the foundation documents of Christian doctrine expressed in Old Testament Hebrew. Comparing Hellenistic with classical Greek, we may fairly say that the greater simplicity of the former gives it a decided advantage over even Attic for pure narrative, although the Ionic of Herodotus may claim equality. And it is fair to assert that what the *Koinḗ* has lost of subtlety and grace, as compared with the Attic of the golden age, has been of little moment for the uses of the Christian writers. These elements are comparable with the more elaborate vocabulary which we find so highly cultured a man as Paul deliberately avoiding, as over the heads of simple people whom he wanted to reach. The characteristic strength of Greek was unimpaired—its wealth of significant differentiation in verbal tense system, its simple but adequate cases, made clear by prepositional resources which are no longer over-complex as in the earlier language.

I might repeat here some words written in *Cambridge Biblical Essays* (500 f.) upon one significant instance:—

The delicate precision of the use of the optative commands our admiration as we see it in the great writers of Athens. And yet we may remember that, except to express a wish, the optative has really no function which other moods cannot express equally well, so that by practically dropping the rest of its uses, Hellenistic has lost no real necessity of language. Indeed the fact that all the Indo-European dialects have either fused these two moods into one (as Latin) or let one of them go (as post-Vedic-Sanskrit), is evidence enough that classical Greek was preserving a mere superfluity, developing the same after its manner into a thing of beauty which added to the resources of the most delicate and graceful idiom the world has ever seen. But we are not belittling the masterpieces of Hellas when we say that their language was far less fitted than Hellenistic for the work that awaited the missionaries of the new world-faith. The delicacies of Attic would have been thrown away on the barbarians whom

Paul did not disdain to seek for the Kingdom of Christ. If much of the old grace was gone, the strength and suppleness, the lucidity and expressiveness of that matchless tongue were there in undimmed perfection. They are recognised still when travellers master the unschooled "jargon" of the peasants in modern Hellas, the direct descendant of the Greek of Mark and Paul. As one of the most accomplished of them, Dr. W. H. D. Rouse, well says: "The most abstruse and abstract ideas are capable of clear expression in the popular speech. The book-learned will often hesitate for an expression, the peasant never. He spends all his days in talking, and has plenty of practice; and his vernacular is not only vivid and racy, it is capable of expressing any thought. . . . His language has the further advantage of being able to form new words by composition." Assuredly a language which had all these characteristics three thousand years ago, and has them to-day, is scarcely likely to have lost them awhile during the great period when Greek was spoken and understood by a far larger proportion of civilised mankind than it had ever been in the period of its greatest glory, or has ever been again since East and West parted asunder and let the dark ages in.

2. CONTACTS WITH LITERARY LANGUAGE.

§ 5. The general rule that NT writers do not make use of the artificial literary dialect has one partial exception to prove it; and there are naturally degrees of approximation towards this dialect according to the extent of the writer's education. We may take the exception first. It is a book which stands apart in many ways, by general consent decidedly the latest in the Canon, and the solitary NT example of pseudepigraphic writing. *2 Peter* is written in Greek which seems to have been learnt mainly from books. Greek proverbs,¹ Greek inscriptions,² and Greek books which we can no longer handle, contributed to the writer's vocabulary, and moulded the fine sense of rhythm to which Mayor bears effective testimony. It is to literature rather than to vernacular inscriptions and papyri that we go when we

¹ See J. B. Mayor on 2nd.

² Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, 360 ff.

seek to illustrate rare words in this little book; and the general style is far removed from the language of daily life, as any tiro can see. These traces of elaboration are as much in keeping with the character of the book as the well-understood convention by which the writer shelters under a great name from the past. Only a shallow judgement could find in either the justification of disparaging views as to the Epistle's value. The presence of a fair crop of solecisms is natural in a book so composed. If it was written, as generally supposed, early in the second century, we may note that the development of a language proper to books had advanced greatly since the age whence most of the NT writings come. As has been remarked already with reference to Clement of Alexandria, at the close of the same century,¹ the motive of this artificial language may well be that at the time of writing it commended a book to readers whose taste was no longer satisfied with a simple and natural style.²

§ 6. It is a long step from *2 Peter* to the Lucan writings, but we take them next because they and *Hebrews* alone show any consciousness of style. *Hebrews*, indeed, may be summarily dealt with as a composition into which admittedly³ nothing artificial has entered, though the writer's culture prompts a style decidedly removed from the colloquial.

¹ For Clement's Atticising see the monograph on his use of the optative by Jakob Scham, and my review in *Deutsche Literaturzeitung*, 1914, 1503-6.

² On Atticism as a literary phenomenon, reaching its climax in the second century A.D. and almost justifying itself in the hands of the brilliant Syrian Lucian, see especially Schmid's *Atticismus* (Stuttgart, 1887-96). Its theory is seen best in Phrynichus (fl. A.D. 180), with his fine scorn of ἀμαθείς who (for example) could use γλωσσόκομος instead of γλωττοκομείον, and applied it to a box for books or clothes instead of restricting it to the mouthpieces of flutes. W. G. Rutherford's *New Phrynichus* (London, 1881) edits the old pedant for us, and adds thereto many like words.

³ Blass, indeed (*Brief an die Hebräer, Text mit Angabe der Rhythmen*, Göttingen, 1903; cf. *Grammatik der Neutestamentlichen Griechisch*², 304 f.), argued for an elaborate system of rhythm in *Hebrews*, which would have transferred the Epistle into the literary category very decisively. It may be very seriously questioned whether prose rhythm was *consciously* elaborated even by the Attic orators, from the study of whom Blass derived his theories: it is probable that instinct alone trained the ear to rhythm, even when analysis can formulate rules. That Blass could discover orthodox rhythms even in Paul might fairly count as a *reductio ad absurdum* of his theory for *Hebrews*.

The absence of the potential optative is a primary test of freedom from artificialism, and this is complete in the Epistle. The best analogue will be the pulpit style of a cultured extempore preacher, or that of his letters to the religious press. The test just mentioned needs further inspection for Luke, the only NT writer to use the potential optative, in indirect questions and conditional with *ἄν*. The latter is still used in the epistolary formulæ of Ptolemaic times, when the writers are well educated, and it can hardly be called artificial, though in i/A.D. it must have been almost confined to book language. Since the growth of the Atticising movement was bringing the optative into greater prominence as a literary usage, it may be safely said that the presence of this survival was by this time essential for any claim to style. We are left then with Luke as the only *littérateur* among the authors of NT books. (I make no apology for speaking of "Luke": those who prefer "Lk₁," "Lk₂," . . . "Lk_n," are, of course, welcome to their opinion. I would only observe that in grammar and vocabulary and phraseology Lk_{1, 2} . . . n have an astonishing resemblance to one another.) In using the term we are not suggesting that Luke capitulated to the growing fashion of going back to archaic models as alone suitable for literary composition. A page of Josephus would disabuse our minds of any such idea. It is only that Luke as a Greek fell by a native instinct into the habit of style which would make his narrative tell. It would be hard to find ancient parallels for the variation of style he shows as his story changes its scene. A modern novelist will see to it that his country yokel and his professor do not talk the same dialect; and he will often try to make a Lancashire weaver or a Cornish miner approximate to the speech actually current in those areas. Similarly, Aristophanes makes a Megarian, a Boeotian, a Spartan woman speak their own dialect fairly correctly. But this is only partial illustration: it suits Luke's accurate reproduction of the reported dialogues that came to him in rough translations like that we postulate for Q. But it is not going as far as Luke when he steepes his style in Biblical phraseology, drawn from the Greek Old Testament, so long as his narrative moves in Palestinian circles, where the speakers use Greek

that obviously represents a foreign idiom—like Shakespeare's Fluellen with his Welsh English. That Luke should do this fits in well with his presumed history. A proselyte who made his first acquaintance with the Old Testament in its Greek version was likely to feel for that version as no Hebrew could feel, accustomed to keep all his reverence for the original. His imitation of the translation-Greek of his model—*e.g.* in the construction *καὶ ἐρέvero καὶ* with a finite verb, which yields to the *acc. et infn.* in Ac¹—reminds us of the Biblical style of John Bunyan, and other English writers whose education it was to be *homo unius libri*. That Luke instinctively departs from that style when his subject takes him away from the Biblical land and people, is equally natural. It is mostly in these parts of his work that he makes what concessions he does make to the book style. We are sometimes able to distinguish between the Greek of his sources. Compare the masterpiece of Lk 15 with the parable that follows. There is absolutely nothing in the story of the Two Sons which suggests translation from a Semitic original: the conjecture rises to one's thought that it never was translated, but spoken in Greek to an audience that knew no Aramaic—a point to which we shall return.

§ 7. There is only one other writer whom we might expect to show contacts with the literary Greek. A highly educated man like Paul,² who spent his early years in a great centre of Hellenistic culture, might have used the book Greek as to the manner born. It is very obvious that he did not. The exordium of an address to Athenian philosophers survives to show us that he could use the language of the higher culture when occasion required.³ But his letters,

¹ See *Proleg.*, 16 f.

² Professor Deissmann's brilliant work, *St. Paul*, seems to miss the mark altogether in describing Paul as a working man, largely on the strength of his big clumsy writing inferred from Gal 6¹¹. If this interpretation of *πηλίκους γράμμασι* be conceded, such writing does not nowadays imply illiteracy, and we have no evidence that it did in Paul's day. The Apostle's tent-making is completely explained by a well-known precept of the Rabbis, and his exercise of the art by Ramsay's most reasonable supposition that a bigoted Jewish father had cut him off.

³ Of course Luke is usually credited with Paul's *Areopagitica*, and it may be difficult to prove completely that he wrote his report from full notes, given

addressed to churches into which "not many wise were called," are studiously kept within the range of popular vocabularly and colloquial grammar. Nägeli's monograph¹ shows this conclusively for the vocabulary. As to the grammar, it may be noted that Paul uses the highly colloquial types *γέγοναν*, and perhaps *παρελάβοσαν*² (the former also Luke), also *καυχᾶσαι*, *ζηλοῦτε* and *φυσιοῦσθε* as subj., *νοῦ*, *ἐφ' ἐλπίδι*, etc. In the use of popular forms he and Luke go as far, with rare exceptions, as the least cultured of NT writers. These facts are the strongest possible disproof for both Paul and Luke of any charge of using book Greek: no author who could favour the Atticist rules would fail to purge his pages of vernacular inflexions. If, however, the two friends keep company in their inflexions, they part again in vocabulary and in so typical a matter as the use of the optative, and in both Paul leans away from the literary style. What Paul might have done had he been writing "treatises" (*λόγοι*—Ac 1¹) like Luke, we cannot say. What has come down to us from him is all of a casual character, open letters to communities, for which permanence was never contemplated. There is a good modern parallel in Wesley's Sermons, addressed to plain folks in simple language: even when the Fellow of Lincoln preached before his University, he took care, in republishing the sermons in a volume destined to be an informal manual of doctrine, to keep their language within popular range. In them as in the Pauline Epistles "ignorant and unstable men" might find *δυσνόητά τινα*, but it would not be because of their dialect.

him not long after by his master. But when we find the Lukan Paul quoting Epimenides (Ac 17^{28a}), and the Paul of the Pastorals citing the very same context (Tit 1¹²), with the Aratus-Cleanthes quotation (*ib.*^{28b}) to match the Menander (1 Co 15³²), we may at least remark that the speech is very subtly concocted. Paul was, moreover, much more likely than Luke to know the tenets of Stoics and Epicureans so as to make such delicately suited allusions to them. Luke's knowledge of Greek literature does not seem to have gone far beyond the medical writers who so profoundly influenced his diction. He no doubt shared with all educated Greeks some familiarity with Homer: the obsolete word *ναῦς* in Ac 27⁴¹ was acutely traced to Homer by Blass (*Philology of the Gospels*, 186).

¹ *Das Wortschatz des Apostels Paulus* (Göttingen, 1905).

² *Proleg.* 52: I have modified my view with the accumulation of evidence.

§ 8. The remarkably good Greek of *James* and *First Peter* will engage our attention under another heading, but we may add here one or two points which suggest themselves in another Palestinian writer, the author of the First Gospel. In spite of Harnack, there seems little doubt that he alters the language of his sources very much more than Luke does, so as to make the style of his work decidedly more uniform. He shows the artist in his genius for compression,¹ and in his fondness for Hebraic parallelism;² while he frequently substitutes literary flexions for popular. Thus where Q *ap.* Luke has ἀμφιάζει, Mt 6³⁰ shows the obsolete ἀμφιέννυσι, where it has συνάξει (Lk 3¹⁷ N*), Mt 3¹² dexterously brings in the future συνάξει,³ as in ἐπισυνάξει, Lk 13³⁴, mended to ἐπισυναγαγεῖν in Mt 23³⁷.

The degree of literary flavour attained in all these amounts to very little. It may be compared, on the one side, to our literary avoidance of colloquialisms like *don't* and *can't*, which everybody uses almost exclusively in conversation, but instinctively replaces by the *leno* forms in written style, except in private letters. On the other side, we have a whole vocabulary which has its perfectly natural place in written English, with the same exception, and in the higher spoken style of serious oratory, but strikes us instantly as pedantic or affected when brought into conversation. Greek words of a similar type are avoided by Paul, but used by Luke and the *auctor ad Hebræos*. The mere fact that no NT writer thinks of avoiding the flexions which conspicuously distinguish Hellenistic from Attic,⁴ or of using the dual, the final optative, or other Atticist hall-marks, is enough by itself to show that even though NT writers might sometimes take some pains with their style, the better to achieve their purpose, they would never allow themselves an archaism or affectation

¹ Cf. 3¹¹ where βαρβάσαι, *take off*, expresses the full content of four words in Mk 1⁷ and 11³⁷ where ἐπιγινώσκει exactly represents γινώσκει τις ἔστιν of Q, etc.

² See my paper in *Expositor*, VII. ii. 97 f. (reprinted in J. H. Moulton, *The Christian Religion in the Study and the Street*, 47 ff.; cf. *ib.* 79).

³ See *Camb. Bibl. Essays*, 485.

⁴ Such as the types στείρης, τοὸς τοί, ἡμῖσιν, ἀπεκατεστάθη, ἐλελόκεισαν, γέγοναν, δοῖ, ὀδυνάσαι, φάγεσαι, λυέτωσαν, οἶδας οἶδαμεν, ἡμῶν, ἐλήμφθη, etc. There are, of course, some which only Mark or the Apocalypticist would admit, such as λέλυκες or ἐλυες.

which might endanger their being "understanded of the people."

§ 9. One further point needs to be guarded. There are some tests of literary Greek which have been applied in misapprehension of the facts and have produced results that are wholly misleading. Such is especially the assumption—treated as axiomatic by Harnack—that compound verbs are an evidence of cultured Greek. Harnack¹ builds upon it one of his working principles in reconstructing Q out of Mt and Lk: where either of them (which usually means Mt) shows the simplex, it goes back to Q, which is assumed to be written in rude vernacular. The axiom fails to survive so elementary a test as the counting of compound verbs in Mk and Lk. It is found that the two evangelists have an identical percentage per page, while their Greek notoriously differs more widely than anything else within the limits of the NT. Mark has actually 5·7 compound verbs per page (of WH), while *Acts* has 6·25, *Hebrews* 8·0, and Paul only 3·8. Reference may be made to the statistical investigation in *Camb. Bibl. Essays*, 492 f., where it is shown that illiterate private letters among the papyri employ compound verbs as conspicuously as Mark. A fondness for compounds is fairly enough noted as a characteristic of an individual style: for example, the contrast between the figures for Paul and for *Hebrews* (3·8 per page and 8·0) is enough to discredit the Pauline authorship of the Epistle, were there further need of witnesses. But Harnack's test must clearly disappear from our critical tool-box. The real history of the matter is that the increased use of compounds was one of the features of the *Koinḗ* as compared with classical Greek,² and applied to literary and vernacular language alike. Writers like the First³ and Fourth Evangelists, who markedly prefer simplicia, are in this regard aloof from a prevailing tendency.

¹ *Sayings*, 150; see the German *Sprüche*, 106.

² Compare the fact that *βαλω* simplex is very nearly extinct in Hellenistic: see *Vocabulary*, s.v. Mark uses compounds of *πορεύομαι*, the simplex never.

³ Note as a typical example Mark's *ἀνεμῆσθη* in 14²³, which Mt 26⁷⁰ reduces to *ἐμῆσθη*, while Lk 22⁵¹ varies it to *ὕπεμῆσθη*.

3. SEMITIC COLOURING.

(1) *Language Conditions of Palestine.*

§ 10. There is a large bibliography on the problem of "the mother-tongue of Jesus." We cannot discuss the problem here, but summary statements of results are demanded. It seems to me highly probable that some of the contradictory data may be reconciled by making more of the difference between Jerusalem and Galilee. The Holy City was in our Lord's time a metropolis of aggressive nationalism. The Hellenising high priests, who had filled the city with Greek customs and speech, were no more; and a fanatical hatred of all things foreign was limited only by the hard fact of a Roman Procurator and soldiers at his command, within striking distance of the Temple. Under such conditions it is easy to see that a knowledge of Greek would be reduced to a minimum demanded by the necessities of intercourse with pilgrims from the Dispersion and officials of the Roman government. Galilee, on the other hand, was notoriously "of the Gentiles." There were towns there, such as Tiberias, where Jews and Judaism were invisible. Two centuries before, there had been a general clearance of Jews, and the consequences were sufficiently lasting to give a cue to modern paradoxists like Herr Houston Stewart Chamberlain, who would fain convince us that as a Galilean Jesus must have been of Aryan blood.¹ The swine of Gerasa (Mk 5¹¹), when all is said, do not approve themselves as belonging to Jewish masters. The question really is what language or languages did the Gentile majority in Galilee speak in the first century, which the Jewish minority were compelled to use if they had any dealings with them. Now Aramaic was not only the special language of the Jews: it was in rapidly growing use as a *lingua franca* in Western Asia, its rival, of course, being Greek. The realm of Greek as a world-language extended far beyond Palestine at the time of its greatest influence. Greek inscriptions are found all over Asia Minor and eastward up to the borders of India

¹ *Foundations of the Nineteenth Century*, i. 210; cf. Paul Haupt, *Transactions of the Third International Congress for the History of Religions*, i. 804.

—as far, in fact, as Alexander's arms had penetrated.¹ Two parchments have been published lately² which came from Avroman in Media, dated respectively B.C. 88 and 22-1. They are the title-deeds of a vineyard, and are written in good *Koivḥ* Greek: with them, however, is a third in a dialect unknown, the document being still undeciphered. In his notes Mr. Minns calls attention to the fact that the tide of Greek language supremacy began to ebb from Western Asia about the beginning of the Christian era. Aramaic or Syriac would be the natural tongue of Gentiles as well as Jews in Galilee a very few generations later. But it does not appear that Greek was expelled, or near expulsion, in the early part of i/A.D. We are at liberty then to reflect on the notable fact that three NT books are traditionally assigned to Galilean writers, viz. 1 Pet, Jas and Jude, and that their Greek—especially that of the first two—is of a remarkably free and idiomatic kind. On the other hand, Mark was a Jerusalemite, and his Greek equipment is very meagre. The John of the Fourth Gospel and the Epistles is also on very strong grounds claimed as a Jerusalemite, and his Greek, while correct enough, is very bald and destitute of idiom. May we not infer that Galileans might be expected to use Greek freely, as having been accustomed to it by living among Greek-speaking people? This does not mean that we should question the usual assumption that the bulk of our Lord's teaching, public and private, was in Aramaic, the language from which Palestinian Jews were not likely to deviate except when speaking to people who only knew Greek. But that He and His disciples were thoroughly familiar with Greek seems altogether probable. It is evident that if Mark's indifferent Greek may be credited to his Jerusalem upbringing, we have a contributory item which may be useful for some critical questions.

¹ See Dittenberger's two volumes, *Orientalis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae* (Leipzig, 1903, 1905).

² Ellis H. Minns, "Parchment of the Parthian Period from Avroman in Kurdistan" (*JHS*, 1915, 22 ff.).

(2) *Aramaisms and Hebraisms.*

§ 11. The past decade has produced much helpful discussion on the burning question of Semitism in the Greek Bible. Nothing has emerged, I believe, to shake the general position taken by Deissmann, adopted with some developments in *Prolegomena*, but there are some applications of the principle which I should myself admit to be too rigorous. It will be advisable therefore to restate the central thesis of "Deissmannism," albeit, alas! without the advantage of Professor Deissmann's own judgement, to seek which was in happier days as much a pleasure as a duty.

Semitism in the NT will be defined as a deviation from genuine Greek idiom due to too literal rendering of the language of a Semitic original. "Semitic" for this purpose means either Hebrew, as the language of the Old Testament, or Aramaic, as the mother-tongue of many NT writers. The definition omits intentionally the case in which literal rendering of Semitic produces Greek which is perfectly idiomatic.

The resulting sense may be (1) identical. In that case it might have seemed that we were spared the trouble of discussing Semitism, unless we felt ourselves bound to find "Latinism" in the sentence "Balbus built a wall," which is an undeniably literal rendering of *Balbus murum ædificavit*. E. Nestle, however, a first-rate authority on Semitic subjects, stoutly claimed *ὡς πότε*; as a Hebraism, "even if it is still used by Pallis in his MGr translation," and though it "may be quotable from early Greek, and have spread in later times." To this declaration, put forth in a review of my *Prolegomena*, I replied with the question whether the Emperor Hadrian's *ἐκ πότε*; and our own *till when?* were likewise to be branded as Hebraism.¹ Of course, all languages when we compare them show multitudes of idioms in which two or more of them exactly agree. The generally similar structure of the human mind secures this mitigation of the translator's otherwise intolerable lot. But beside this case, which really does not deserve detailed investigation, there is the more difficult case of approximation not amounting to identity. A literal or nearly

¹ *Camb. Bibl. Essays*, 473 f.; *Proleg.* 107.

literal rendering may give us a phrase which is moderately idiomatic, but of decidedly restricted use in the language of the translation. The result may be a very marked *over-use* of a rare locution, as representing exactly what is common in the language from which the translation is made. Thus the very rare preposition *ἐνώπιον*—the adverbial neuter of an adjective found in Greek literature, though seldom enough—figures in legal Greek papyri to represent *coram*, without a case expressed, and in some NT writers to render 'פָּנָיִם. It is quite genuine Greek, but it is fair to call it a Latinism in the papyri and a Hebraism in Luke, since it is most unlikely that either would have used it except in reference to its original. So again the relative frequency of *ἰδοῦ* in *James*—compared (*Proleg.* 11 n.) with the Welshman's "look you" in Shakespeare—may be reasonably enough called Hebraism if we only mean that its prominence is to be connected with the writer's familiarity with a language in which an interjection with this meaning was used much more frequently than it was in native Greek. While, however, we are justified in considering all such cases of "over-use" when we are estimating the language of a particular writer, it would be well to restrict the term Semitism (Hebraism, Aramaism) to cases where Greek idiom is violated or at least seriously strained. We will add the adjective "secondary" when Semitisms of the milder kind are in question.

Then (2) the resultant meaning, when literal translation has produced idiomatic Greek, may be something different from that of the original. In this case, of course, the translator must have misunderstood his original, or else failed to realise in what sense ordinary Greek readers would understand his phrase. A good example of the former was pointed out by Thackeray¹ in Lk 14²². It is clear that when we meet in a NT book a phrase which makes good sense as Greek, we shall have to treat it as Greek: we may sometimes suspect that the writer was really thinking of something different, and we may have evidence from his lapses elsewhere

¹ *JTS* xiv. 389 f. Here the reading of B preserves the recognised translation-Greek of the later LXX for the familiar Hebrew phrase for salutation, which where royalty was concerned acquired the special connotation of tendering allegiance, or, as in this passage, of making unconditional surrender.

which makes the suspicions plausible, but obviously the Greek readers for whom the book was intended never suspected anything of the kind. Except in the Apocalypse, where we have a writer who simply did not know the grammar of Greek except in shreds and patches, we shall hardly care to allow that the readers of the book on its first appearance had no adequate equipment for understanding what the author meant; and even in that book we shall only admit the assumption very sparingly. We may take as an example Wellhausen's treatment of Mk 27:1 *λαλεῖ βλασφημεῖ* are to be taken together as a blundering attempt to represent an Aramaic construction which would be accurately rendered by *λαλεῖ βλασφημίας* (Lk 5²¹).² Whether this is the most probable Aramaic original we need not inquire: it is enough to reply that no Greek reader could possibly suspect any other sense than that which the RV represents, and that Luke's paraphrase is no warrant for making Mark guilty of a wildly impossible Greek combination, with no second offence to create a presumption against him. The fascinating pursuit of Aramaic originals may lead to a good percentage of successful guesses; but they are mere guesses still, except when a decided failure in the Greek can be cleared up by an Aramaic which explains the error, and this acts as corroboration.

§ 12. True Semitisms in the NT are of two kinds. First come imitations, conscious or unconscious, of the Greek OT, where the translators had perpetrated "translation Greek." Secondly, there are similarly slavish renderings of Semitic sources, oral or written, which lie behind the NT documents: we may here stretch the term "sources" to include a writer's native Semitic in which he frames his sentences in his own mind, and then more or less successfully translates them into Greek. Of course, in the OT the Semitisms only differ from the second class just named in that they are Hebraisms, while those in the NT are Aramaisms—Aramaic originals in OT and Hebrew possible originals in NT may be left out of account. Perhaps we should add the difference due to the

¹ See his *Einl.*¹ 22.

² Matthew characteristically abbreviates: *οὗτος βλασφημεῖ* (9⁹) practically contains the sense of *τί οὗτος οὕτω λαλεῖ; βλασφημεῖ*—see above.

fact that the LXX is a definite translation of a series of books, long current and highly authoritative, while in the NT we have free composition in Greek, based frequently upon Semitic which had no fixed or authoritative form. The NT Aramaisms accordingly will be unconscious, and due to defective knowledge of Greek. The Hebraisms of the LXX were very often conscious sins against Greek idiom, due to a theory that words believed to be divinely inspired must be rendered so that every detail had its equivalent. It was this which gave birth to Aquila's ἐν κεφαλαίῳ ἔκτισεν ὁ θεὸς σὺν τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ σὺν τῇν γῆν: no Greek could imagine what the σὺν meant, but the Hebrew לְבָרֵךְ must not be left without an equivalent. It must be admitted that our own RV was as unhappily conscientious when it gave us "By hearing ye shall hear," or "who also have been in Christ before me" (Rom 16⁷). Translation of this kind is, of course, an outcome of conditions peculiar to canonical books. In the LXX we find very little of it in the Pentateuch, executed before this theory of a translator's duty was framed, and very little in a book like *Tobit*, which only became (semi)canonical in its Greek, or rather in one of its two Greek forms. In estimating the effect of the LXX upon NT language we have to note carefully the very different degree in which its various parts influenced NT thought.

If we count the separate verses cited in WH to make a rough test, we find that the Pentateuch accounts for a quarter of the New Testament quotations and allusions, the Prophets (and Daniel) for nearly a half, and the Psalms for a fifth, while all the rest only amount to 6 per cent.¹ It may be added that *Isaiah* claims two-fifths of the προφητεία credited to the Prophets. Putting aside, therefore, the relatively negligible historical and poetical books, we have two forces acting on the NT writers from the Greek OT. On the one side is the good *Κοινή* Greek of the Law, the work of men who understood their original thoroughly, and aimed at expressing its meaning in plain every-day speech. On the other, there is the often inferior Greek of the Psalms and the Prophets, where the much more difficult original was frequently

¹ *Camb. Bibl. Essays*, 475.

misunderstood, and the misunderstanding often veiled by slavish literalness, while the development of the more rigorous theory of translation introduced yet more of this Greek that was no Greek. Since quotations from Prophets and Psalms are between two and three times as numerous as those from the Pentateuch, we might expect to find the stylistic influence of the latter altogether counterbalanced by the linguistically mischievous effects of the former. But the NT writers, except probably Luke and the author(ess) of *Hebrews*, knew the Hebrew original too well to be at the mercy of a defective translation. We very rarely find quotations which seriously violate Greek idiom. The "Biblical style" which influenced pre-eminently Luke among NT writers was that of the Pentateuch. It came first in time, stood first in authority, and being very largely narrative was more calculated to affect narrative books than the other books, which mostly supplied isolated phrases for quotation.¹

§ 13. We proceed to remark on the extent to which Semitisms and secondary Semitisms may be observed in the several writers.² Let us take **Luke** first, both as the largest individual contributor and as the one who exhibits specimens of Hebraism to an appreciable extent. The most typical of Luke's many imitations of OT Greek is the narrative "it came to pass"—to represent it by the Biblical English, the appearance of which in one of our own writers would produce almost exactly the same mental association. How far this locution approximated to vernacular Greek idiom has been discussed in *Proleg.* 16 f.; and the significant fact is noted that in *Acts* Luke reverts to the form which least diverges from that vernacular. Luke often goes further in imitation of the Hebrew by writing *καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ c. infin. καὶ . . .*: here, also, there are cases elsewhere, as in Mk 4⁴, where both Mt and Lk agree in omitting. Apart from these imitations of the Greek Bible, Luke shares with others certain Aramaisms which arise from literal rendering of vernacular sources. Whether Luke himself or his own immediate

¹ For some further remarks on LXX Greek, see my already cited essay in *Camb. Bibl. Essays*, 475 f.

² The details will be reserved for the Appendix.

sources in Greek were responsible can hardly perhaps be decided dogmatically. Neither Aramaic specialists nor Hellenistic have the right to decide whether he had any knowledge of a Semitic tongue: what we really need is prolonged collaboration of both, till a joint impression is formed which may have elements of authoritativeness. Much depends upon our opinion as to Luke's antecedents. If he was an Antiochene, he might very well speak Aramaic, as a language already beginning to dispute with Greek the position of general medium of communication all over Western Asia.¹ If he was a Philipian, which seems to me very much more probable,² he would have to learn Aramaic in Palestine, which he seems to have visited first in 57 A.D. His "two years" (cf. Ac 24²⁷) in the country were doubtless the opportunity of collecting material for his Gospel and the earlier part of *Acts*. Did he trouble to acquire Aramaic for the purpose? It was in any case not essential, for in Galilee Greek-speaking people abounded, and even in Judæa—if Luke's researches were really pursued there, of which there is not much evidence—it would be very easy to find interpreters. If this is true, all Luke's Palestinian material could come to him in Greek, and any Aramaisms or other phenomena traceable to defective Greek may be transferred to the various informants whose contributions Luke scrupulously noted down and reproduced. When, on the other hand, we find evidence that Luke's text involves a misunderstanding of a Semitic original, such as would often occur when a foreigner with a fair but incomplete knowledge of the native dialect gathers information from people of varying degrees of education, it is obvious that such misunderstanding may as easily be credited to Luke's sources as to himself. To prove him responsible, we should at least have to show that they were very numerous and evenly distributed, and that the same kind of mistake occurred in different places. And even then it

¹ See § 10.

² The tradition of his connection with Antioch appears in Eusebius (*HE* iii. 4. 6), Jerome (*de Vir. Illustr.* vii.), and the *Monarchian Prologues* (*Kleine Texte* i., by H. Leitzmann, Bonn, 1902). See art. "Luke," by K. Lake, in *DAC*. For the view that Luke belonged to Philippi, see Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller*, 200 ff.; art. "Luke," by Souter, in *DCG*.

might only mean that Luke took about with him some Christian brother as his dragoman, a Greek who had been in the country longer than himself and had a passable knowledge of Aramaic.

That the two chief sources, used by Luke and by the First Evangelist, were Greek, is, of course, admitted. Mark's defective Greek supplied Luke with Aramaisms ready made; and sometimes a phrase of Mark's, by which an Aramaic idiom is rendered word for word, the corresponding Greek idiom being inaccessible to him, may produce misunderstanding on Luke's part. Equally assured is Luke's use of a Greek Q, one of the translations of the Apostle Matthew's Logia, as Papias's famous sentence prompts us to hold.¹ Here we are constantly finding that Luke faithfully preserved the rough Greek of his original, where Mt freely edits.² That Luke treats his other sources along similar lines does not even depend on the acceptance of this doctrine, which I do not pretend to state as an admitted fact, though it seems to me quite certain. The wide differences in Greek style between one section and another of Luke's peculiar matter can only be explained by assuming that he reproduced his sources generally as he received them. Probably this was mainly because in reporting discourses of Jesus he felt it was the safest procedure, since he had no materials for checking his sources. He had "revised them afresh" (1² *παρηκολουθηκότι ἄνωθεν*) with personal inquiry; but when he had no information enabling him to improve what he felt to be defective, it was better to copy his notes as they stood than to amend them by guesswork. It is the existence of these wide divergences between the discourses in Luke's peculiar sections which weighs most with me in

¹ We probably do not make enough of his very definite assertion that "every one translated the Logia as best he could." While "Matthew" and Luke certainly used the same version for a considerable number of the sayings, for which we are justified in using the common symbol Q, it is highly probable that they often had different versions, and that with this in mind we should spare our ingenuity superfluous exercise in places where Mt and Lk widely differ.

² For some argument in support of this thesis, against Harnack, I may refer to *Expositor*, VII. vii. 411 f. (or Moulton, *Christian Religion*, 71 f.). One or two typical minutiae are repeated above, p. 10.

my own judgement that Luke knew no Aramaic. Had he been his own translator, we should have expected to find the same evenness in the distribution of Aramaisms as we find in those general features of grammar and style which so overwhelmingly vindicate the unity of the two books *ad Theophilum*.

§ 14. We pass on to **Paul**, the next largest contributor to the NT Canon. It is soon realised that we have no longer to do with effects of conscious style. Opinions may differ as to the proper description of *Romans*, his weightiest work: some insist upon its casual character as an open letter addressed to a church that needed doctrinal upbuilding, with no more elaboration than we should put into a letter to the press, while others would make it approximate to a set treatise. But even if the second alternative were adopted, there is no possibility of claiming any definitely literary form. Nägeli's study of a section of Paul's vocabulary shows that he kept himself to words in popular use. Similarly in grammar and style we look in vain for constructions or inflexions of an archaic or worked-up character. As to his Greek, it is obvious from all we know of him that he must have spoken Greek from the first as freely as Aramaic. He calls himself *Ἑβραῖος ἐξ Ἑβραίων*, "a Hebrew of Hebrew descent," and the term naturally implies the familiar use of the Semitic mother-tongue. But the most patriotic Jew of the Dispersion could not get on without Greek. It need not be added that for Paul's missionary work in the West, Greek had no possible alternative except Latin. A man thus accustomed to use the language of the West was not likely to import into it words or constructions that would have a foreign sound. The LXX had no such supreme authority for Paul that a copying of its language would strike him as natural. And if Greek was an alternative mother-tongue to him, he would use it too unconsciously to drop into Aramaisms, defective renderings of a language he could correct as well as any one. The *a priori* view thus sketched tallies satisfactorily with the observed facts. Paul very rarely uses phrases which come from a literal rendering of the Semitic. His Semitisms are secondary at most—defensible as Greek, and natural to a Greek ear.

How carefully he kept away from language which might seem archaic or remote to the ordinary people for whom he wrote is well seen in the case of ἄδης.¹ Paul deliberately mars the rhetorical effect of the quotation from Hosea in 1 Co 15* by substituting θάνατε for ἄδη. For Hades was a Greek divinity, not a place, and the name, though common enough in literature, had dropped out of the ordinary vernacular. Its occurrence elsewhere in the NT may be traced directly to the influence of the LXX, where it is freely used. The LXX translators appropriated it from the technical language of Greek religion because they found it to be an exact rendering of the Hebrew שֵׁשׁ. For Paul, however, no such felicity in the commerce of tongues could stand against the plain fact that the word in question had no place in the vocabulary of every-day Greek. In turning from lexical to grammatical considerations of style we may look at one or two hall-marks of Semitism as they affect Paul.² Twice in Ephesians we find the collocation πᾶς οὐ or μὴ for οὐδεὶς or μηδεὶς, which has been quoted as "a sign that the Semitic influence passed from Paul's thought into his language." But this Hebraism never occurs elsewhere in Paul, and its occurrence twice in this one disputed Epistle must at least be put among the special features of its language which have to be explained.³ In 5^b there is another possible Hebraism, ἵστε γινώσκοντες, the coincidence of which with πᾶς . . . οὐ in the same sentence perhaps emphasises the presence of language moulded on Biblical phraseology. *Ephesians* keeps to itself almost as completely another noteworthy Semitism—"sons of disobedience," "sons of men," "children of wrath," "children of light." I can find no Pauline parallels except 1 Thess 5^b "sons

¹ See *Vocabulary*, s.v.

* At this point Dr. Moulton's MS ends abruptly in the middle of a sentence.

² The rest of this section (§ 14) is taken from a paper read by Dr. Moulton before the Society of Historical Theology, Oxford, on January 24, 1913; it is partly a reply to a valuable critique of his *Prolegomena* by Mr. G. C. Richards in *JTS* x. 283 ff.

³ See *Proleg.* § 246 and *Einl.* 127. A unique parallel for this "Hebraism" is provided by P. Ryl ii. 113¹² (A.D. 133), where Hieracion of Letopolis, beekeeper, complains of unjust treatment from persons μὴ ἔχοντας πᾶν πρᾶγμα πρὸς ἐμέ: the document is very ungrammatical, but shows no marks of Semitic nationality in the writer.

of light and sons of day," and 2 Thess 2³ "son of perdition." The first of these Deissmann regards as a quoted Logion, and the second as a quotation from the LXX. In Col 3⁶ "sons of disobedience" is interpolated; and the phrase "the children of the promise" in Gal 4²⁸, Rom 9⁸ is taken out of this category altogether by the context. Here, then, is another secondary Semitism from which Paul was quite free, except when he wrote *Ephesians*, or (if so preferred) unless he wrote *Ephesians*.¹ The same absence of Semitism comes out for Paul by other tests. *Οὐ μὴ* in the NT is characteristic of Logia and OT quotations, both, of course, admitting the suspicion of "translation Greek," with the consequence that the locution need no more be emphatic than when in the LXX it will alternate with *οὐ* in one verse as a rendering of *אֵין*. In Paul it occurs only four times (with two LXX quotations to be added), and in all four the emphasis is unmistakable, making his use identical with that of classical and Hellenistic Greek. Then *ἰδοῦ* used freely is a natural product of Semitic thought. I have compared Fluellen's "look you" as a mark of a Welshman talking English. Even the excellent Greek of the Epistle of James may show relics of the writer's Semitic mother-tongue in the frequency of *ἰδοῦ*, as in the isolated *προσευχῇ προσηύξατο*. Paul uses *ἰδοῦ* only eight times (and once in a quotation), and never has a trace of James's other Semitism, unless Eph 5⁶ is rightly thus read² and comes from Paul's hand. Both *ἰδοῦ* and *ἰδέ* (*semel*) are used by him with the classical *nuance* and with normal Greek frequency. The participle with *ἦν*, etc., is probably an Aramaism sometimes in translated books, however justifiable as Greek: when Paul uses it, we can trace the same force which it has in classical writings. One more example may be named—the curious *ἐν ῥάβδῳ ἔλθω πρὸς ὑμᾶς* (1 Cor 4²¹), which even Deissmann had to explain away, until Ptolemaic papyri, linked with Lucian, showed that *ἐν*, meaning "armed with," was good vernacular Greek.³

¹ For an interesting conjecture as to the authorship of *Ephesians* and its relation to *Colossians*, see Dr. Moulton's popular lectures, *From Egyptian Rubbish-heaps*, 59 ff. (London: C. H. Kelly. 1916).

² See *Proleg.* 245, *Einl.* 119.

³ See *Vocab. s. v. ἐν*.

§ 15. When we pass from Paul to that noble work which came from the pen of some unknown member of his circle we are met by the striking paradox that a letter "to Hebrews" is written by some one who knew no Hebrew, and used the Greek Bible alone. It is hardly necessary for our present purpose to discuss the structure of this Epistle. Whether it was originally an epistle or a treatise,¹ it has a literary flavour that distinguishes it from any other book in the NT Canon. "Alike in form and contents this epistle strives to rise from the stratum in which Christianity had its origin towards the higher level of learning and culture."² We have already³ referred to the author's sensitive ear for the rhythm of words, and have looked in that direction rather than to any elaborate system of rhetoric for the true explanation of what must strike even the casual reader as a distinctive feature of this book. Blass was on surer ground when he pointed out another characteristic,—viz. a general avoidance of the harsher kinds of hiatus between successive words. This would probably be almost instinctive in any one who had received a good Greek education, to whom ἐλέγγο αὐτῶ would have sounded harsh, much as a word like "idea" sounds harsh in English when followed by a vowel in rapid speech.⁴ Familiarity with some of the niceties of classical syntax may be traced in the exact significance of the tenses, in the freer and more skilful use of particles and conjunctions, and in the more complex structure of the sentence as compared with the other NT writings. Yet his skilful mastery of language never betrays the writer into artificiality, nor is his sonorous vocabulary allowed to weary us with the excessive use of heavy compounds. Dr. Nairne⁵ calls our attention to the "sudden touch of conversational audacity" which introduces such a word as πηλίκος into the majestic description of Melchizedek (7⁴). So flexible a Greek style might seem to entitle its possessor to unconditional exemption from any examination into his Semitic connexions. There is no reason to suspect him of acquaintance with either Aramaic

¹ See Deissmann, *BS* 49 f., and Moffatt, *Introd.* 428 ff.

² Deissmann, *LAE* 237.

³ *Supra*, p. 6 n.³

⁴ *CBE* 482.

⁵ *The Ep. to the Hebrews*, in *CGT*, cli. His chapter on *The Style of the Epistle* abounds in illustrations of the characteristics of the author's Greek.

or Hebrew. Nevertheless one fact necessitates the inquiry. This Epistle is steeped in the language of the LXX, and quotes from it even more copiously than does St. Paul. It is therefore not surprising to find a formidable list of Semitisms in the arraignment. Three of them¹—the predicative use of *εἰς*, *οὐ μὴ*, and a violent use of the participle standing by itself in the genitive absolute—need not detain us, as they occur in a direct citation from the LXX in chap. 8. A similar defence might secure speedy acquittal on another count, for the phrase *ἐν αἵματι διαθήκης* (13²⁰) is certainly based on Zech 9¹¹. It should be counted to him for righteousness, however, that in his use of such a Hebraism the author transcends Semitic idiom.² The presence of a "secondary Semitism" must be acknowledged in *ἐν τῷ λέγεσθαι* (3¹⁵). Dalman's claim was denied on the strength of the frequent occurrence of the locution in Thucydides, Plato and Xenophon; but in view of Dr. E. A. Abbott's acute criticism, that the instances cited must convey the sense of "during," we have transferred this "Hebraism" to the category of "possible but unidiomatic Greek."³ The same chapter furnishes another instance of the pervasive influence of the phraseology of the LXX. *Καρδία πονηρὰ ἀπιστίας* (3¹²) can be easily paralleled from Sophocles, as was shown in *Proleg.* 74. But its subject-matter leaves us in little doubt that Biblical associations prompted this rather overstrained use in prose of the poetical genitive of definition.

§ 16. In the linguistic conditions of Palestine we have already found a clue to the remarkably free Greek of a group of writings traditionally ascribed to three members of our Lord's own circle, **1 Peter, James and Jude**. When, therefore, the question is asked⁴ about the first, "Is it credible that a Galilean fisherman who left out his H's (Mt 26⁷³) should after middle life, and in the midst of absorbing occupa-

¹ See, further, *Proleg.* 72, 74, 187.

² Cf. Nairne, *ib.* cxlvii, "He will adopt a rude Hebraic use of the preposition *ἐν*, and by careful context fill it with significance, as in 1¹ *ἐν τ. προφήταις* . . . *ἐν υἱῷ*, 10¹⁰ *ἐν ᾧ θελήματι*, 13²⁰, where notice how *ἐν αἵματι* and *ἐν ἡμῶν* explain one another."

³ *Proleg.* 249, *Eini.* 841.

⁴ Simcox, *The Writers of the New Testament*, 68.

tion, have learnt to write scholarly Greek like this?" the answer is by no means a foregone conclusion. Without denying the possibility that this "open letter" owes its mastery of idiom to the practised pen of Silvanus, we can yet argue that Peter's Greek may well have been better than his Aramaic. A provincial brogue of Aramaic that attracted attention in the metropolis of Judaism does not necessarily imply defective culture.¹ Moreover, in the thirty-five years that lie between the Crucifixion and the probable date of this letter, Greek rather than Aramaic would be the tongue in which Peter conversed with the Hellenist Jews of Jerusalem and Antioch, and the LXX would of necessity be the Bible used in all his missionary work abroad. Now it is evident that the author of *1 Peter* was steeped in the language of the LXX. This appears in the number of direct quotations, still more in the reminiscences of LXX phraseology which are woven into the fabric of his style. In view of the rhythm and balance of sentence, the copiousness of vocabulary, and the management of tenses and prepositions to which Bp. Chase² has drawn attention, it is interesting to notice points of contact which the same scholar has indicated between this Epistle and the non-Hebraic and literary books of the Apocrypha, such as *Wisdom*, *2 Mac* and *4 Mac*. From Semitisms this Epistle is singularly free, if we exclude from consideration the plentiful sprinkling of phrases and citations from the LXX. A secondary Semitism may be allowed in 1^{14} (τέκνα ὑπακοῆς),³ and no doubt the OT is responsible for such a word as ἀπροσωπολήμπτως (1^{17}). The influence of the LXX may be traced in such words as ἀναστροφή, ἀναστρέφομαι and παρεπίδημος, but the evidence from papyri and inscriptions removes them from the old class of "Hebraisms of Vocabulary."⁴

The bilingual birthright of the Galilean may also account for the paradox that "the letter of that specially Jewish

¹ See Dalman, *Words*, 80.

² Hastings, *DB* iii. 781 f. Mayor (*Comm. on Jude and 2 Pet.*) even says, "Perhaps no other book of the NT has such a sustained stateliness of rhythm as *1 Pet.*"

³ *Supra*, pp. 22 f. Cf. also Deissmann, *BS* 163 f.

⁴ Deissmann, *BS* 88, 149, 194. *Vocabulary*, s. vv.

apostle, St. James, is perhaps the best Greek in the New Testament."¹ We need not linger over the theory of an Aramaic original.² The writer's fondness for paronomasia and alliteration do not suggest the hand of a translator; and whilst the crisp vivacity of James offers a striking contrast to the rather long and well-balanced sentences of *1 Peter*, such constructions as *ἄγε νῦν, ἔοικεν, χρῆ, ἀπαρχή τις*, are evidence that his style takes high rank in the Greek of the NT. Two traces of the author's Semitic mother-tongue have already been mentioned (p. 23). We must also notice an overstrain in the use of the genitive of definition in such phrases as *τὸ πρόσωπον τῆς γενέσεως αὐτοῦ* and *ἀκροατῆς ἐπιλησμονῆς*. Instrumental *ἐν* in 3⁹ was formerly counted a Hebraism, so were the aorists in 1¹¹. But the publication of the *Tebtunis Papyri* closed the controversy about the former (cf. *supra*, p. 23), as the weighty judgement of Hort³ may be held to have settled the other question in favour of the gnomic aorist.

The little letter that bears the name of Jude is chiefly remarkable for the wealth of its vocabulary, derived in part from the LXX, the pseudepigrapha and the Pauline Epistles. Its fondness for sonorous words might seem to suggest a wider acquaintance with literature. But writers of the *Κουρή*, "embodying older strata of the language, would suffice to supply him with his vocabulary."⁴ Less flexible than *1 Peter* in syntactical structure, Jude also lacks the epigrammatic succinctness of James. Vigorous and descriptive he certainly is; and the tendency to triple expression is a well-marked feature of his style. Mayor's exhaustive analysis of his grammar shows that the author was quite at home in Hellenistic idiom. Indeed the critical microscope fails to detect a genuine Semitism in the 24 verses.

Another writer calls for brief mention with this Palestinian group on the ground of literary indebtedness rather than from considerations of style. The "Atticism" of *2 Peter* has been mentioned in an earlier section (§ 5),

¹ Salmon, *Introd.* § 139.

² Bp. John Wordsworth's *a priori* arguments have been fully answered by Mayor (*Comm.* § cccxxii ff.).

³ *Comm. on 1 Pet.* 96.

⁴ Chase, *Hastings' DB* ii. 801.

which explained the unique character of its Greek as an artificial dialect of high-sounding words learnt from rhetoricians or books and employed with the uneasy touch of one who acquired the language in later life. It is significant that this Epistle has not a single quotation from the OT and but five uncertain allusions. This absence of the phraseology of the LXX may account for its freedom from the slightly Semitic colouring that we have noticed in the admirable Greek of the other Epistles in this group. In only two places is there any real approach to Semitism. 'Εν ἐμπαιγμονῇ ἐμπαίκτης may belong to the same class as James's προσευχῇ προσήξατο. But in view of the slight impression which the LXX has left on his diction, and bearing in mind Dalman's caution,¹ it seems more reasonable to explain this locution as an instance of the author's tendency to reduplication. Κατάρας τέκνα claims kinship with that familiar genitive of definition, though a quasi-classical turn is given to the phrase by the inverted order of the words.

§ 17. Starting from Luke we have fetched a wide compass and must now return to the other three Gospels. There can, of course, be no question that translation-Greek occurs in Mark and those parts of the Synoptic Gospels which reproduce "Q." Enough has already been said to indicate that real Aramaism may be allowed ungrudgingly in those parts of the NT which are virtually translated from Aramaic oral or written sources. Wellhausen's brilliant investigation serves to remind us of the need of keeping in view the distinction made above between secondary Semitisms and Semitisms pure and simple. For like other Semitic specialists, that lamented scholar was perhaps sometimes in danger of recognising foreign idiom where a Greek reader of the book would never suspect anything wrong. Thus in Lk 14¹⁸ ἀπὸ μιᾶς is said to be the Aramaic *min ch'da*, which he calls "a thumping Aramaism." But why call it an Aramaism when the phrase was a very idiomatic expression in Luke's own language? It is merely a case of coincidence between the

¹ *Words*, 34. "The Hebrew mode of emphasising the finite verb by adding its infinitive or cognate substantive . . . is in the Palestine Aramaic of the Jews—apart from the Targums—quite unknown."

idioms of two languages; and while Mark perhaps might have been ignorant of it as Greek, and was capable of employing it as a literal translation of the Aramaic, Luke simply could not have used it as other than a normal Greek term. Although the same instinct for Greek style cannot be claimed for **Matthew**, the First Gospel betrays Semitic authorship only in its range of ideas and its sympathetic understanding of the Jewish-Christian point of view. The language, on the other hand, is a correct if rather colourless Greek which avoids the vulgar forms without displaying a mastery of the literary syntax. The Hebraisms which in Luke express a literary feeling that formed itself on ancient models are noticeably wanting from Matthew's narrative. Instances have already been given of his editorial revision where Luke preferred to sacrifice style in favour of fidelity to the original source. The same freedom is shown in his treatment of Mark,¹ so much so indeed that it has been said² that "Matthew græcises Mark." One or two exceptions, however, may be noticed because of their bearing on the question of Semitisms. The phrase *πέμψας διά* is unquestionably the right reading in 11², and Wellhausen points out that *ܒܪ ܢܗܫ* in Aramaic as in Hebrew is a regular phrase for sending a message. In the Lucan parallel *διά* has become *δύο τινάς*, from which it seems to follow that Luke misread³ the literal *διά* of his source, which is preserved in Matthew. Incidentally we have here strong evidence in favour of the Greek basis in the common source. Similar testimony is borne by the notable logion in Mt 10²⁶⁻²⁸ where, in addition to the sequence of words in v.²⁷ and the whole of v.²⁸, the Lucan parallel gives us also Matthew's *ἐπὶ τῶν δωματίων*, a good Hellenistic phrase; *φοβηθῆναι ἀπό*, a very marked piece of translation-Greek; and *ὁμολογεῖν ἐν ἑμοί*. Deissmann⁴ describes this last as a translation made "with a painful scrupulousness coming near to a pedantry of interpretation." Even the author of the Apocalypse gives this logion in a better Greek form (cf.

¹ For instances see W. C. Allen, *ExpT* xiii. 328 f., and *Comm. on Matt.* xix f.

² This is Wellhausen's summary (*Eint.* 1 35) of Zahn's argument as quoted by Wernle, *Die synoptische Frage* (1899, vii, viii and 120). But see Zahn, *Introd.* (E.T.) ii. 576, 591-2.

³ See § 13.

⁴ *In Christo*, 60, quoted in *Proleg.* 104.

Rev 3⁵). Turning to Matthew's treatment of his other chief source we note another apparent exception to the general rule. In the lawyer's question (Mt 22³⁸) *ποία ἐντολή μεγάλη ἐν τῷ νόμῳ*; Mark has not *μεγάλη* but *πρώτη πάντων*, a thoroughly vernacular phrase. Matthew's form is quite clearly a much less idiomatic translation of the Aramaic (which has no degrees of comparison), and it falls in with various indications that he is here drawing upon other material, quite possibly derived from Q. This literal translation of the Aramaic would be very natural when we bear in mind the obsolescence of *μέγιστος*.¹ Another instance of translation-Greek which Wellhausen notices is the impersonal use of the 3 plur. active in place of the passive. This is common to all the Synoptists, but may be mentioned here because of two occurrences in Matthew which raise points of interest in Synoptic criticism. In 1²⁸ *καλέουσιν* replaces the more natural *καλέσεις* of the LXX and suggests an Aramaic translation from the Hebrew current in Matthew's time as part of a collection of *testimonia*.² Once again in 5¹⁵ the Matthean *οὐδὲ καλοῦσιν καὶ τιθέασιν* preserves an Aramaism where Luke employs the more idiomatic *οὐδεὶς ἄψας τίθησιν*. The fact that this logion is a doublet in Luke and that in the Marcan passage the Aramaism is absent, seems to show that the saying was current in more than one form, which would account for the divergence without crediting it, with Harnack, to Luke's stylistic improvement of Q. In many of these instances given by Wellhausen,³ although the active use of the verb is quite permissible Greek,⁴ it must be allowed that the passive would probably have been used but for the influence of a Semitic original.

The language of our Second Gospel shows a very marked deficiency in culture on the part of the Jerusalemite **Mark**, who seems to have a foreign idiom perpetually behind his Greek. "Peter's former interpreter"—for so we must render Papias's phrase⁵—had been a *ὑπηρέτης* or "minister of the

¹ See *Proleg.* 78, and cf. the frequent introduction of *μέγας μέγας* in early papyri (as P Tebt i. 63^b (ii/b.c.)); so *Einvl.* 122, 124.

² So A. H. McNeile, *Comm. in loc.*

³ *Ibid.* 25 f.

⁴ Cf. *Proleg.* 58 f., also *Einvl.* 87.

⁵ *Μάρκος μὲν ἑρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου γενόμενος* (or "having been Peter's interpreter"); cf. *Vocabulary*, s.v. *γίνομαι*.

word," that is, a teacher or catechist who accompanied an apostle on his missionary tour for the purpose of instructing inquirers in the outlines of the life and teaching of that Jesus whom they preached. We may repeat here what has been said elsewhere:¹ "There can be no question that the catechetical lessons on which the written Gospel was ultimately based, were given first in Aramaic; and they may well have become so fixed in that form that when their author transferred them to Greek they retained ubiquitous marks of too literal translation. It is of great critical importance to observe how these Aramaisms of translation were progressively smoothed away. Wellhausen shows that D has most of them and B distinctly less. Unless this is due (as Bishop Chase argued) to a Syriac infection in D, we have here a most important source of evidence as to the origin of the Western Text, of which in this respect the 'Neutral' becomes a revision. As has been noted already, there is plenty of revision of Mark's Aramaism to be seen in Matthew and Luke. In a considerable number of little points these Evangelists coincide in their amendments, a fact well explained by Dr. Sanday's suggestion² that the text of Mark had been polished by a cultured scribe before it reached them: our Mark descends from the unrevised form. Mark's Semitisms . . . are hardly ever really barbarous Greek, though his extremely vernacular language often makes us think so, until we read the less educated papyri. Generally we recognise them by their over-use of a possible though uncommon idiom which happens to agree with Aramaic."

A singularly neat instance came to light in a Berlin papyrus³ to confute those who would describe βλέπειν ἀπό (Mk 8¹⁵ etc.) as a rank Hebraism: ὡς ἂν πάντες καὶ σὺ βλέπε σατὸν ἀπὸ τῶν Ἰουδαίων. Surely it was no Jew who gave this warning to his friend!

§ 18. The Fourth Gospel and the Johannine Epistles (which, on every consideration of style, form with it a literary unity) are the work of a writer to whom Greek was

¹ *Camd. Bibl. Essays*, 491.

² *Oxford Studies*, 21.

³ BGU iv. 1079²⁴ (A.D. 41) (= *Selections*, p. 40).

evidently no mother-tongue. We infer this from the excessive simplicity of the style and its poverty of idiom, not from any grammatical aberrations. The conditions lend support to the theory that the author was brought up in Jerusalem (see p. 13). But in spite of certain superficial indications that point that way the style is not Semitic. Two such indications in the Gospel may be briefly noticed,—the prevailing use of parataxis and the priority of the verb in the sentence. As for the former, parataxis predominates to such an extent that we instinctively recognise an editorial hand in the flowing periods that form the prologue to the Passion narrative (13¹⁻⁴). Yet it is impossible to claim that the incessant co-ordination of simple sentences by *καί* is a hall-mark of Semitism after studying Deissmann's parallel¹ between the narrative in John 9⁷⁻¹¹ and a Roman inscription of the time of the Antonines giving an account of the marvellous cures wrought by Asclepius. A stronger argument can be based on the arrangement of words, for, as a rule, in the Johannine writings the verb stands first and the subject follows, and it is tempting to trace the Semitic genius of language in such an order. Even upon this subject it is well to suspend judgement until careful statistical investigation on the lines of Kieckers's important monograph² has provided us with material for a wider induction. Meanwhile we do well to observe other significant features in the order of words. Wellhausen³ attributes the precedence given to the verb to imitation of the Biblical style as best fitted to the subject-matter. He even discovers in the solemn rhythm a self-conscious, sacerdotal language, to be compared with the pedantry of the Priestly Code in the Pentateuch. Whatever we may think of this judgement we must accept his verdict that the position of words in general is unSemitic. This can be seen best in the tendency to remove the subject to the very end of the sentence (cf. 2⁹, 6³, 18²³, 19³⁵), and in the position of the dependent genitive in phrases like *αὐτοῦ μαθηταί, δύο ἀνθρώπων ἡ μαρτυρία*, etc. The great Semitist discovers no trace of the construct state in John, and stays

¹ *LAE* 131.

² *Die Stellung des Verbs im Griechischen* (Strassburg, 1911).

³ *Das Evangelium Johannis*, 133-146.

his hand when he finds an occasional *casus pendens* followed by a resumptive pronoun. The linguistic evidence all goes to show that the author of the Fourth Gospel was a man who, while cultured to the last degree, wrote Greek after the fashion of men of quite elementary attainment. His uneasy movement in the region of unfamiliar idiom is never suffered to betray him into a breach of the laws of grammar.

§ 19. Very different are the phenomena that meet us in that marvellous book which so fittingly closes the canon of the NT. The Greek of the **Apocalypse** differs in an extraordinary degree from that of the Fourth Gospel. Not only does it display a greater freedom in copiousness of vocabulary and elaborate phraseology; it is simply defiant of the restraints of grammar. Various attempts have been made to secure the traditional unity of authorship with the Gospel. But even Hort's strong argument for an early date, leaving thirty years in which the author could improve his Greek before writing the Gospel, falls short of a solution. Modern criticism has little to add to the penetrating analysis which Dionysius of Alexandria furnished in the middle of the third century. Speaking with the authority of one to whom Greek was a native tongue, this critic discerned a difference not of degree but of kind. Even if the decision against an early date were not fairly unanimous, it would still tax our ingenuity to bridge the chasm between the unchartered liberty of *Revelation* and the austere simplicity of the Gospel according to St. John. The Apocalypse, in the contrast it affords between wealth of diction and grammatical solecisms, suggests an author who had used Greek all his life as a second language and never from choice. His seeming indifference to the rules of concord can be readily understood by Englishmen who stumble over the genders of French and German after speaking a language unburdened with this useless survival. A fresh impetus has been given to the study of this strange dialect by Dr. R. H. Charles, who has shown in his *Studies in the Apocalypse*¹ that many of its

¹ And with greater fulness of detail in his two-volume commentary in the *Int. Crit. Com.* from which Canon Charles has kindly shown me extracts in the proof stage.

mannerisms are due to the literal transference of Semitic idioms. A striking illustration (found seven times in Rev) is the co-ordination of the participle in one of the oblique cases and the finite verb, e.g. 2³ τοὺς λέγοντας ἑαυτοὺς ἀποστόλους καὶ οὐκ εἰσίν. But while the book abounds in translation-Greek and bears constantly the imprint of the author's Semitic mind, it is easy to go too far in attributing all its peculiarities of grammar and idiom to the influence of the LXX when a Hebrew or Aramaic source is not in question. Thus Moffatt's treatment of the subject¹ finds a useful counterpoise in Radermacher's² judgement. After all the author was capable of writing a vigorous though irregular Greek with a very free pen and, as Dean Armitage Robinson has pointed out,³ "the Greek in which he expressed himself was more like the Greek of the Egyptian papyri and of inscriptions found in various parts of the Graeco-Roman world." The very blunders in concord do not imply ignorance in the ordinary sense; "it is familiarity with a relaxed standard of speech, such as we find often enough in the professional letter-writers who indited the petitions and private correspondence of the peasants of the Fayûm." Perhaps it was but fitting that the weird melodies and daring harmonies in which the seer of Patmos gave utterance to the things which he had seen "which must shortly come to pass," should speak to us now in the haunting cadences of Jewish apocalyptic, and again in the popular idiom of the Graeco-Roman world.

¹ *Introd.* 501.

² *Neutestamentliche Grammatik*, 87: "Was die Apokalypse, und zwar sie allein unter den Schriften des Neuen Testaments, an entsprechenden Fällen zeigt, hat also nicht mehr als Solöcismus zu gelten und darf schwerlich als sklavische Nachbildung eines hebräischen Originaltextes erklärt werden."

³ *JTS* x. 9.

PART I.
SOUNDS AND WRITING.

This page intentionally left blank

PART I.

PHONOLOGY AND WRITING.

§ 20. The Greek Alphabet in the Hellenistic period had twenty-four letters :—

Form.			Transliteration.	Name.	
1	2	3		In Greek.	In English.
Α	α	α	a	ἄλφα	Alpha
Β	β	β	b	βῆτα	Bēta
Γ	γ	γ	g	γάμμα	Gamma
Δ	δ	δ	d	δέλτα	Delta
Ε	ε	ε, ε	ö	εἰ, later ε̄	Epsilon
Ζ	ζ	ζ	z	ζῆτα	Zēta
Η	η	η	ē	ἦτα	Ēta
Θ	θ	θ, θ	th	θῆτα	Thēta
Ι	ι	ι	i	ἰῶτα	Iōta
Κ	κ	κ	k (c)	κάππα	Kappa
Λ	λ	λ	l	λά(μ)βδα	Lambda
Μ	μ	μ	m	μῦ	Mu
Ν	ν	ν	n	νῦ	Nu
Ξ	ξ	ξ	x	ξέι	Xi
Ο	ο	ο	ö	οῦ, later ö	Omicron
Π	π	π	p	πέι	Pi
Ρ	ρ	ρ	r	ῥῶ	Rho
Σ	σ	σ, σ	s	σίγμα	Sigma
Τ	τ	τ	t	ταῦ	Tau
Υ	υ	υ	u (y)	ῥ	Upsilon
Φ	φ	φ	ph	φεἰ	Phi
Χ	χ	χ	kh (ch)	χεἰ	Chi
Ψ	ψ	ψ	ps	ψεἰ	Psi
Ω	ω	ω	ō	ῶ	Omega

Notes.

1. The first column represents the printed form of the capital letters, based on the alphabet (τὰ Ἰωνικὰ γράμματα) which from iv/b.c. was generally used in inscriptions. For the history of the forms see §§ 21 f.

2. In the second column stands the alphabet of the oldest uncial MSS, as printed by WH in citations from the OT. The third column is the ordinary alphabet of modern printed books, based on that which the early printers derived from "cursive" or "minuscule" MSS. The alternative forms here given are indifferent except in the case of σ , s , the latter of which is used at the end of words only. Some print it also at the end of a preposition or adverb compounded with another word (*προσφέρω* etc.); but the historical justification of this form does not apply to any position other than the actual end of a word.¹

3. The transliteration column shows the value of the letters as evidenced by the form they take in contemporary Latin: an exception is made with κ , ν , χ , which in Latin take the bracketed form only. The pronunciation of the letters will be treated summarily below §§ 23 ff., and in detail under the Orthography.

4. The names of the letters are given in English according to their conventional forms, many of which, however, are unwarranted by early usage. The addition of *ψιλον* to the names ξ and ϑ is a late misunderstanding: Byzantine grammarians, giving rules for writing $\alpha\iota$ or ϵ , $\omicron\iota$ or υ (which were not distinguished in sound), would say that a particular word was written *διὰ τὸ ε ψιλοῦ*, "with a simple ϵ ," as distinguished from a diphthong $\alpha\iota$. "Little \omicron " and "big \omicron " are names dating from the Byzantine period, when the two letters were pronounced alike. The name for λ is better attested as *Labda* than as *Lambda*.

History of the Alphabet. § 21. For the history of the alphabet, a long and complex subject, reference may be made to special works: see literature in art. "Writing," *Enc. Brit.* (P. Giles). It must only be mentioned here that the alphabet (in Greek *γράμματα*, of the forms of the letters, *στοιχεῖα*, of the sounds) came in prehistoric times² into Greece from Phoenicia. The date

¹ In the earlier printed books we find the compendia $\zeta = \sigma\tau$, $\vartheta = \omicron\nu$.

² The event is already covered with a myth, Cadmus, the "eastern" (ὄστρ), being credited with the *καδμητῖα γράμματα* (Herod. v. 58), which are, however, *φοινικητῖα* in the same context and elsewhere. Nöldeke (*Beitr. z. semit. Sprachwiss.*, 1904, 124-136) rejects the suggestion that Aramaic influence is traceable in the names *ἄλφα* and others: the forms are only due to Greek modification. (I owe the reference to Prof. Hogg.) Nestle (*Philologus*, 1900, 476 f.) says the theory is as old as the sixteenth century. Dr. A. J. Evans has shown that the Phoenicians themselves derived the alphabet from the prehistoric Cretan script of the newly discovered Minoan inscriptions; see his *Scripta Minoa* (1909), 86 ff.

may possibly be prior to the composition of the oldest parts of the *Iliad*, but certainty on this famous question can hardly be expected. It is a very striking fact that contact with the Semites should have occurred before the dawn, and after the sunset of classical Greek literature, and hardly at all in the interval. The letters seem to have been adapted to some extent independently by different Greek communities. But we find in all alike the central principle which betrays Greek genius at work even when, for once, it was borrowing and not inventing. An alphabet without vowels would have been peculiarly useless for expressing Greek words. Accordingly superfluous consonants were adapted to new uses: α became $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\phi\alpha$, η supplied $\epsilon\acute{\iota}$, π $\eta\tau\alpha$ (in earlier times λ , as in the local alphabet with which Latin was ultimately written), ' was $\acute{\iota}\omega\tau\alpha$, γ was $\acute{o}\upsilon$. Later invention produced υ and $\acute{\omega}$. In several Greek dialects γ survived as F ($\beta\alpha\upsilon$, or $\delta\acute{\iota}\gamma\alpha\mu\mu\alpha$, from its form); but this sound disappeared in Attic before the birth of its literature, and there is no trace of it left in the *Κοινή*. Its sign was still used in numeration: see § 70. So also with ρ ($\kappa\acute{o}\pi\pi\alpha$) and ψ ($\sigma\acute{\alpha}\nu$),¹ the former of which (preserved in the Latin alphabet) still survives in the earlier period inscriptions to represent the k -sound before o and u . The other equations may be summarily stated: $\beta = \beta$, $\gamma = \gamma$, $\delta = \delta$, $\zeta = \zeta$, $\theta = \theta$, $\kappa = \kappa$, $\lambda = \lambda$, $\mu = \mu$, $\nu = \nu$, $\pi = \pi$, $\rho = \rho$, $\sigma(?) = \sigma$, $\tau = \tau$. In υ adapted as ξ we have an application of a useless letter which was at first confined to the Asiatic Ionians; but it was their alphabet which ultimately established itself in universal use. The last five letters of the Greek alphabet are later additions, and of these υ alone is found in all parts of Greece alike. The different value attaching to X in Latin, which owed its letters to Chalcis in Euboea, through its colony of Cumae, illustrates the independence with which these non-Phoenician signs were used in different localities.

§ 22. We must not tarry here to show how the forms and names of the Semitic letters are related to the Greek derivatives, nor how in Greece itself these letters and their names varied from place to place and

¹ There is considerable doubt as to the history of the sibilants: see Roberts, *Greek Epigraphy*, i. 9 f., where σ is identified with $\sigma\acute{\alpha}\nu$.

generation to generation, till the final victory of the Ionic alphabet in which alone the Common Greek was ever written. Two points only may be selected from the history of Greek writing, the development of the Breathings, and the change of direction from the retrograde Semitic to that which we inherit now. In the pre-Ionic alphabets H was used for h; but when it was requisitioned to express *ē*, the first half of it, *ι*, was used as an aspirate sign, perhaps as early as iv/b.c. (Blass). The Alexandrian grammarians introduced the corresponding *ι* to represent the voiced sound answering to the breathed h, the glottal catch which Semitic languages wrote with *ħ*: it is a sound with which every vowel-initial opens, if not aspirated. From *ι* and *ι* respectively are derived the ' and ' which we call rough and smooth breathing (*πνεῦμα δασύ* and *πνεῦμα ψιλόν*). The other matter, the direction of writing, need only be mentioned here because the relation of the Greek to the Hebrew writing specially interests students of the Greek Bible. It is enough to say that in the earliest Greek inscriptions the writing is from right to left; that this develops into what was called *βουστροφηδόν*, because it "turns" at the end of each line in the opposite direction as the "ox" does in ploughing; and that out of this in v/b.c. developed the left-to-right style which Greece passed on to Rome, and Rome to modern Europe. The three stages may be illustrated by short examples. (1) *ΞΖΟΓΞ ἐποιέ(ι)* (Thera, vii/b.c.). (2) *ΕΜ ΠΟΛΕΜΟΙ*
ΜΟΜΑΜΙΘΘ ἐν πολέμῳ φθίμενον (Attica, vii/b.c.). (3) *ΡΑΥ*
ΔΥΟΜ παῖ Διός (Thera, vii/b.c.).

On the whole subject see Roberts, *Introduction to Greek Epigraphy*, vol. i. (Cambridge, 1887).

Classification of Sounds.

Sounds. § 23. Greek sounds are thus classified for the Hellenistic period.

(a) *Vowels*:—*a*, *i*, *υ*, long or short; *ε*, *ο*, (short only); *η*, *ω*, (long only).

(b) *Diphthongs*:—*αι*, *ει*, *οι*, *υι* (short); *αη*, *ηη*, *ωη* (long); *αυ*, *ευ*, *ου* (short); *ηυ* (long). For the vowels and diphthongs see §§ 33 ff.

(c) *Mutes*.—These sounds are divided in two ways: (1) according to the point of articulation, (2) according to the presence or absence of *voice*, *i.e.* the tension of the vocal chords, and of *aspiration*, *i.e.* the accompaniment of an *h*-sound. By the first, sounds are classed as *labials*, made with the lips, *dentals*, made with the tip of the tongue against the teeth, and *gutturals* or *palatals*, made with the back of the tongue against the palate. By the second, they are

breathed or *hard*, *voiced* or *soft*, and *aspirate*, the last class being *breathed* (hard) as well. The classification is as follows:—

	<i>Breathed.</i>	<i>Voiced.</i>	<i>Aspirate.</i>
<i>Labial</i>	π	β	φ
<i>Dental</i>	τ	δ	θ
<i>Guttural</i>	κ	γ	χ

There are other names used for *breathed* and *voiced*, such as *surd* and *sonant*, *tenuis* and *mediae*, *smooth* and *middle*: Goodwin, who employs the last-named pair, calls the aspirates *rough*.

(d) *Continuous*, or *Semivocalic* consonants. These sounds differ from the Mutes, or stopped sounds, in that they are capable of prolongation, and may even become vowels. They are classed thus. *Spirants* result from relaxing slightly the contact which produces a mute. Thus the position of *t*, if the tongue is held loosely to allow breath to pass, produces our English *th*. Nearly the same position, with a groove along the tongue, results in *σ*, the only spirant represented in the Greek alphabet (see however § 43): the breathings ' and ' belong to the same class. The labial spirant *F*, our *w*, is obsolete in Hellenistic Greek. *Nasals* are characterised by the opening of the nasal passage. They are three in Greek, *μ* (labial), *ν* (dental), and that which is written *γ* before gutturals (*κ*, *γ*, *χ*, *ξ*), the guttural nasal *ng* (as in *sing*). *Liquids* are *ρ* and *λ*: the same rather elastic term is often used to include *μ* and *ν*. Both *ρ* and *λ* are made with the tip of the tongue against the front palate: in *λ* it is at rest there, while voice passes on both sides; in *ρ* it vibrates, while the two sides are stopped. Initial *ρ* in earlier Greek was *breathed*, as also is the second element in the doubled *ρρ*: it may be questioned whether this was really true for i/A.D.

This classification does not include the digraphs *ψ*, *ζ*, *ξ*, which are mere combinations of labial, dental and guttural mutes with the sibilant, like our superfluous letter *x*. The pronunciation of *ζ* however fluctuated considerably: see § 43.

Pronunciation.

§ 24. The pronunciation of Greek in the Hellenistic period raises a great many difficult questions which cannot be discussed here. It is probable that considerable differences existed

Summary of Pronunciation.

between the Greek of Rome and Asia, Hellas and Egypt. The pronunciation of *i/iv*/A.D. is a matter of great importance from its bearing on textual criticism. If we could delimit the localities affected by certain variations, we should have important evidence for the localising of textual types. Unhappily our information is too scanty to make this a really useful resource. Pronunciation had greatly changed since the classical period. As shown already (*Prol.* 34), Hellenistic Greek, though written with Attic orthography, sounded much more like Boeotian than Attic. Many of the processes had already started which reach their full effects in MGr. It does not follow that to pronounce Hellenistic as if it were MGr would compensate in accuracy for the inconvenience it would cause. For pronouncing Attic of the classical period, the MGr system is almost as wide of the mark as our English system of reading Greek as if it were English—a system which pretends to no advantage but convenience. For Hellenistic, it is much closer, but still far from exact, as we shall see; and the practical awkwardness of blotting out the difference between *ει, ι, η, γ, οι* and *ι* would be too great a price to pay for the approximation gained.

Vowels and Diphthongs.

Under the head of *Vowels*, we have first the distinction between long and short. In classical Greek this is felt throughout the language. It is the basis of all metrical composition, when combined with the rules by which a short vowel before groups of consonants counted as long. Its influence upon accentuation will be seen in § 29. The essence of the distinction is that a long vowel took the time of two shorts: in technical language a short vowel had one *mora*, a long vowel two. The progressive disappearance of this distinction is one of the most important changes in the language. It established itself very gradually, and localities differed widely in their treatment of the several sounds concerned. Perhaps Asia Minor was its earliest home: Greece proper was the latest to accept it. The main cause of this levelling was the change in the character of the *accent* (see § 29): when stress replaced pitch accent, the accented syllable tended to be long, and the unaccented inevitably was shortened. We may take the process to have been complete before the date of our oldest uncials, though many quantity-distinctions were still operative in *i/A.D.*

The other general tendency needing mention at this stage is that by which the diphthongs as such were destroyed, being replaced by simple sounds. This was a tendency which Hellenistic owed to Boeotian

phonology: see *ProL* 33. The only exceptions were found in *av* and *ev*, which tended to consonantise the second element, so that the MGr pronunciation is *av*, *ev* (or *af*, *ef*, before breathed consonants). Even these last changes were incipient already in our period, and were complete before the mass of our MSS were written.

On the vowel *a*, long and short, it need only be said that its pronunciation was the same as in nearly every I.E. language except our own. The *ā* was sounded as in *father*, and the *ǎ*, so far as it was still distinguished, was the same sound pronounced in half the time. Our characteristic *á* (in *man*, only short) was unknown in Greek. From *a*, in which both lips and throat are wide open, the vowels bifurcate along two lines, according as the throat is narrowed or the lips rounded and contracted. The former class includes the *e-i* vowels, the latter the *o-u*.

In classical Greek of early times the progressive narrowing of the throat aperture produced the series *η* (long, open), *ε* (short or long, close), *ι* (short or long). When *ε* was long it was written *ει* in the Ionic alphabet: it must be carefully distinguished from the genuine diphthongal *ει*, which was never written with simple *E*.¹ Open *e* is the sound of French *è*, our *e* in *there*; close *e* is French *é*, which we do not possess—our common *a* in *day*, *daisy*, *date*, is the same sound with an *i* “glide” making it diphthongal. In the Hellenistic period there were many changes going on, and in different directions according to locality. *H* in many places is still open *e*, especially in the area once occupied by Ionic. In inscriptions of Asia Minor we very often find *η* confused with *ε* (short), which was by this time probably not as close as it was in Attic: *ε* is a medium *e* now. But in the Greek of Hellas itself it would seem that *η* had become closer than *ε*, as in the Boeotian of the earlier age; and the difference is reflected to-day. In the Pontic-Cappadocian MGr *η* is frequently *ε*, as *πεγάδι* from *πηγή*; and such general MGr words as *στέκω*, from Hellenistic *στήκω*, may have originated in districts where this pronunciation was the rule. But in continental MGr *η* is now a simple *i*: this change was complete before vi/A.D. Finally *ι*, with which *ει* was now wholly convertible even when short, was the closest vowel of all: note that in transliterating Latin, where *ī* was open like our *i* in *kin*, *ε* was often used instead of *ι*.

By rounding the lips and progressively contracting the aperture there came in early Greek the corresponding series *ω* (long, open), *ο* (short or long, close), and in one or two dialects, as Boeotian, *υ* short or long (as in *full*, *fool*). In Attic however, and most dialects, *υ* had become *ι* (German, like the French *u*), which is pronounced by simultaneously rounding and contracting the lips and narrowing the throat aperture. This was still the sound generally in our period. Meanwhile the close long *ο*, written *ου*—as in the case of *ει*, to be distinguished from the

¹ Thus *ειμι ἴδο*, where *ι* is radical, was always EIMI; *ειμι sum*, where *ει* is simply *ε* lengthened by compensation for the loss of *σ*, was written EMI in Attic before the archonship of Euclides (403 B.C.).

genuine diphthong *ov*—had become so close as to answer entirely to our own *oo*. In Hellenistic *o* no longer seems to differ from *ω* in the original way, as the *o* in *mote* differs from that in *more*. The original open vowel, as in the case of *η*, has become closer: as *η* approximates to *i*, so *ω* ultimately does to *u*. In i/A.D., in many parts of the Greek-speaking world, there was little perceptible difference between *o*, *ω* and *ov*, a fact which leaves its traces on our texts.

The *Diphthongs* were largely monophthongs by the time with which we are concerned. *Αι* seems to have become entirely equivalent to *ε*, (but see § 36). *Ει* and *ι*, even *ζι*, are constantly confused; and in both these diphthongs the MS tradition is valuable only in so far as it may preserve a historical difference affecting the sense—if an unlettered scribe supplied a link in the chain, its value for us is gone, and we can write *αι* or *ε*, *ει* or *ι*, according to our own preference. *Οι* was in classical Attic not very different from our *oi*; but it passed through *δ* (German, as French *eu*) to *ü*, like *υ*, with which it ultimately coalesced. Illiterate papyri of i/A.D. and even earlier show this confusion; but outside Egypt the sounds were distinct for generations after this time. *Υι*, in *υίος*, *δργυιά* and perfect participles feminine, maintains itself against the literary *υ*: it was presumably still *üy*. The *ι*-diphthongs with long vowels as their first element—in which *ι* has since xii/A.D. been *subscript*—completely lost their diphthongal character at an early date. *Ηι* was fused with *ει* in Attic; but the indifference with which *ι* is added, especially in i/B.C. and i/A.D., to long vowels without justification,¹ shows that in the *Κοινή* *η* was nearer to *η* than to *ει*, while *α* and *ω* were identical with *α* and *ω*. See further § 36.

In the *υ*-diphthongs (*av*, *ev*, *ov*, *ηυ*) the *υ* had from the first the sound of simple *u*. The tendency to consonantise this *u* in the case of *av* and *ev* has been already mentioned. Apart from this, the pronunciation of *av* and *ev*, *ηυ* was normally what we should get by running together *ah-oo*, *eh-oo* respectively. *Ov* had been for long simply *ü*, sometimes representing even *ü* (in *full*). In the case of *av* there was a separate tendency to slur and finally drop the *υ* when it came before a consonant: a similar tendency is observable in the later vernacular Latin. For NT *exx.* of this see *Prol.* 47.

Consonants; § 25. We pass on to the *Consonants*, and take first the nine *Mutes* or "stopped" sounds. The *breathed* *π*, *τ*, *κ* call for no remark, as they were pronounced very nearly as in English. The *voiced* *β*, *δ*, *γ*, had changed considerably from the sounds they had in Attic, which were virtually *b*, *d* and *g*. *Γ* was clearly (as partially in MGr) the voiced form of *ch* (Scotch or German), a guttural spirant like the German *g* between vowels (*Tage*), not far from the English *γ*. Similarly *β* and *δ* came to be our *v* (nearly) and *th* (as in *thou*), but the change was not completed so early, and it seems to have varied in different districts. The fact that *ι* consonantal is still *υ* in *Δαυείδ* (all uncials

¹ Thus in BGU iii. 883² (ii/A.D.) . . . *δκτώι, ούληι δακτόλω πρώτων.*

which do not use exclusively the abbreviation), and the Latin consonantal *w* in *Silvanus* is *ov* (see § 37), shows that the interlabial *v* sound of β was not established in the Greek of the NT writers; otherwise the sound was so near the *w* that we should have had a certain amount of inconsistency in our documents. (At a later time *Δαβίδ* and *Δαυείδ* would be pronounced alike.) The aspirates were during the classical period mutes followed by *h*: our *shepherd*, *hothouse*, *packhorse* give the sounds fairly, except that the mute has to be pronounced in the same syllable as the *h* (*she-pherd* etc.). In Laconian however θ was apparently our *th* (in *thin*) at an early date, as is shown by the frequent spelling σ , which may represent a further development. In other dialects likewise the tendency to make θ a spirant seems to have worked fairly early. In the Hellenistic period we may probably assume that the spirant pronunciation ($\phi=f$, $\theta=th$, χ =Scotch or German *ch*) was fully developed in most parts of the Greek-speaking world, though it may have lagged in some. After σ , or another aspirate, the spirant never developed: $\phi\theta\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega$ is in MGr *ftáno*, $\alpha\iota\sigma\theta\acute{\alpha}\nu\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ is *estánome*. This only partially applies to ϕ . The MGr spirant pronunciation of κ and π before τ (*ἐπτά* = *eftá*, *ὀκτώ* = *ochtío*), shows its earliest indications in the period to which our uncial MSS belong.

Liquids,

The Liquids λ and ρ , and the nasal liquids γ (before κ , γ , χ , ξ), μ and ν , being practically identical with the modern sounds, need no detailed description. As in nearly all European languages except (southern) English, the ρ is trilled: when initial, or following an aspirate or another ρ , it was breathed (Welsh *rh*), but in our period the breath in initial ρ was feeble.

Sibilants.

The Sibilant σ was always breathed (our *hiss*), though the voiced sound (as *his*) was heard before voiced consonants, as in *σβέσαι*, *Σμύρνα*. For this s sound ζ was often written. This symbol, which in the classical period seems to represent sometimes *ds*, sometimes *zd*, was already tending towards the simple s , as in MGr. The pronunciation of the closely related combinations $\sigma\sigma$ and $\tau\tau$ is very difficult to determine. There is some reason for assigning the value *ts* to the former, and *tth* (as *that thing* pronounced in one word) to the latter; but this is conjectural. The combinations ξ and ψ are always breathed.

Breathings.

There remain the *Breathings*, ' and '. The former, which the Hebrew alphabet represented by \aleph (initial) is heard at the beginning of every English word with vowel initial in normal pronunciation: it is the glottal catch which, except in singing, we can hardly avoid sounding before the vowel. The corresponding breathed sound, our *h*, was already obsolete in some of the Greek dialects of classical times, and must have been faintly heard in many districts in the Hellenistic period, apart from those which inherited the early *psilosis*. In Palestine we may fairly assume that the aspirate survived intact, as was natural in a country where the native speech retained this element so clearly. A native name like $\Psi\eta\eta$ was represented by *Ἀλφαῖος*: the Vulgate transliteration *Alphæus* illustrates the enfeeblement of *h* in

other regions and at a later time. The fact that effects of initial aspirate like καθ' ἡμέραν not only survived but even produced analogic forms like καθ' ἔτος (see § 40), is evidence as far as it goes that the complete *psilosis* of MGr was only local in the earlier centuries of Hellenistic.

The above *resumé* of results will be enough to show how complex the subject is. A history of Greek pronunciation in the Hellenistic period is greatly needed, showing both when and where the various developments first appeared which issue in the system, or rather systems, of MGr. Such a history would have an important bearing on textual questions. The pronunciation of Greek in Palestine can be ascertained with considerable accuracy from the very numerous Greek words borrowed by Aramaic and Aramaic words transliterated into Greek. Since, however, the bulk of the NT was written outside Palestine, there seems no reason for taking up one part of a complicated investigation, to complete which would be impossible within our limits. The sections which follow on Orthography will raise a number of points bearing on pronunciation, supplying some of the evidence for summary statements already made, and discussing the relations of these facts to the phenomena of our MS tradition.

MODERN PRINTED GREEK.

Punctuation.

Punctuation; § 26. Ancient writing knew very little of so obvious a help to reading as punctuation. As early as iv/B.C. we find the mark : in the "Artemisia" papyrus at the end of some sentences. The great grammarian Aristophanes (iii/B.C.) invented the stops (·) and (.), to which he gave the reverse values to those for which we use them; also a comma (·), placed half-way between the position of the colon and the full stop. Literary papyri, especially those of lyric poets, who needed such helps to reading more than others, show these punctuation marks earliest. Thus the Bacchylides papyrus (i/B.C.) shows the colon freely at the end of sentences, and "generally, it would seem, correctly," says Kenyon (*Bacchylides*, xxi). See further E. Maunde Thompson *Palaeography*, 60.

**in Earlier
Uncials,**

The oldest NT uncials have none of these adjuncts. "In \aleph B the first hand very rarely shows any points, and the words are not divided except sometimes when a change of subject brings in \aleph a new line or in B a small blank. Later we find a single dot, as in the second hand of \aleph B and the first in ACIN^bPQZ Ξ ; sometimes as in A a comma and a double dot. In NR 0115 the dot is placed at the top, the middle or the bottom of the letter without distinction. The dot is most freely used in F^p and G^p" So Gregory (Ti⁸ iii. 111), who gives a specimen from F in 1 Tim 3¹⁶, with each word divided from the next by a dot. He goes on to observe that obviously no argument towards a right punctuation can be drawn from the barrenness of the earlier or the abundance of the later signs.

**in Later
Uncials.**

A fuller system is observed by the later uncials, including ELM^p, and they are here as in some other features anticipated by W: though its punctuation is scanty, it goes decidedly beyond \aleph B. The single dot occurs on the average less than three times per page, being most frequent in the first part of Lk, and least so in Mk. "The double dot (:) occurs 12 times in Mt, 6 in Jn (excluding the first quire), 23 in Lk, and 11 in Mk (7 are in the first four chapters)." Sanders (*The Washington Manuscript* 12) goes on to observe that (:) was "a decidedly strong punctuation," used generally at the ends of paragraphs. There is also "a substitute for punctuation formed by leaving small blank spaces between the phrases. These occur frequently and regularly in all parts of the MS," and are said to correspond fairly well with the number of *στίχοι* (see below), and more closely still to the *ῥήματα*. "They doubtless coincided with the sense-divisions used in reading." Sanders compares these phrase-lengths in W, and the *στίχοι* in D, with the introduction of each phrase by a capital in Δ , so as to deduce "an ancient system of phrasing, used in reading the Scriptures in church service." It may have originated as early as ii/A.D.

Paragraphs.

Paragraphs are found even in the earliest uncials: an account of those in W, as compared with \aleph , B and D, may be seen in Sanders 15 ff. On

the *στίχοι*, so conspicuous in D, where the text looks like poetry in very short uneven lines, and *ῥήματα* or *ῥήσεις* "sentences," a very similar but independent division, see J. R. Harris *Origin of Ferrar-Group* (Cambridge, 1893), 8 ff.

It will be clear that there is little probability that any punctuation worth counting such was present in the NT autographs. If they had any of Aristophanes' points—never found in papyri dated B.C.—or those of different systems which are known to have existed in Aristotle's time,¹ we have no proof that they underlie the meagre punctuation of W and later MSS.

Passing to our modern system, we should begin with a full recognition that it is purely modern. Apart from the use of (;) for the query, and (:) for colon and semicolon alike, the punctuation of our printed Greek Testaments is on exactly the same footing as that of their English versions. It is simply in essence a form of commentary; and the modern editor is on every page compelled to choose between alternative punctuations, involving different interpretation, where the only ancient authority is that of patristic comments or early versions. Since these go back to periods considerably antedating our best uncials, they have naturally the weight in many cases of a primitive tradition, which no wise exegete would ignore. But as little would he consent to be bound hand and foot by interpretations which do not depend on the autographs, and may be no more than guesses by readers who were not by any means better qualified from all sides than ourselves. When therefore we use an extremely careful edition like that of WH, where punctuations in text and in margin are constantly determining the meaning for us, we must always be careful to realise our freedom to take our own line on sufficient reason. Rarely—as when in Jn 1st. W punctuates *εγευετο ουδε εν ο γεγοθεν εν | αυτω ζωη*—their interpretation may have behind it the punctuation of the oldest MSS in which such marks appear at all. But even

¹ On these see Kühner-Blass i. 351-3, Mayser 48-50. Mayser notes that an instance of the *παράγραφος*, a stroke which points to the end of a sentence, is found in v/b.c. in a Laconian inscr. More rarely still in papyri appears the double point, which may also be seen on inscr.

there, if exegetes insist on the reading of AV and RV, we cannot oppose them successfully on the authority of W: our arguments must be exegetical, and the traditional punctuation seen in W will count for little.

It is not the function of a Greek Grammar under these circumstances to lay down principles for punctuation. Our system being purely modern, we insert commas just where we should insert them in a corresponding sentence of English. Since any kind of editing in modern form involves in many places the editor's decision between rival interpretations, it is well frankly to recognise this, and insert these helps to reading freely. At the best they will not be equal to those we employ. Quotation marks—which many uncials use for OT citations—might be multiplied to advantage. There is one further difference between ancient and modern writing which we might well reduce. The absence of facility for indicating parentheses introduces complications into our understanding of a great many passages. Often we should simplify a passage considerably by taking out a parenthesis and putting it underneath as a footnote. Thus in Jn 4⁹ the last sentence is taken as the author's comment in RV, and in a modern work would naturally become a footnote: still more clearly Ac 1^{18t}, which interrupts the speech with matter extraneous to it. Further instances may be Heb 3⁴, 1 Co 7²¹ ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ . . . χρῆσαι, *ib.* 15^{27b}. Illustrations, of course, could be multiplied indefinitely, and those given already do not pretend to be indisputable.¹

§ 27. Very few of our modern accessories existed in the early periods of the NT, or appear in our oldest MSS. *Breathings* begin to appear in v/A.D., as we shall see in § 40. *Accents* had been invented long before, but seem only to have been used in poetical texts, such as the Bacchylides papyrus (i/B.C.): see § 36. It was a long time before MSS even began to divide words—a point in which Greek was curiously behind Latin, where words are separated in early inscr. The use of

¹ An attempt is made in *The Modern Reader's Bible*, by R. G. Moulton (New York and London, 1907), to present the English RV text with these accessories of modern printing.

"*iota subscript*," convenient as distinguishing sundry flexions, but not answering to any living feature of speech, was discontinued some time before the NT began to be written, and only returned with Byzantine scholarship: indeed in the strict sense it is a practice of xii/A.D. and later, for not till then was the unpronounced *i* written underneath. To complete the difference between a modern printed Greek Bible and an early MS thereof, we have the use of the small and convenient "minuscule" script, in place of the clumsy and space-filling "capital" letters, which though in early use for non-literary purposes, only in ix/A.D. began to be applied to books. Further details on most of these subjects will be given below.

Diaeresis. One of these accessories, however, stands on a different footing, the Diaeresis, which figures largely in our oldest MSS and in the papyri. It is used to distinguish vowels, especially *i* and *u*, which begin a syllable: thus we find ἴνα, ὕπο etc. Our use of it is a special application of the same principle—if we may call it a principle which is applied only in a minute proportion of the instances where on the above definition it should appear. We employ it to distinguish vowels which are to be pronounced separately, and keep them from being merged in the vowel before. Thus ΓΑΙΟC might be read Γαίος (as WH actually print), had we not evidence that the Latin *Gaius* was trisyllabic, so that we should write Γάιος: in this case the accentual difference makes the diaeresis less necessary. In MSS the diaeresis often preserves evidence of pronunciation, as when κ writes η|ῥδοκησα in Mt 3¹⁷, even dividing the line after the first element in the diphthong. The diaeresis often affects transliterations of foreign words. Thus in Mt 11²¹ = Lk 10¹³ D has χοροζαῖν and βεθσαεῖδα (βεδσαῖδα in Lk), implying by two typical devices (diaeresis and *aei* for *ai*) the tetrasyllabic pronunciation of both names. On the other hand Jn 11⁶⁴ Ἐφρέμ κL reinforces the absence of diaeresis in the uncials which write Ἐφραῖμ. Our uniform accent system spares us the necessity of using the diaeresis very often: πρόμιος, πρῶι, πρῶινός, Πτολεμαῖδα, Λῶις, etc. might as well be left without, while Ἀχαῖα, Ῥωμαῖστί and the like might be ambiguous.

SOUNDS AND ORTHOGRAPHY.

§ 28. Educated Greek writing in our period had practically lost the earlier phonetic character. Attic literature dominated the orthographic tradition, though Hellenistic pronunciation diverged widely from Attic. We have accordingly a great difference between the conventional spelling and that of less educated people, who tended in various points to write as they and others spoke. The great NT uncials present a considerable number of spellings thus depending on the pronunciation current in the period when they or their originals were written. How far we ought to follow them in their deviations from conventional spelling is an open question. There are some points in which the evidence of papyri and inscriptions shows that a particular spelling was widely current in i/A.D., and may reasonably be traced to the author. This is made especially plausible in the not infrequent cases where the said spelling was extinct before the actual period of the scribe. This point is well brought out for Codex Bezae by Rudberg, *Ntlcher Text u. Nomina Sacra* (Upsala, 1915). He notes that while D perpetually confuses *ai* and *e*, *ei* and *i*, it hardly ever confuses *η* and *ι*, and never (according to von Soden) *η* and *ει*, although in v/vi A.D. *ι*, *η* and *ει* were indistinguishable: he argues that we have here a proof that the orthography of D is that of ii/A.D. He proceeds on the same lines with sundry other orthographical peculiarities of the Bezan text.

The notes which follow are restricted to matters of spelling, and the questions of pronunciation affected. Where flexions are concerned, reference must be made to the *Accidence*.

Accentuation.

§ 29. The accents with which Greek has been written since the Hellenistic age are the invention of the great grammarians who tried to preserve a record of the classical language when it was in danger of obscurity. In their time the character of the accent was changing from pitch to stress. The MGr

accent, which remains with few exceptions on the same syllable as in the ancient language, is just like our own; and, as in English, the stress affects the quality of all syllables, stressed or unstressed. Thus *ἄθροπος man* has stress on the first syllable, and the second and third syllables in consequence have the same vowel: *ω* becomes long again in the plural, where the accent falls on the penult. In classical Greek there was a "musical" accent, the tone involving a higher note but no sort of stress. We have this musical accent in English, and it plays a very important part. But it is perfectly free, depending on the shade of meaning intended by a speaker, and differing very much with different individual speakers: in Greek the tone was tied to the word or word-group, and was capable of no variation. It was a fixed element, almost as much as a similar but more elaborated tone-system is in Chinese. We recall the well-known story of the actor Hegelochus, who in declaiming a line of Euripides ending with *γαλήν' ὄρω* ("I see a calm") pronounced a circumflex instead of an acute, and sent the audience into roars of laughter: *γαλήν ὄρω* = "I see a weasel."

Acute.

We need not pause to state in detail the rules of the Greek accents, which are fully given in the ordinary Greek grammars. The *acute* accent marks the rising inflexion of the voice: the second syllable of our interjection "*Really?*" (expressing surprise or incredulity) usually shows this intonation. The falling tone (heard in the same syllable of "*Really!*") is written only

Grave.

when an acute falls on the last syllable of a word and is changed by rule to "*grave*": this happens when the word as it comes in a sentence does not precede an enclitic (see below), or a stop (comma, colon, full stop or query). The interrogative *τίς* however keeps its acute accent under all conditions. The falling inflexion belongs naturally to all syllables which are not marked with accents. In addition to the acute (´) and the grave (˘) there

Circumflex.

was the *circumflex* accent, which denoted the combination of the two (ˆ = ˘): it was confined to long syllables, where the voice rose in pitch during the first half (technically *mora*) and fell in the second. We may represent the three accents in musical notation, premising

that the notes would vary in pitch with different individuals, and that the intervals would not be constant:—



(The time of a *mora* is represented here by a crotchet.)

Rules of Accentuation. The following rules are a summary of the general principles governing Greek accentuation:—

(1) The limits of the position of an accent depend on the “three-syllable law,” by which the rising inflexion cannot stand farther back than on the third syllable from the end of a word. Only in the case of a word ending with a trochee (˘˘) can the equivalent of three short syllables at the end of a word stand together unaccented.

Thus (a) if a word ends with a *short* syllable, the *acute* may fall on the ultima, as λεκτός, an “*oxytone*” word, or on the penult, as παρθένος, a “*paroxytone*,” or on the antepenult, as λέγομεν, a “*proparoxytone*”; the *circumflex* may fall on the ultima, as τιμῶ, a “*perispomenon*” word, or on the penult, as τιμῶμεν, a “*properispomenon*.” (N.B.—If a word ends with ˘˘ and the penult has an accent, it must be a circumflex.)

(b) If a word ends with a *long* syllable, the *acute* may fall on the ultima, as τιμή (*oxytone*), or on the penult, as τιμώντων (*paroxytone*); the *circumflex* can fall only on the ultima, as τιμών (*perispomenon*).

The rationale of these restrictions appears as soon as the circumflex is resolved into acute + grave, and each *mora*—short syllable or half of a long one—has its accent supplied. Thus τιμώντων and τιμώντων are seen to be impossible, since in each case the rising inflexion is followed by more than two *morae* with falling tone. Τιμώντων, accented in full, would be τιμώντων, and is according to the rule.

(2) For purposes of accent, syllables are not long unless the vowel in them is a long vowel or diphthong. Thus in λαϊᾶψ the second syllable is short, and the circumflex falls on the first syllable accordingly, although the word is a spondee for metrical purposes. Greek grammarians tell us that we must write κῆρυξ and φοῖνιξ: if this is correct, we must assume that the \bar{v} and \bar{i} were shortened in the nominative before ξ.

Final -αι and -οι (not followed by a consonant) had only one *mora* each, except when they were *locative* terminations or *optatives*, and of course when they were contracted. Thus we have οἶκοι, χώραι nom. pl., but οἴκοι, ἱσθμοί, loc. sing.; τίμησαι imper mid., τιμήσαι infin. act., but τιμήσαι opt. act.

(3) Since accents were in existence long before the contraction of vowels or other later modifications which arose in the historical period, the accentuation must follow the earlier conditions. Thus *τιμάμεν* (i.e. *τιμάμεν*) became *τιμῶμεν*, *ἔσταώς* (*ἔσταώς*) *ἔστώς*, *πόλιος* became *πόλιως* when the quantity of its last two vowels was inverted. When *τὰ ἄλλα* is contracted into one word we write *τᾶλλα*, not *τᾶλλα*, since the crasis joins grave + acute, and the rising inflexion comes on the second *morā*.

(4) Against these *orthotone* (i.e. accented) words may be set two classes of words which were without an accent under specific conditions.

Proclitics.

Proclitics linked themselves to the word following, and took an accent only when that word threw its accent upon them. Thus *ἐκ τούτου*, *ἐκβηθι*, *οὐκ ἔστι*, *οὐποσε*. *Enclitics* (except when standing at the beginning of a sentence) threw their accent back upon the last syllable of the preceding word,

Enclitics.

unless this would involve two acutes following. Thus *τινὲς μὲν . . .* (Phil 1¹⁶), *ἐκ τινος*, *εἴ τινων*, but *ἄλλα τινά*: *ὀποῖά τινα*, but *ὀποῖων τινῶν*. *Proclitics* include the article forms *ὁ, ἡ, οἱ, αἱ*, the prepositions *eis, ἐξ* (*ἐκ*), *ἐν*, the conjunctions *εἰ* and *ὡς*, and the negative *οὐ* (*οὐκ, οὐχ*). But *οὐ* takes accent (*οὐ*) at end of sentence, or standing alone. In reality all prepositions are proclitic, for (e.g.) *ἀπὸ* has no rising inflexion, and its own accent is paroxytone when standing free or after its case. *Enclitics* include the pronoun forms *μοῦ, μοί, μέ*: *σοῦ, σοί, σέ* (except when emphatic): *τις* (indefinite) and the indefinite adverbs *πού, ποτέ, πῶ, πῶς*: the particles *γέ, τέ*: and the present indicative of *εἰμί* (except 2 sg. *εἶ*), and *φημί, φησί*. (*Ἔστι* at the beginning of a sentence becomes *ἔστι*: so after *οὐκ, μή, εἰ, ὡς, καί, ἀλλά*, and *τοῦτο*, and when it means "exists" or "is possible.")

A proparoxytone or properispomenon or a proclitic, followed by an enclitic, receives an acute accent on its ultima; an oxytone keeps its acute without change to grave. A perispomenon is unchanged, as is a paroxytone, but if the enclitic has two syllables, the second is accented. If a series of enclitics follow one another, each throws an accent back on the preceding, as *εἴ τις τί σοί φησιν*. But *μοῦ, σοῦ* throw an acute upon the preceding word and receive it from a following enclitic, e.g. *σύνδουλός σου εἰμι* (Rev 19¹⁰ 22⁹). The rules for enclitics account for some combinations which seem to break the ordinary principles given above: thus *ᾤτινι, ᾤστε*.

(5) The accent of nouns, adjectives and pronouns must generally be learnt from observation, and there are few general rules. Monosyllabic

Noun Accent.

3rd decl. nouns usually are oxytone in gen. dat. sing. and dat. pl., perispomenon in gen. pl. Other nouns keep the accent on the same syllable as in nom. sing. unless it is forced forward by the rules of accent, as *θάλασσα* gen. *θαλάσσης*. The gen. pl. in 1st decl. nouns (not adj. or pron.) is perispomenon (since *-ῶν* comes from *-έων*, and that from *(-ήων), ᾄ-(σ)ων*). Vocatives sometimes retain their primitive *recessive* accent (i.e. accent as far as possible from the end of the word): thus *πάτερ* from *πατήρ*, *ἄδελφε* from *ἀδελφός*. (This arises from the original enclitic character of vocatives when not

opening a clause.) It may be noted that (as in MGr) common nouns when taken to serve as proper names often suffered a change of accent.

(6) Finite verb forms are recessively accented—a consequence of their primitive enclitic condition. Infinitives and participles, being nouns or adjectives, do not come under this rule. In compound

Verb Accent. verbs the accent cannot go behind the augment or reduplication. Apparent exceptions to the recessive rule are historically due to contraction: there is however the peculiar case of strong aorist imperatives, *εἰπέ*, *εἰπόν*, *λαβέ*, *λαβού*, which (like the case of *ἔστω* above) are survivals of the primitive condition retaining the verb's original accent when standing first in a sentence, as imperatives naturally did.

(7) In a few words which suffer *crasis*—the fusing of two words into one by contraction—the accent of the first word is ignored. See § 32.

Crasis.

Imperfection of accent record. § 30. The record of classical accentuation is in many respects seriously imperfect, and it is probable that our modern printed texts differ not infrequently from the genuine pronunciation of their authors. This is well seen when we study classical texts preserved for us in ancient papyri. Professor Wilamowitz goes so far as to say (*Sappho und Simonides*², 100 f., *ap. Sonnenschein in The Year's Work in Classical Studies*, 1913, p. 102):—

We now possess so many remains of ancient books that we see clearly how late, how rare, and how incomplete is the indication of accents, and how far it departs from that which is customary among us at the present day. No one can any longer dispute the fact that our accentuation is a product of the time of Photius.

The statement is not intended to suggest that we must simply acquiesce in ignorance, for Wilamowitz declares that we are "well able to go behind the Byzantine period," and are bound, to do so. It must not be forgotten that the MGr accent, scientifically used, can help us a great deal in verifying our accentuation of ancient texts, going back as it does to the period of the *Kouφή*.

Accentuation of NT text. Our specific information for the accentuation of the NT text comes necessarily from later authorities. Sir E. Maunde Thompson states¹ that accentuation, only occasional even in literary texts

¹ *Introduction to Greek and Latin Palaeography* (Oxford, 1912), 61 f.

of the papyrus period, begins to become general in iii/A.D. The oldest literary texts showing accents at all regularly are the Bacchylides and the Alcman, both i/B.C.; Sir F. G. Kenyon observes that lyric poets seem to have needed helps to the reader more than other texts. The earlier uncial MSS on vellum have no accents at all: we have to wait till vii/A.D.¹ There are a few instances of the circumflex in D, perhaps in N, and in Δ and F₂G₃, but mostly alien from our modern use. The later uncials are accented on our system generally, and late correctors have equipped B and C; but the best of them are least accurate in this respect. Gregory's table (*Prol.* 100 ff.) may be consulted for the evidence of these MSS as to the accent of doubtful words.

Pitch accent becoming stress. Soon after the date A.D.—a period when the *Koinē* began its first new period—the old musical accent developed into a pure stress; and we may assume that the NT documents were from the first pronounced with the accentual conditions familiar in MGr. If we read the words aloud with a stress upon the syllables written with an accent—all three accents being now equivalent—we shall be practically compelled to reduce to a minimum the difference between long and short vowels, imparting the quality of length to the stressed syllable alone (cf. *Prol.* 34 n.²). This is practically the pronunciation of the modern language. Quantitative levelling was not complete in i/A.D., but the distinction between *o* and *ω*, *ă* and *ā*, was becoming very slight. It follows that when texts were transmitted to any extent orally, such distinctions as that of *ἔχομεν* and *ἔχωμεν* were very easily lost. The new stress accent began to affect the forms of words. The Hellenistic *νοσσίον* for *νεοσσ.* has been attributed to this cause; Thumb rejects this (Brugmann *Gr.*⁴ 76). A clearer case is that of Kretschmer's Law, by which an unstressed vowel after a liquid or nasal dropped out when the same vowel stood in the previous syllable. Thus *Βερούκη* answers to an older form *Βερευίκη*: see Brugmann *Gr.*⁴ 80, and § 33 below.

¹ Gregory *Prol.* 99.

Specific accent questions in NT. Some points may be collected in which the accentuation of NT words is doubtful, or specially significant:—

(1) There are some words in which we have evidence of a change of pronunciation between classical and Hellenistic times:—

- (a) Certain 2 aor. imper. forms—*ιδέ, εἰπέ, λαβέ, εὔρε*—which in Attic retained a primitive oxytone, have in Hellenistic succumbed to levelling. (Moeris, *s.v. ιδέ*, p. 193.)
- (b) Shortening of quantity took place in the penult in many nouns in *-μα*. Thus in Hellenistic we find *ἀνάθεμα* (in poetry *ἀνθεμα*) in place of *ἀνάθημα*, and even words like *σίστεμα*, not **-στᾶμα*, showing that the shortening is late. The wide extent of this phenomenon, which is probably due to the analogy of nouns in *-σις*, makes *κλίμα, κρίμα* (so MSS), *μίγμα* preferable to the class. properisomena. In the case of *χρίσμα* we have definite evidence that the *ι* was short: see W. M. Lindsay *The Latin Language*, 30. Possibly the case of *κῆρυξ* and *φοίνιξ* may come here: for the grammarians who prescribe this accentuation see Chandler's *ref.*, § 669. The ultimate shortening of *ι* and *υ* before *ξ* may perhaps have been Hellenistic, in which case we might accentuate *Φηλιξ, κῆρυξ* and *κηρύξαι*¹ in Hellenistic, leaving the question open whether *κῆρυξ* and *κηρῦξαι* should be retained for classical times. See Lobeck *Paral.* 411. In his *Phryg.* 107, Lobeck mentions a number of dissyllabic nouns which shortened their penult in later Greek. We may add *ψύχος*. Shortenings like *θλίψις* (so MSS) may be defended on the same lines, but we should need special evidence to justify *ρίψαν* (as several MSS), *συντετριφθαί*. *Σπίλος* is a mere mistake, for the *ι* is short from its first appearance, which is not early. See in general Lipsius, *Gr. Unt.* 31–46, summarised by W. F. Moulton, WM 57 n.
- (c) A different class of shortening may arise in the nom. acc. sing. of nouns in *-ειᾶ* where confusion with those in *(ε)ία* is possible: the complete identity of *ει* and *ι* in popular speech helps the confusion by bringing *-εία* and *-ία* nouns together. *Ἐπιθεία* and *ἀρεσκεία* are claimed for the *-ā* class on the strength of derivation from verbs in *-εῖω*. See on these nouns below under Word-formation.

(2) In the following NT words the accent is questioned, or accentuation distinguishes different words or forms:—

ἀγόραιο and *ἀγοραῖος* are differently distinguished by grammarians. Zonaras has *ἀγοραῖοι* for *οἱ ἐν ἀγορᾷ ἀναστρεφόμενοι ἄνθρωποι*, and *ἀγόραιο* as *ἡ ἡμέρα ἐν ἧ ἡ ἀγορὰ τελεῖται*. If that is correct, we must write *ἀγόραιοι* in Ac 19³⁸, and make *ἀγοραῖοι* the nom. of the noun in 17⁵; but Ammonius, who is eight centuries older than Zonaras, gives an entirely different distinction. HLP have *ἀγοραῖοι* in Ac 19³⁸.

¹ So FHKMUGA in Lk 4¹⁹, and HL 61 in Ac 10⁴²; the MSS for *κῆρυξ* and *κηρῦξαι* seem to be few (Gregory *Prol.* 101).

ἄγων from ἀγω : ἀγών a noun.

ἀδελφός has the old voc. ἀδελφε, as seems proved by the survival of ἀδελφε in Pontic MGr (beside ἀδερφέ).

αι from art. : αἰ relative.

ἄλλα is neut. pl. of ἄλλος : ἄλλά *but* is the same become proclitic for a conjunction.

ἄνω = up : ἀνώ 2 aor. subj. of ἀνίημι.

ἀπόδεκτος, as a compound verbal assumed to be of two terminations, will retract accent : see however Kühner-Blass i. 538, WS 69.

ἀρά = curse : ἀρα then, ἀρα asks question.

ἀχρεῖος said by gramm. to be non-Attic for ἄχρειος.

γλωσσόκομον is defended by Schmiedel (WS 140), on the ground that the second element is active : WH print γλωσσόκομον.

δεινά terrible things : δείνα *so-and-so*.

διά θύρουη : Δία acc. of Ζεύς.

εἰ if : εἰ θου art, or in εἰ μὴν (also written εἰ μὴν) *verily*.

εἰπὼν imper. : εἶπον indic. The grammarian Charax tells us that the former was Syracusan Greek ; the latter appears to be Attic (Lobeck *Phrym.* 348). Which belongs to the Κοινή is not very certain, but editors in Ac 28²⁶ print εἰπὼν (so B²—*contra* L₁HL₂, l, 61).

ἐκλεκτός has three terminations and is oxytone : Kühner-Blass i. 538, Chandler 199.

ἐρημος, ἔτοιμος, ὁμοιος are said by gramm. to be Attic, while properisp. is Homeric or Ionic. Supposing this true, it would not be proof that we should not write ἐρημος etc. in NT. But MGr has ἐρημος, ἔτοιμος, ὁμοιος, which is better evidence.

ἐχθρα *enimīy* : ἐχθρά fem. of ἐχθρός *hostile*.

ἡ def. art. : ἡ rel.

ἴσος is doubtless the Κοινή form (Attic), though the Epic ἴσος occurs in late poetry.

καθαίρω *purge* : καθαίρῶ *pull down*.

κλείς *key* : κλεῖς *keys*.

μωρός is generally preferred, but gramm. give μῶρος also as Attic. MGr seems to speak for μωρός, but an interj. μῶρε survives in Pontus : there was presumably dialectic variation.

Νύμφαν *Nymphā* (acc. fem.) : Νυμφᾶν *Nymphās* (masc.).

ὁ, οἱ nom. masc. sing. and pl. def. art. : ὁ, οἱ neut. sing. and masc. pl. relative.

ὁμοιος see *s.v.* ἐρημος.

ὄργια and ὄργια alternate in our authorities.

πότε, ποῦ, πῶς interrog. : ποτέ, που, πως indef.

πρωτότοκος *first-born* : πρωτότοκος *first-bearing*. See on this general distinction under Word-formation.

σκῦλον and στυλος should be left unchanged : see WS 68.

τεσσαρακονταετης (and the like) of time :—ετης elsewhere—thus in Ac 7²³ 13¹⁸ (so 81) parox., but ἑκατονταετης Rom 4¹⁹ (not D^oL). But the evidence is insufficient : see Lobeck *Phrym.* 406.

τίς τί etc. interrog. : τις τι etc. indef.

τροχός *wheel*: τροχός *course* has no real claim in Jas 3⁶.

φάγος is printed as a paroxytone, on the ground that it is a substantive, the adjective being φαγός. MGr φαγᾶς, fem. φαγοῦ, "gourmand," are some evidence against this.

(3) When oxytones or paroxytones were adapted as proper names, the accent was drawn back. This is perhaps due to the strong influence of the vocative in personal names, and the survival of the old rule by which the vocative took recessive accent:

Recession of accent.

cf. πάτερ, ἀδελφε, and note how the predominance of the vocative changed the accent of μήτηρ (Skt *mātā*, with same accent evidenced by O.E. *moder*). In NT we have Τύχικος, Φίλητος, Ἐπαινετος, Ἐραστος, Πύρρος, Βλάστος, Κάρπος, Ὀνησίφορος (for παροχ.), Σωσθένης, Ἐρμογένης, Διοτρέφης: cf. WS 70. The name Χριστός was not changed, since it was never in the first age treated as a real proper name. Ἀχαιῆκος, not having been a common noun to start with, was not altered. The rule does not seem to be conditioned by convenience of differentiation, for names like Ὑμέναιος, Τρόφιμος, Ἀσύγκριτος retain their accent unchanged. The principle survives in MGr: see Thumb *Handbook*, § 38. 1.

(4) Oxytone adjectives retract the accent when they become nouns: thus κρύπτη from κρυπτός. This is also MGr (Thumb *l.c.*).

(5) Latin words were sometimes accented in a manner which reminds us that Latin and Greek accentuation differed altogether in quality. (Thus we get the place-name *St. Heléna* ultimately from the Greek Ἑλένη, but the personal name *Hélen* from Latin *Hélena*, where the accent was changed by the short penult.)

Accent of Latin words,

The Latin *Christiánus* became Χριστιανός, as it is still in MGr: similarly other adj. in *-ánus*. Words in *-ínus*, but not those in *-énus* or *-únus*, retain accent on penult, as Ἀλεξανδρίνος, Λιβερτίνος. The analogy of genuine Greek words in *-ános*, *-ηνός* presumably worked here. Generally however we accent Latin words in accordance with their original form: thus Λίνος, Τίτος, Πειλάτος, Γάιος (trisyll.), Κουάρτος, Σεκούνδος, Πρισκίλλα, etc.

(6) The current accentuation of Semitic words is, as Schmiedel notes (WS 76), often governed by pure caprice. The only intelligible principle

and of Semitic.

would be to set the accent always on the tone-syllable of the original Semitic. Our difficulties in that case would arise only where words had been partially Hellenised; and even here, unless popular etymology had produced a really new form, or the word could be shown to have taken an independent place in Greek—as in our treatment of the place-names *Paris* and *Vienna*—it would be safe to keep the tone-syllable unaltered if possible. When Hebrew names were inflected in Greek declension the variations of case naturally affected the accent in places. It is needless to discuss the application of these principles, as the number of words affected is extremely large.

(7) WS (71) gives a selection of passages in which (except in those marked *) a different accentuation would involve a change of sense.

**Differentiation
by accent.**

The forms are quoted here as they stand in WH, the alternative, whether probable or not, being added in brackets :—*μενεῖ* 1 Co 3¹⁴ (*μένει*), *κρινούσιν* 6² (WH *mg.* *κρίνουσιν*), *ἴσται* Mk 5²⁰ (*ἰσται*—as Ac 9³⁴), *καθήσθε* Lk 22³⁰ (*κάθησθε* indic.), *βαθεία* Rev 2²⁴ (*βάβεια* ! an uncontr. pl. from *βάθος*), *ἅγια* Heb 9² (*ἀγία*), *ἦ* before *πόρνος* 1 Co 5¹¹ (*ἡ*), *ὅμως* 14⁷ (*ὀμῶς* = *ὀμοίως*), *φώτων* Jas 1¹⁷ (*φωτῶν μεν* !), *τινες* Heb 3¹⁶ (*τινές*, as in AV), *τίσιν* 3^{17c} (*τισίν*), *τῶ* 1 Co 15⁸ 16¹⁶, 1 Th 4⁶, Mt 24⁴¹ (*τῶ*, Attic for *τινί*, and obsolete), **συνίων* Rom 3¹¹ (*συνιών*—see § 86n 1 (*β*)), **συνιούσιν* Mt 13¹³ (*συνιούσιν*), *ἄρα* Gal 2¹⁷ (*ἀρα*), *οὐκοῦν* Jn 18³⁷ (*οὐκουν*), *αὕτη* Mt 22³⁹ (WH *mg.* *αὐτῆ*), Lk 2² (*αὐτῆ*), Rom 7¹⁰ (*αὐτῆ*), 1 Co 7¹² (*αὐτῆ*), *αὐτῆ* Lk 23⁷ 7¹² 8⁴², Rom 16² (*αὐτη*), *εἰμί* Jn 7³⁴. 36 14³ 17²⁴ (*εἰμι* !—obsolete), *Ἐλαιῶν* Lk 19²⁹ 21³⁷ (*Ἐλαιῶν*—see § 61 (*b*), *Prol.* 49, 69, 235), *μακρά* Mk 12⁴⁰ (*μακρᾶ*), ΠΟΡΝΩΝ Rev 17⁵ (indeterminate between *πόρνων* m. and *πορνῶν* f.), *κερδανῶ* 1 Co 9³¹ (*κερδάνω* subj.—see § 95), **πίμπρασθαι* Ac 28⁰ (*πιμπρᾶσθαι*—see § 95), *ἐκφυῆ* act. Mt 24³², Mk 13²⁸ (*ἐκφυῆ* pass.—see § 95), **ἀποκνεῖ* Jas 1¹⁵ (*ἀποκνεί*—§ 95), *μένει* Jn 14¹⁷ (*μενεῖ*), *φάνη* Rev 8¹² 18²³ (*φανῆ*—§ 95), *ἐγχρίσαι* Rev 3¹⁸ (*ἐγχρισαι* imper. mid.), *ἐπιβλέψαι* Lk 9³⁸ (*ἐπιβλεψαι* imper. mid.), *τινά* 1 Pet 5⁸ in WH *mg.* (*τίνα*), Heb 5¹² (*τίνα*), *ἡ τίς* Mt 7⁹ (*ἡ τις*), *ἄλλα* Jn 6²⁸ (*ἄλλα*), *ἐν* Mk 4⁸, 30 (WH *mg.* *ἐν*).

Syllabification.

**Word-division
and Syllabifica-
tion.**

§ 31. The Greek rules for word-division, carefully laid down by grammarians, and normally observed in MSS and papyri, are important because of the light they throw on the syllabification of Greek speech. The most general rule is that the new line must begin with the largest consonant group which is capable of beginning a word. In addition to *γρ*, *δρ*, *θρ*, *κλ*, *κμ*, *κρ*, *κτ*, *μν*, *πλ*, *πρ*, *πτ*, *τρ*, *φθ*, *χθ*, which are found initially, we have *γμ*, *θμ*, *τν* and *χμ*. A liquid (except in the case of *μν*) is taken to end the preceding syllable. On the same principle *σ* is often thus abstracted, but here there were differences of usage: the verbal suffixes with *σθ* tended to bring the *σ* over to the next line. Before a vowel *σ* stood at the head of the new syllable. Proclitics were counted as belonging to the next word, and divided accordingly, except in the case of the prepositions *εις*, *πρός*, *σύν* and *ὑπέρ*. Similarly, if there was elision the two words ran into one. Thus we have *κατ' ἔτος* P Oxy i. 101 *ter* (A.D. 142), *δῖ]ς ἄν ἰβ.* ii. 270³² (A.D. 94), *πα|ρ' αὐτοῦ ἰβ.* 36, *ἐκ τοῦ* P Lond 22¹⁸ (= i. p. 7—B.C. 164), *οὐκ ἐφρόντισας* P Petr ii. 23 (3)¹¹ (iii/B.C.), *μηδ' ἄλλον* P Reinach 11¹² (B.C. 111), *ἐξοῦ=ἐκ σοῦ* Mt 2⁶ 8, etc.

The rationale of this may be seen in English. If we used the same general principle of word-division, we should print "not a-t all," for the syllables are divided exactly as in "not a tall man." For further illustration see Mayerer 44 ff., also WH *Intr.*² 315.

There is a tendency to make continuous sounds, especially *σ* and the

nasals, divide themselves between both syllables. The effect is sometimes to double the letter, as ἐν|ναντίος, θαλ|λάσση (Mt 8²⁶ κ), προστάγ|γμασιν, κατέσ|σπαρκεν, μνησ|στευθίσης (Mt 1¹⁸ κ), sometimes to omit one of a genuine double, as τῆ|σωτηρίας, ἀφει|σαντόν, ἐὰ|νύν. The practice should be borne in mind as one calculated to generate various readings. Thus it might be applied to the reading πλήρης σίτον Mk 4²⁸ C* cu², which seems to be the oldest accessible: the alternative (see § 65) is to regard the adj. as indeclinable.

Elision.

Elision § 32. In the Hellenistic period the practice of writing elided final vowels (as in Latin) considerably advanced. In 1 Co 15³³ the iambic line from Menander is written φθειρουσιν ἦθη χρηστὰ ὀμιλῖαι κακάι, and there is no authority at all for χροῖσθ'. This is a common practice in metrical inscriptions and papyri of our period. In prose the rules observable in the best NT uncials are set forth by WH (*App.*² 153) thus:—

in NT uncials, Elision takes place habitually and without variation before pronouns and particles; also before nouns in combinations of frequent occurrence, as ἀν' ἀρχῆς, κατ' οἶκον. In other cases there is much diversity, and occasional variation.

In ἀλλά elision takes place usually before articles, pronouns and particles, but with many exceptions and much variation. [In W the full form is normal (Sanders 25).] The passage Rom 6¹⁴⁻⁸ is remarkable as having consecutively (with a single exception 7¹⁶ ἀλλ' ὁ) 9 non-elisions attested by 3 or more primary MSS: in the six following cases (to 10¹⁰) there is no evidence for any non-elision. Elision is commonest before words (of all kinds) beginning with ε, rarest before those that begin with α.

Δέ is never elided except in δε δ' αὖν, once or perhaps twice in τὸ δ' αὐτό (not Phil 2¹⁸), and perhaps in ἡνίκα δ' αὖν 2 Co 3¹⁶ (see margin); οὐδ' occurs a few times.

The places where WH regard the reading as open to some doubt may be tabulated thus: the figures represent the totals for the text, non-elisions standing first—the same figures reversed would accordingly represent their margin:

ἀπὸ ἀ. 0 : 2	διὰ ἀ. 0 : 3	ἐπὶ ε. 1 : 2	ἀλλά 28 : 38
ὑπὸ ἀ. 2 : 0	κατὰ ἀ. 1 : 0	ἐπὶ δ. 1 : 0	δέ 1 : 0
ὑπὸ ἀ. 1 : 1	κατὰ ε. 1 : 0	ἐπὶ ὕ. 1 : 0	οὐδέ 1 : 1
	μετὰ ε. 0 : 1	ἐπὶ ἰ. 0 : 1	
	μετὰ δ. 1 : 1		

Thus, in places where MS evidence is evenly balanced, WH prefer non-elision 39 times and elision 50 times.

in papyri. A comparison may be instituted with some representative papyri. For this purpose nos. 1-41 in Milligan's *Selections* are examined, dating from B.C. 311 to the end of ii/A.D.

- (1) *Prepositions*.—Here elision preponderates greatly. Ἐπί occurs once unelided, and ἀπό three times, and all of these are with nouns. On the other hand we find elision with ἀπό (2-1 noun), διά (5-1 δι' ὀλίγων, 1 δι' ἐγγύου), ἐπί (7-1 ἐφ' ὕβρει, 1 ἐπ' ἄχυρον 1 ἐπ' ἀληθείας), κατά (10-3 καθ' ἡμέραν, 1 καθ' ὄνομα, 1 καθ' ἀρχάς, 1 καθ' οἰκίαν), μετά (3), παρά (8-1 a name), ὑπό (5). The exx. not stated above are all with pronouns, and so suit WH's rule. Nearly all the nouns are also in combinations answering to the requirement of "frequent occurrence." These statistics may be supported by the totals in Witkowski's collection of Ptolemaic private correspondence.¹ Here elision takes place 16 times where prepositions stand with pronouns, and twice with nouns (καθ' ἡμέραν, παρ' Ἰουδαίου). There is not one example of non-elision.
- (2) Ἄλλά has elision 3 times, and never non-elision; δέ 7 and 13 respectively; οὐδέ and μηδέ 4 and 4; τε and ὥστε are never elided, nor are με and σε. Ἴνα has elision in the formula ἴν' ἰγυαίνης (so in Witkowski 8 times), but never elsewhere. In Witkowski ἀλλά is always elided (6 times), and δέ 14 times to 10; μηδέ 1 : 1, ὥστε 2 : 0, τε 2 : 0 (unless τοῖς τ [ἄλλοις] in no. 24 must count). Με and σε are not elided, except δ σ' οὐ in no. 46 (illiterate).
- (3) Rarely other words suffer elision: viz. ἠναγκάσμεθ' ὑ., ἐποίησθ' ἐ., ἐνοφλόμεν' ἀ., μηδέν' ἀ.: add ὁπηνίκ' ἄν from Witkowski. Ὅσας δ' εἶν might equally be read ὄσας δέ ἄν, and is therefore not counted. The occurrence of μηδέν' ἀπολελύσθαι in BGU i. 27¹⁴ (= Milligan p. 101—ii/A.D.) might be cited in support of μηδέν' ἀπελπίζοντες in Lk 6⁸⁵, thus making ABL etc. agree in sense with the μηδένα of NW (cf. syr^{re} ^{romb}).

Allegro utterance. The bearing of these facts on the enunciation of sentences in the Common Greek is not unimportant.

Elision is due to *allegro* utterance; and the uniform absence of elision shows us under what conditions this was avoided. Δέ and the enclitics τε, με, σε, attached naturally to the preceding word, were not linked with the following word enough to produce elision. The prepositions and ἀλλά, being proclitic, suffered elision as naturally as the former did when compounded with verbs (with initial vowel): exceptions seem to occur almost only where nouns which are not parts of a formula may prompt *lento* pronunciation to produce a kind of emphasis.

Hiatus. The subject is closely connected with one which figures largely in discussions of literary Greek, viz. the avoidance of hiatus which became an instinct with prose writers. Definitions may be found in Blass *Grammar*, 296 f., together with a detailed attempt to show that a partial observance of the hiatus rule can be seen in Heb. The attempt does not seem very successful, and no other NT book is accused of attention to this refinement. Dr. Rendel

¹ Documents also included in Milligan are omitted.

Harris calls my attention to the avoidance of hiatus as a motive present in literary revisers of the text of NT, who would change the order of words for the purpose. This applies especially to the class of variants which Hort called "Alexandrian." But in genuine vernacular this disposition to avoid hiatus was almost wholly absent. The well-marked tendency by which in vernacular Hellenistic hiatus is permitted in compounds at the juncture—as in *τετραάρχης*, *ἀλλοτριεπισκοπος*¹ etc.—may be set by the practice of writing elided vowels in verse, to create a presumption that the later language was indifferent to the confluence of vowels. In pronunciation no doubt the usage was to sound the vowels rapidly, except in the cases where elision was still the rule, which means as we have seen cases of proclisis. Thus *τετραάρχης* was a real quadrissyllable, produced by the influence of other compounds in *τετρα-*, and *χρηστὰ ὁμίλιαι* (1 Co 15⁸³) had the *a o* distinct, but pronounced in quick time so as not to disturb the rhythm of the verse. In this respect the difference between Hellenistic and classical usage is very much like that between modern and eighteenth century or older English: where poets used to write "th' action," we write and pronounce "the action," though the scansion is the same. English dialects of course use the *allegro* forms very largely (as *Irlams o' th' Height, in t'hoos=in the house*); and the analogy may prepare us for the probability that Hellenistic was not uniform. MGr implies as much by its free use of elision.

Crasis.

Crasis. As we should expect, this result of virtual proclisis is greatly restricted in later Greek. In NT, except for *τοῦνομα* in Mt 27⁶⁷, *τοῦναντίον* *ter*, and *ταῦτά* in Lk, crasis is confined to combinations with *καί*, which retains the same tendency in MGr more conspicuously. We find *κἀγώ*, *κἀμέ* etc., with which cf. *κἀγώ*, P Petr iii. 53 n.³ (iii./B.C.)—but *καί γώ* in P Oxy ii. 294¹³ (A.D. 22); also *κἀκεῖ*, *κἀκεῖθεν*, *κἀκεῖνος*, and the stereotyped *κἄν* (MGr), on which see § 29 (7). Papyri of culture low enough to admit phonetic spelling show us that crasis was practised sometimes when unaccented words were capable of being fused with the preceding word: thus P Oxy iv. 744⁴ (B.C. 1) *ἐν Ἀλεξανδρέφσμεν*, as we might write—*σμεν* with prodelision would suit our practice better, and means the same thing—, BGU iii. 975¹¹ (A.D. 45) *οὐλή καστρογνημίφ κς ἀριστερῶ*. Note *κἀπεθύμει* in D* (Lk 15¹⁶).

Combinations written as one word.

One word or more? There is no evidence earlier than the minuscules by which we may decide whether to print phrases like *δέκα ἔξ*, *ἀπ' ἄρτι*, *ἐφ' ἅπαξ*, *ὑπὲρ ἐκ περισσοῦ* etc. as one word or as two or three. The only case in which it matters

¹ NB have *ἀλλοτριεπ.*, which may well be right, though papyri have parallel forms to support the other: see *Vocabulary*, s. v.

—for of course in the older uncials there is no division of words—is where the fusion involves assuming that the accent of one element was dropped. Sometimes MGr may give possible evidence, though we must not lay too much stress on it: fusion may easily be of late origin, and the evidence of MSS which divide or punctuate off the words may be of equal weight, since though in danger of being literary it is of higher antiquity. Thus MGr *ἀνάμεσα* disagrees with *ἀνὰ μέσον* which Ti prints, presumably on evidence of MSS.

Vowels.

§ 33. The vowel system in the *Κοινή* has undergone more extensive change than is apparent from the spelling, which is still largely dominated by the literary tradition. The operative factor in change was the development of a stress accent out of a pitch accent (see § 30), which necessarily worked towards an ultimate levelling of quantity in vowels. In MGr long vowels and short are not distinguished: an accented syllable is half-long with an *ο*, an unaccented one short with an *ω*. The process which thus radically altered the whole sound of Greek speech was not complete for generations after the NT, but it had set in strongly, and must have done much of its work. In so far as accent was gathering stress character, it necessarily produced the *ablaut* effects which we may note in English, where also spelling fails to express many of the products of accentual conditions. Among those which find expression in writing we may instance “Kretschmer’s Law” (see § 30) by which an unaccented short vowel after a liquid or nasal fell out when the neighbouring syllable had the same (or nearly the same) vowel. Thus *Βερενίκη* became *Βερνίκη*, *σκόροδον* *σκόρδον*, *ἐπηκολούθηκα* loses its first *ο* and *ἀπελήλυθε* its *υ*. Illiterate papyri and inscriptions show more of these syncopations than “correctly” written documents,¹ but doubtless ordinary speech showed them plentifully. They are like our own pronunciation of words like *laboratory*, where the first *ο* is practically crushed out by the stress before it. The result is that Vowel-gradation (*Ablaut*), which ceased to work during the earlier period of Greek, when all

¹ But our uncials are not without instances: see a list in Thackeray 99 f. of such forms found in LXX.

syllables had equal weight and there was no force operating to produce disintegration, started afresh as it must whenever stress accent comes in. It will not be necessary to enlarge upon the later gradation developments, for they only produce visible results on a large scale when we come to the MGr: of course gradation in its prehistoric working belongs to the description of the earlier language, from which the *Κοινή* inherited the familiar series λέγω : λόγος, λείπω : λέλοιπα : λιπέϊν, πένθος : πέπονθα : παθείν, ἴστημι : ἴστᾶμεν, etc. Our only concern with *Ablaut* here is to observe that it is not simply a force acting in the period when the Indo-European languages were undivided, but a necessary and constant sequence of stress accent, only suspended when language takes the musical accent like French or ancient Greek.

Itacism.

It need only be remarked further that in i/A.D. itacism was levelling the vowels considerably. *Αι* and *ε* were not far behind in their fusion, and *οι* and *υ* followed in time: see each development discussed below. These changes of pronunciation are of great importance in textual criticism. The extent of itacism in an early uncial may be well illustrated by a summary in Sanders's introduction to Codex W (p. 20):—

In the first quire of John the itacisms are as follow: *ι* for *ει*, 193 times; *ει* for *ι*, 17; *ε* for *αι*, 82; *αι* for *ε*, 16; *ο* for *ω*, 3; *ι* for *ε*, 3; *οι* for *ω*, or *οι* for *η*, *υ* for *οι*, *ι* for *η*, and *ε* for *υ* occur once each.

Of course some of these are mere isolated freaks: the nature and significance of the rest will appear from the following pages.

We proceed to take the vowels *seriatim*, starting in each case from the classical form and chronicling variations.

1. *A*.

(a) *Short*.

A short. There are some cases of substitution of *ε* for *ᾱ* in contact with *ρ*. The possibility of phonetic origin must be considered, especially as it is accepted by Thackeray for some LXX phenomena of the kind. The Egyptian deity Serapis came into Greek first as *Σαρᾶπις* (Mayser 56 f.); but Mayser gives two Ptolemaic instances of *Σεραπιεῖον*, and suggests that the distance from the accent was responsible, coupled with the influence of *ρ*. *Σεράπις* does not appear

till the Roman age. Ἐρσενικός also (Mayser 5) seems best explained by the two forces which produced Σεραπίειον: an isolated περά for παρά (P Tebt i. 110⁴—B.C. 92 or 59) may be thrown in. Τέσσαρα is witnessed first by a British Museum inscr. from Egypt (B.C. 51–47), OGIS 193¹¹ τάλαν[τα τέσ]σερα; ¹ next comes BGU i. 133⁹ (A.D. 144)—there seem to be hardly any others till the Byzantine age.² Τέσσαρες as accus. belongs to an entirely different category: see the accidence, § 71 (a) (γ). The case for τεσσαράκοντα is distinctly better, but it is greatly outnumbered by the α form until the Byzantine period.³ It is perhaps significant that the earliest instance we possess (see below) is of the ordinal, where the α syllable was further away from the accent than in the cardinal. When we note that *four* differed from *forty* in the fact that the accent preceded the α syllable instead of following it, we have a reason for presuming phonetic causes at work. Ionic influence⁴ would not account for the unequal treatment of parts of the same numeral. It is significant that τεσσάρων maintained itself even in Byzantine, as in MGr; cf. P Flor i. 37 (v/vi A.D.), where τεσσάρων and τέσ[σ]ερα come in successive lines. That the order of development is seen in the chronological succession Σεραπίειον and ἔρσενικός and τεσσερακοστός, then Σεράπης and τεσσαράκοντα, and finally τέσσαρα(s) much later, encourages us to hold that the earliest change depended on the position of α well before the accent.⁵ The evidence here given will suffice to make it

¹ Or δέκα [τέσ]σερα, as given by Strack, *Archiv* i. 209.

² See CR xv. 33a, also xviii. 107a, where I cite εικοσιτέσσαρες bis from a ii/A.D. papyrus: CPR 242 (cited in the former paper) is apparently a mistake. Mr. Thackeray (in a letter) retracts his statement (p. 74) that “Σεράπης and τέσσαρα appear to have come into general use together about i/A.D.” Add P Oxy viii. 1142⁴ τέσσαρα (late iii/A.D.).

³ For τεσσαράκοντα before ii/A.D. may be cited P Tebt ii. 388⁸ ¹⁰ (A.D. 98), P Gen 24¹¹ (A.D. 96), CPR 220¹ (i/A.D.), P Flor i. 61⁶⁸ (A.D. 86–8), *ib.* 86⁸ (i/A.D.), BGU iii. 916⁴ (Vespasian), P Lond 262² τεσσερακοστού (A.D. 11=ii. p. 177): the same document has τεσσαράκοντα bis. Mr. Thackeray's tables for papyri published before 1907, which he has kindly sent me, contain 26 instances of τεσσαράκοντα (-κοστός) from i/ to iii/A.D., and 46+ with α. In making my own tables I have ceased to enumerate instances of α for the early centuries. That there was a marked difference between cardinal and ordinal may be seen well in P Flor i. 1 (A.D. 153), where τέσσαρες [nom. and acc.] occurs twice and τεσσαράκοντα four times. See also *Proz.*³ 243 f., and Mayser's *ref.*, p. 57. I have one ex. of τέσσαρες, a Tebtunis ostrakon of B.C. 6/5, in P Tebt ii. p. 337.

⁴ Which accounts for τεσσαράκοντα in the ii/A.D. Homer, P Tebt ii. 265 (*II.* ii. 545), and the Teos inscr. *Syll.* 177⁴⁶ (B.C. 303), although the latter is in Κοινή Greek.

⁵ I can quote only one instance of accented α>ε, viz. BGU iv. 1013⁸ (mid i/A.D.) θυγατρείσι, which is not a case of α but of ρα: moreover the case may be one of blundering declension, the -τερ- of the stem affecting the abnormal -τρα-. Mayser's instances (p. 58) are referred by him to Coptic influence. Κρέβατος (twice in W), which has left its mark on MGr, is too late to be brought into the case.

certain that *τέσσαρες* etc. and *τεσσαράκοντα* (-κοστός) were the autograph forms for NT. Against these stand "Jn 19²³ *τέσσαρα* \aleph ALM, Rev 4⁶ A, 4⁸ \aleph A etc." (Debrunner), with *τεσσαράκοντα* regularly in the uncials: see Ti.-Gregory 80. Dissimilation, which WH (*App.*² 157) postulate as cause, is excluded by the fact that *τέσσαρες* has no attestation except A once in Rev 4⁴. On *τέσσαρα* it is only necessary to observe that sporadic instances meet us in documents contemporary with Jn and Rev. In proper names of foreign origin there is considerable variation, but it need not occupy us where Semitic is concerned. *Δελματία* 2 Ti 4¹⁰ A (*ερ*) C 424** cu¹² is compared by Deissmann (*BS* 182) with *δελματική* in BGU i. 93⁷ (ii/iii A.D.), against CPR 21¹⁶ (A.D. 230): Radermacher 35 assigns it to Latin influence, which is likely enough. See *Vocab. s.v.* *Δαλματία*. *Πάτερα*, however, found in AC at Ac 21¹, has no European support. A different matter is the change of *αρ* to *ερ* in augmented and reduplicated forms of *καθαρίζω*.¹ In LXX (Thackeray 74) A has it 14/21 times, B once, while \aleph never shows it in LXX or NT. As we might expect, the evidence is scantier (and probably insufficient) for Luke and Heb, more satisfactory for Mt and Mk. Thus Mt 8⁸ has *ερ* in B*ELXII*, Mk 1⁴² in AB*CGLAII**al.*; but Lk 4²⁷ ACLX, 17¹⁴ AX, 17 ALΔ, Ac 10¹⁸ ACLP 33 81, 11⁹ AHL *al.*, Heb 10² AC. Thackeray attempts a phonetic account of the change, but the fact that in one case (*ἐκαθήρισα*) the vowel is accented makes it much more probable that the *ε* is a double augment; Schmiedel (*WS* 50) seems inclined to this. Of course it is abnormal, as a verb *καθ-αρίζω*, if a compound of *κατά*, would have made *-ήρισα*. But this does not seem a serious objection.

There are one or two other instances of *ε* substituted for an older *α*. *Ἐγγαρεύω*, derived from the early (Persian) loan word *ἀγγαρος*, appears in Mt 5⁴¹ \aleph , Mk 15²¹ \aleph *B*: the spelling is not infrequent in inscr. and papyri—see *Vocabulary, s.v.* It did not however ultimately prevail, as MGr *ἀγγαρευμένος* shows; but its claim to a place in the autographs is strong, especially in Mk. *Χλιερός* stands in Rev 3¹⁶ \aleph *; *ῥαλος* in Rev 21¹⁸ cu²¹ (two have *λλ*) and so 21²¹ 4⁶ 15² *bis*. For LXX forms of this kind see Thackeray 75: the variation was said to be dialectic, *ῥαλος* and *χλιαρός* being Attic. See Lob. *Phryg.* 282 (Rutherford *NP* 364), Moeris 418, Thumb *Hellen.* 75 f., Schweizer *Perg.* 36 f. (where inscriptional evidence is cited). Thumb (*l.c.*) thinks that both *α* and *ε* forms had their place in Hellenistic. In NT *χλιαρός*, *ῥαλος* (*ῥάλινος*) and *φιάλη* seem certain, though WH admit *χλιερός* as alternative (*App.*² 157).

The variation between *ἐνεκα* and *ἐνεκεν*, *εἴνεκεν* is due to dialect mixture. The Attic *ἐνεκα* in Ac 26²¹ is regarded by Blass as in keeping with a speech in the presence of royalty: it appears also in Ac 19³² \aleph AB, Lk 6²² (exc. DW *al. pauc.*), Mt 19⁵ (exc. CDW), Mk 13⁹ B. *Ἐνεκεν* (partially Ionic in origin) is normal, but the still more Ionic *εἴνεκεν* figures in Lk 4¹⁸ 18²⁹ \aleph B, Ac. 28²⁰ \aleph *A, 2 Co 3¹⁰ (exc. C *al.*). *Ἐνεκεν* is the normal form in later Attic and *Κοινή*: see Mayser 241 f., Crönert,

¹ Mr. H. Scott points out that in *Test XII Patr.* Charles (Oxford, 1908) gives following *v.l.* Reuben iv. 8 *ἐκαθάρισεν* (his text) *af*, *ἐκαθάρησεν* *c*, *ἐκαθαίρσεν* *b*, *ἐκαθήρσεν* *de*.

Mem. 113 f.—the two other forms occur relatively much as in NT. The similar Ionic εἶπεν is only found in Mk 4²⁸ $\aleph B^* L \Delta$: Phrynichus gives it and ἐπειπεν a specially bad mark (ἐσχάτως βάρβαρα), and a solitary appearance in the least cultured book of the NT is quite in keeping.

A has yielded to o in 1 Ti 1⁹ παρολώαις, μηρολώαις, where only cursives have ρα (exc. K παρραλ.). The consciousness of origin (παρ-αλώαις, cf. ἀλωαίω) has weakened, and analogy of πάτρο- and μητρο- compounds prevails. Βατταλογήσητε Mt 6⁷ $\aleph B$ (W βατταλογείται) is replaced by βαττολ. in the other MSS (βλαττολ. in D*). See *Vocab. s.v.* and below § 105. Since the word is probably for βατταλο-λογ., by haplology, the a is original, and βαττολ. will be due to wrong association with βάρτος. Mayser 60–62 gives a few exx. of a>o and o>a, but they are not enough to be significant.

(b) Long.

A long. Σίνᾱπι shows the Ionic η in Lk 17⁶ W. This would have been the Attic form if Attic had used the word: at Athens they said νᾱπυ (Lob. *Phryg.* 288, where Κοινή citations for σίνηπι are given). The survival of ā in λαός and ναός is noted in § 34. Mayser thinks λαός may be originally a poetic word, used primarily in plur.: see p. 29, but note also Thumb's comments on this section in *Archiv* iv. 490. The flexion of the -ήω verbs, with their tendency towards the -άω type, is discussed under verbal accidence. In two words apparently the Ionic η has secured a place in the Κοινή, δηνεκής (Att. δᾱν., but not consistently), and πρηνής (usually taken as =Att. πρᾱνής): if Chase's explanation of the latter is right, the root is πρᾱ 'burn.'¹ So also χορηγεῖν (Att. χορᾱγ.), which is not so much an Ionism as an effect of analogy (στρατηγός, δδηγός). It is needless to bring in proper names, which might of course start in Doric or other dialects as easily as in normal Κοινή.

2. E.

E and α. Two verbs in -άζω appear in NT where ε would be expected. Ἀμφιάζει replaces the literary ἀμφιέννυσιν (still in Mt 6³⁰) in Lk 12²⁸ B, where the rest read ἀμφιέζει: so ἡμφιασμένον Mt 11⁸ D, and predominantly in LXX (Thackeray 75). The outside evidence for -άζω is not early: see *Vocab. s.v.*, and add P Iand 82¹⁴ (vi/A.D.). Radermacher 35 accepts the explanation of it as coming directly from ἀμφί, as ἀντιάζω from ἀντί. The fact that ἀμφί did not survive in the Κοινή is one of the difficulties in this view. I prefer the account which Schweizer, *Perg.* 37, takes from W. Schmid, that -άζω (said to be Doric) is the product of a very large class of -άζω verbs, which naturally exerted strong influence on the comparatively few verbs in -έζω. The new present ἀμφιέζω was of course a back-formation from the

¹ See *JTS* xiii. (1912) 278 ff., and J. R. Harris in *AJT* xviii. 128 f.

aor. in *-εσα*. Πιάζω may be similar in history, but it seems to have assumed a new meaning, which would encourage the supposition that it came into the Κοινή separately from some dialect: Theocritus 4⁸⁵ πιάξας τᾶς ὀπλάς, "gripping it by the hoof," is warrant for the Doric provenance. The older form still survives with the meaning "press" in Lk 6³⁸. MGr πιάνω "take" joins several papyrus exx. in support of the Κοινή πιάζω with that meaning.

The interesting blunder ελαβον γυναίκας in Heb 11²⁵ p¹⁸ N*AD* is perhaps not phonetic in origin, though Thackeray 149 quotes three exx. of nom. in *-as* from LXX; and the opposite, γυναίκες for *-as*, occurs in P Catt (*Chrest.* ii. 372^u 2)—cf. § 55(4) on acc. pl. in *-es*. The importance of the reading consists in the link it helps to establish between all the best MSS: the mistake was very probably in the autograph itself.

E and α. The itacistic variation between *ε* and *α* figures incessantly in the MSS, as in papyri and other witnesses. It was indeed hardly even a case of "shortening" (as WH *App.*² 157 f., where σύλος and κρίμα are put on the same footing): *ε* and *α* were as completely identical as *ι* and *ει* in the uncial period. WH 309 f. give Gal 4¹⁸ as "one of the few instances in which B and N have happened to fall into the same itacistic error," ζηλοῦσθε for *-α*. Practically this means that where either would make sense we are allowed to choose for ourselves on other considerations than MS authority. When in 1 Tim 6²⁰, 2 Tim 2¹⁶ some δ-text authorities (FG and a few cursives) read καινοφωνίας for *κεν.*, we recognise it as a legitimate interpretation of what when read aloud is an ambiguous word. But our acceptance of it is discounted by finding that the version which adopts it (lat^v (vs^{semel})) is one which has a close nexus with the δ-text uncials; while the Sahidic, Bohairic and Syriac vss. justify the spelling with *ε*. But in Mt 11¹⁶ the choice between ἐτέροις and ἐταίροις is not so easy, in spite of WH's description of the latter as a "perverse confusion" (p. 310). 'Eταίροις is read by poor uncials only, but the Old Syriac (^{su} and ^{cu}) and the Latin Vulgate support it; and that in many uncials (including CL) ἐτέροις means ἐταίροις, is shown by the addition of αὐτῶν. Indeed N itself makes us uncertain as to its testimony, when just above τοῖς ἐτέροις we read τῆς ἀγορῆς, with *α* in each case supplied by the corrector: can we say more than that the corrector saw nothing wrong with ἐτέροις, while he did with ἀγορῆς? The oldest tradition in vss. is here divided, the Old Latin being against the Old Syriac. The rendering of WH ("the other 'side' or party in the game") is very attractive; but I should accept it on its merits, and not because in such a matter NB are to be preferred to CL.

In one frequent category *α* and *ε* involve different renderings, that of inf. *-σθαι* against imper. *-σθε*, as in Lk 14¹⁷, 19¹⁹. There is further the choice between ἐπάναγκες (most MSS) and ἐπ' ἀνάγκαις NAC in Ac 15²⁶: the second does not seem to have much of a case. Only one remark need be made as to words which through isolation may have lost their traditional spelling, such as κερία, ἐξέφνης etc. (WH *App.*² 158).

The acceptance of ϵ here is justified if it is clearly understood that the preponderant spelling of the oldest uncials is taken simply as the best attested, and is not claimed for the autographs. For these the papyri of i/ or ii/A.D. are decidedly better evidence. Thus for $\phi\epsilon\lambda\acute{o}\nu\eta\varsigma$ 2 Tim 4¹³ $\aleph\text{ACDEFG}$ I know only one papyrus parallel (P Fay 347, ii/A.D.) against twelve occurrences of $\phi\alpha\iota\nu$. ($\phi\alpha\iota\lambda$. *ter*) from papyri of i/-iii/¹ Similarly $\alpha\iota\phi\nu\acute{\iota}\delta\iota\omicron\varsigma$ has one papyrus parallel ($\acute{\epsilon}\phi\nu$. none—see *Vocab. s.v.*), while $\acute{\epsilon}\xi\alpha\iota\phi\eta\eta\varsigma$ is less clear.² Ἐπάναγκες (which Blass called *doctum vocabulum*!) is very common in papyri with this spelling, and there is nothing to suggest the alternative. So far then as the evidence of our vernacular documents goes, there is little encouragement for deserting the traditional orthography in words where the substitution of ϵ does not affect the sense: the variation appears to be purely casual, and probably nowhere became a habit as early as i/A.D.³ On the date of the development see below, § 36, under $\alpha\iota$.

Schmiedel gives the following list of ambiguous places where we must decide between ϵ and $\alpha\iota$ on internal grounds. $\xi\gamma\epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon$ Mt 9⁶ *al.*, $\acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\alpha}\pi\epsilon\sigma\epsilon$ Lk 14¹⁰ 17⁷, $\pi\alpha\rho\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\gamma\kappa\epsilon$ Mk 14³⁶, Lk 22⁴³, $\xi\rho\chi\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon$ Lk 14¹⁷, $\pi\rho\alpha\gamma\mu\alpha\tau\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\alpha\sigma\theta\epsilon$ Lk 19¹³, $\phi\upsilon\sigma\iota\omicron\upsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ 1 Co 4⁶, $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\upsilon\sigma\acute{\epsilon}\iota\tau\epsilon$ 1 Co 14³⁸; also the choices in Mt 11¹⁶ and Ac 15²⁸ mentioned above. (See WS 47 f.)

It will be shown later (§ 36) that the contacts between ϵ and $\alpha\iota$ are of a special nature, and do not fall into the same category as those with ι proper. One conspicuous instance of the latter is the series of compounds in $\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\iota-$, which becomes a very large one in Hellenistic. Forms like Ἀρχέλαος —to name one which survives as a proper name in NT—are older; but the change is not phonetic, but extended from the influence of a special category found in early Greek. Instances of ι for ϵ in Egypt may sometimes be due to the native language, where ϵ and i were very close together. See Mayser 80 ff. That $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\sigma\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\lambda\omega$ in Ac 7³⁴ is misspelt for $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\sigma\tau\epsilon\lambda\acute{\omega}$ is wrongly assumed by WS 43 n.²⁷: it is a matter of syntax, not orthography. See *Prol.* 185,⁴ and additions in *Einkl.* 292.

A special case is $\acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\iota\omicron\nu$, which in Attic presumably would have ended in $-\gamma\epsilon\iota\omicron\nu$: see Rutherford *NP* 357 f. The Hellenistic form was Doric or Ionic.

¹ P Oxy iv. 736 *ter* (c. A.D. 1); P Giss 10²¹, 12⁴, 79^{1v. 2}, P Oxy iii. 531¹⁴, vi. 933²⁰, P Hamb 10¹⁹ (ii/A.D.); BGU iii. 816²⁴ and P Oxy vi. 936 *bis* (iii/A.D.).

² Ἐξαίφης in P Par 51⁸ (B.C. 160) and in P Flor ii. 175⁷ (A.D. 255) $\acute{\epsilon}\xi\epsilon\phi\eta\eta\varsigma$, where the correction is significant. *Per contra* $\acute{\epsilon}\xi\epsilon\phi\eta\eta\varsigma$ in P Giss 86² (early ii/A.D.), and $\acute{\epsilon}\xi\epsilon\phi\acute{\alpha}\eta\eta\varsigma$ in *Cognat* iii. 1145 (Syria).

³ How little significance the variation has in the uncials may be seen from a random page of \aleph (Mt 9²⁸-10¹⁷), where out of 23 occurrences of $\alpha\iota$ no less than 9 are wrong, while 6 times ϵ is wrongly written for $\alpha\iota$. On the other hand, in Rom 9⁶-4¹¹ there is but one itacism ($\alpha\iota\upsilon\acute{\omicron}\tau\epsilon\varsigma$) to 40 which are right.

⁴ Add there P Ryl ii. 233⁸ (ii/A.D.) $\acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\tau\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\kappa\omega$ $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ Ἐρακλείω , "I will refer it to H."

E and η. The change of ε to η—for which see below, § 34—may be tentatively recognised in the special case of *πλήρης* for *πλήρες*, which is not uncommon in papyri of the Roman age. Thackeray 176 f. thinks this may have arisen partly from the working of the ρ flanking two vowels that were approximating in sound. This would first assimilate *πλήρες* and *πλήρεις*, and then *πλήρη*, with *πλήρους* following later, so that the adj. became indeclinable. The explanation is not without difficulties, but is perhaps the best yet offered. On the appearance of this indeclinable *πλήρης* in NT see under the flexion, § 65.

E and α. E has been assimilated to ο in *δλοθρευτοῦ* 1 Co 10¹⁰ (all but D*), *δλοθρεύων* Heb 11²⁸ (Nω, against ADE), *ἐξολοθρευθήσεται* Ac 3²⁸ (NEPω, against AB*CD). Thackeray (p. 88) shows that it was rare in LXX uncial: it was a later development, due to the λ, and surviving in MGr *ξολοθρεύω*. He compares the much earlier development of *ὀβολός* in Attic out of *ὀβελός*, on which see Meisterhans³ 22 n. In *ὀχύρωμα* (2 Co 10⁴, P Petr ii. *ter*—see Maysen 96) we have a variation from Attic, which had *ἐχυρός* and *ἐχυρώς*; but *ὀχυρός* was older, and Attic seems to have assimilated to *ζχῶ*.

3. H.

H. § 34. Attic η maintained itself in the Κοινή overwhelmingly, against the *ā* of all dialects except Ionic. This, the most impressive evidence of the predominance of Attic as basis of the Κοινή, is confirmed by the reversion of η when “pure” to *ā*, wherein Ionic differs from Attic (Ion. *πρήσσω*, *ἀληθῆν* etc.). (The Κοινή naturally never changes pre-Greek η, as in *τίθημι*: Elean was the only dialect which did so.) Compound nouns in -ηγός (from *ἄγω*) not only show the η throughout (*ἀρχηγός*, *ὀδηγός*, *στρατηγός*), but their analogy changes the Attic *χορᾶγός*, so that in the Κοινή we have only *χορηγέω*. *Δᾶός* and *νᾶός* (contr. *νεωκόρος*) established themselves in Hellenistic from dialects outside Ionic-Attic. There are sporadic occurrences of *ā* forms. For *ὀδηγ.* we find *ὀδαγοί* and *ὀδαγῆ* Mt 15¹⁴ D, *ὀδαγεῖν* Lk 6⁸⁸ D, and *ὀδαγήσει* Ac 8⁸¹ B*: B shows the *ā* 1/8, D 3/7. In Mk 9¹⁸ D 565 read *ῥάσσει*, which need not be equated with *ῥήσσει*—see below, § 95: the *a* is therefore short. The very attractive reading of B in Ac 27²⁷ *προσαχεῖν* (*g resonare*), which accounts for the variants, has the difficulty of being a Doric (etc.) form which disagrees with the common derivatives of the same root: *κατηχεῖν* and *ἦχος* are conspicuous in NT. Can it have been a term used by sailors from Crete, Cyprus, Lesbos, Corinth, or some other maritime country outside the Ionic-Attic area, appropriated as a *t. t.*? One other abnormal *a* is that in *Νύμφαν* Col 4¹⁵: in *Prol.* 48 it is argued that this was probably *Νύμφᾶν*, a woman's name, not *Νυμφᾶν* masc., which involves a less probable reading (*αἰτᾶν*).

H and ε. In two words class. η is replaced by ε. The spelling *εἰ μὴν* cannot be due to confusion with *εἰ* “if,” as is shown by the quotation from a Doric inscr. in *Prol.* 46 n.⁴ Thackeray (83 f.) supplements the account there by observing that papyrus citations for *εἰ μὴν* begin with B.C. 112: he also shows how

LXX usage is sometimes inconsistent with any connexion with $\epsilon\iota$, though there are many instances where $\aleph\ \text{DN}$ is rendered by $\epsilon\iota\ \mu\acute{\eta}\nu$, and confusion with $\epsilon\iota\ \mu\acute{\eta}$ would be possible were it not for the plentiful papyrus *exx.*; cf. Mayser 78 n. To these may be added now some parallels. In *Archiv* v. 232, Wilcken quotes a papyrus of Wessely's, which he reads $\epsilon\iota (= \eta)\ \sigma\acute{\upsilon}$ [δι-]δωραί μοι κ.τ.λ. (reign of Augustus). BGU iv. 1141⁶ (B.C. 13) $\eta\ \epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\nu\ \eta\ \sigma\acute{\upsilon}$ gives us η for $\epsilon\iota$: P Hamb 4⁴ (A.D. 87) has $\epsilon\iota\ \mu\acute{\eta}\nu$ followed in ¹⁸ by $\epsilon\iota (= \eta)\ \epsilon\upsilon\sigma\chi\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\iota\eta\nu\ \tau\acute{\omega}\ \delta\rho\kappa\omega\iota$, and so P Lips 121¹³ (A.D. 151). In P Oxy viii. 1148³ (i/A.D.) Hunt takes $\epsilon\iota\ \beta\epsilon\lambda\tau\iota\omicron\nu$ as for η , asking a question: may this be simply the interrogative $\epsilon\iota$ common in NT, and could we regard this use as originating in η ? See *Vocab. s.v. \epsilon\iota\ \mu\acute{\eta}\nu* for further instances. We may note that in 2 Co 2⁹ we have to make this same choice with resulting difference of meaning— $\epsilon\iota$ (i.e. $\epsilon\iota$) with $\aleph\text{CDG}\omega$, or η (= η) with AB 33. We find one or two *exx.* of this itacism, earlier than our uncials, in two Oxyrhynchus MSS: P Oxy iv. 655¹⁴ (uncanonical Gospel, not later than A.D. 250) $\epsilon\iota\lambda\iota\kappa\iota\alpha\nu$, and 656^{28, 43} (LXX of Gen 19^{38, 36}—early iii/A.D.) $\epsilon\iota\delta\eta$, $\epsilon\iota\delta\eta$, for $\eta\delta\epsilon\iota$. See further Mayser 78 f. He puts under this heading the new perf. $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\theta\epsilon\iota\kappa\alpha$ for $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\theta\eta\kappa\alpha$: the latter stands alone in Attic inscr. from 400 to 200 B.C. (Meisterhans³ 189, Schweizer *Perg.* 184): $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\theta\epsilon\iota\kappa\alpha$ begins to appear in ii/B.C., as *Perg.* 248²³ (B.C. 135/4). The old explanation of this from analogy— $\acute{\alpha}\phi\eta\kappa\alpha$: $\acute{\alpha}\phi\epsilon\iota\kappa\alpha$: $\acute{\epsilon}\theta\eta\kappa\alpha$: $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\theta\epsilon\iota\kappa\alpha$ —seems however to be adequate. But no analogy is apparent for $\kappa\eta\rho\iota\alpha\iota\varsigma$ Jn 11⁴⁴ AX *al.*, nor for $\acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\alpha}\pi\epsilon\iota\rho\omicron\varsigma$ Lk 14^{13, 21} ABDE*^{LW} (- $\pi\iota\rho$. \aleph PR) *al.*, which is further recommended to us by the stigma of $\acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha\theta\iota\alpha$ in Phrynichus (*ap. Ti in loc.*). His note mentions further that the Hellenistic spelling was $\epsilon\iota$ and not ι .¹

In the same category stands ι for η . So Rev 18¹²
H and ι . $\sigma\iota\rho\iota\kappa\omicron\upsilon$ (all uncials), for which WH quote *CIG* 5834; 1 Co 4¹¹ $\gamma\upsilon\mu\upsilon\tau\epsilon\iota\omicron\upsilon\mu\epsilon\nu$ (all *exc.* L—*νευ.* B*D*); $\sigma\iota\mu\kappa\iota\upsilon\theta\iota\omicron\nu$ Ac 19¹³; Κυρήνιος Lk 2² (*exc.* BW)—Blass thinks that Κυρήνη provided the suggestion; $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\ \mu\acute{\iota}\ \mu\upsilon\eta\sigma\theta\acute{\eta}\sigma\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ Heb 10¹⁷ (p¹³); $\pi\lambda\acute{\eta}\rho\iota\varsigma$ Jn 1¹⁴ (W). The name Μετυλήνην Ac 20¹⁴ ends with $-\iota\eta\nu$ in AEL. Under this heading comes also Lk 23¹¹ W $\acute{\epsilon}\xi\sigma\upsilon\theta\epsilon\nu\acute{\iota}\sigma\alpha\varsigma$, which however may be a deliberate correction, since it agrees with the form that seems to have been used by Plutarch: see below, § 46, and further on this verb § 119. The spelling Χρηστιανός \aleph^* 3/3 (also 81 in Ac 11²⁶) is not so much an itacism as a consequence of the common pagan misreading of the mysterious name Χριστός . Finally, we may preserve for the museum of exegetical curiosities the Byzantine invention of a $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\mu\iota\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ "cable" to be an improvement on $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\mu\eta\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ in the paradox of Mt 19²⁴ and \parallel s (Suidas and a scholiast). Instances of ι for η in LXX may be noted in Thackeray 85: they are "distinctly rare in B and not much commoner in \aleph^* A." See above, § 28, for Rudberg's note on the rarity of a confusion of η and ι in D.

¹ WH compare $\acute{\alpha}\pi\epsilon\iota\rho\omicron\varsigma$ (*gs.* "unmaimed") in Hdt. i. 32: if the reading is sound, we might take the NT word to be Ionic. But cf. Stein *in loc.* It should be added that in Heb 11²⁷ WH mention with some approval the conjecture $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\eta\rho\acute{\omega}\theta\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$ for $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\iota\rho\acute{\omega}\theta\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$, which would come by way of $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\epsilon\iota\rho\acute{\omega}\theta\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$.

H and u.

The very common MS confusion of *ἡμεῖς* (and cases) with *ὕμεῖς* is discussed under *υ* in § 35, and a suggestion is made as to the phonetic cause. WH *Intr.* 310 urge that confusion of sound plays only a part: they recognise a "prevailing tendency . . . to introduce *ἡμεῖς* wrongly, doubtless owing to the natural substitution of a practical for a historical point of view." 1 Pet and 2 Co are specially mentioned as largely affected, and Ac 17²⁸ [B cu⁶ boh] *τινὲς τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς ποιητῶν* is noted as a reading they would much like to accept, but for "the limited range of attestation."

H and ε.

Nouns in *-ημα* are sometimes found with *-εμα*, through the strong association with the *-σις* class, in which the weakened root-vowel was primitive: *εὔρεσις*, *θέσις* etc. produced *εὔρεμα*, *θέμα*, just as *κρίσις* produced *κρίμα*. See § 30, and Thackeray's list, *Gr.* 79 f. On *ἐρρέθην*, *ῥηθῆναι*, see § 95 s.v. *ἔρω*. In verb-endings WS 48 gives *στήκετε* Mk 11²⁵, 1 Thess 3⁸, *θαυμάζετε* Jn 5³⁰, *ἐξομολογήσεται* Phil 2¹¹, as instances of well-supported but grammatically dubious substitutions.

H dropped.

An apparent extrusion of *η* after *αι* is rather widely found in forms of *ποιέω*: cf. also *βοιθοῦ* for *βο(ι)ηθοῦ* in Wilcken *Ostr.* 1084¹¹ (B.C. 136), 1089⁷ (B.C. 135). So *ποιῖσαι* Lk 11⁴⁸ K, *ποιῖσας* Jn 5¹¹ W. Mayser 83 cites four papyrus exx. from ii/B.C. See Blass *Pron.* 38 n.⁵, and G. Meyer *Gr.* 132 n.³; also Radermacher 34, who accepts Hatzidakis' postulate of a parallel stem *ποιῖα*, like *νόα* against *νοέω*.

4. O.

O and α.

A replacing of *ο* by *α* is seen in *μεσανύκτιον (-ου)* Mk 13³⁵ B*W, Lk 11⁵ D*. MGR *μεσάνυχτα* shows that it is not a mere accident: the adv. *μέσα* may suggest its origin. *Αἱμαροῦσα* Mt 9³⁰ K* is an obvious assimilation to the primary. *Κολασσαίς* in the title of Col in AB*K *al.* and in K twice at the top of the page, is shown by Lightfoot (*Comm.* 7 17n) to be a later spelling: Paul's own spelling in 1² is *Κολοσσαίς*.

O and ω.

The close approximation of *ο* and *ω*, which has plentiful evidence in ii/B.C. in Egypt, but in Attica not before ii/A.D. (Thackeray 89), accounts for some doubtful spellings, and for a few more important matters. WH mention the following:—*Συκομορέα* (Lk 19⁴ DQ *-μωρ.*); *χρεοφιλέτης* (L 1², U 2²; have the "correct" *χρεωφ.*); *πράμος* (from *πρό*, antithetic to *ᾄψιμος*) but *πρωινός* (from *πρωί*), both as in LXX—see Thackeray 90; *ἐνδώμησις*, now confirmed by the inscr. *Syll.* 583³⁰ (i/A.D.)—*ο* is only due to false etymology; *Στωϊκός*, in Ac 17¹⁸ B, is the original spelling (see Brugmann-Thumb 64), which in *NADE al.* is changed to *Στω.* by influence of *στοά*. Nouns in *-ωσίνη* and comparatives in *-ώτερος* may be taken as maintaining their place when the preceding syllable is short: such exceptions as there are explain themselves simply by levelling, which works easily when the two sounds are getting very near together.

The fact that the uncials generally preserve the historic spelling in

cases like these where nothing turns upon it must count for something in their favour when it is urged that mere itacism accounts for the change of *-ομεν* into *-ωμεν*, or the like, which WH (309) call "probably the commonest permutation." It may be questioned whether the great uncials show instances of *ω* for *ο*, or *ο* for *ω*, in which the matter is one of mere orthography. Thackeray (91) remarks, "In the LXX at least we shall not expect *ἐχομεν* and *ἐχωμεν* to be confused in Cod. B": the rarity of this confusion in the principal LXX uncials comes out strikingly on p. 89 f. He is applying this to the crucial case in Rom 5¹. The only objection to following the uncials here is removed by syntactical considerations, which will be taken in their place: meanwhile see *Prolog.* 110, 247. Here we find all the uncials (exc. *Ν*GP*) and all the *vss.* on the side of *ἐχωμεν*; so also patristic testimony from Marcion down, except Didymus, Epiphanius, Cyril (94). If then Paul really meant *ἐχομεν*, we must assume a primitive error in the written text, due possibly to a mishearing on the part of his scribe. Nachmanson *Magn.* 64 f. gives inscriptional instances of confusion of *ο* and *ω* in Asia, especially Hierapolis. But it can hardly be called common in Asia Minor in i./A.D.; and the fact that in Egypt the fusion was practically complete before Paul's day proves nothing for our purpose, since Egypt was manifestly ahead of other countries in this change. Schweizer *Perg.* 95 gives further evidence for the Asia Province, but it is also indecisive. Champions of *ἐχομεν* must first examine the point of syntax, and then if dissatisfied claim the right to emend the text: their case cannot rest on authority, nor on the assumption of itacism.¹ A further important instance of the same confusion is 1 Co 15⁴⁹ *φορέσωμεν*, if we are to listen to the modern authorities who disapprove of the hortatory sense which Tertullian and Chrysostom attest. Here B and one cursive support *ο*: it is probably again a matter of syntax and not itacism. Jas 4¹⁵ *ζήσωμεν* is best taken as a genuine *v.l.* due to misunderstanding of the construction. To take *exx.* of another kind, we are justified in regarding *καθαρίζων* in Mk 7¹⁹ *Ν*ABLΔW al.*, *μείζον* in Jn 10²⁹ *AB*X (μείζων* in MSS reading *δ* being a compromise), and many other readings where the question is between *ο* and *ω*, as genuine *vv.ll.*, and not mere misspellings. Perhaps *καθήσωμαι* 1 Co 13⁸ *CK al. κερδηθήσονται* 1 Pet 3¹ *cu*, stand about alone as genuine *exx.* of the itacism which we are asked to recognise in Rom 5¹ and 1 Co 15⁴⁹. Schmiedel (WS 48) gives sundry other verb forms where *ο* is well attested for what he regards as a grammatically necessary *ω*: viz. Rom 14¹⁹ *δώκομεν*, Mt 13¹⁵ *al. λάσομαι* (LXX), 1 Jn 5²⁰ *γινώσκομεν*, Ac 21²⁴ *ξυρήσονται*, Rev 14¹⁸ *ἀναπαύσονται* (1), Gal 6¹² *δώκονται*, Rom 14⁸ *ἀποθνήσκομεν*, Lk 3¹⁴ *ποιήσομεν*, Jn 4¹⁵

¹ I modify, mainly on Thackeray's lead, the freedom I claimed for the modern editor in *Prolog.* 86. I have H. A. A. Kennedy (cited *Prolog.* 247), Rendel Harris (*Expositor*, VIII. viii. 527) and Deissmann (*Paul* 148) against me—a trio I am not likely to ignore. Nor do I object to their use of virtual conjecture; I only cannot see why it is necessary, when the sense is practically the same.

διέρχομαι, Rev 6¹¹ ἀναπαύονται; also *vice versa* Lk 9¹⁸ ἀγοράσωμεν, Mk 6³⁷ δώσωμεν. He mentions further two tempting conjectures, Rom 13⁸ ἀγαθοεργῶ and 2 Pet 3⁶ δι' ὧν. In 1 Co 9²⁷ Lk 18⁵ ὑποπιάζειν is an unsuccessful attempt to explain an unusual word, and not an orthographic variant.

Corroboration of the general line here taken may be found in the fact that only two of the iv/A.D. and earlier Biblical texts in P Oxy i.-xi. (see § 36) show this itacism, viz. ii. 209, where in Rom 13.⁶ we find *πρωφητῶν* and *ὑπακῶν πίστεος* (GH call this document (iv/A.D.) a "schoolboy's exercise") and iv. 657¹⁴⁷ (= Heb 10²⁴, iv/A.D.) *κρίσσωνα*. In W I can see no instance, unless we count *παιδίον* for *-ων* in Mk 9³⁷, and even this is translatable and may be a genuine *v.l.* Scrivener (*Collation of Codex Sinaiticus* (1864), p. liii) says that \aleph interchanges *ou* and ω 20 times in the termination of verbs, and σ and ω 68 times. It soon appears that the question is one of syntax as much as of orthography—*e.g.* *ἴνα* with a fut. ind. instead of an aor. subj.—and must be examined on syntactical lines before we can confidently pronounce for itacism. Against the assumption that MSS commonly confused indic. and subj. may be set the round declaration (Blass-Debrunner 17) that in NT there are only a few traces of quantity-levelling. Rudberg¹ remarks that "D observes quantity-distinctions very well, and distinguishes indic. and subj."

5. Ω

Ω

§ 35. In earlier Greek ω differed from σ as η from ϵ : it was the open δ to which we come nearest in the syllable *ore*, as to the open δ in *ore* (there). In Egypt ω becomes much closer in ii/B.C.: Mayser counts from that century 50 instances of σ for ω , and 20 more when accented, 37 and 33 respectively of ω for σ .

Ω and ου.

We find *ου* for $\omega(\iota)$ quite infrequently in Ptolemaic papyri: see Mayser 99 f., 138, where they are all explained as syntactical or orthographical confusions signifying nothing. Later *exx.* such as *ἀγωνιοῦμεν*, *διατιοῦμένων*, *ἀγαποῦντες*, *ἀπαντούντων* (see CR xviii. 110b), are late enough to be classed as due to mixture of classes in the Contracta. *Θυρουρός* in papp. and Mk 13²⁴ D*, Jn 10³ D, is merely on the analogy of *κηπουρός* etc. *Ζηλοῦτε* Gal 4¹⁷ and *φυσιοῦσθε* 1 Co 4⁵ are doubtless subj. (see §§ 84, 85), but owe their form to the assimilation of indic. and subj. in Contracta which started naturally from the *-άω* class. Depending as before on his syntactical presuppositions, which will be examined in their place, Schmiedel gives the following well-attested *reicienda*: Mt 7⁶ *καταπατήσουσιν*, Gal 2⁴ *καταδουλώσουσιν*, Rev 6⁴ *σφάξουσιν*, 9²⁰ *προσκυνήσουσιν*, 2²² *μετανοήσουσιν*, Ac 7⁷ *δουλεύουσιν* (Gal 4¹⁷ *ζηλοῦτε*, 1 Co 4⁵ *φυσιοῦσθε*—see §§ 84-5), Mk 15²⁰ *σταυρώσουσιν*, Mt 18¹⁹ *συμφωνήσουσιν*, Rev 13¹⁸ *προσκυνήσουσιν*, Jn 17⁸ *γνώσκουσιν*, Tit 2⁴ *σωφρονίζουσιν*, Rev 12⁶ *τρέφουσιν*. He bases his rejection of these, as of those in § 34, on the evidence of confusion of vowels in the Egyptian vernacular Greek.

¹ *Nilicher Text* 15.

Ω and α. The perplexed forms of ἀνάγειον (so WH) are noted under ε above: a form ἀνώγειον would account for the MGr, but ἀναγ. must have been the earlier—it is a choice between ἀνά and ἀνω for first element, and on the analogy of κατάγειον we should expect the former, which is in the best MSS. WS 51 compares the alternative forms καταφαγᾶς and κατωφαγᾶς in Phrynichus (NP 497).

6. I.

ι and ε. Dissimilation takes place in ἀλεεῖς, from ἀλειψ, for which WH's Δεκελεεῖς is an illusory parallel, since the nom. sing. will be Δεκελε(ι)εύς.¹ Ἀλεεῖς is found in LXX (Thackeray 84), and can be illustrated from P Flor i. 127¹⁵ (A.D. 256): six papyrus citations must be set against this one. On the contraction which more commonly affects two concurrent i-sounds see below, § 33. The Latin *legio* is transliterated λεγιών, but λεγεών appears not only in ACω at Mt 26⁶⁸, Mk 5¹⁵, Lk 8³⁰, but also in papyri—see CR xv. 33b, 434b, xviii. 107b. Among 31 occurrences of λ. and deriv. in papyri I find 6 with ε; but when only i/A.D. exx. are counted ε has 4 and ι has 7. The ε was probably older, and marks the fact that Latin *i* was more open than Greek ι. A similar case is λέντιον for *lenteum* Jn 13⁴, where in the second syllable we note the more open sound of ι before a vowel. Cf. Lindsay *Latin Language* 30, and note the transliteration Πορίοιοι from *Puteoli*. The late νηφάλεος, which is not an orthographic variant, appears in Tit 2² D*E, and in later uncials in 1 Tim 3^{2.11}.

ι and α. There is no relation whatever between *ιμείρομαι* and the rare verb *ιμείρομαι*, on which see § 95.

ι and α. Στοιβάδας Mk 11⁸ ACSVXΓ (στυβ. N) is probably a mistake of a period in which οι and υ were locally reduced altogether to the i-sound. It is not worth considering as a possible reading of the autographs. Jannaris *Gr* 52 f. would actually have us believe that αι was monophthongal in the age of Thucydides: that he can quote οἴκει as a phonetic equivalent of οἴκοι is sufficient illustration of his equipment in comparative philology.

ι and ε. The most conspicuous and universal of all itacisms is the complete equivalence of ι and ε in uncials as in papyri and inscrr. of the Hellenistic period: whether ι is long or short it may always be replaced by ε. Scribes have their individual preferences. Thus Lake remarks (*Codex Sinaiticus*, p. xi) that scribe A of Ν prefers ι, while scribe D prefers ε. WH *App.*² 159 f. give an elaborate analysis of the orthography as determined by the best uncials. They note (p. 306 f.) that “Ν shews a remarkable inclination to change ε into ι, and Β to change ι into ε . . . the converse confusions being very rare in both, and particularly in Β. Hence Β has to be left virtually out of account as an authority against unclassical forms with ι, and Ν against unclassical forms with ε; while in the converse cases the value of their evidence remains unimpaired, or rather is enhanced, allow-

¹ Cf. Meisterhans² 42.

ance being made for the possible contingency of irregular permutations here and there." Set by this Thackeray's account (p. 86 f.) of the ways of ϵ in LXX. An analysis of p^{18} (before A.D. 350, perhaps before 325) shows 12 instances of ϵ for short ι , 8 for $\tilde{\iota}$, while there are 16 of ι for ϵ ,

one of them corrected ($\lambda\acute{\iota}\tau\omicron\upsilon[\rho\gamma\acute{\omega}\nu]$). This summary, reinforced by the abundance of ϵ for $\tilde{\iota}$ in vernacular inscrr. and papyri, makes it futile to differentiate $\tilde{\iota}$ and $\tilde{\iota}$ for the uncial period. WH are struck by the good attestation of $\gamma\epsilon\iota\acute{\omega}\sigma\kappa\omega$ and $\gamma\epsilon\iota\upsilon\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ in the best NT uncials, but we may assume with safety that it is purely accidental. According to Mayser (87) the change of $\tilde{\epsilon}$ (whether the old diphthong $\epsilon\iota$ or the lengthened ϵ) to ι dates in Egypt from c. 200 B.C., while in Attic, Pergamene and Magnesian inscrr. it is a century later. In Boeotian dialect the change was established in v/B.C. (cf. Thumb *Dial.* 223). Wackernagel acutely points out that the new future $\delta\alpha\upsilon\iota\acute{\omega}$ in LXX from $\delta\alpha\upsilon\epsilon\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega$ convicts the translators and not merely the MSS of itacism.¹ In agreement with this is the fact that in papyri of ii/i B.C., except in carefully written official papers, ϵ is constantly changed to ι , and ι to ϵ (half as often), without any appreciable difference between accented and unaccented syllables: the ϵ for $\tilde{\iota}$ is much commoner when unaccented. Attic does not begin to show ϵ for $\tilde{\iota}$ till ii/A.D., Pergamene still later, and Magnesian much the same.²

We may safely conclude that for the NT, of which probably no part was written in Egypt, there was complete equivalence of ϵ and $\tilde{\iota}$, but that we have no adequate reason to expect from the autographs ϵ for $\tilde{\iota}$. A practical inference is that it is perfectly futile to follow our best uncials in printing abnormal forms like $\tilde{\iota}\delta\omicron\nu^3$ for $\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\delta\omicron\nu$ and $\tilde{\iota}\sigma\tilde{\iota}\eta\kappa\epsilon\upsilon\nu$ for $\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\sigma\tilde{\iota}\eta\kappa\epsilon\upsilon\nu$. It would be quite reasonable to accept an unaugmented aor. indic. in the one case, and to suppose the analogy of $\tilde{\iota}\sigma\tilde{\iota}\eta\mu\iota$ operative in the other. But the MS evidence is not adequate proof that such forms really existed. A still more practical inference is the futility of insisting upon $\epsilon\iota$ $\delta\tilde{\epsilon}$ for $\tilde{\iota}\delta\tilde{\epsilon}$ in Jas 3⁸: see Mayor *in loc.*

(E) | and ϵ . Before vowels, which in practice means before o and a , the $\tilde{\epsilon}$ -sound appears to have remained unmodified even in i/A.D. This is shown by the very frequent spelling with η in Attica, Asia and Egypt, especially during the Augustan period. This is essentially the same as the ϵ which appears e.g. in $\delta\omega\pi\epsilon\acute{\alpha}$ and $\text{'}\text{A}\rho\epsilon\omicron\sigma\pi\alpha\gamma\acute{\iota}\tau\eta\varsigma$, where ϵ =older $\epsilon\iota$: so also $\text{'}\text{A}\lambda\upsilon\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$, $\text{'}\text{A}\nu\delta\tilde{\rho}\acute{\epsilon}\alpha\varsigma$, where the ϵ has the accent. This involves a sharp distinction between nouns in $-\epsilon\acute{\alpha}$ and $-\tilde{\alpha}$, where the difference of accent persisted in nom. acc. sing. and nom. pl., the quality of the penultimate vowel and the quantity of the ultima retaining their difference also. Their coincidence in the other cases, together (perhaps) with Ionic influence, produced no doubt some confusion; but it is very doubtful whether our MSS are good witnesses in

¹ Reviewing Helbing, *ThLZ*, 1908, p. 637. See Thackeray 85 ff.

² For these statements cf. G. Meyer *Gr*³ 180 ff.; Meisterhans³ 48 ff.; Schweizer *Perg.* 52 ff.; Nachmanson *Magn.* 40 f.

³ Wackernagel (in his review of Helbing just cited) calls $\tilde{\iota}\delta\omicron\nu$ an "imbecile spelling."

any such cases. Since the accent is the only element concerned which normally remains unchanged, and documents of iv/A.D. and later¹ are admittedly affected by the complete equivalence of *ει* and *ι* prevailing in their own day, it seems best to spell according to the classical tradition, not because we can prove it for the autographs, but because the autographs are in this matter unattainable and no real difference is made. It may be worth while therefore to cite from the lists in Meisterhans² 50 55 the Attic spelling of words occurring in NT. (1) (δοκιμείον); μείζω, ζμείζα, μεικτός; (σειρά); τείσω, ζτεισα; τρεισκαίδεκα. (2) ἐμπορία, ἐμπόριον; ἰμάτιον; κακοπαθία; ὀθόνιον; οἰκτίρω; περύγιον; σιρός;³ ὄφελια. (3) Inscr. differ as to στρατεία and στρατιά for "expedition": "army" is always στρατία. For the rest, it will suffice to refer to WH for the words in which they think unclassical spellings attested. They include "δοσιος" as an alternative for δοσειος, which means shifting the accent: here again *κ* has *ι* in Ac 7²⁰, Heb 11²², and its evidence may be disregarded. The only word that matters is -ελειπον (-εν) "in places . . . where the aorist would be the most natural tense": since *ND* with -λιπ. are faced by *AC* 33 *al.* with -λειπ., it is hard to see why the less appropriate aor. should be preferred. The syllable in question is unaccented, and the difference in sound between *ει* and *ι* would be infinitesimal. It is hard to set aside, even on small matters, judgements based on so unique a knowledge of the MSS. But since in this place (Heb 10²⁵—*v.* App.² 162) *B* is not extant, and *ND* are to be deducted from the list of "the better MSS" on whose "constancy" WH depend for their reading, one feels blind obedience difficult. A little problem of spelling arises in 1 Co 2⁴ π(ε)ιθοίς: see WS 135 n²⁰. A *π. εἶρ.* like this may be written indifferently, and analogies are mostly lacking—perhaps *πειθός*, as a new adj. straight from the verb-stem, is best. But Schmiedel's supposition, that *πειθοι σοφιας* has had an intrusive sigma put in, has great plausibility: we may follow FG and omit *λόγους*. On the doubling of *σ* etc. at a line division see § 31: the denial of such a possibility in an archetype of *NB* etc. seems to involve a too childlike faith in Vatican and Sinaitic infallibility.

7. T.

Υ and ου. Some confusion with *ου* appears in the word *κολλύριον* Rev 3¹⁸ *NC* 046 cu²⁰, where *APΩ* have *ου*. See Thackeray 92 for variations in LXX MSS. Blass *Gr.* 22 pronounces the *ου* "certainly" due to Latin influence: Debrunner 27 drops this, only noting (from Crönert *Mem.* 130) that *ου* is later. The papyri vary:

¹ In the cursive period a reversion to classical spelling as such may be seen everywhere.

² This word supplies a good test of WH's method. They declare *σειροῖς* "certain" in 2 Pet 2⁴. Here *κ* has *σιρ.* and *B* *σειρ.*, and on the principles quoted above from WH neither of these counts. The "certainty" of *σειρ.* seems to depend on *AC*, unless the witnesses for *σειραῖς* are to be counted. But this word had *ει* in Attic.

for *v* stands P Oxy viii. 1088⁴² (early i/A.D.); for *ov* P Flor ii. 177²⁰ (A.D. 257)—P Ryl i. 29(a)⁴⁶ (ii/A.D.) is ambiguous. An inscr. from Rome apparently from Caracalla's reign, *IGSI* 966¹⁶ (= *Cagnat* i. 41) has *v*. The corruption of *λύσαντι* Rev 1⁵ *AC* into *λούσαντι* P 046 is hardly a case in point, for a supposedly easier sense accounts for the *v.l.* better.

Changes between *v* and *i* are practically always due to assimilation or dissimilation. Βήραλλος Rev 21²⁰ A is a negligible exception. Assimilation changed *βυβλίον* to *βιβλ.*, and (in reverse direction) *ἡμισυς* to *ἡμυσυς*. That *βυβλίον* is much commoner than its primary accounts for the equally regular spelling *βιβλος* (in Mk 12²⁶ and Lk 20⁴² D has *βυβλ.*). Meisterhans⁹ 28 cites Attic inscr. down to ii/B.C. with *βυβλίον* and *βιβλος*: from i/B.C. the original *v* comes in for a while, Kretschmer *Vaseninschriften* 119 f. showed that in Attic a short unaccented *v* passed into *i* if a neighbouring syllable contained *i*. The Attic reversion to type in later inscr. shows that there *βύβλος* never completely yielded to levelling: according to Moeria, Plato said *βιβλία* but Demosthenes *βυβλία*. See Schweizer *Perg.* 99 f. In the papyri *βιβλ.* predominates considerably: see *Vocabulary*, s.v. "ἡμισυ" was in the papyri frequently assimilated *ἡμυσυ*: see Mayser 100, who says it was overwhelmingly predominant in iii/B.C. After this the *i* came in again, by the influence of oblique cases. We find *τὰ ἡμυσοὶ*¹ (with *-οι* = *-v* by itacism) in Lk 19⁸ D*. See further § 73. The island *Μυτιλήνη* was so named in v/ii B.C. (Meisterhans⁹ 29): from B.C. 100 it became progressively *Μιτυλήνη* by the same dissimilation which is illustrated above. So Ac 20¹⁴, except for *Μιτυλίην* L, like *ἡμυσυ*. The next verse has *Τρωγυλία* D, from which we may fairly presume *Τρωγυλι(ον)* was produced by later assimilation in MSS of Strabo and NT.

The very common confusion of *ύμεις* and *ήμεις* in 'Υμείς and ήμείς. the MSS goes back as far as ii/B.C. in papyri: see Mayser's instances, p. 86. The phenomenon is rather perplexing, for we have plenty of evidence that neither *η* nor *v* had found their MGr goal, the *i*-sound, for centuries after ii/B.C., unless it was in strictly limited areas. Thumb, *Hellen.* 150, 193, thinks that approximations of *v* to *i* were due to foreign influence, esp. in Asia Minor; but we can hardly apply this principle to Egypt in the Ptolemaic period. Is it possible to set down its origin to assimilation of the vowels in nom. and dat., the other cases following suit? The *η* and *v* were in the weak position before the stress, and the difference between an unstressed *e* and *ú* would be easily slurred when the next syllable had an accented *i*. It was the confusion in pronunciation between the pronouns which ultimately produced the new forms *έμεις* (from *έμέ*, but barely differing from *ήμεις*) and *έσείς*.

¹ Robertson *Gr.* 199 wrongly reports D as reading *ἡμυσυον*. The corrector has written H over the OI, so as to indicate *τὰ ήμισυη*. "The reading *ήμισυη* can be seen to be later by observing that the first stroke of the H is not straight, and the cross-bar was made from right to left, and not carried through to meet the other limb" (Dr. J. R. Harris, letter of Sept. 4, 1915).

'Αλυκός (Jas 3¹⁹) is really a different word from ἀλικός. Moeris makes υ Attic and ι Κοινή. See Mayser 102.

8. *Diphthongs with ε.*

§ 36. These were all monophthongal in pronunciation before the beginning of the Byzantine age. When our oldest MSS were written, the three short diphthongs were respectively ε, ι, and υ, the three long ones had lost the ε element altogether.

A₁, date of fusion with ε. (a) On αι most of what need be said has been given under ε, where it is shown that the uncials confuse the two completely, the pronunciation having become identical. The date at which the change took place naturally differed locally. In Attica it became conspicuous from A.D. 150 on: a little earlier αι was sometimes written η,¹ as it was in Boeotian long before. In Egypt the itacism appears in ii/ and i/B.C., but very sparingly and in illiterate papyri.² Pergamum supplies only two late stones, badly spelt.³ Magnesia has one instance of αι for ε as early as A.D. 50, and isolated cases a little later.⁴ Nachmanson gives samples of the abundance available from Asia Minor everywhere in later times. Pompeii is especially instructive, since of course A.D. 79 is the latest possible date. When therefore we find (Diehl, no. 10) an iambic ε[υθ]άδαι κατοικεῖ μηδὲν εἰσειαίτω κακόμ, with αι twice scanned short as an itacism for ε, we have adequate evidence that in Italy of i/A.D. the confusion was possible.⁵ Blass however denies⁶ that the fusion was generally complete till iii/iv A.D. While, therefore, Mark might have confused αι and ε if he wrote in Rome and used a liberty possible there outside cultured circles, there is no proof that books written in Asia Minor would show this licence. It was complete before our uncials, but probably the autographs showed very little of it.

A₁ in Biblical papyri. Some materials for further inductions may be secured by studying the Biblical or quasi-Biblical papyri from Oxyrhynchus, coeval with or older than N and B. Only four of these have any itacisms of this kind. P Oxy 657, a copy of Heb. covering about one-third of the Epistle and dated in the first half of iv/A.D., has ε 14 times among 61 places where αι should stand, as well as κέ once for καί, which is elsewhere universal and is not included in the enumeration following. It has also 3 cases of αι for ε. The close affinity between this strongly itacistic MS and B in some important readings may be remembered. The two Logia papyri, P Oxy 1 and 654 (iii/A.D.), have -αι twice for -ε, and 6 times rightly. The Hermas papyrus, P Oxy 1172 (iv/A.D.), shows ε 4/10 times. Finally we have in 1229 *πλανᾶσθαι* Jas 1¹⁶ (5 exx. of correct αι), and in 1230 *ἔλεον*

¹ Meisterhans³ 34. His exx. for ε are all before vowels, until nearly the end of ii/A.D.

² Mayser 107.

³ Schweizer 78.

⁴ Nachmanson 37.

⁵ Cf. Kretschmer *Entstehung* 7.

⁶ *Pronunc.* 68.

Rev 6^o (no *αι*): both fragments are iv/A.D. The other documents have *αι* 133 times in all, without a single instance of itacism.¹

and in *κΒ*.

In Egypt accordingly this itacism hardly ever appeared in Christian literary documents till iv/A.D. and most scribes avoided it even in that century, common though it was in non-literary writing. The extent to which *κ* and *B* show it becomes the more remarkable; but it does not affect their date, since the Hebrews papyrus is securely anchored in the same period, and is strongly itacistic. But the authority of *κΒ* as evidence between *αι* and *ε* is seriously shaken, just as it is for *ει* and *ι*, when we consider the strong claim that Egypt has to be the home of the *β*-text.

List of substitutions of *ε* in *WH*.

It may be convenient to append Schmiedel's list of forms in which *WH* print *ε* for *αι* (not all of them invariably): — *φελόνης, κερία, κρεπάλη, εφνίδιος, εξέφνης, Δασία, σνκομορέα, βέδη*. It will be noticed that they are all isolated words in which there is no analogy to preserve their older form: they were likely therefore to take on a new spelling earlier than words protected by association with a system. We have seen (p. 80) that even here the *ε* has a very precarious footing before iv/A.D.

Αι and *α*.

A note may be added as to relations of *αι* and *α*. The archaic *αίει* is not uncommon in post-Ptolemaic papyri, but *αί* predominates: the word itself survives mainly in formulae—see *Vocab. s.v.* There is no trace of this or of *αίερός* in NT MSS; nor of *ελάα* (etc.), *κάω, κλάω* (unless *εκλααν* for *εκλαιον* in Rev 5⁴ *κ* is to be counted), which Mayser 104 f. notes as occurring sporadically in papyri. He notes that early papyri not seldom show **Αγυπτος (-ιστεί)*, under influence of Egyptian, as also final *-α* for *-αι* (unaccented) and in *καί*, even before consonants. If instances of this phenomenon were found in NT MSS, it might perhaps be taken as a sign—*valeat quantum!*—of Egyptian influence. But it does not occur in *κ*, nor in *ρ*¹², in the word *Αίγυπτος (-ιος)*: to assert the negative for the other matter would involve an endless search, even if the silence of *Ti* could be implicitly taken as evidence. *Κά* occurs seven times in *W*, and in *L* at *Mk* 11⁸.

Αῖ and *αῖ*.

A special case is the passage of *αῖ* into *αῖ*, as in the names **Αχαϊκός* and *Προλεμαῖς*, both of them in accord with normal papyrus spelling. Phrynichus considered **Αλκαϊκός* Attic: see Rutherford *NP* 111-3.

Ει and *ε* (*η*).

(*b*) *Ει* in its relation to *ι* has been already discussed. Some instances of *ει* becoming *ε* remain to be noted. In a LXX quotation, Rom 3¹², we find *ἡχρεώθησαν* in *κΑΒ*D*G*,

¹ The following are their numbers and volume references. All are iv/A.D., except those marked * (iii/) and † (iii/iv).

- (1) LXX and OT Apocrypha: iv. 656*, vii. 1007*, 1010, viii. 1075*, ix. 1166*, 1167, 1168.
- (2) NT: ii. 208†, 209, vi. 847, vii. 1008, 1009, viii. 1078, 1079†, 1080, ix. 1171*, x. 1228†.
- (3) Hermas, Apocryphal Gospels and Acts: iii. 404†, 406*, iv. 655*. v. 840, vi. 849, 850, x. 1224, 1225, 1226†.

against ἀχρείος. This is attested by a i/A.D. Cilician inscr. : see *Vocab.* on ἀχρείος and ἀχρειόω Meisterhans⁸ 47 f. argues that the very frequent spelling -ηα for -εα etc. (inscr.—also papyri, esp. the Alexandrian collection of the reign of Augustus) proves the ε to have been still an ε-sound before vowels. See *exx.* in Schweizer *Perg.* 55 ff., Mayser 67 f. : cf. Brugmann-Thumb 56. In *ib.* 247 the history of πλέον (πλεονάζω, πλεονέκτης) is described : the case is not parallel with those which arose in the Κοινή period. Levelling has naturally brought in πλείον in most places (18/21 according to WH *App.*² 158), but not in derivatives. Mayser 69 shows how the ε form progressively ousted the ε in B.C. papyri : it is clear therefore that our uncials here represent their originals. In the case of Ἀρεοπαγίτης as compared with Ἄρειος Πάγος we cannot be quite certain whether we are dealing with a Hellenistic or an older sound-change.¹ When Attic δωρεά (so till B.C. 403) became δωρεά (which was inherited by Hellenistic) it was a genuine loss of ζ between vowels, and so when τέλειος became τέλειος (as in Heb 10¹ D^c and 3 Macc A bis—Thackeray 82) ; but when the late noun λογεία becomes λογεία in Ptolemaic papyri (Mayser 67), it means that ε retains an ε sound before a vowel. The relations of ἔσω and εἰς belong to the earlier history of Greek. In the Κοινή, εἶσω did not survive, nor ἐς, but we have ἔσοπτρον.

Ει in infn. of Contracta.

Hellenistic shows no trace of the double value of ε, the ancient diphthong (written EI in early alphabets) and the lengthened close ε (written E) : they had been completely fused before the Κοινή was born. One consequence remains, the infn. in -οῦν from verbs in -όω, the regular contraction of ο + ε̄ : similarly -ἄν from -άω (not -ἄν). The incorrect -οῖν—found in our uncials (see § 84), but certainly not in the autographs—was not derived from a fresh fusion of ο + εῖν, since for that a re-forming of the uncontracted -όειν would be needed : it was only that in all other -ω verbs the pres. inf. differed from 3 sg. pres. indic. by adding -ν.

Οι and υ.

(c) Οι had the same relation to υ that αι had to ε and εἰ to ε : as in those cases, the approximation began with the long simple vowel (η, ι, ῡ), and then the levelling of quantity brought in the short vowel. Apart from its early completion in Boeotian, this change appeared first in Egypt, before other Κοινή-speaking districts, as was the case with the change in αι. There are sporadic *exx.* in badly written papyri of ii/B.C. ; and the fusion becomes evident after i/A.D. Meanwhile in Attica *exx.* are not found till A.D. 238–44 ; in Pergamum the common people of ii/A.D. seem to have lost the distinction which—as elsewhere—cultured men kept up generations longer ; while in Magnesia no instances are forthcoming. Schweizer *Perg.* 80 and Nachmanson *Magn.* 44 f. give a number of *exx.* from Asia Minor generally, and by the time our uncials were written οι and υ must have been everywhere identical except in rather artificial speech. Among the Oxyrhynchus literary documents examined above (§ 36 (a))

¹ Tacitus (*Ann.* ii. 55, *Areo indicio*) transliterates with ε in the primary, but this proves nothing for the Greek form before him.

there are no *exx.* at all except in ρ^{13} (P Oxy 657), where we find $\epsilon\nu\lambda\nu\omega\omega\nu$ and $\epsilon\tau\omicron\mu\iota[\pi\alpha]\nu\iota\sigma\theta\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$ (Heb 4¹², 11³⁵). It is not uncommon in the LXX uncials, especially in words where the papyri soonest and most freely show the itacism: $\acute{\alpha}\nu\omicron\lambda\gamma\omega$ is so marked an example that Radermacher proposed to recognise the analogy of $\acute{\alpha}\nu\iota\tau\omega$ —see *Vocabulary*, s.v. So $\lambda\omicron\mu\alpha\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ six times in B: Thackeray (94) thinks $\lambda\omicron\mu\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ responsible. See his LXX evidence. The verb $\acute{\alpha}\nu\omicron\lambda\gamma\omega$ will supply a fair sample of the prevalence of this itacism in NT uncials:—Mt 20³³ \aleph , Mk 7⁸⁴ D, Lk 12⁸⁶ D, 24³² \aleph BDDA, Jn 9¹⁷ DE, ²⁶ \aleph DM, ^{30, 32} D, 11³⁷ B*D, Ac 7⁸⁶ B*, 9⁸ \aleph^* , 12¹⁰ \aleph B*D, Rev 3⁷ *bis* \aleph , 6¹² \aleph^* . In W the only instances of this itacism are forms of $\acute{\alpha}\nu\omicron\lambda\gamma\omega$ in Mt 7⁷, Mk 7^{84, 86}, Lk 11⁹ (cf. ¹⁰ $\acute{\alpha}\nu\eta\chi\theta.$); and $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}$ for $\sigma\omicron\iota$ in Mk 12⁴, Jn 2⁴, $\sigma\omicron\iota$ for $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}$ Jn 13⁷. When we note that W simply swarms with the *a* and *ei* itacisms, and that $\acute{\alpha}\nu\omicron\lambda\gamma\omega$ is a very common word and more affected by this itacism than any other word in LXX, inscr. and papyri, we have evidence enough that the *oi-v* confusion was much less conspicuous than either of the others, and still less likely to have figured in the autographs. One remarkable *v.l.* should be mentioned as involving the itacism, viz. $\epsilon\tau\omicron\mu\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ for $\epsilon\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\mu\alpha\varsigma$, Ac 13⁸ D*d (Lucifer and Ambrosiaster): see J. Rendel Harris, *Exp.* vi. v. 189-95 (1902). The loss of *i* from *oi* before vowels (not the *o* vowels) is very

oi and o (ω). conspicuous in early papyri: see Mayser's tables, 108 f. It is also frequent in Pergamum, but does not appear in Magnesia. It was very common in Attic. Its origin belongs to the time when *oi* was still a diphthong: it is significant that Thackeray can note only one LXX instance, $\pi\omicron\eta\sigma\epsilon$ Jer 39⁸ \aleph . Hellenistic sometimes uses *oi* forms where Attic had dropped the *i*: thus $\pi\omicron\iota\alpha$ (*grass*) occurs in LXX 2/3 (Thackeray 93),¹ as in the Doric inscr. from the Asclepieum, *Syll.* 803¹²¹ (iii/B.C.)—P Lille 5⁸ (B.C. 260) has $\pi\omega\omicron\lambda\omicron\gamma\iota[\alpha\nu]$. This substitution of ω for an older *oi* is seen also in $\delta\phi\eta$ (LXX and NT), in $-\phi\eta\nu$ from $-\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ verbs ("as early as Epicurus," says Radermacher 73), and in $\pi\alpha\rho\lambda\omega\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ and $\mu\eta\rho\lambda\omega\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$; *per contra* $\delta\omicron\iota\varsigma$, $\delta\omicron\acute{\iota}$, $\gamma\upsilon\acute{\alpha}\iota$ and $\delta\iota\delta\omicron\iota$ for the subj. in $-\acute{\phi}(s)$ —cf. $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\upsilon\omicron\iota\nu = -\omega\nu$ Lk 16⁴ D(*al.*—see Crönert *Mem.* 217), $\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\omicron\iota$ dat. P Lille 17²⁰ (iii/B.C.) and a few other *exx.* in Mayser 137. In all these cases ϕ would be written, but ϕ and ω were identical. It would be possible to explain $\pi\omega\acute{\alpha}$, $\delta\phi\eta$ and $\pi\alpha\rho\lambda\omega\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ on the same lines as cases of $\epsilon\iota > \eta$ before vowels ((*b*) above), assuming that before vowels *oi* was arrested in its passage towards $\iota\acute{\iota}$, in the δ stage, where ω might be a graphic equivalent. The opposite change, $\delta\omicron\iota$ etc., is explicable always without phonetic considerations.

Oī and oi. Mayser 110 shows that *oi* tended towards *oi*, as $\acute{\alpha}\iota\iota$ to $\acute{\alpha}\iota$ (above (*a*)): in NT we have however $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\theta\omicron\sigma\omicron\upsilon\acute{\alpha}$ (A - $\epsilon\iota\alpha$) and $\epsilon\upsilon\pi\omicron\iota\acute{\alpha}$ (AC - $\epsilon\iota\alpha$).

Diphthongs and the diaeresis. Before leaving *ai*, *ei*, *oi* we should note that there are words in which the use of the diaeresis, or the substitution of $\epsilon\iota$ for *i* in the second part of the diphthong, shows that the two elements were still pronounced with their

¹ And quite conceivably in Jas 4¹⁴.

own original value. Ἀχαιᾶ is transliterated *Achaia* in Latin, and Ἀχαιή in Herodotus shows that we have a tetrasyllabic word. The Latin praenomen *Gaius*, which was never spelt with *ae*, is found in vulgar Greek inscr. with *v* for *i*, at a date when *v* was a pure *i* sound. While our uncials are by no means systematic in the use of diaeresis, their evidence is often important. Blass, for example (*Gr.* 17), notes that *Ναιμάν* and *Ἰεσσαί* have no diaeresis in MSS, and *Νεμάν* is therefore not surprising: *Ναῖν* and *Καῖν* always in NB: Ἡσαίας 10/19 in N, but *ai* in B except for four places; *Βηθσαιδά(ν) ter* in N, but also *ai ter*, while B usually has *ai*.

Long *i* diphthongs.

(*d*) The long diphthongs, which we write *z*, *v*, *φ*, have been briefly alluded to in § 27. The "silent *i*" (*ι ἀνεκφώνητον*) is not regularly "subscript" till *xii/A.D.*, though Blass (*Pronunciation* 50) notes a *vii/A.D.* papyrus where it is written a little higher or lower than the vowel to which it is attached. In the middle Hellenistic period it has become a mere matter of orthography; and it is only because our spelling normally conforms to the Attic that we trouble about it at all. It is omitted in the uncials till *vii/A.D.*, and ranks accordingly with accents and punctuation as a device of Byzantine and mediaeval orthography, useful for distinguishing nom. and dat. sg. fem. etc. It preserves, like the accents, a feature of Attic pronunciation, which—unlike the accents—had been for centuries extinct.

(*a*) Classical usage decides for *κῆρα* (= *καί εἶτα*), but *κἀγώ* etc., where the second element has no *i*; *ἦρον* impf., but *ἦρα* aor. etc., in verbs where *i* appears in present stem because of the suffix *-γω*; *ζῆν*, *τιμᾶν* etc., where our rejection of *δηλοῖν* (see § 36 (*b*)) forbids our altering the classical spelling: *πρᾶος*, *πρωῖ*, *ζῶον*, *ὑπερφῶον*, *Ἡρῶδης*, *πρῶρα*, *Σαμοθράκη*, *πατρῶος*, *ἀποθνήσκω*, *σφίζω* and *σέσφσμαι*, but *ἔσωσα*, etc., *Τρῶάς*, *φόν*, *ἀθῶος*, *μυμήσκειν*. See reff. in WS 41.

(*β*) Some forms which look like datives, but were in part primitive instrumentals, varied in their acceptance of the *-ι*: on their historical basis see Brugmann-Thumb 269. The Attic inscriptions are the only safe basis, for we cannot always dogmatise as to the datival or instrumental origin of the form. It seems best to write *κρυφῆ*, *λάβρα*, *πάντη*, *εἰκῆ*, but to allow the *-ι* in *ἄλλη*, *πανταχῆ*, *ἰδία*, *δημοσία*, etc.

Dropping of *i* ("subscript")—its date.

Mayser (132 f., 125) shows that the omission of *i* in dative sing. is hardly found in *iii/B.C.*: in *ii/B.C.* *ωι*: *ω* in dat. is as five to one, though medial and initial it is only two to one. Against 250 exx. of correct *ηι* in *iii/B.C.* he finds only 2 of initial *i* and 11 of final *i* dropped. But while in *ii/B.C.* 414 datives and conjunctives in *-ηι* are noted, to 121 with *-η*, in a series of documents dated *c.* 100 B.C. (P Grenf) there are 27 of each. This prepares the way for the period in which *i* is added or dropped indifferently, having ceased to affect the pronunciation. The disappear-

ance of the *i* from the long diphthong *āi* presents the same chronology (Mayser 120 f.). The analysis of P Tebt i. (ii/i B.C.) is instructive:—

“The proportion of *-āi* to *-ā* final is in official documents [including petitions] (nos. 5-54) 25 : 14; in private letters and the land survey (nos. 55-103) 8 : 2; in contracts (nos. 104-111) 8 : 3; in private accounts (nos. 112-123) 0 : 11.”

The next stage is the irrational addition of *-i*, sporadically found even in iii/B.C., and visible in ii/i (once or twice even with *-ā*), but not common.

Latin Evidence. These facts obviously show that before the second period of the Κοινή developed (c. A.D.—see § 30) these long *i*-diphthongs had lost the glide. That this was not a peculiarity of Egyptian pronunciation may be seen, among other evidences, from Latin transliterations. Blass (*Pronunciation* 50) cites *Thraex* etc. from Cicero, later *Thracia*; *citharoedus*, *comoedia*, *tragoedia*, later *ode* and *melodia*. He also quotes Strabo († A.D. 24), who tells us that “many write datives without the *i*, and reject the whole custom [of adding *-i*] as having no reason grounded on nature” (xiv. p. 648).

Application in NT. It follows that in ambiguous passages of the NT we are as much at liberty to insert or drop *i* *subscr.* as to alter accents or punctuation, since none of these can have been in the autographs. Early translations and patristic quotations, if unanimous, will attest a traditional interpretation which must not be ignored, but need not wholly bar our freedom.

Thus in Jn 5³ Milligan and Moulton (*Comm. in loc.*) proposed to read *κολυμβήθρα* (“... by the sheep pool the (pool) that is called . . .”).¹ In Heb 11¹¹ WH *mg* read *αὐτῇ Σάρρα*, thus making Abraham the subject of *ἐλαβεν*. An instance of another kind is the convincing emendation *δ ἄν* (so D) *ὠφελήθης* for *ὠφεληθῆς* in Mk 7¹¹: see Goodspeed in *ExpT* xx. 471 f.

In forms which are born in the Κοινή our orthography is necessarily guided only by analogy, there being no authority unless the word happens to occur in well-written papyri of iii/B.C., when the *i* still represents a real sound. Whether Crönert's instances of *δῶτη* (*Mem.* 215) are early enough for the purpose is doubtful: here however the classical *τιμῆν* encourages us. But *πατρολόφας* (*μητρολ.*) has no real reason behind it, nor *πφολογία* in P Lille 5³ (§ 36 (c)).

9. Diphthongs with *v*.

Ev, Au. § 37. *Ev* and *āv* retain their full diphthongal character, and the *v* necessarily resisted the tendency towards *ū*. Hence the spelling *εου*, found even in D₂ at 2 Ti 4¹⁴ (*χαλακούς*), as Debrunner notes, with ref. to Crönert *Mem.* 128 f. Later

¹ So Moffatt renders, “there is a bath beside the sheep-pool.” The reading of W, *τῆ ἐπιλεγόμενῃ*, points the same way; and there is new evidence that it was so read in v/A.D. (?), from a Christian amulet P Oxy viii. 1151⁷², which appeals to *δ θς τῆς προβατικῆς κολυμβήθρας*.

we find even $\epsilon\beta$; and as an ultimate result there is the pronunciation $\epsilon\nu$, av , which gives us MGr $\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{o}s$ ($\alpha\upsilon\rho\acute{o}s$). So Hebrew אָהַב becomes $\Delta\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\acute{\iota}$, $\eta\eta\Delta\alpha\upsilon\epsilon\acute{\iota}\delta$: on the later use of β in $\Delta\epsilon\beta\beta\alpha\acute{\iota}o\varsigma$, $\Delta\alpha\beta\acute{\iota}\delta$, see § 45. $O\upsilon$ on the other hand became completely monophthongal. See Mayser 114 and reff.

$\epsilon\nu$ has a peculiar tendency towards av in the derivatives of $\epsilon\rho\upsilon\nu\alpha$. The av forms do not appear in Ptolemaic times (Mayser 113). The earliest known ex. is one supplied by Wackernagel¹— $\epsilon\acute{\xi}\epsilon\rho\alpha\nu\eta\sigma\omicron\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ in a psephism from Syros, one of the Cyclades, dated mid i/B.C. Then follow instances from the papyri, beginning with $\eta\rho\alpha\upsilon\nu\eta\tau\alpha$ in P Oxy ii. 294⁹, 10 (A.D. 22): see *Vocab. s.v. \epsilon\rho\alpha\nu\acute{\alpha}\omega*. Only in CP Herm 102¹³ does $\epsilon\rho\epsilon\nu$ [. . . appear in Roman age papyri.² Crönert *Mem.* 128 gives several instances from MSS of Philo and Josephus. Thumb *Hellen.* 176 f. cites two or three papyrus exx. of ϵ broadening to a , which he thinks might be due to native Egyptian (not Alexandrian) influence. But there are closer parallels from Greek dialects, in Delphian $\epsilon\lambda\alpha\nu\theta\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha\nu$, and Theran Doric compounds of $\epsilon\upsilon$ - as $\alpha\upsilon$ -.³ In LXX Thackeray 79 cites $\kappa\omicron\lambda\omicron\kappa\alpha\acute{\upsilon}\epsilon\iota$ 1 Es 4⁸¹ B and $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\tau\alpha\upsilon\rho\omicron\nu$ Prov 9¹⁸ Bab^{nc}. a. (The converse $\epsilon\nu\tau\acute{\epsilon}\upsilon\theta\alpha$ 1 Es 5⁶⁶ A is clearly a mere confusion with $\epsilon\nu\tau\acute{\epsilon}\upsilon\theta\epsilon\nu$.) These, so far as they go, might be taken as showing that there was some tendency towards such a pronunciation in Egypt. But in uncials of the NT we find it 7/8 in \aleph , 6/7 in B*, 4/7 in A, 2/4 in C, 1/1 in T, 1/2 in W, and 0/5 in D and D₂. It is rather difficult to reconcile such wide attestation with any very close association with Egypt, which is also discouraged by Wackernagel's Syros inser.; but it may be noteworthy that the δ -text authorities have no trace of it—unless the fact that in Jn 7⁵² W has a reading shared only with D lat^{vt} is to mark that passage as of δ character, and so neutralise the association of W with AB*T in $\epsilon\rho\alpha\nu$. there. Schmiedel's observation (WS 51) that B prefers $\epsilon\nu$ in OT and av in NT would suit the evidence of papyri very neatly; but it needs checking by Thackeray's figures (p. 79n), whence it appears that in OT B has 13 of each. Proportionally therefore the statement is true.

It is noteworthy however that it is only in the imperfect that there is authority worth counting for the $\eta\nu$ in the conjugation of $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\rho\acute{\iota}\sigma\kappa\omega$. The moods in the aorist would form a check upon a spelling in indic. that represented no practical difference of sound. That $\eta\nu$ was still thoroughly diphthongal is well seen by a tendency, esp. in \aleph and A, to write $\eta\upsilon$; moreover \aleph can even divide $\eta\upsilon$ between two lines—see § 27. The foreign word Μουσησ was trisyllabic, as the Latin transliteration helps to show.

Thackeray 97 gives four LXX passages where $\pi\rho\epsilon\sigma\beta\upsilon\tau\eta\varsigma$ = *senex* is written for $\pi\rho\epsilon\sigma\beta\epsilon\upsilon\tau\eta\varsigma$ = *legatus*, and recalls Lightfoot's note on Phm⁹, in which $\pi\rho\epsilon\sigma\beta\upsilon\tau\eta\varsigma$ was rendered "ambassador." The evidence Lightfoot gives for believing in a confusion

¹ See Nachmanson in *Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 1911, 1184: the ref. is *IG XII. v.* 653²¹.

² Undated, but apparently Roman.

³ Nachmanson, *Eranos* xi. (1912) 220 ff.; Kretschmer, *DLZ* 1901, 1049.

consists of MS mistakes, dating necessarily centuries after our period. Both words can be freely quoted from vernacular sources in their distinct forms: on P Oxy vi. 933 (ii/A.D.), a letter to a *πρεσβευτής*, the edd. remark that an error for *πρεσβύτης* is unlikely. Thayer, however (Grimm, *s.v.* *πρεσβύτης*), cites *πρεσβευτέριος* from an inscr. from the great theatre at Ephesus, which may be set with Lightfoot's MS citations. Hort (WH, *App.*² 136) prefers to read *πρεσβευτής* in Phm⁹, rather than take *πρεσβύτης* in that sense. Whether *πρεσβύτης* in its proper meaning is not tenable after all is quite open to debate: the unanimity of the great Cambridge triumvirate did not convince a bare majority of the Revisers, as appears from their unpublished first draft ("an aged man," with margin "an ambassador").

Ωυ.

The long diphthongs, hystero-genous in Greek, (see Brugmann-Thumb 64), had a very limited place in the Κοινή. Ionic used ωυ, but it did not penetrate Hellenistic, except in the Egyptian names Ἐωυθ and Μωύσης, where Thackeray 163 recognises an attempt to represent a Coptic pronunciation: in both words the ωυ passed later into ω. So also ᾠυ is distinguished from ᾶυ only by a rather doubtful phonetic principle (see below). Ηυ is found in the augment syllable of a few

Ἄυ.

Ηυ.

verbs, as αὐξάνω, εὐρίσκω. There are hardly any *vv.ll.* when ηυ comes from αυ—Ac 12²⁴ εὐξανε D*, ἤξανε P—but from εὐρίσκω many exx. of εἶρον etc. show that the shortening here was merely levelling from the present stem.

Ἄυ and ᾶ.

The papyri show very largely the reduction of ᾠυ to ᾶ, scantily till i/B.C. (Mayser 114), but freely later, especially in less educated writing. It appears often in Attic inscr. after B.C. 74 (Meisterhans³ 154) in the case of εἰαυροῦ and αἰροῦ. Radermacher 37 makes the length of the diphthong essential, in which case the common ἀρός must be analogical;¹ but Mayser's early citations (Γλακίου, and similarly Πολυδέκης: cf. ἐχαριστέι in a papyrus) do not encourage the limitation. In NT we have Ἄγουστον Lk 2¹ NC*Δ, but it is probably Latin which accounts for this: cf. Ital. agosto. (See *Vocab. s.v.*) A more certain instance is κλαθμός, six times in W (once also in L, and regularly in E, according to Wetstein: see Sanders *The Washington Manuscript* 21n). It is noteworthy that W never has εἰαροῦ or the like. There is very little of this phenomenon in LXX: see Thackeray 79, where one or two apparent instances are (perhaps needlessly) explained away. It was at first strictly limited in range. As in MGR αἰρός and (ἀ)ρός exist side by side (Thumb *Handb.* 85), we may assume dialectic difference within the Κοινή. As noted in *Prol.* 47, ἀκαταπάστους 2 Pet 2¹⁴ AB and ἀχηρῶ 2 Pet 1¹⁹ A (see Mayor, *Comm. in loc.*) are probably cases in point. They would be excluded if we allowed only ᾠυ to be thus affected.

Ου.

Ου had become a simple ο̄ sound in the classical period; as in the case of ε̄ι, there was no distinction between the inherited diphthong and the close ο̄ lengthened by com-

¹ So also Thumb in Brugmann⁴ 64.

pensation or contraction. As the quantity distinction weakened, *ou* could represent even *ū*, as it had done in Boeotian long before (e.g. *τιούχα* = Att. *τύχη*). It is also used regularly to express consonantal *χ* in Latin, as *Quartus Κονάρτος*, *Silvanus Σιλουανός*, or *vae οιαί*.

Passing by analogy formations like *δῶναι*¹ Mt 26¹⁵ N (often in papp., after *γνώναι*), we note some relations between *ou* and *ev* which descend partly from classical dialects. The Ionic contraction *ev* from *eo* survives in the proper name *Θευδᾶς* (= *Θεόδωρος* or *Θεόδωτος*): see Mayser 114, 148, also 10, where he gives several other names in *Θευ-* against the usual *Θεο-*. Ionic forms in such cases would start with individuals hailing from Ionic country. An interesting question is raised by the transliteration of *Lucius* by *Λεύκιος* in P Tebt i. 33² (B.C. 112) *al.*: contrast *Λούκιος* Ac 13¹, Rom 16²¹. Nachmanson 61 gives several other exx. of *Λεύκιος*, and thinks a genuine Greek name (derived from *λευκός*) has affected the spelling. The fact that this common name appears with both these forms has naturally suggested the possibility of regarding *Λουκᾶς* as = *Lucius* rather than as *Lucanus*; but there does not seem to be any strong reason. A link between *ou* and *ω* is implied by the frequently asserted identity of *Κλεόπας*

ou and *ω*. (for *Κλεόπαρος*) and *Κλωπᾶς*, since if the *eo* did contract it would normally make *ou*, as in *Θουκνυδίδης* etc. The contraction is very abnormal, and can be made plausible only by the difficulty of otherwise explaining the name. Confusion of *ou* and *ω* in verb terminations is another matter: it may be questioned if we are ever to credit this to itacism. See above, under *ω*.

O and *ou* are not infrequently confused in early papyri: see Mayser 116f., where the conclusion is drawn that in this period *o*, *ou* and *ω* were pronounced close—cf. the same development with *ε*, *ei*, *η*. A case of a different kind is the fluctuation between *Διόσκουροι* (as Ac 28¹¹) and *Διόσκοροι*, with derivatives: Mayser 10f. makes the latter normal in papyri for the divine name, the former for derived human names like *Διόσκουρίδης*. Here the difference depends simply on mixture of dialects, *κόρος* being Attic and *κούρος* Ionic (see *Vocab. s.v.*).

10. *TI*.

Υ.

This combination, not reckoned among the proper diphthongs because the elements could not truly combine, was sometimes written *υει* (as Mk 9¹ *εληλύθειαν* W), to show that the vowels were really distinct. Crönert *Mem.* 123 ff. shows with a mass of exx. that *υει* continued to be so written in the *Κοινή*, the Attic *υ* being rare. Radermacher's note (*Gr.* 32 n.²) that *ειδύα* *ειδύης* had replaced the old *ειδυία* *ειδυίας* must accordingly be read in close connexion with the reference to "educated people" in the text to which it is appended.

¹ In *κ* the reading is *δῶνε* [= *δῶνας*] which Scrivener marks as a scribe's error.—[Ed.]

How far the Attic *εἶδῶ* survived in archaizing speech need not be discussed here: there is no doubt about *εἶδῶ εἶδῶν* in the vernacular and in NT. Similarly there is no sign of any form but *νίος*, regularly declined: contrast Attic inscrr., where from vi/ to i/b.c. there are only 8 instances of *νι.* to 67 of *ύ.* After this *νι.* becomes "much more frequent" than *ν* (Meisterhans⁸ 60). It should be added that Blass 10 and Radermacher argue that the flexion *-νία -νίης* in Hellenistic proves that the *ι* has no force, or even (Blass) was "not pronounced." But of course the change of *η* to *ᾶ* after *ρ* or *ι* in Attic was a phonetic process which ceased to work generations before Hellenistic arose, as such a word as Attic *κόρη* shows. We have to do with inherited forms, and the presence or absence of the *ι* has no concern with the appearance of the new flexion.

Prothesis.

Prothesis. § 38. Ἐχθές (Attic: see Rutherford *NP* 370-2) was the regular Hellenistic form, not the (Ionic) χθές: the two appear to be related as *ἐκείνος* (Attic and Κοινή) and *κείνος* (Ionic —ib. 4). The *ε-* is supposed to be a deictic pronominal element. On the other hand *ἐθέλω*, where the *ε-* has a different origin, is not Hellenistic: we have only *θέλω, ἤθελον*.

In certain districts of the Κοινή prothesis is very marked before *σ* and consonant, as *ιστήλη, εισπρατιώτης, ιστοργή*. Thumb gives a table of them in *Hellen.* 145, where 25 instances are mentioned from Asia Minor, 13 of them being from Phrygia. He infers with reason that we should seek the centre of the infection in Phrygian influence, it being natural to suspect some foreign admixture where the language outside Asia shows no real sign. Where a similarly limited prothesis before "impure *σ*" occurs in other regions, it may, as Deissmann suggests, be traced on the same principle to vulgar Latin: cf. G. Meyer *Gr.*³ 166.

Contraction.

Contraction. The most important and almost the only new rule of contraction observed in the Κοινή is that by which two *ι*-sounds were made into one. Thus *πιεῖν, ταμείον, ὑγίεια* were in the NT period *π(ε)ῖν, ταμ(ε)ῖον, ὑγ(ε)ῖα*, and this spelling is reflected in our best uncials normally: in the later MSS there is reversion to the classical type. An independent anticipation of this contraction is found in Ionic *πῶϊ* from *-υ*. Ἄφεῖς in Rev 2²⁰ is probably for *ἀφείς* (see § 86): cf. *ἀνασῖ* Lk 23⁵ N.¹ Ἐπιεικεία loses *ι* in Ac 24⁴ B*, but elsewhere it and the adj. retain it. Ταμείον is found only in L 33 at Mt 24²⁶. But *πιεῖν* (καταπ.) appears in Mt 20²² (exc. W), Mk 10³⁸ (exc. D), Ac 23^{12, 21} (exc. B*), Rom 14²¹ (exc. D*), 1 Pet 5⁸ (exc. N*),

¹ *Procl.* 45, where the parallel *διασεῖν* (P Leid G¹⁰—i/b.c.) must be cancelled, as Wilken reads *διασειν* there. It is too early for that contraction. Ἄρασεῖς occurs in Wessely *Zauberpap.* p. 116.

Rev 16⁶ (exc. AC), as well as in Mt 27³⁴ ABN, Jn 4^{7.10} A, 1 Co 9⁴ A, 10⁷ AC. (WH rather unaccountably edit $\pi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ in Ac 23^{12.21}, following B* alone, but obey D* rather than \aleph B when they go with the multitude in Rom 14²¹. Since they have no objection to $\pi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ in 5/14 places, it is hard to deduce any principle.) The fluctuations of the uncials are reflected in vernacular documents. Mayser (92) cites one papyrus of B.C. 111 for contraction ($\Sigma\upsilon\chi\acute{\iota}\omega\iota$, P Tebt i. 114¹⁰—not a striking instance), and one pre-Christian inscr., OGIS 194²² (B.C. 37), while $\epsilon\epsilon\iota$ is common to the end of the Ptolemaic age. Attic began to contract as early as B.C. 100 (Meisterhans³ 49 f.). In Asia Minor it becomes abundant in the Roman period, but the date of the change is hard to fix: see instances in Schweizer *Perg.* 101, Nachmanson *Magn.* 69 f. In Egypt we note [$\acute{\upsilon}$] $\gamma\eta\eta = \acute{\upsilon}\gamma\eta$ BGU iii. 912¹³ (A.D. 33), $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\kappa\lambda\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu = -\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ P Oxy ii. 265¹⁴ (A.D. 81/95); but $\tau\alpha\mu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu$ once in A.D. 199, $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\iota\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ twice in iii/A.D. Thackeray (63) gives $\tau\alpha\mu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu$ CPR 113.³⁰ (A.D. 83/4) as the earliest instance; and we put beside it $\tau\alpha\mu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu$ in BGU iv. 1194¹⁵ (B.C. 27)—the contraction falls anyhow somewhere between these limits. $\Upsilon\gamma\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha$ begins in the papyri early in ii/A.D., and so does $\pi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ ($\pi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ appearing twice in i/A.D.). Thackeray's analysis shows that in LXX the BN text does not represent the spelling of the age when the LXX was written. It cannot be proved to agree even with NT autographs, as we cannot be sure of it till the end of i/A.D. The change would naturally affect some words sooner than others. $\tau\alpha\mu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu$ was not so obviously connected with $\tau\alpha\mu\acute{\iota}\alpha$ as $\pi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ was with $\pi\acute{\omega}\nu$; and the softening of the γ in $\acute{\upsilon}\gamma\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha$ would hasten the contraction of a word decidedly awkward in pronunciation. The MSS record for such words in NT probably reflects a state of inconsistency in the autographs. It is perhaps not without significance that $\pi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ is best attested in books written early, and $\pi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ most certain in Jn, traditionally published at the end of i/A.D. If we follow the lead of the uncials, and edit $\tau\alpha\mu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu$ everywhere, $\pi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ in Mt, Mk, Ac, 1 Pet, $\pi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ in Jn and Rev, we shall probably come as near the original as we can hope to do. Paul we must leave to be inconsistent, with $\pi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ in Rom but $\pi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ in 1 Co: if the original copies had these, it only meant that Tertius and the amanuensis who wrote 1 Co differed in their practice at a period when $\pi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ was just coming in. We must add a caveat against Radermacher's account (*Gr.* 36) of the genesis of this contraction. He would get it from the spirantising of the ϵ , just as $\sigma\omega\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu$ became $\sigma\omega\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu$ sometimes, or $\sigma\alpha\rho\delta\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu\nu\zeta$ in Rev 21²⁰ A became $\sigma\alpha\rho\delta\acute{\omicron}\nu\nu\zeta$. It is simply a contraction of identical vowels coming together, just as in Ionic $\pi\acute{\omicron}\lambda\upsilon$ produced $\pi\acute{\omicron}\lambda\acute{\iota}$ generations earlier.¹

Reversion to uncontracted forms.

The contractions which operated in classical Greek, and especially in Attic, were no longer demanded by phonetic necessity in the Κοινή, and only remained in being because they were inherited. It was therefore possible for levelling of flexion to bring back uncontracted forms like $\epsilon\rho\rho\epsilon\epsilon$ P Oxy vi. 850²⁴ (Acts of John—iv/A.D.), $\epsilon\delta\acute{\epsilon}\epsilon\tau\omicron$ Lk 8³⁸ (all except

¹ Cf. Nachmanson in *Berl. Phil. Woch.* 1911, 1183.

№BLX33). Phrynichus and Thomas regarded these as Ionic, but it is more likely to be a new operation of analogy— $\tilde{\epsilon}\lambda\upsilon\omicron\nu$: $\tilde{\epsilon}\lambda\upsilon\epsilon$: : $\tilde{\epsilon}\rho\rho\epsilon\omicron\nu$: $\tilde{\epsilon}\rho\rho\epsilon$ etc.¹ The forms of $\chi\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ present problems which will be discussed in their place (§ 95): here it is enough to say that while $\kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\epsilon\nu$ Mk 14⁸ is an aorist, $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\chi\acute{\epsilon}\tau\epsilon$ Rev 16¹ and $\sigma\upsilon\nu\acute{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\omicron\nu$ Ac 21²⁷ need not be detached from the present stem unless syntactical considerations appear weighty. For further parallels cf. *Prol.* 54 f., and 234. Uncontracted noun forms such as $\chi\rho\upsilon\sigma\acute{\epsilon}\omega\nu$ and $\delta\omicron\sigma\tau\acute{\epsilon}\omega\nu$ are more likely to be Ionic inasmuch as they are specially characteristic of the Eastern *Koinḗ*: see below under noun-flexion, § 53 B (b). Occasional contraction of $\delta\gamma\delta\omicron\sigma\omicron\nu$ to $\delta\gamma\delta\omicron\nu$ in papyri is explicable by analogy, if uncontracted forms of other adjectives survived by the side of contracted. Words like $\nu\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\varsigma$, where the uncontracted form was traditional, showed no tendency to contract, but see below on the forms of $\nu\epsilon\omicron\sigma\sigma\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$. An occasional form like $\nu\acute{\omicron}\phi$ from $\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ (BGU ii. 385⁵-ii/iii A.D.) serves as a set-off for $\delta\gamma\delta\omicron\nu$. On open forms in 3rd decl. ($\delta\rho\acute{\epsilon}\omega\nu$, $\chi\epsilon\iota\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omega\nu$) see § 58 (1) (c), and on $\pi\acute{\eta}\chi\epsilon\omega\nu$, § 59 (1): $\acute{\alpha}\nu$ for $\acute{\epsilon}\alpha\nu$ is discussed in *Prol.* 43 n.

Ω and εο.

The identification of $\kappa\lambda\omega\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ and $\kappa\lambda\epsilon\acute{\omicron}\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ —on which see also § 44—raises some questions belonging properly to commentaries. Of course $\kappa\lambda\omega\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ could not be due to contraction: $\epsilon\omicron$ in Hellenistic as in earlier Greek would become \omicron , unless Ionic influence made it $\epsilon\upsilon$ —as in $\Theta\epsilon\upsilon\delta\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ for $\Theta\epsilon\acute{\omicron}\delta\omega\rho\omicron\varsigma$ or the like, $\tau\epsilon\upsilon\phi\acute{\omicron}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ or $\Theta\epsilon\acute{\omicron}\phi\acute{\omicron}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ (papp.) for $\Theta\epsilon\acute{\omicron}\phi\acute{\omicron}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$. But some analogy beyond our reach might account for the variant form. $\kappa\lambda\epsilon\acute{\omicron}\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ is normally abbreviated for $\kappa\lambda\epsilon\acute{\omicron}\pi\acute{\alpha}\rho\omicron\varsigma$. I should add that, while ready to leave the decision to the Semitists, I myself find the identification of $\kappa\lambda\omega\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$, $\kappa\lambda\epsilon\acute{\omicron}\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ and $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\phi\acute{\alpha}\iota\omicron\varsigma$ an extremely hard saying.

New forms with hiatus.

The Hellenistic indifference to the confluence of vowels, due to the slower pronunciation which has been already noted, is well seen in the levelling which assimilates $\tau\epsilon\tau\rho\alpha\text{-}\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\eta\varsigma$ to other compounds of $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\tau\rho\alpha\text{-}$, and made even $\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\iota\text{-}\iota\epsilon\rho\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ possible (Mt 26¹⁴ B, P Petr iii. 53 (p)²—iii/B.C.). See Ti on Ac 13¹. So with late cpds. like $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\theta\omicron\epsilon\rho\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\iota\nu$ (1 Tim 6¹⁸—not Ac 14¹⁷), against the inherited $\kappa\alpha\kappa\omicron\upsilon\rho\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ and $\iota\epsilon\rho\omicron\upsilon\rho\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\iota\nu$, and numeral forms like $\delta\epsilon\kappa\alpha\kappa\omicron\tau\acute{\omega}$, $\tau\epsilon\sigma\sigma\alpha\rho\alpha\kappa\omicron\nu\tau\epsilon\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma$. This feature of the *Koinḗ* makes it very plain that classical scholars of the last generation were yielding to their besetting sin when they ruled out (e.g.) etymologies of $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\omicron\upsilon\acute{\omicron}\sigma\iota\omicron\varsigma$ that broke the laws of "correctness" by allowing hiatus. We shall see in this example (see § 120), and many others, that Hellenistic must be held as subject to its own laws alone. Analogy, and the retention of local dialectic forms, may account for a few new contracted forms, as $\text{-}\delta\gamma\delta\omicron\nu$ (see § 72), $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\acute{\alpha}\nu$ = $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\alpha\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu$ P Ryl ii. 130¹¹, 231⁴ (A.D. 31 and 40), $\phi\rho\eta\tau\omicron\varsigma$ from $\phi\rho\acute{\epsilon}\alpha\rho$ *Lect.* 12 (ii/A.D.). On the other side is $\nu\epsilon\omicron\mu\eta\nu\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$ Col 2¹⁶ BFG, Ionic for $\nu\omicron\upsilon\mu\eta\nu\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$: it is not quotable from papyri or inserr. till ii/A.D.,² and is doubtless a *f.l.* $\text{\textit{I}}\epsilon\rho\omega\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\eta$ for Attic $\text{\textit{I}}\epsilon\rho\epsilon\omega\sigma$. is Ionic, but need not

¹ Cf. the compromise form $\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\iota\epsilon\acute{\iota}\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$, P Ryl ii. 154¹⁶ (A.D. 66).

² Thackeray 98.

be contraction. Έάν for άν after δς etc. was selected in *Prol.* 42 f. as a test of the uncials' accuracy, and it was shown that their usage agrees with that of the papyri during i/ and ii/A.D., while the use of either άν or έάν in this construction was very rare in the century of our oldest uncials. My statistics may be compared with Thackeray's (*Gr.* 67 f.), which take in later material but do not alter the result.¹ As the cause of this variation cannot be phonetic, we may postpone further notice of it till the Syntax.

Syncope.

The total loss of a vowel, reducing thus the number of syllables in a word, is a phenomenon obviously resembling the prehistoric effects of Gradation; and as we know a stress accent was developing in the Κοινή—especially, we may assume, in districts where the native dialect had stress, and people had difficulty in pronouncing without it—we may confidently trace it to an identic cause. Νοσσοός (-ια, -ιον) is an established Hellenistic form exclusively found in NT: it arose from the slurring of ε into a y sound, just as βορέας much earlier produced (βορυᾶς) βορᾶς. The phonetic principle is still active, as such MGr forms as παιδία (pron. pedhiá) show. Attic έορτή kept its ground, despite Ion. όρτή; but in ελευός we find the ε slurred once before ε, in Rev 3¹⁷ AC (contrast 1 Co 15¹⁹, where only FG reads thus). Even here ελευός, with ι for ε, may just as well be read: Α actually has a diaeresis over the ε, if I read it rightly. The reading αλλοτριπίσκοπος 1 Pet 4¹⁵ NB cu¹ is due to the same treatment of ο, which became a w and dropped out, just as in the other words ε vanished through the stage y. Note that in all these products of *allegro* pronunciation the sound affected lies well behind the accent. Έσθω Mk 1⁸ for έσθίωv is not a case in point, for έσθω is an alternative conjugation.

A different application is that of "Kretschmer's Law," by which e.g. Βερενίκη became Βερνίκη. See §§ 30 and 33. Different again is καμμύειν, regular in LXX and NT (Thackeray 99), and warranted good Κοινή by the ban of Phrynichus (?) (cf. Rutherford *NP* 426). Forms involving κάτ for κατά, άν for άνά, πάτ for παρά, were abundant in poetry from the first, and easily if occasionally crept into popular language. It was forgotten that καμμύειν was a compound.

There are not a few instances in our MSS of a peculiar syncope affecting prepositions, found largely in inscr. Thus in D, Rendel Harris notes² κα(τα)φαρόντι Lk 15²⁰, πε(ρι) του̅ Ι. Mk 5²⁷, ά(να)στάς Mk 10¹, ά(να)πτίξας Lk 4¹⁷, κα(τα)λύσαι Ac 5²⁹, and perhaps έ(πι)πλήσ(σ)οντι Lk 23⁴⁸: he observes that Ν in Hermas is not free from such forms.

¹ It may be added that Jannaris *Gr.* 421 gives several instances of δς έάν etc. from MSS of classical authors. As he puts it, we should suppose Xenophon, Demosthenes etc. responsible for the form—*quod erat absurdum!*

² *A Study of Codex Bezae* (Cambridge, 1891), p. 147.

Words which always stand in the pretone are liable to changes of this kind when the accent has become stress; and we see the process complete in MGr *μέ* for *μερά*.

Pronunciation of the Vowels.

Pronunciation and Textual Criticism. § 39. Our survey of the vowel system in detail may now be focused into a general view, and its results brought into line with our whole purpose. Pronunciation might seem to have but little interest for us, to whom the written page of the NT must be everything. But the sounds as well as the signs have to be studied if we would have a clear conception of the value of our oldest MS tradition. Textual Criticism can restore to a large extent the text of the period after A.D. 150, but in matters of spelling it gives us no evidence that is not two centuries later than that epoch. How far can we regard the spelling of *αβ* and their successors as faithfully representing that of the first century? Faithfulness in so trifling a department of a scribe's duty, especially if it is maintained where contemporary usage had diverged from that of the first century, creates a strong presumption that the transcript will faithfully represent its exemplar in more important matters. It becomes therefore a really serious duty to go behind our MSS and evaluate as far as we can the phonetic conditions of the language in which Paul dictated his letters and Mark and Luke wrote their chronicles. Only by such inquiry can we gauge the accuracy of the copies on which we depend.

We first ask as to the *quantity* of vowels. The classical language, where accent was purely "musical," and there was no stress to lengthen or reduce a vowel, is governed by strict rules of quantity which are necessarily familiar to all students of poetry. These rules were maintained in literary tradition, so that a cosmopolitan collection of epigrams like the Greek Anthology can show us poems from the Byzantine age in which mistakes of quantity are almost as rare as in the Greek verses of a Jebb or a Headlam. But when we take up copies of metrical epitaphs rudely inscribed on Anatolian tombs in the period from which our great Biblical MSS come,

we find a great contrast. Short syllables are scanned long, and long as short, in odd disagreement with Homeric phrases and conventional terms of older poetry. When did the change in quantity fulfil itself, as a consequence of the change in accent?

Hatzidakis, in his monograph on the subject referred to in *Prol.* 34 n.³, shows that quantity-levelling began outside Greece and established itself very gradually. The iambic quoted above (§ 36) from Pompeii shows that in i./A.D. both *ε* and *αι* could be written for short *ι* and *ε*. Philostratus (ii./iii A.D.) tells us¹ that in his time the Cappadocians "shortened the long and lengthened the short vowels." That an Athenian graduate like Philostratus noticed the difference tells us at once that the vowels were still long and short in educated Attic and that they had lost their quantity in the Eastern *Καυή*. Meanwhile in Egypt, as Mayser shows (p. 138 ff.), from ii./B.C. down the long vowels and the diphthongs were free to change with short: it is clear however that there was in Egypt no relation between accented syllables and length, or *vice versa*—see Mayser's tables pp. 140 f. Crossing to Roman Asia, we have in Schweizer *Perg.* 94 ff. inscriptional evidence to show that *η* could stand for *ε* and *ι*, that the name *Νικομήδεια* could scan $\sim\sim\sim\sim$ and that *ο* and *ω* were free to interchange: *ov* could represent Latin *ū*, and *αι* and *οι* were sometimes *ε* and *υ*. The evidence is not dated as narrowly as we should like. Nachmanson (*Magn.* 63) makes the levelling begin in Asia Minor and Egypt in ii./B.C.: his instances from Magnesia are not very numerous, but are more precise in date. In his elaborate review of Radermacher,² the Swedish scholar refutes R.'s inference from *αα* in *Μάαρκος*, *Ἰσάακ* etc., that there was a sense of long vowels needing separate notation such as the additional sign supplied for *ε* and *ο*. Attic instances of levelling are given by Meisterhans³, but can only be dated as "Kaiserzeit." It was natural that a phenomenon depending ultimately on the speaking of Greek by various peoples with native languages of their own, should develop earliest in foreign countries.

From quantity we pass on to quality. **Changing quality in vowel system.** It has become very clear already that the whole vowel system has taken a different aspect from that which it wears in the golden age of Athens. Any modern reconstruction by which we may attempt to pronounce Attic as the Athenians did will be almost as far from representing Hellenistic as the avowedly haphazard pronunciation we have hitherto used in England. The language is well on the way towards the pronunciation

¹ *Vit. Soph.* ii. 13

² *Berl. Phil. Woch.* 1911, Sept. 23, p. 1192.

of MGr, where *αι* and *ε* are *e*, *ο* and *ω* are *o*, and *ου* *u*, *α* is still *a*, and *η*, *ι*, *ει*, *οι*, *υ* and *η* have all sunk into *i*. But we have already seen that it would be a serious mistake to suppose that even in the age of our uncials the process was complete. Not even the speech of the common people had in any country "etacised" *οι* and *υ*, or even *η*, in the century of the NT autographs, or for generations after. We must always be ready to take our proofs from the language of the common people, rather than from literary documents which are likely to be touched with artificiality; though of course we shall expect to find a considerable difference between NT writers due to geographical separation and to varying degrees of Greek culture. As knowledge of the varieties of dialect within the *Κοινή* grows, we may reasonably expect to discover traces in our best MSS of the minute distinctions by which higher criticism might argue towards a book's original home, or lower criticism claim some particular district for the place where a MS was written.

A word should be added as to the forces
Causes of the that produced a change of pronunciation at
change. least as extensive as that which marks
 modern English against that of Chaucer's time. When it is recalled that the Boeotian dialect of v/B.C. was already pronouncing *αι* as *e*, *ει* as *i*, *οι* as *ü*, and *η* as a close *e*, it is natural to conjecture a historical connexion with the same pronunciation in a later time all over the new Greek-speaking world. To this it is replied that Boeotian never seems to have affected even its next-door neighbour Attic until—on the assumption that this development really was due to Boeotian—the infection had already passed through every other region where Greek was spoken. It is abundantly clear that Attic accounts for (say) seventy per cent. of the *Κοινή* in phonology, accidence and syntax, Ionic for perhaps twenty per cent., and the other dialects possibly for as much as ten. It becomes therefore very improbable *a priori* that Boeotian should affect Hellenistic pronunciation so profoundly without doing much more, and equally improbable that this very widespread charity should have failed to begin at home. To substitute some other single cause is beyond our power. In the change of the accent system we shall probably find a

more powerful solvent of the vowels than any other influence at work. And this in its turn may well have been largely due to the fact that Hellenistic was everywhere (except in Greece itself) the language of bilingual people. Of course the influences of native dialects—discussed at length by Thumb in chap. iv. of *Hellenismus*—would affect Greek in very different ways. But they would mostly agree in possessing stress rather than pitch accent; and it would be natural for them to impart a stress to the Greek accent. This however is mere conjecture. We must mostly be content to recognise the fact of development without attempting to explain it, the conditions being largely outside our range of knowledge.

Itacism and Syntax.

A summary of pronunciation was attempted above, but we must return to one problem more in detail. How does itacism affect questions of syntax? If $\eta(\iota)$ and ϵ were identical, and o and ω , was there any real difference between the future indicative and the first aorist subjunctive, the present indicative and subjunctive of verbs like λύω? The answer has so much effect on our views of verb syntax that we must examine the history of the ϵ vowels more closely. We may start with the Attic η , which in iii/ii B.C. was predominantly changed to ϵ (Meisterhans³ 38 f.), but recovered itself in i/B.C., and afterwards dropped its ϵ like α and φ . One curious survival of this orthography is very general in Hellenistic (see Mayser 127 and the inscr. cited in Dittenberger's index, *Syll.*² iii. 226 f.), viz. the perf. act. and mid. (not the other augmented tenses) of αἰρέω and cpds.¹ In ληστής and ἀποθυήσκω the older η survived, in λεφουργός the later ϵ or ι (perhaps through association with λητή 'prayer'): so also κλείς and κλείω. The dative τιμῆι was replaced by τιμῆ after a short period of prominence by levelling action: χώρα nom. and χώρα dat. were only orthographically different in i/A.D., and τιμή, τιμῆ followed suit, except for the accent. This takes us to the relations of ϵ and η , already described in detail. H and ϵ have contacts especially in prevocalic position. Such a table as Dittenberger's in *Syll.*² iii. 226 will show how abundant was η for ϵ before vowels. The same may be said of the papyri, especially during the Augustan period. H had thus two values, one that of an open $\bar{\epsilon}$, as in earlier times, and the other close $\bar{\epsilon}$: the former drew ϵ to it and the latter ϵ . Ultimately ϵ remained an ϵ sound, as it does to-day; and the old η which had this value was ultimately spelt ϵ (as στήκω, MGr στέκω). The other η passed at last into ι : thus *Quirinius* is transliterated Κυρ(ε)ίνος in BW, but Κυρήνιος in the rest. Why στήκω kept an ϵ sound while πλῆθος took an ι we are hardly able to say.

¹ The NT has only one occurrence, 2 Co 9^v, but there FG 33 show -ειρ: in Ac 5²⁶ and 27²⁰ there is no variant upon ἀνηρέθη and περιηρέτω.

To return to the practical problem of indicative and subjunctive. It is clear that in the Attic of iii/ii B.C. the two spellings of the 2nd sing. pres. indic. mid., $\lambdaύει$ and $\lambdaύη$, were wholly equivalent, and the indic. $\lambdaύεις -ει$, $\lambdaύσεις -ει$, identical with subj. $\lambdaύης -η$, $\lambdaύσης -η$. Restricting ourselves to Attic, we ask whether this identity continued. Differentiation could arise, as in the noun, by levelling: $\lambdaύεις \lambdaύητε$ invited assimilation as strongly as $\tauιμή -ήν -ῆς -εῖ$. But the very levelling which brought back a new η tended to keep it nearer to η than the old η_i that had passed into ϵ_i . Hence its readiness to lose ϵ and attach itself rather to η than to ϵ_i . Meanwhile η itself was becoming close, and in ii/A.D. had largely lost its difference from ϵ_i even in Attica.¹ Outside Attica, according to Brugmann-Thumb, final $-η$ never changed to $-\epsilon_i$. In that case there was an additional force tending to differentiate indic. and subj. for a time. There was moreover a reason for the survival of the normal $-η$ ($=-\epsilon(\sigma)αι$) in 2 sg. pres. ind. mid.: the three exceptions $\betaούλει$ (still in NT), $οἶε$, $δύε$, may perhaps be treated as Attic forms surviving through the influence of idiomatic turns of speech in which they occurred.² We have thus a reason for the survival of a separate flexion for indic. and subj. until the time when η and its equivalent η had sunk into ϵ . By that time o , ω and ou were very near each other,³ and o and ω in many parts were identical. Thus the 2nd pl. was the only person unaccounted for, and in an unaccented syllable ϵ and ϵ did not differ greatly. All this will account well for a partial fusion of indicative and subjunctive, such as we shall have to note in the Syntax: syntactical forces may have co-operated with phonetic in producing this. But it is extremely hazardous to assume that these conditions applied in i/A.D., except in districts which had little or nothing to do with the NT, and in an educational stratum lower than any represented there.

Aspiration.

Breathings in MSS. § 40. The early uncials have breathings marked as little as they have punctuation or accents; but literary documents have begun to insert them at a date not much later than that of N and B. They appear in W, where Sanders (p. 18) says the rough breathing may be rarely seen on monosyllables, and on words liable to be confused: he counts "29 instances in Mt; none in Mk 1-5⁸⁰; 3 in the rest of Mk; 44 in Lk; and 4 in Jn 5¹² to end. There are no mistakes in its use. In the first quire of Jn there are no breathings." This MS is accordingly the earliest to show them. We find breathings marked in some of the papyri edited in *Berliner Klassikertexte* vi. by Schmidt and Schubart (1910)—a v/A.D. codex of Ignatius, and an anthology of Basil's letters (same cent.): see CR xxvii. 176 f. (The sign τ was used for h by grammarians perhaps as early as Aristotle; see Blass *Pron.* 92).

¹ See Brugmann-Thumb 62-4, Nachmanson *Beiträge* 87, Meisterhans² 19.

² But the history of this form is much disputed: see Brugmann-Thumb 405.

³ Radermacher 87 dates this approximation in iii/A.D.

Interaspiration. A point of interest arises in these documents, where we find ΔΩΡΑΤΟΙ (p. 5) and ΔΗΘΕΪΤΗΚΕ (p. 26). The second of these does not represent classical pronunciation, since the *h* was absorbed in combination with the *τ*, while *δόρατος* certainly lost any aspiration centuries before this papyrus was written. But it may be assumed that while the aspirate lasted it was pronounced in medial position in such cases: cf. such Latin transliterations as *Euhemerus*, *Euhodius*. As *h* was not yet dead in i/A.D., we may safely infer that εὐδοῦν and the like would represent pronunciation more accurately than our conventional spelling. Alexandrian grammarians wrote the "interaspiration" in the texts of the poets; but there is no doubt that the *h* was even weaker in this position than it was when initial. See Blass *Pron.* 96.

Misplacement of *h*. Initial *h* was weak, but still pronounced in our period, and (as in other dialects where it is weak) it is not infrequently misplaced. There is a series of wrongly aspirated words which obtained such a hold that a trace even survives in MGr, where an initial *h* has not been pronounced for many centuries. This is ἐφ'ετος ("of this year," which takes us back to ἐφ' ἔτος, a very common combination in papyri and Κοινή inscriptions. So καθ' ἔτος etc. This form does not happen to occur in NT, for in Lk 2⁴¹ the newly discovered W alone reads καθ'. But "ἐφ' ἐλπιδι, accepted Rom 8²⁰, has some primary authority (N³. A¹. B¹. C¹. D⁴. D₂¹. G₃⁵) 8/9 times, besides ἀφελπίζοντες 1/1" (WH *App.* 2 150). This last is read by DP in Lk 6²⁶. The occasional aspiration of εἶδον and its compounds, accepted by WH in Ph 2²³ and Ac 2^{7mg}, is found in the best MSS; while οὐχ ὀλίγος appears 6/8 times in Ac (N⁴. A⁵. B¹. D¹) as in LXX twice. Καθ' ἰδιαν occurs "9/16 times (N¹. B⁸. D⁸. Δ¹)—add W¹). Αὐθόπται stands in Lk 1² W, and οὐχ ὄψεσθε in Lk 17²² A. A series of such forms is noted from D by Rendel Harris in his monograph on the MS¹—ἡδύνατο¹, εἶδον², ἴδιος², ὀλίγος¹, ἐφίστασθε¹, ἐφαγαγείν¹, ἐμοῦ¹, ἐμέ¹, ἐλπίζω¹, ἐλπίς⁴.

Due to analogy. The causes of this phenomenon must be sought in the working of analogy. Thumb puts this concisely in Brugmann *Gr.* 143, where he shows how in classical Greek ἡμεῖς, ἦσται and ὀκτώ ἐννέα (in Heraclian Doric) followed respectively ὑμεῖς, ἕξομαι and ἐπτά, etc. "In the Κοινή this process went further, e.g. ἔτος after ἡμέρα, ἴσος after δμοιος, ἐφιδεῖν and ἐφόντης after ὄρω: see Thumb *Spiritus Asper* 70 ff., Mayser 199 f." Common formulae like καθ' ἡμέραν, ἐπ' ἰση καὶ ὀμοίᾳ, and the unifying effect of a paradigm like ἐφορᾶν: ἐπιδεῖν: ἐπόψεσθαι, help us to see how the analogy worked. Καθ' ἰδιαν may have followed καθ' ἑαυτόν. Ἐφ' αὐριον (as P Tebt i. 119¹⁷, v.c. 105-1; P Ryl ii. 441⁴, iii/A.D.) obviously follows ἐφ' ἡμέραν, and is itself an argument for a similar account of ἐφ' ἔτος. Οὐχ ὀλίγος

¹ Where (p. 138) he also notes a dropped aspirate, in εὐρίσκω⁴, καταξήσ², οδρος¹ and ἑαυτῶν¹. The explanations offered in this chapter (dated 1891) are antiquated by later developments of comparative philology. Some of the instances included are discounted by the special conditions affecting οὐκ and οὐχ: see below.

arose later than the rest, being rare in LXX, where other cases are frequent: see Thackeray 126, where an explanation is attempted, based on a (less probable) account of the common Hellenistic ἐφιορκεῖν (Mt 5²⁸ κ), ἐφιορκος (1 Tim 1¹⁰ DP). Brugmann-Thumb 166 explains the latter as a mixture of ἐπιορκ. and ἐφορκ., which are *lento* and *allegro* forms respectively. Since it is only with οὐχ that these aspirated forms of ὀλίγος occur, we cannot safely draw any inference: see below, and cf. Crönert *Mem.* 152 n.⁴, where one instance of μεθ' ὀλίγον is the only exception. It is less easy to suggest analogical cause for ἐλπῖς, which (Prof. Souther tells me) is supported by proper names in Latin inscr.—*Helpis*, *Helpidius*, *Helpidophorus*. Was εἰεῖν in thought?

Not connected with long lost digamma. Since even Thackeray¹ still clings to the old idea that the lost *F* produced this *h*, it should be observed that a large proportion of forms already mentioned—add from papyri such types as μεθηνέχθη, καθ' ἐνιαυτόν, 'Εφ' Ἀσκληπιάδου, μήθ' ἄλλον, ἐφ' ὄνοισ, ἐφαγαγεῖν—cannot be explained in this way. And there is this further objection, that the phenomena in question are late, whereas in Attic and Ionic *F* totally disappeared in pre-historic times. We should have to assume, for example, that *Fελπίς* generated ἐλπῖς in some dialect which ultimately influenced the Κοινή, but left no trace of itself until the *h* outcropped in post-classical times. For this there is nowhere any evidence; and even if (as in the case of ἐλπῖς) we have no complete explanation to offer, it is safer to assume some hidden analogy. Can we always account scientifically for our own cockney's sins of commission and omission in this matter? The analogy is the more instructive since contemporary Rome had "Arry" similarly employed: cf. Catullus 84:

Chommoda dicebat, si quando commoda uellet
dicere, et insidias *Arrius* *hinsidias*.

It saves us a good deal of trouble to realise that when *h* is feeble it always tends to be misused in ways which cannot be wholly accounted for.

See on the whole subject Thumb's monograph on the *Spiritus Asper* in Greek (Trübner, 1889), also Crönert *Mem.* 148 ff.; Schweizer *Perg.* 116 ff.; Radermacher *Gr.* 38; Mayser 199 ff.

Miscellaneous irregularities. Miscellaneous problems involving the aspirate may be collected here (mostly from WH *App.*² 150 ff.).

Ἐπίσταται 1 Th 5³ NBL 33 (Wisd 6⁹ B) is an isolated slip, to be set beside ἀποκαριστάνει Mk 9¹² B* (where however the true read-

¹ And later still A. T. Robertson *Gram.* 209. It should be observed that he fails to represent the philologist's case against the digamma as a *vera causa* for the Hellenistic aspiration. No one doubts that *h* sometimes represents *F*: it is found in three words beginning with *ves-*, as explained by Thumb in Brugmann *Gr.*⁴ 52. But all this belongs to a period centuries earlier than that in which καθ' ἕρος and the like began to appear, when *F* was absolutely dead except in a few corners where old dialects still struggled for life.

ing may be ἀποκαταστάνει N*D—cf. MGr στάνω, a form thrice found in D). The converse is found in ἐφίστασθαι for ἐπίστασθε, Ac 10²⁸ D* WH and Schmiedel take both as “thoughtless confusion of the verbs ἐφίστ. and ἐπίστ.” (WS 39).

Αἰτοῦ (etc.) is read by WH some twenty times: see the question discussed below, § 76.

Οὐχ appears in LXX and NT not infrequently where οὐκ is expected. Thus οὐχ ἠγάπησεν Rev 12¹¹ A, οὐχ Ἰουδαϊκῶς Gal 2¹⁴ N*ACP 33 (οὐχ Ἰούδα Sus ⁵⁸ ABQ, according to WH p. 314), οὐχ ὀλίγος (see above), οὐχ ὄψεσθε Lk 17²² A (see above), οὐχ ἰδοῦ Ac 2⁷ NDE 61; οὐχ ἐπόνεσαν, οὐχ εἰσακούσομαι, οὐχ ὠδίνες, οὐχ ἰσχυροί in LXX (WS 39). Some of these cases may be specially explained: thus WH would make Ἰούδας the regular representative of Πῆρῆ. But there does not seem to be strong reason for our seeking to take them one by one. Moreover there are instances of οὐκ for οὐχ, as οὐκ ἔνεκεν 2 Co 7¹² NCFDE 33, οὐκ ὑπάρχει Ac 3⁸ NC, οὐκ εὔρον Lk 24³ NC* (“etc.,” says Schmiedel). We must apparently allow exegesis to decide between ἕστηκεν and the Hellenistic imperfect ἕσθηκεν after οὐκ in Jn 8⁴⁴.

Metathesis of aspiration.

An important class of variant forms due to metathesis of aspiration came into the Κοινή through Ionic influence, and are shown by MGr to have maintained their position: see *Prol.* 38. Χιτών κιθών, χύτρα κύθρα, ἐνταῦθα ἐνθαῦρα, Βάτραχος Βάθρακος, φάνη πάβνη, are instances, and there are further complications due to mixture, such as χιθών and κιθών. See plentiful exx. from papyri for κιθών etc. and κύθρα in Crönert *Mem.* 82 n.², 83 n.¹; also Mayser 16, 41 and 184, Thackeray 103. Traces in NT are not many: χειθῶνας Mt 10¹⁰ D*, Lk 9³ W, κιθῶνας Mk 14⁶⁸ B* (“ut alibi N^o TI), πάβνης Lk 13¹⁵ W. See Brugmann-Thumb 121 f. Rendel Harris (*Codex Bezae* 140) points out that in Lk 3¹¹ D has χιτώνας, with a smooth breathing: this is by way of correcting his exemplar, which had χιθ. Dr. Harris gives other instances of this metathesis of aspiration from D (or its Latin), viz. Ac 16¹⁶ *phytonem* (i.e. *φύτωνα), 16¹¹ *Samotrachiam* (*Σαμοτράχην), Mk 7⁹ ἀρεθίεε.

Words beginning with a single ρ, with another ρ at the head of the second syllable, were according to the ancient grammarians (see WS 40) without the usual ‘. Thus ῥεραντισμένοι etc. This is in accord with the rule which makes reduplication involve loss of aspirate (ρίθμι etc.), if we may assume that the voiceless initial ρ kept its quality when pushed into a second syllable. But it is not really certain that initial ρ was voiceless except when it came from *sr*: see Brugmann-Thumb 145.

The breathing has been variously determined for ὀμείρεσθαι (see § 95), εἰλικρινής and -ία (§ 105), ἀλοᾶν (cf. ἀπαλοᾶν and καταλ.) and δλυσις.

In Semitic loan-words WH use ‘ for η and η, ‘ for ξ and γ. There is no reason for writing ὕσσωπος (Ἰήξ) except that initial υ regularly has ‘: apparently even English has only aspirated

the word since the Genevan Version. There is difference between editors as to the breathing in the name *Jerusalem*. WH (*Intr.*³ 313) refuse the ' to Ἱεροσόλυμα as coming from a "false association with ἱερός." But however "false," it may well be quite real as popular etymology. In Ἱερουσαλήμ Blass is right in giving Ἱ, since the association would not affect the indeclinable.

Single and Double Consonants.

Single and Double Consonants.

§ 41. Ambiguous cases under this heading are practically restricted to the continuous sounds, the Liquids and Nasals and σ. We find in papyri and inscriptions of the Hellenistic age, as in inscriptions of classical times, a tendency to double and a counter-tendency to drop one of the elements in a double: thus we have τᾶλα, ἀναβάλουσιν, παρησία, γραματίς, γεναί(ου), ἔλασον etc. in early papyri (see Mayser 212-4), and again διάλλογον, ἐναντιῶν, εἰσαναγγελέων, ἔλλαττον, ὄρρου, λατομίδα, ἀνναεώσεις, ἐκπεσεῖν (*ib.* 217-9). Instances with mutes are virtually negligible.

(a) Ἐννέα but ἔνατος ἐνενήκοντα must be kept as in earlier Greek. D shows ἔννατος, an obvious case of analogy.

Γέννημα (from γ γεν of γίνομαι) is a Κοινή word for "vegetable produce," and must be sharply distinguished from γέννημα (from γεννάω) "offspring."

Ἐνεός has ν as in cl. Gr.

Ἐκ- and συν-χύνωω are supported by MGr (*Prol.* 45 n.³): cf. ἐκτιννω in BGU iii. 896⁸ (ii/A.D.) and i. 282⁴⁰ (*ib.*), and ἀποτιννω in P Gen 74²¹ (i iii/A.D.), and ἀποτιννωτ *Syll.* 737⁸¹ (ii/A.D.).

Ἄρ(ρ)αβῶν with ρ and ρρ has about equal warrant in papyri (*Prol.* 45).

Παρ(ρ)ησία (-ιάζομαι) has ρ single in some of the best uncials in nearly one-third of its occurrences.

Πυρ(ρ)ός and πυρ(ρ)άζω drop an ρ in Mt 16³ C and late uncials, Rev 6⁴ AP 046, 12⁸ C 046: in these last πυρός was sometimes mistaken for the gen. of πῦρ.

The proper names Μύρρα (Ac 27⁵ B Hier) and Φύγελος have the single liquid better attested in inscriptions: see WS 58, and note Μύρα in Ac 21¹ D.

Πλημύρης Lk 6⁴⁸ DW *al.* is the older spelling: the doubled μ is due to a popular etymology connecting the first part with πλήν—see Boisacq, *s.v.* Of course it does not follow that we should edit the single μ, which may well be due to correction by literary hands in some ancestor.

(b) The older doubling of ρ after the augment or in composition is very imperfectly carried out, and in many forms vanishes entirely. Words which have an established existence as compounds, with the simplex no longer in conscious contact, tend

to keep their ρρ: thus χειμάρρους, ἄρρητος (but ἀναντίρητος), ἔρρωσθε (ῥώννυμι being obsolete), ἄρρωστος, αἰμορροεῖν. But for words kept in contact with a paradigm the ρρ is in a minority: διαρρήξαντες Ac 14¹⁴ (but διαρρήξας Mk 14⁶⁸, περιρρήξαντες Ac 16²²), ἔρριζωμένοι, ἐρρέθη(σαν), ἔρριπται Lk 17² (but ρ in other forms from ῥίπτω), against ἄραφος and various forms from ῥάπτω, ῥήσσω, ῥέω, ῥαπίζω, ῥαβδίζω, ῥύομαι, ῥαντίζω. The opposite tendency may be seen in sporadic spellings like παρρών in 2 Co 10² DE 47.

- (c) Semitic words (among which should be included the thoroughly naturalised ἀραβῶν above) show some degree of uncertainty in their spelling. Ἰωάνης is accepted by WH except in two places, since B has it 121/130 times. But N has νν except in one part, which Lake has now shown *not* to be "written by the scribe of B."¹ The inscriptional evidence WH quote is relatively late, but it is as good evidence as the *a priori* considerations in WS 57. The record of D is curiously divergent: it has νν in Mt, Mk and Jn at the beginning, but ν in Jn from 5³⁸ to the end, and in Lk and Ac. See the discussion of the significance of this variation in G. Rudberg's *Nitlicher Text*, 14.² Ἐλισαῖος and μαμωνᾶς are clear, Ἰό(π)η, Γεν(ν)ησαπέρ, Βαρσαβ(β)ᾶς are regarded by Schmiedel as more doubtful, on the ground of their Semitic etymology. In Ac 7² D has Χαράν after the Hebrew: *contr.* Κάρραι (Strabo), Lat. *Carrhae*.
- (d) Κράβαρρος, a word of foreign origin (said to be Macedonian), is spelt with single τ several times in B, which thus agrees with Latin *grabatus*. ACDW³ have ττ always, as also N 1/11: elsewhere N reads κράβακτος, a form found elsewhere only in two papyri, dating respectively from the centuries before and after that in which N was written: for the bearing of this on the provenance of N see Lake's introduction to the facsimile of the MS, p. xi. The spelling κράβατος can be quoted from Egypt much earlier, viz. from a "probably Ptolemaic" ostrakon in *Mélanges Nicole*, 184, which enables us, if we like, to associate B also with Egypt as far as the evidence of this word goes. But κράβαρρος also can be quoted from Egypt: see P Lond 191¹⁶ (A.D. 103-17) (=ii. p. 265). Κράβαρρος appears in Ac 5¹⁸ E and in the mass of later MSS: it seems to be a dialectic variation in the Κοινή, which has left descendants in MGr dialects. Cf. my *Einleitung* 60, and *Vocabulary*, s.v.
- (e) Doubled aspirates in Semitic words like Μαθθαῖος, ἐφφαθά, or the Phrygian Ἀφφία, are contributory evidence of the spirant pronunciation.

¹ WH *App.*² 166: see Lake, *Codex Sinaiticus* xii.

² Upsala University publications, 1915.

³ W has κράβαρρος twice—a form which has parallels in MGr.

Intrusive Consonants.

Intrusive dental The combination $\sigma\rho$, which is not found in native Greek words, sometimes developed a transition sound τ in the name Ἰσραήλ and derivatives. So in Mt 19²⁸, Mk 12²⁹ in W, with D in the latter, and sometimes in Ac in B. In \aleph there is a δ , which appears 8/9 times in the word Ἰσδραηλείτης. The occurrence of Ἰσραήλ in magic papyri and in one or two Egyptian inscr. is noted by Lake (*Cod. Sin.* xi.) as nullifying the argument of WH¹ that the intrusive dental was a Latinism and therefore supported Western provenance for \aleph or B or both. The phonetic development was easy, as is shown by the fact that the root *streu* "flow" ($\beta\rho\epsilon\omega$) produced the original of our *stream* in Germanic and Στρυμών in Thracian, with the same thing in Albanian and Lithuanian: see Brugmann *Grd.*² i. 827.

and labial
between μ and
 ρ or σ .

Intrusive β between μ and ρ (as in ἄμβροτος, μεσημβρία) appears in the proper name Ἰαμβρῆς, if the usual Hebrew etymology is right. So Mamre becomes Μαμβρῆ, and Samson Σαμψών (Heb 11³²).

Cases like the analogical λήμψομαι and the (unexplained) σφυδρόν are dealt with elsewhere.

Liquids and Nasals.

Variations of
 λ and ρ ,

§ 42. Variation between λ and ρ appears in κλίβανος, for which Phrynichus (Rutherford *NP* 267 f.) claimed κρίβανος as Attic: the λ form probably entered the Κοινή from Ionic (as Herodotus has it) or Doric (Sophron). As Lat. *libum* and our *loaf* (A.S. *hláf*) show, the *l* was original, and Attic was peculiar. The Latin word *flagellum* is dissimilated to φραγέλλιον (φραγελλῶ): D keeps the λ , as does a papyrus written apparently by a Roman, in Trajan's reign—P Lond 191¹¹ (=ii p. 265). The Hebrew לֶמֶץ is transliterated Βελίαρ,² which again may be mere dissimilation; but some Semitic etymology need not be excluded—see *EBr* s.v. In D the ν in λύχνος is twice written λ , and in πνέω once: see J. R. Harris, *Codex Bezae* 143 f., where also μέγαρ in Lk 1¹⁶ is connected with the λ in μεγάλη. The form πλέοντα (Lk 12⁶⁶) is a happy accident, agreeing with a prehistoric ancestor of πνεύμων: see Walde, *Lat. Etym. Wört.* s.v. *pulmo*. So κάλφος Lk 6⁴¹ W, λεφέλη Lk 9³⁴ W; also P Oxy ii. 242¹² (A.D. 77) λαύλας.

$\rho\rho$ and $\rho\sigma$.

The relations of $\rho\rho$ and $\rho\sigma$ affect the NT forms of θαρσέω and ἄρσην. Θάρσει -εἶτε is used exclusively (Evng., Ac), while for the rest of the verb forms of θαρπέω occur 2 Co *quinquies* and Heb 13⁶, without variant. Ἄρσην (a derivative) appears

¹ *Intr.*² 265.

² WS 58 cites *Berial* from *Asc. Isai.*, but see Charles's edition, p. 6.

unchallenged in Mk 10⁶, Lk 2²³, 1 Co 6⁹, 1 Tim 1¹⁰; but ἀρρην has some warrant in Mt 19⁴ E, Rev 12⁵ K 046, *ibid*¹³ 046 cup¹; and in Paul, Rom 1²⁷ N*AC 33 (*ter*, but C has ρσ 3⁰), Gal 3²⁸ K, where WH give ρρ as an alternative. Wackernagel (*Hellenistica*, Göttingen, 1907) shows that the sporadic appearance of Attic ρρ is parallel with that of ττ, and normally comes into the Κοινή with specifically Attic words that contained it. Whereas, however, "the Attic ττ was shared only with the dialects of Eretria, Oropus and Boeotia, numerous dialects agreed with it in the use of ρρ" (*op. cit.* p. 25). Ionian influence would be the only serious discouragement to the use of θαρρῶ and ἀρρην, so that mixture was easy. We might imagine, for instance, that θάρσει, θαρσεῖτε, "cheer up," was a favourite phrase in Ionic: if that were so—it is only offered as an illustrative speculation—we could understand how the rest of the verb came from θαρρεῖν, while the imperative phrase lived only in the ρσ form. This distinction is maintained in NT, and in LXX with only one or two exceptions; and it might easily arise from such cause as has been suggested. An interesting confirmation may be seen in W at Mk 10⁴⁹, where θαρρῶν ἔγειρε is read instead of θάρσει, ἔγ. The noun θάρπος was not really even Attic, and θάρπος accordingly stands alone. In the Ptolemaic papyri however we have ρσ only (Mayser 220): ρρ begins to appear later (cf. CR xv. 33), as it does even in Ionic territory on the inscr. of Pergamum (Schweizer *Perg.* 125). MGr shows mixture still; see Thumb *Hellen.* 77 f. In NT ἀρσην is read throughout by WH (against NAC in Rom 1²⁷ and K in Gal 3²⁸); but the papyri show great variation—see *Vocabulary*, s.v. Δέρπος occurs in Mk 1⁶ D; Wackernagel (p. 13) notes that δέρσις never existed.

Assimilation of ν in ἐν and σύν. Assimilation of the ν of ἐν and σύν takes place in composition according to the traditional spelling, which probably represents the pronunciation even in the Hellenistic age, to judge from the freedom with which assimilation takes place in inscriptions and papyri when proclitics are linked closely with the following word. Mayser's exhaustive presentation of the evidence from Ptolemaic papyri is summed up in tables on p. 231 (with which compare those of Thackeray 132–4, tending the same way). He shows that the words which most favour assimilation are τόν, τήν, τῶν; δν, ἦν, ὄν; ἄν, ἑάν, ἐν, ἐπάν, μέν, αὐτόν, τοσοῦτον, πλέον; πλήν, νύν. There is moreover a marked difference between the effect of labial and guttural initial. For a large number of papyri from iii/ and ii/B.C. the proportion of assimilations to non-assimilations in separate words is for iii/ 1 : 4 before labials, 1 : 9 before gutturals; for ii/ 1 : 11 before labials, none before gutturals (80 exx.). The tables for ἐν and σύν in composition (p. 234) give for iii/ 7 : 1 for assimilation before labials, 4 : 3 for ii/; before gutturals 4 : 1 and 5 : 6 respectively. Even here therefore the progressive ousting of assimilation is very marked, and the difference between gutturals and labials.

In NT συγγενής (-εια) and σύγχυσις are the only forms with συγ- that find their way into WH's list of "certain and constant" assimilations: they print with an alternative συγκεκαλυμμένον and συγκυρίαν. Compounds

of *έν* show 7 assim. to 7 non-assim. with *έγ*-, and 26 assim. to 1 non-assim. with *έμ*-. This means that assimilation remains decidedly more prominent in the semi-literary MSS of NT than it is in the non-literary papyri even of the early Ptolemaic age, but the difference between labials and gutturals is still well marked. According to WH (*App.*² 156 f.), non-assimilation is the usual practice in the best NT uncials before *π*, *ψ*, *β*, *φ*; *κ*, *γ*, *χ*; *ζ*, *σ*; *λ*, *μ*. But some words have assimilation regularly, the *έν* compounds showing it more freely than those of *σύν*. Details may be sought in their list, or more fully in that of Gregory, pp. 73 ff., where uncial evidence in each case is supplied. How far the oldest uncials in this matter represent the autographs must be left an open question. Note the frequency of *έμ μέσφ* "in good MSS wherever *έν μέσφ* occurs, but never in *κ*, *β*, *δ* or *δ₂*"; also *έγ Κανά* Jn 2¹¹ AF, *έγ γαστρι* Lk 21²² A, *έμ πραιτίτη* Jas 1²¹ κ, *έμ πολέμφ* Heb 11²⁴ ρ¹³, *σύν Μαριάμ* Lk 2⁵ AE *al.* *σύν πάσιν* Lk 24²¹ EG *al.* (Debrunner 14). Thackeray 131 gives corresponding evidence from LXX, but remarks that such forms were probably more abundant in the autographs—which for the NT is hardly likely.

Causes of non-assimilation.

The rationale of this tendency to drop assimilation may be sought partly in *lento* pronunciation: a nasal ending a syllable would naturally tend towards *ν*, the form of all final nasals *in pausa*. This is supported by the frequency of such spellings as *άνγελος* and *ένέπω* (cf. Mayser 235 f., Nachmanson 106): NT exx. are *Κενχρεά* Ac 18¹⁸ κADE, *ένέψω* 13 times in *δ₂*, *έλανψεν* 2 Co 4⁶ *δ₂* (Debrunner 14), where the *ν* was not due to etymological association as in other NT words, *παλιγγενεσία*, *πανπληθεί*, *έξηραμμένην* (Mk 11³⁰ W), *μεμιαμμένους* (Tit 1¹⁵ *δ₂*). We must note that nasals at the end of syllables were by this time becoming faint, and the distinction between their three classes (*μ*, *ν*, *γ*) was less easily heard. It should be added that in literary papyri of the period assimilation was decidedly more abundant: Mayser (p. 232) gives 12:8 before labials and 10:2 before gutturals in favour of assimilation for a series of classical papyri from the Ptolemaic age. The contrast emphasises the non-literary practice the more.

Βεεζεβούλ

The form Βεεζεβούλ, which we must assume to be for Βεελζεβούλ (read by all the later Greek authorities), is found throughout in κB except in Mk 3²², where κ joins the mass. No explanation of this reading is suggested which would justify its originality: we must perhaps assume a kind of assimilation based on the abnormality of the combination λζ in Greek. If so, the corruption must go to swell the list of small errors which κ and B share, proving their common origin. The word involves a further problem in the matter of λ, if we follow the Latin and Syriac *vss.* in the equation with OT *Ba'al z'bab*. But this is unnecessary, and whatever interpretation is adopted, we may be quite sure that -λ is the original and -β a primitive guess by students acquainted with Hebrew.

Γολγοθά.

Γολγοθά has also lost λ (by dissimilation?), when compared with either Hebrew or Aramaic: see EB: *s.v.* In Mt 27²² Δ and syrhr have Γολγολθά.

Φαιλόνης. In 2 Tim 4¹³ φαίλονη is read practically without variant. Its relation to Lat. *paenula* is difficult, for the latter can be quoted from a much earlier date. In papyri the form φαινώλης is commoner, but both are found. If it were not for the Latin, we might have regarded φαυν. as popular etymology (φαίνω). It is quite possible that both Latin and Greek go back to some unknown foreign word.

Insertion of Nasal. The word μογγιλαλος in Mk 7²² is found in W, in LNΔ *al.*, and the important cursives 28 and 33, with three of the Ferrar group. Since the word *μογγός hoarse* is attested (very rarely) from v/A.D.—see E. A. Sophocles *s.v.*—we must probably regard this as a real *v.l.*, rather than as a nasalising like some words mentioned below.

The insertion of μ in λήμψεσθαι, λημφθῆναι etc., is a Hellenistic analogy-product belonging to the flexion of that verb (see § 95). The (classical) loss of μ by dissimilation in compounds of πίμπλημι and πίμπρημι with ἐν and σύν is overcome by analogy in Ac 14¹⁷ DEP, 28⁶ cu³: as Lobeck shows (*Phryg.* 95 f.), forms with μ appear frequently in classical MSS. In the latter place \aleph^* reads ἐμπιπράσθαι. The inserted ν in θηναυρούς Mt 2¹¹ D is no doubt due to the Latin: we find the loan-word often in Plautus spelt thus (see Lindsay *Latin Language* 69). *Per contra*, in the Roman name *Clēmēns* the nom. (not in NT) was written Κλήμης, though *cēnsus* was transliterated κήσος. The *n* in Latin was faintly heard in these combinations. WH write Ἀδραμυνητός as the adj. of *Hadrumetum* in Ac 27², following AB 33 and the Bohairic, with some minor cursives.

Sibilants.

Z in the Κοινή. § 43. It seems probable that in the Hellenistic period ζ had passed from its earlier double value as = *zd* or *dz* into the soft *z* as in English; that is, the MGr pronunciation was reached in the Ptolemaic age. A possible survival of *zd* in the Κοινή might be recognised in Ἀζωτος: in *IMAc* i. 406 we find Ἀσζωτ[is], with the note, "Semiticam formam *Aśdōd* optime reddit." The name presumably acquired this orthography before the sign had changed its value. That κῆγγ was transliterated Ἔσδρας in the same early period proves nothing, for the δ could be intrusive as in Ἰσδραήλ—see § 41. For the proof of this development of ζ see Mayser 209 and *reff.* there. It depends largely on the frequency with which ζ in our documents is substituted for σ before voiced sounds. In NT we find ζβέννουμι in Mt 12³⁰ 25⁸ D, 1 Th 5¹⁵ B*D*₂FG, ἄζβεστος Mk 9⁴⁸ N; ζύρνα Mt 2¹¹ DW, Jn 19³⁹ \aleph (σζμ.) D^{sup}W; Ζύρνα Rev 1¹¹ 2⁸ \aleph and Latin. So in BGU iv. 1175 *ter* (B.C. 4) Ζύρνα is the name of a woman of Persian birth; in P Oxy viii. 1088³⁹ (early i/A.D.) Ζύρνα occurs in a medical prescription; and in P Ryl ii. 153¹⁸ (mid. ii/A.D.) we read ἐν Ζύρνη τῆς Ἀσίας. We find *Zmyrna* in Catullus 95, and elsewhere in MSS of Latin authors. Lightfoot's note (ii. 331) on *Ep. Ign. ad Polyc. (ad inii.)* gives abundant evidence that in

the name of Smyrna the ζ and the σ were used impartially in i/A.D. (*imit.*). "In the earliest coins the ζ seems to be preferred, in the latest the σ." If so, ζ would rule in i/A.D. Crönert *Mem.* 95 gives a multitude of parallels from the Herculaneum papyri (before A.D. 79) and from inscriptions. It is in fact abundantly clear that if ζμ and ζβ are "Western" only (WH *App.*² 155), that is not so much a reason for banning the ζ as for approving the "δ Text" in its (characteristic!) use of spelling that was coeval with the autographs and true to the pronunciation. In MGr σβ and σμ are pronounced with voiceless ζ.

Ισ and ττ.

The relations of σσ and ττ may be treated here: it must be remembered that in earlier Greek σσ(ττ) nearly always, and ζ very often, arise from a guttural followed by consonantal γ. In MGr we find in Carpathos and Chios σσ (and σγ) becoming τσ, while "the transition from ζ to δζ (*e.g.* παιδζω = παιζω) is more widely spread" (Thumb *Handb.* 22). One is tempted to regard both as survivals, and take τσ as the old pronunciation of σσ (perhaps τθ of ττ), just as we know δζ was that of ζ in class. Greek. Without dwelling on this conjecture, we go on to note that the Κοινή has σσ almost exclusively where Attic had ττ, which was hardly used outside the contiguous districts of Attica and Boeotia. The following instances of ττ are accepted by WH in NT: κρείττον in Paul 1/4, 1 Pet 1/1, 2 Pet 1/1, κρείττων etc. Heb 11/12 and one doubtful; ἐλάττων 2/4, ἐλαττώ 3/3, ἐλαττονέω 1/1; ἤττημα Paul 2/2, ἤττάω 2 Pet 2/2, but ἤσσω Paul 2/2 and ἡσώθηε Paul 1/1; ἐκπλήττω 1/12 (in Ac 13¹²). These are mostly explained satisfactorily by Wackernagel's thesis referred to above (§ 42). The verb from ἤσσω was either ἐσσώ (Ionic) or ἤττάω (Attic): when the Κοινή took it over, it naturally did not fuse these alternatives into ἡσώω. ἤττημα accordingly was an Attic word, adopted as it stood. Wackernagel thinks that ἤττων followed ἤττᾶσθαι, and in its turn influenced its synonym ἐλάττων and its antithesis κρείττων, both of which appear in LXX—ἐλάττων with its derivative verbs greatly outnumbering the σσ form. Here the process was helped by the fact that the verb ἐλαττώ (and noun -ωσις) was specifically Attic and had no Ionic rival to endanger its ττ. No special explanation can be suggested for the isolated ἐκπληττόμενος, with which cf. καταπλήττεσθαι in P Petr ii. 45^{11, 18} (c. B.C. 246);¹ but similar isolated or occasional variations can be quoted from papyri and other Κοινή documents—see Wackernagel's samples. The influence of Attic was so commanding that we cannot be surprised if reminiscences of an Attic peculiarity slip in to disturb normal pronunciation.

ζ in transliteration.

There remains the question of transliteration from Semitic, already raised on the name Ἄζωτος. Burkitt shows² that Ναζαρά (Ναζαρέτ) stands practically alone if we make its ζ represent a Semitic ṣ; for which reason among others he seeks to get the adjectives Ναζαρηός and Ναζωραῖος from נְזַרְיָ. Normally

¹ Wrongly given from P Grenf in Mayser 223.

² *Syriac Forms of NT Proper Names* (Brit. Acad. 1912), 16, 28 f.

ϣ was σ and ϣ was ζ, as we might expect, ψ and ϣ being also σ, since Greek had no means of differentiating.

Gutturals.

Γμ, γν. § 44. The combinations γμ and γν were pronounced with γ as ng (as in *kingmaker* etc.). In Ionic during iv/B.C. -γγ- became -ιν- in γίνομαι and γινώσκω, perhaps through dissimilating influence of the initial γ (so Brugmann-Thumb *Gr.* 126): Thumb thinks that the same forms in Doric, Thessalian and Boeotian arose from later Attic (B.C. 300 and after) and Hellenistic influence. These forms are universal in the Κοινή, as innumerable papyrus records show—a few pedantic revivals of γγγ. serve as exceptions to prove the rule. It is curious that W, which has so many thoroughly vernacular spellings, uses γινώσκω often, and γίνομαι, though less frequently (Sanders 23). Sporadic instances of the dropping of ng may be seen in λάρυξ Rom 3¹⁸ AP 33 cu⁷, and σαλπιξ 1 Co 14⁸ ALP. The papyri show

innumerable instances of εκ with κ softened before voiced sounds: thus the recurrent formula καθάπερ εγ δίκης. Mayser (225 f.) shows that it is normal, κ being quite exceptional. In NT it is curiously absent, but note ζγγονα 1 Tim 5⁴ D* cu⁵ (see ref. in Mayser 228), ἀπεγδίσει Col 2¹¹ B*, ἀνέγλιπτος Lk 12³⁸ D, ἐγλύου Heb 12⁶ p¹³ (from Debrunner 14); also ἐπιδιγνύμεναι in Ac 9³⁹ A. So γναφεύς, which in old Attic was κν.: γν. is found in an Attic inscr. of iv/B.C., and exclusively in Ptolemaic papyri (Mayser 169 f.). It may be noted here

Contiguous

κ and σ.

that εκ sometimes combined with initial σ to ξ: thus εξογ=εκ σου Mt 2⁶ NC *al.*, 21¹⁹ D *al.* So in papyri ἐξυμφώνου etc. (CR xv. 31). The v.l. in Ac 27³⁹ ἐξώσαι NAω, ἐκώσαι BC boh arm, is really perhaps a mere matter of orthography in its inception.

Κ and χ.

On δρονιξ see § 55 (3) (ε). Πανδοχεύς -εῖον has χ from the influence of its original δέχομαι: the κ (cf. Ionic δέκομαι) is still found in *Syll.* 901 (? i/B.C.) and even in P Gen 54²⁶ (iii/A.D.). For κ in Lk 10³⁴ stand N*Ξ, ib.³⁵ N*D*, against ABLWω: Ti takes the correction in ND as evidence that the κ form was obsolete. Forms like ἐκθρός—common in D¹—and the converse ἐχθείσει (Wis 11¹⁴, from ἔκθεισις: see Thackeray 103) show the development of θ into a spirant, which involved a strange articulation of the guttural before it. Metathesis of aspiration produces interchange of χ and κ in χερών and other words: see § 40.

Semitic words

with χ and κ.

Semitic words show χ occasionally as a transliteration of the gutturals, including even κ. So Ἀκελαδαμάχ (ak- BCD, aχ- NA) = Aram. אכר, אכר, and Σειράχ = סרῳ. See Kautzsch *Gramm. d. bibl. Aram.* (1884) 8. Dalman (*Gramm.* 161) compares Ἰωσήχ Lk 3³⁶ = יושי, and says that

¹ See Bendel Harris, *Codex Bezae* 141. Also cf. Mayser 172.

the χ marks the word as an indeclinable. Elsewhere \aleph always disappears: $\acute{\alpha}\beta\beta\acute{\alpha} = \aleph\beta\aleph$, $\sigma\acute{\iota}\kappa\epsilon\rho\alpha = \aleph\tau\chi\psi$ etc. But $\acute{\epsilon}\phi\phi\alpha\theta\acute{\alpha} = \pi\eta\eta\theta\eta\aleph$ (Kautzsch 10), while η and η initial are often only a (presumed) rough breathing. 'Paxάβ in Mt 1^s stands for $\chi\eta\eta$, which in Jas 2^{ss}, Heb 11^{ss} is 'Paάβ, all without variant. In 'Ροβοάμ^τ for $\eta\psi\chi\eta\eta$ both ψ and η disappear. The transliteration of ψ by γ under certain conditions is rather a matter for Semitists than for us: it is enough to observe that in our period γ was generally a spirant, so that Γόμορρα represented $\eta\eta\chi\eta\gamma$ satisfactorily. The instances of χ standing for ρ (cf. $\acute{\alpha}\chi\epsilon\lambda\delta\alpha\mu\acute{\alpha}\chi$ above) may be due to the differentiation of ρ and χ : χ when spirantised may have represented ρ better as being articulated farther back. An instance of the opposite procedure is where Καναναίος represents an initial ρ , and Καναναία a χ , on the evidence of the Syriac.¹ The representation of η by κ in Κλωπᾶς cannot be accepted if it means direct transliteration, since $\eta\chi\eta$ has 'Αλφαῖος already to represent it; but Dalman (*Gramm.* 142 n.⁵) suggests that it might be the Gentile name of a Jew $\eta\delta\eta\eta$ —as a Saul took the similar-sounding "Paul," or a Silas "Silvanus." This presumes our identifying Κλωπᾶς with Κλεόπας , on which see above, § 38.

Labials.

♦ for π .

§ 45. $\Sigma\phi\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ for $\sigma\pi\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ is well attested in NT, and appears very often in papyri: CR xv. 33, xviii. 107, Mayser 173. So $\sigma\phi\acute{\omicron}\gamma\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ Mk 15^{ss} D, $\sigma\phi\epsilon\kappa\omicron\upsilon\lambda\acute{\omicron}\tau\omicron\rho\alpha$ Mk 6^{ss} W. See Crönert *Mem.* 85 n.³. Meisterhans² 78 shows that $\sigma\phi\acute{\omicron}\nu\delta\upsilon\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ was Attic in iv/B.C. He also cites Attic inscr. of ii/A.D. and later for 'Αφφίανός, where $\phi\phi$ is assumed to represent Latin pp , as in Phm² 'Αφφία D*. So from mid. ii/B.C. the Latin *Sulpicius* becomes $\Sigma\omicron\lambda\pi\acute{\iota}\kappa\iota\omicron\varsigma$. (Contrast 'Αππιανός *novius* in P Oxy i. 33 (ii/A.D.): so CP Herm 127 vs iii.⁹ (i/A.D.), and BGU iii. 785¹ (i/A.D.)) But the inscriptional parallels from Asia Minor in Kretschmer's *Einleitung* 346 f. make it highly probable that this name in its various forms was affected by an Anatolian word (cf. $\delta\pi\phi\alpha$ "papa" in Greek nursery speech) unconnected with *Appius*. This last appears in Ac 28¹⁵, where 33 cu² read 'Απφίον. No doubt in Asia Minor this word influenced the spelling of really Latin names. Schweizer *Perg.* 110 remarks that when ϕ became a spirant it probably remained bilabial, and therefore not quite equivalent to the f of imperial Latin, which like ours was labiodental. The relations between π and ϕ are concerned in the v.l. at Ac 13¹⁸ $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omicron\pi\omicron\phi\acute{\omicron}\rho\eta\sigma\epsilon\nu$ $\aleph\text{B}\text{D}\omega$, $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omicron\phi$. AC*E 33 lat^v syr νh sah boh; there is no probability that the former could arise from the latter phonetically. See § 28.

The addition of ϕ in 'Ασάφ Mt 17^l $\aleph\text{B}\text{C}\rho^1$ (also D in Lk) 1 etc. lat^v sah boh is discussed by F. C. Burkitt in *Proc. Camb. Philolog. Soc.* for March 4, 1897. He shows from Latin evidence that the true LXX form of the

¹ F. C. Burkitt, *Syriac Forms of NT Proper Names* (Brit. Acad. 1912), 5.

name, however explained, was Ἀσάφ, so that Mt was following the Greek Bible: this disposes of Salmon's criticism on the NT uncials (*Some Thoughts on the Textual Criticism of NT* 29, 156).

B and o(v) for a w sound. An important point for Greek pronunciation is raised by the transliteration of Ψ and *Silvanus*. Un-

cialials have only $\Delta\alpha\nu(\epsilon)\acute{\iota}\delta$ (often abbreviated), and $\Delta\alpha\beta\acute{\iota}\delta$ comes in with the cursives. The earlier spelling is exactly parallel with the representation of Roman names like *Flavius*, for which in the papyri we find $\Phi\lambda\acute{\alpha}\upsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma$ as well as $\Phi\lambda\alpha\acute{\omicron}\upsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma$: thus P Oxy ii. 237ⁱⁱⁱ.¹⁹ (A.D. 186), vi. p. 223 (and 356) (A.D. 154), 991 (A.D. 341)—the spelling with *ou* is much the commoner. The case of *Silvanus* is rather different, as *v* follows a consonant. $\Sigma\iota\lambda\omicron\nu\alpha\acute{\nu}\omicron\varsigma$ is the overwhelmingly attested form, but $\Sigma\iota\lambda\beta\alpha\nu\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ has better warrant than $\Delta\alpha\beta\acute{\iota}\delta$, appearing in B at 1 Pet 5¹² and in DEFG at 2 Co 1¹⁰, 1 Th 1¹, 2 Th 1¹ (where also add 424^{**}). Now in the papyri $\Sigma\iota\lambda\beta\alpha\nu\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ stands alone from iii/A.D. onwards: the very few earlier instances of the name quotable from inscrr. and papyri seem to show that the β spelling did not arise (with one exception, which is not quite certain) till the end of ii/A.D.¹ That \aleph always and B 3/4 times should have preserved the long obsolete *ou* of the autographs is another of the striking trifles which go to prove their accuracy. It was only in later times that β became the normal representative of *F* (i.e. Eng. *w*): being a spirant like our *v* (but interlabial), it did not accurately express the Latin *u* or Hebrew γ . Earlier Egyptian contacts of β and *v* may be seen in Mayser 116, where from ii/b.c. words like $\rho\acute{\alpha}\upsilon\delta\omicron\upsilon\varsigma = \rho\acute{\alpha}\beta\delta\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ (P Par 40³³), $\epsilon\mu\beta\lambda\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\alpha\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ (P Lond 23¹⁵ = i. p. 38) = $-\beta\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\phi\text{-}\sigma\alpha\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ made up afresh with $\phi = f$, etc., show the spirant value of both. Note that *o* sometimes represents Latin consonant *u*, as Κοῖντος , Ὀαλέριος .

Dentals.

τ and θ.

§ 46. Interchanges of θ and τ from metathesis of aspiration are treated in § 40. Μαστός varies: Lk 11²⁷ $\mu\alpha\sigma\theta\acute{\omicron}\iota$ DG 23²⁹ D*FG ($\mu\alpha\zeta\acute{\omicron}\iota$ C), Rev 1¹⁸ $\mu\alpha\sigma\theta\acute{\omicron}\iota\varsigma$ \aleph ($\mu\alpha\zeta\acute{\omicron}\iota\varsigma$ A). Μαζός and μασθός are primitive doublets: cf. Skt. *méda-* and *médha-* (Brugmann-Thumb *Gr.* 117, 125). Μαστός (the normal cl. form) may perhaps be independent: it might be a verbal from the root (cf. $\mu\alpha\delta\acute{\alpha}\omega$) from which the other two are derived. See the material in Walde, *Lat. Etym. Wörterb.*² 453 f. $\Phi\acute{\omicron}\beta\eta\theta\rho\nu$ Lk 21¹¹ BDW (Is 19¹⁷ B) is presumably due to the analogy of words like $\kappa\acute{\omicron}\rho\eta\theta\rho\nu$, $\kappa\acute{\iota}\kappa\eta\theta\rho\nu$ (W. F. Moulton in WM 119 n.²): add $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\upsilon\nu\theta\rho\nu$ BGU iv. 1120¹⁷ (b.c. 5). See Brugmann-Thumb *Gr.* § 206, and Thackeray 104 ($\mu\alpha\sigma\theta\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ and $\phi\acute{\omicron}\beta\eta\theta\rho\nu$ in LXX) Mayser 179 illustrates the frequent change of $\sigma\theta$ to $\sigma\tau$ in papyri. Rendel Harris describes this as "very common in Codex Bezae": he instances Mk 4¹ $\kappa\alpha\theta\eta\sigma\tau\alpha\iota$, Ac 19²⁵ $\epsilon\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\alpha\sigma\tau\alpha\iota$.

¹ See the facts concerning *Silvanus* in *Vocabulary*, s.v. It must be noted that in some names β represents Latin *u* much earlier: see Viereck *Sermo* 57, with instances from i/b.c. *Livia* is Αβλια in P RyI ii. 127²⁰ (A.D. 29).

οὐθείς, etc.

The variation between *οὐδείς μηδείς* and *οὐθείς μηθείς* is one of peculiar importance as a test of our MSS: cf. what is said on *έάν* for *άν* in § 38. The history of this rather shortlived development is acutely traced by Thackeray (pp. 58-62 and 104 f.), whose account should be carefully followed. That *οὐρεμία* is never found proves that mixture of *οὔρε* and *οὐδέ* has nothing to do with it: there has been a re-formation *οὐδ' εἰς*, with $\delta+h$ producing θ —see Brugmann-Thumb 170 f. “First found in an inscr. of 378 B.C.,¹ it is practically the only form in use throughout the Greek-speaking world during iii/B.C. and the first half of ii/B.C. In 132 B.C. the δ forms begin again to reassert themselves, and the period from that date to about 100 B.C. appears to have been one of transition, when the δ and θ forms are found side by side in the same documents. For i/B.C. we are in the dark, but in i/A.D. we find that *οὐδείς* has completely regained its ascendancy, and by the end of ii/A.D. *οὐθείς*, which still lingers on in i/ii A.D., mainly in a single phrase *μηθέν ἡσσοῦ*, is extinct, never apparently to reappear, at all events not within the period covered by the papyri.”² It follows naturally that *οὐθείς* plays a very small part in NT. It is accepted by WH eight times: Lk 22⁸⁵ 23¹⁴, Ac 15⁹ 19²⁷ 26²⁶, 1 Co 13², 2 Co 11⁸ (*οὐθ.*), and Ac 27³⁸ (*μηθ.*). To these might be added Ac 20³⁸ NA E 27³⁴ A, 1 Co 13³ NA 33 cu²: since *-θείς* was obsolete long before our oldest MSS, we should incline towards accepting it as often as good uncials show it. But against these possible 11 instances we have some 220 of *οὐδείς* and 80 of *μηδείς*. We have to note the peculiar case of the verb *έξουθενεῖν*, a verb coined while *οὐθείς* was still in use: Thackeray shows (104 f.) that *έξουδενουῖν* was coined afresh when *οὐδείς* was reasserting itself, and mixed forms *-δενεῖν* and *-θενουῖν* appear in a few places in LXX. In Plutarch we have *έξουδενερίζω*, perhaps a corrected form from *έξουθενερίζω* which we have in a scholiast: *έ[ξ]ουδενη[σαι]* is said by Schubart to be the most probable reading in BGU iv. 1117⁸¹ (B.C. 13), and it is printed by Mitteis in *Ohrest.* ii. p. 129 without question. In NT *έξουθενεῖν*, as a long-established word which has detached itself from its origin, stands without doubt in 11 places. In Mk 9¹² there is doubt: *έξουθενωθῆ* N 69 is confronted by *έξουδενηθῆ* in BD 565, while LNW have *έξουθενηθῆ* and ACXΔ *αλ. έξουδενωθῆ*—perhaps the most probable reading, since the general NT form *-θενη-* will explain the θ of the N and the η of the BD reading. From other places the only variants are Lk 23¹¹ *-ώσας X*,

¹ But in *Amer. Journ. of Archaeol.* vii. 152, S. O. Dickerman gives an inscr. from Cleonae which has *μηθέν*, and he assigns it to early v/A.C. at latest. I cannot criticise this judgement.

² Thackeray *Gr.* 58. Since this was written, our “darkness” as to i/B.C. has been somewhat relieved by the publication (in BGU iv.) of about a hundred papyri from Alexandria, dated under Augustus. One of these documents, No. 1141, a private letter, and almost the only paper in the collection which is not formal, shows *οὐθέν* and *μηθέν* once each, and even this has *μηθέν* twice. Even the formal character of the remainder does not altogether discount the fact that *οὐδείς* appears 5 times and *μηδείς* 56 (largely in identic formulae).

-*ισας* W (cf. Plutarch's verb, unless it is mere itacism—see § 34), Ac 4¹¹ *-αθείς* cu⁶ (-*δενωθείς* cu¹), 1 Co 1²⁸ *ἐξουδενωμένα* 33 (-*θενω*- cu¹), 16¹¹ *ἐξουθενώσῃ* 33 (-*δενω*- cu²), 2 Co 10¹⁰ *ἐξουδενημένος* B (as in Mk 9¹²).

Miscellaneous variations.

A few miscellaneous variant forms may be noted. A dental is dropped in *ἄρκου* Rev 13³ (all unc.). It is explained in Brugmann-Thumb 151 as an effect of popular etymology, produced by *ἀρκέω* and *τὸ ἄρκος* "defence." The link hardly seems obvious: if we are seeking an etymon it is more plausible to try *ἄρκυς*, the bear being assimilated in name to the net that snared him. But Boisacq (*s.v.*) regards both forms as primitive Idg doublets. Add the old word *ἄρκᾶλος* "young panther." **Ἄρκος* is both literary (Ælian) and vernacular *Κοινή* (see *Vocab. s.v.*), and MGr. For the added dental in *σφυδρά* (Ac 3⁷ *κ*AB*C**) we have only Hesychius to quote. (*Ἄνα*)*βαθμός* came into the *Κοινή* from Ionic, according to Phrynichus; but G. Meyer (p. 365) gives inscr. evidence against this (cf. Thumb *Hellen.* 73). Anyhow it is Hellenistic, while *βασμός* is Attic. See *Vocab.* on both words. On the other hand no trace survives of the old form *ὀδμή*, which figures in Herculaneum papyri and some later writers as *v.l.*: see Crönert *Mem.* 136, who notes dissidence among the old grammarians. *Ἐθύθη* 1 Co 5⁷ is only a blunder in very late sources of TR. Δ and τ are concerned in the Hellenistic *παρατός*, which comes from class. *παρατός* (see under Word-formation) by assimilation to *πότε*. There is no connexion with the frequent substitution of τ for δ in badly written papyri, which is due wholly to Egyptian native pronunciation.

A curious substitution of χ for θ occurs in D at Mk 6²¹ *γενεχλοῖς*. There is only a fortuitous resemblance to the χ in *ὄρνιξ*.

In foreign words.

In foreign words there is some wavering between τ and θ, shown by doubling (as *Μαθηθαῖος*) to be spirant, representing Aram. ܦ. So esp. *Ναζαρέτ* and *Ναζαρέθ*, the latter predominating in Mt and Lk,¹ the former in Mk and Jn, according to Gregory 120. WH print only τ (*Ναζαρά* Mt 4¹³): the form with θ is attested by κ 4 times, B at least 4, D also 4. W oddly drops it in the best-attested place, Mt 21¹¹, and in Lk 4 times, but has it everywhere else, as the later MSS normally.

Movable Letters

§ 47. (1) Final -s in *οὔτως* is practically fixed. *Οὔτως* Final s movable. is admitted by WH 10 times (W. F. Moulton in WM 44 n.) out of over 200, on the mechanical principle of accepting an omission found in κ or B supported by A or C—a principle they adopt also for movable -v.¹ In Ptolemaic papyri *οὔτως* is found a few times, even before vowels, but *οὔτως* predominates (Mayser 242 f.). On the other hand, Crönert counts 75 instances of *οὔτω* to 25 of *οὔτως* before consonants, in the Herculaneum rolls included in his survey (*Mem.* 142). Since

¹ Their neglect of D in this matter is in accord with their general principle, but it is hard to defend it to-day.

these are literary, they need not disturb the impression that *ῡρος* is normal.

**Αχρῖ* and *μέχρῖ* were Attic, according to Thomas Mag. (p. 135) and Phrynichus (*al.*—see Rutherford *NP* 64): Moeris (p. 34) calls *ἄχρῖς* Hellenistic. But the record of the forms with *-s* is not good enough to justify this claim. They appear first in the Roman period (Mayser 243): an early instance is BGU iii. 830¹³ (i/A.D.) *ἄχρῖς ἄν*. Instances before vowels appear in early Fathers (Reinhold 37). In NT "*ἄχρῖ* usually precedes vowels (14–16 times), Gal 3¹⁹ *ἄχρῖς ἄν* or *οὐδ* being the only certain exception: *μέχρῖ* preceding a vowel is certain only Lk 16¹⁶, *μέχρῖς* 2–3 times" (WH *App.*² 155). They give *ἄχρῖς* as alternative in Rom 11²⁵, and read *ἄχρῖς* in Heb 3¹⁵, *μέχρῖς* in Heb 12⁴ with alternatives, in Mk 13³⁰ Gal 4¹⁹ without alternative.

**Ἀντικρῖς Χίου* is found in "all good MSS" at Ac 20¹⁵ (WH).

The omission of *-s* in *-κῖς* adverbs (Crönert *Mem.* 142 f.), not uncommon in the Κοινή, has no place in NT.

Radermacher (*Gr.* 39) observes that final *-s* and final *-ν* were alike feeble in the Hellenistic period. There are even instances of *-i* written for *-s*, as more often for *-ν*: thus *τὰς ἄλωι* P Tebt i. 61 b²⁷⁸ (B.C. 118). See Mayser 136.

Final -ν. (2) Final *-ν* (*ν ἐφέλκυστικόν*) is so universal in the forms which admit it at all, that it is only necessary to take note of omissions. Modern use, by which *ν* is inserted before vowels only, is known to be wrong even for classical writers, and in Hellenistic it is altogether to be set aside. Indeed a superfluous *-ν* appears largely in forms which had never known it. A conspicuous instance is *ἦν*, subj. of *εἰμί*, which has misled even Deissmann (*LAE* 155). See *Prol.* 49, where *μειζων* acc. sing. is quoted from Jn 5⁸⁶ AB *al.* (add W). Cf. *βορρᾶν* gen. in *Ν* in LXX (Thackeray 143). Cf. from papyri P Oxy iii. 505 (ii/A.D.) *ἀπηλιώτουν*, Preisigke *Samm.* 4317¹⁴ (c. A.D. 200) *ἐν Ἀλεξανδρίαν*, P Tebt i. 104 (i/B.C.) *Ἀπολλωνίαν*, P Oxy viii. 1088⁴⁸ (i/A.D.) *εἶταν*, P Ryl ii. 90⁸² (iii/A.D.) *τῶν ἡμῶν κινδύνων*, *ib.* 160⁸ (A.D. 28–9) *β]εβαιώσιν* (dat.) etc. etc. Cf. Nachmanson *Beiträge* 66 f.

For the practice of *ΝABC* in the matter of movable *-ν*, see WH *App.*² 153–5, who explain there the admittedly mechanical rule by which they decide whether to print *-ν* or omit it: see under (1) above.

The irrational addition of *-ν* may be set beside its irrational omission, for which see many *exx* in Mayser 190 f. One recurrent instance may be named, *πάλι* for *πάλιν*, a vulgar by-form found in post-Ptolemaic *nscr.* and papyri—cf. Mayser 241. It occurs in W at Jn 1²⁵.

Final *-ν* has the same uncertain tenure in MGr that it had in Hellenistic, and the range of its variation has been considerably extended. See Thumb's account, *Handbook* 24 f.

Final *ι* movable. (3) Final *-ι* after *η* or *ω*—the *ι subscript* of mediaeval and modern writing (see above, § 27)—was in i/B.C. and i/A.D. inserted and omitted so freely in papyri that it may be counted as a movable final indifferent for pronunciation, even beyond *-ν*. A finely concentrated instance is BGU iii. 883² (ii/A.D.—by which time

it was rare) *ὀκτώϊ, οὐλήϊ δακτύλῳ πρώτῳ*: the *ι* is in these four words inserted once rightly, twice wrongly, and once wrongly omitted. It might be substituted for the other weak finals, as we have seen: add such *exx.* as BGU iv. 1188¹⁴ (B.C. 15) *εἰς τὴν κώμηι*, and conversely Preisigke *Ostr.* 15⁷ (B.C. 59) *ἀριθμῶν* dat. sg. Further instances are given in *CR* xviii. 108a. See in general on the long diphthongs in § 36. Since *-āi* might be read *-āi* and so pronounced *-ε*, the irrational *-ι* was naturally added to *-ā* less often than to *-η* or *-ω*. The insertion of this irrational *ι* is best taken as a mere consequence of literary tradition: the proper limits of a now functionless letter were forgotten, and indiscriminate insertion paved the way for impartial omission from ii/A.D. According to Gregory *Prol.* 109 the *ι* is found very rarely in NT uncials: he quotes *ἡιδισαν* (= *ἡδισαν*) Mk 1³⁴ D, *ῶι* Mt 25¹⁵ U, Lk 7⁴ Δ, and *ξύλωι* Lk 23³¹ K. He adds on Scrivener's authority that it is not found subscript in the minuscules before the time of cod. 71 (written A.D. 1160). (See §§ 27, 36.)

PART II.

ACCIDENCE.

THE Noun and Verb paradigms that follow are printed in bold type (as ἡμέρα) whenever the forms themselves or forms on the same model actually occur in NT. Small type is used, as κύνα, when the word is isolated and only part of its flexion occurs, or when from actual instances in NT it is not possible to make up the flexion of a model word. When there is reason to doubt the continued existence of an inflexional type in Hellenistic, a blank is left.

This page intentionally left blank

PART II.

ACCIDENCE.

DEFINITE ARTICLE.

§ 48. The forms of the Article should strictly be presented among the other Pronouns, to which it belongs by historical syntax. But in post-Homeric Greek, except for a few uses which will be treated under the Syntax, the Article had detached itself for special functions answering generally to those of our own *the*; and convenience demands that it should be given here. There are no irregularities. The base is *to-*, *tā-*, except in N. sing. m.f., where it is *so*, *sā* (as in Skt, Germanic etc.): this has in Attic and other dialects infected the plur., which was originally *τοί*.

<i>Sing. N.</i>	ὁ	ἡ	τό	<i>Plur.</i>	οἱ	αἱ	τά
A.	τόν	τήν	τό		τούς	τάς	τά
G.	τοῦ	τῆς	τοῦ		τῶν	τῶν	τῶν
D.	τῷ	τῇ	τῷ		τοῖς	ταῖς	τοῖς

NOUNS.

FIRST DECLENSION.

§ 49. This declension includes nouns and adjectives with stems in *-ā*, masculine and feminine, together with those (distinct in their origin) which in Greek show a nom. sing. in *-ῖᾱ*, feminine only. The feminine type is original in the *-ā*-nouns also: we shall present it first.

A. Feminine Nouns in *-ā*, *-η*, and *-ᾱ*.

ἡμέρᾱ day. *φωνή* voice. *γλῶσσᾱ* tongue. *σπεῖρα* cohort.

<i>Sing. N.</i>	ἡ	ἡμέρα	φωνή	γλῶσσα	σπεῖρα	
A.	τήν	ἡμέραν	φωνήν	γλῶσσαν	σπεῖραν	
G.	τῆς	ἡμέρας	φωνῆς	γλώσσης	σπείρης	
D.	τῇ	ἡμέρᾳ	φωνῇ	γλώσση	σπείρῃ	
<i>Plur. N.</i>	αἱ	ἡμέραι	φωναί	and so		
A.	τάς	ἡμέρας	φωνάς	} all other First Declension words, Gen. plur. always perispomenon.		
G.	τῶν	ἡμερῶν	φωνῶν			
D.	ταῖς	ἡμέραις	φωναῖς			

The Vocative is identical with the Nominative throughout.

It will be seen that Hellenistic agrees with Attic in its treatment of *ā pure* (see above, § 33). There are two divergences from Attic in this flexion, the first of which affects nouns in *-ης* as well.

(1) In spelling the dat. sing. in *η* was unchanged, but in reality it was new. Attic *η* was pronounced as *ei* (*ē* close as in *day*), while *η* was the open *ē* in *there*. Hence nom. and dat. sing. of barytone *-η* nouns were not mere graphic variants, as in Hellenistic, where *η* and *η* were alike close *ē*, while *ει* was *ī* (as in *machine*). The new dative came from gen.—*ἡμέρας* : *ἡμέρα* : : *φωνῆς* : *φωνῆ*, aided by the uniformity thus established throughout Decl. I. by nom. and acc. having the same relation to the dative in *-ā* (*-ās*) and *-η* (*-ης*) nouns alike.

(2) There is a partial levelling of *-ā* stems : nouns in *-pā* and participles in *-vīa* follow *γλῶσσα* in gen. and dat. sing.¹

(a) The evidence of NT MSS is as follows. *Μαχαίρης* (*-η*) \aleph ξ , B $\frac{1}{2}$, A $\frac{2}{3}$, C $\frac{1}{2}$, D $\frac{1}{2}$, D₂ $\frac{2}{3}$, L $\frac{2}{3}$, Δ $\frac{1}{2}$, W $\frac{2}{3}$, P¹⁸ $\frac{1}{2}$: add single occurrences in T 33 81 124. Πλη(μ)μύρης † in \aleph B*LW Ξ 33. Πρόφης † in \aleph A 33. Σπείρης $\frac{2}{3}$ (Ac) with no serious variant except B in 10¹ and P twice. Σαπφείρη † \aleph AE Φ . Συνειδυίης † \aleph ABE. In the papyri both *-ρης* and *-vίης* are normal A.D., exceptions being about as frequent relatively as in the older NT uncials. In its full development this flexion is characteristic of the second period of the Κοινή (i/A.D. and after), and is therefore only sporadic in LXX. Thackeray's evidence there may prove that the infection started in words with Ionic associations : this suggestion combines the alternatives discussed in *Prol. l.c.* It is difficult to say why the type *ὀφέλια* did not conform to the new rule.²

(b) *Στείρα* Lk 1³⁶ has no variant. It is the fem. of *στείρος* (usually of two terminations), and *στείρα* (*sic scrib.*) is a new fem. : see § 64. Note that the irreg. nom. *ἐστηκινή* Wis 10⁷ \aleph * has no parallel in NT, and very few elsewhere.

(c) On the form *Νύμφαν* in Col 4¹⁵ B, as an instance of levelling in an opposite direction, see *Prol.* 48.

(d) *Σροά* (from *στοιά*) has *ā pure* after the *ι* has disappeared.

(e) *Πρύμνα* is found in Ac 27⁴¹ without variant : in cl. Grk *πρύμνη* alternates with it. In *μάμμη* and *θέρμα*, where there is similar fluctuation, the NT exx. are indeterminate (gen. or dat.), while *ἄκανθα* (Attic) only occurs in plur. : see Thackeray 143, G. Meyer *Gr.*³ 94.

¹ *Prol.* 38, 48. Cf. Thumb *Hellen.* 69 ff., WS 81 n., Thackeray *Gr.* 140–2, Mayer 12 f., Schweizer *Perg.* 40 ff., Kretschmer *Entstehung* 30, Reinhold 48, Hatzidakis 84, CR xv. 34, 434 (papyrus evidence up to 1901), and xviii. 108.

² Blass and Thackeray would find a motive in Attic *-σα* for *-vīa* (Meisterhans 59) which is assumed to make *ā* impure. But Attic had gen. *-ίας*, and the power of *ι* and *ρ* to influence a following *ξ* had ceased to act centuries earlier. That *ἀλήθεια* *et sim.* did not follow suit proves nothing, for nouns in *-ια* would supply a powerful analogy.

§ 50. B. Masculine Nouns in *-ας* and *-ης*.

	νεανίας youth.	κριτής judge.	βορρᾶς north (wind).	ᾗδης Hades.
<i>Sing. N.</i>	δ νεανίας	κριτής	βορρᾶς	ᾗδης
<i>V.</i>	νεανία	κριτά	βορρά	ᾗδη
<i>A.</i>	τὸν νεανίαν	κριτήν	βορρᾶν	ᾗδην
<i>G.</i>	τοῦ νεανίου	κριτοῦ	βορρά	ᾗδου
<i>D.</i>	τῷ νεανίᾳ	κριτῇ	βορρᾷ	ᾗδι

Non-Greek proper names will be dealt with separately. Greek names in *-ᾶς* and in *-ας* *impure* follow normally the third of these models, those in *-ας* *pure* the first.

(a) *Βορρᾶς* is the usual *Κοινή* form, though the older Attic *βορέας* is rarely found. It is not a "contracted noun"—*βορέας* → *βορξᾶς*, as *στερεός* → *στερξός* → *στερρός*. Meisterhans⁸ 100 thinks the declension was adapted to the analogy of the "originally not Ionic-Attic abbreviated names in *-ᾶς*." *Βορρά* gen. is the only NT form, but the whole of the above flexion is found in LXX (Thackeray 143).

(b) *Ἄιδη* only 1 Co 15⁵⁵ *Ν^οΑ²* etc.: it is regular (K.Bl. i. 387). The only vocatives found in NT are *δέσποτα*, *ἐπιστάτα*, *καρδιωνῶστα*, *ὑποκριτά*, *Αἰνέα*, *Ἀγρίππα*, and four Hebrew names (see § 60 for foreign names).

(c) The gen. in *-ου* is specifically Attic (e.g. even *βορροῦ*), and naturally the alternative *-ᾶ* extends itself in the *Κοινή*, having a certain footing in Attic *Volkssprache*: in Lesbian (G. Meyer³ 439) and in late Attic we even find *exx.* of gen. *-η* from nouns in *-ης*. (Cf. MGr *κλέφτης*, gen. *-η*.) It would probably have spread more if the Ionic had here agreed with the form characteristic of Greek outside Ion. Attic. Greek names in *-ας* *pure* take *-ου*, as *Ἀνδρέου*, *Λυσανίου* (K.Bl. i. 386 f.).—Josephus however shows many exceptions (Schmidt 489 f.); while those in *-ᾶς* and *-ας* *impure* have *-ᾶ* (*-α*)—thus *Στεφανᾶ*, *Ἐπαφρᾶ*, and (*e conj.*) *Ἀντίπα* (Rev 21³—see *Prol.* 12). But usage differed for *-ας* *impure*: cf. *Ἀγρίππα* P Amh 75 *ter* (ii/A.D.), but *Ἀγρίππου* BGU ii. 511^{11,4} (ii/A.D., a copy of an official document of Claudius' reign), and *Ἀκύλα* in BGU i. 71 (i/A.D.). See Schmidt *Jos.* 487 f. for similar fluctuations in Josephus: *-ου* here slightly predominates, but *-α* is common, and greatly outnumbers *-ου* in other names. According to Herodian (K.Bl. i. 386) *παρολόφας* and *μητρολόφας* (as we spell in NT—see p. 83) had "Doric" gen., but NT has only dat. pl. Cf. Thackeray 162 on the "vulgar and late" use of *-α* in Hebrew proper names in LXX: also below, § 60 (4).

(d) For cases of *Metaplasmus* see § 54.

§ 51. C. Contracted Nouns.

This category includes *μνᾶ* (like *ἡμέρα*) and *γῆ*, *συκῆ*, like *φωνή*. They differ only in that the accent is *perispome-*

non throughout. The feminine of contracted adjectives (διπλοῦς, χρυσοῦς, ἀργυροῦς, σιδηροῦς) follows this model, with nom. διπλῆ, χρυσῆ, ἀργυρᾶ, σιδηρᾶ.

(a) Χρυσᾶν Rev 1¹⁸ N*AC follows the analogy of ἀργυρᾶν, its natural associate. The pair react on each other in both ways—thus P Lond 124²⁶ (iv/v A.D.) (=L. p. 122) χρυσᾶν ἢ ἀργυρᾶν, P Leid W ^{xviii.}22 (ii/iii A.D.) χρυσῆν ἢ ἀργυρῆν. Blass (p. 25) gives a much less probable account of the genesis of this “gross blunder,” as he calls it.

(b) Uncontracted forms are occasionally found from χρυσῆ in Rev: χρυσέας 5⁸ N, χρυσέων 2¹ AC. See below, § 64.

SECOND DECLENSION.

(1) Flexion.

§ 52. A. Masculines and Feminines in -ος, and Neuters in -ον.

	φίλος friend.	ὁδός way.	τέκνον child.
<i>Sing. N.</i>	ὁ φίλος	ἡ ὁδός	τὸ τέκνον
<i>V.</i>	φίλε		τέκνον
<i>A.</i>	τὸν φίλον	τὴν ὁδόν	τὸ τέκνον
<i>G.</i>	τοῦ φίλου	τῆς ὁδοῦ	τοῦ τέκνου
<i>D.</i>	τῷ φίλῳ	τῇ ὁδῷ	τῷ τέκνῳ
<i>Plur. N.</i>	οἱ φίλοι	αἱ ὁδοί	τὰ τέκνα
<i>V.</i>	φίλοι		τέκνα
<i>A.</i>	τοὺς φίλους	τὰς ὁδοὺς	τὰ τέκνα
<i>G.</i>	τῶν φίλων	τῶν ὁδῶν	τῶν τέκνων
<i>D.</i>	τοῖς φίλοις	ταῖς ὁδοῖς	τοῖς τέκνοις

(a) Nearly thirty vocatives in -ε occur in NT: this formation survives in MGr. No feminine -ος nouns in the NT show the vocative. Θεός makes θεέ nearly always in LXX, as in Hellenistic generally (θεός Att.): cf. Thackeray 145, CR xv. 34, 434. Τιμόθεε (Lucian) answers to old Attic models. Note υἱός voc. once in Mt (1²⁰—υἱά appears four times): cf. Mayser 256

B. Contracted Nouns.

The norm may be seen in the masc. and neut. of adjectives: thus

<i>Sing. N.</i>	διπλοῦς	διπλοῦν	<i>Plur.</i>	διπλοῖ	διπλᾶ
<i>A.</i>	διπλοῦν			διπλοῦς	διπλᾶ
<i>G.</i>	διπλοῦ			διπλῶν	
<i>D.</i>	διπλῷ			διπλοῖς	

(a) For *νοῦς* and *πλοῦς*, originally in this class, see § 59 (4).

(b) Open forms, presumably Ionic in origin (Thumb *Hellen.* 63), are found rather freely in the flexion of *χρυσούς* in Rev: thus 2¹ *χρυσέων* AC, 4⁴ *-έους* N, 5⁸ *-έας* N, 9²⁰ *-αία* N, 14¹⁴ *-εον* (in 38 only); so *χάλκεα* 9²⁰ N. Thumb's statement that they were characteristic of the Eastern Κοινή is suggestive in connexion with the curious fact that they are peculiar to Rev. On the other hand the flexion of *δοτούν*, the only substantive in this class in NT, shows open forms in the plural: *δοτέα* Lk 24²⁹ (-â DN), *δοτέων* Mt 23²⁷ Heb 11²³ (Eph 5³⁰ N^cD etc). This differs from LXX, where the rule is that uncontracted forms come in gen. and dat. sing. and plur. (Thackeray 144: see also 172 f. on the adjectives). See CR xv. 35, 435; Schmidt *Jos.* 490 ff.; K.Bl. i. 402 (§ 113 n. 3).

(c) *Χειμάρρον* in Jn 18¹ may probably be accented thus (so Blass 25), as coming from a late shortened form *χείμαρρος*; but *χειμάρρους* occurs normally in LXX (Thackeray 144).

C. "Attic" Declension.

Strictly this declension affects a few words which by "metathesis of quantity" had substituted *-ως* for the final *-ος*. Thus *νεώς*, *λεώς* from *νηός*, *ληός*, for which Hellenistic replaced (except in the compound *νεωκόρος*) the general Greek *ναός*, *λαός*.

With a different history we have *ἄλως* (*δ*) *threshing-floor*, which still survives in LXX and papyri, though replaced in NT by *ἄλων* (*ή*): its flexion (sing.) is A. *ἄλων*, G. *ἄλω*, D. *ἄλω*. In Ptolemaic papyri (Mayser 259) A. plur. *ἄλω(ς)*, G. *ἄλων*. See in general Meisterhans³ 129-131.

(a) For the neuter *ἀνώγειον* Ti cites 15 cursives in Mk 14¹⁸ and names two (with "αί") in Lk 22¹². See WS 47. It has no classical or Hellenistic warrant.

(b) *ἴλεως* survives only in the nom. sing. It had been stereotyped largely by the phrase *ἴλεώς σοι* (etc.) "mercy on thee!": see *Prol.* 240. It was rather more alive in the LXX period—see Thackeray 173.

(c) *Ἀπολλώς* follows this model in N.A.G., with the same fluctuation as in Attic (Goodwin *Gram.* § 199) between *-ών* and *-ώ* in acc. Thus 1 Co 4⁶ *Ἀπολλών* N^{*}AB^{*} but *Ἀπολλώ* Ac 19¹ exc. A²L 40. See Meisterhans³ § 49d. There was hardly any difference in sound.

Κῶς in Ac 21¹ has acc. *Κῶ* exc. in HLP.

Both these nouns have been preserved by the influence of the mixed declension.

(2) Gender.

§ 53. (a) Neuter plurals attached to a masc. sing. in *-ος* are still found in NT. They were originally collectives,¹ and some traces of this sense survive.

Δεσμός has plur. *δεσμά* in Lk 8²⁰ Ac 16²⁶ 20²³, *δεσμοί*

¹ Giles³ 266 ff.

Phil 1¹³, the rest being ambiguous. Thackeray (p. 154) observes that in LXX as in NT *δεσμά* is literary.

Rutherford *Gram.* 9, asserts after Cobet that *δεσμά*=actual bonds, *δεσμοί*=bondage. The distinction cannot be pressed for the NT, though it would suit very well: Ac 20²³ gains vividness from it. The original differentia is in this case almost inverted.

Θεμέλιος (*sc.* *λίθος*) has masculine forms except in Ac 16²⁶. *Τὰ θεμέλια* here shows the collective sense: contrast *οἱ θ.* in Rev 21¹⁹.

It is common in LXX, where the masc. appears rarely. Thackeray (154) suggests that the earlier and later *Κοινή* levelled in different directions, "the former using the neuter throughout, the latter the masc." Thucydides however has *οἱ θ.* (i. 93) and so has Aristotle. Moeris and Thomas Magister declared the neuter alone Attic: it may be questioned whether they had adequate data. See Mayser 289, Crönert 175.

Σίτος shows the old plur. *σίτα* in Ac 7¹² HP, where Blass says *σιτία* does not suit; but see Wendt or Knowling. It survives in two literary LXX books (Thackeray 155).

Στάδιον retains the old double plural, but *στάδιοι* predominates: *στάδια* only Jn 6¹⁹ *κ**D 106 (against *κ**⁷ ABL etc.).

Thackeray assigns *στάδιοι* to the literary element, which NT use makes doubtful. Kälker (p. 239 f.) says that Polybius alternates the forms to avoid hiatus, which makes them mere equivalents.

Λύχνος and *χαλινός* have only masc. plur., as in LXX.

(b) Gender fluctuates in the following:—

**ἄβυσσος*, an adj., becomes a fem. noun (*sc.* *χώρα*).

First in LXX (as Gn 1²), but a citation from Diogenes Laertius (ii/A.D.) shows it was a "profane" use: see Grimm-Thayer *s.v.*

Ἀλάβαστρος* is fem. in Mk 14³ *κBCLΔ, masc. in *κ**AD etc., and actually stands as neuter in GM 1 13–69 (Ferrar).

LS quote for the neuter Theocritus and the Anthology. The Attic *ὁ ἀλάβαστρος* accounts for the second alternative, which occurs in LXX (4 K 21¹³ B). Ti quotes a scholiast who writes *τῆν ἄ.*, observing that Herodotus made it masc. Blass (p. 26) says Attic should be *ἡ ἄ.*, though he quotes no authority and admits *ὁ ἀλάβαστρος* for Aristophanes and *τὸ ἀλάβαστρον* for Menander. The word probably comes from Arabic (see Boisacq *s.v.*), and naturally wavered when a gender had to be found, much as German wavers between *der*, *die* and *das* *Awesta*.

**Ἀμφοδον* neut. in Mk 11⁴ as usual, but see Mayser 261 n.

Ἀψινθος* in Rev 8¹¹ is *ὁ ἄ.*, but *κ substitutes the more usual *ἀψίνθιον*.

Fem in Aretaëus (medical—i/A.D.). From a pre-Greek place-name, according to Kretschmer: Boisacq gives *Ἀψίνθιοι* as a Thracian tribe. WS 83 accounts for masc. in Rev 8¹¹ by noting it is an angel's name.

Βάτος is fem. according to Moeris in Hellenistic. So in Luke's use: see Blass on Ac 7³⁶.

Thackeray (p. 145) appears to be wrong in making the LXX masc. the *Κοινή* norm, unless Moeris is the blunderer. Mk 12²⁶ has masc. (γ). We might read here (with RV and Swete) *ἐπὶ τοῦ Βάτου* from τὸ "*Βάτος*," "the *Bush* passage." SH on Rom 11² show that *ἐν* without article is normal in this locution, but their evidence is hardly decisive. The order of the words in Mk favours the RV translation: Luke's change of order and gender may well mean that he took it locally—it was actually "at the Bush" that Moses made the pronouncement.

Δεῖπνον appears as masc. in Lk 14¹⁶ B³DAIT², Rev 19⁹ 046 cu⁴, 19¹⁷ cu²⁰: so MGr.

Ζυγός is regular in the *Κοινή* since Polybius for *ζυγόν*: earlier masc. only in sense of *balance* (see LS).

Ληρός has (class.) fem. in Rev 14²⁰ bis 19¹⁶; but in 14¹⁹ τὴν λ. . . τὸν μέγαν (*κ* corrects)! It is only another instance of the breach of concord familiar in Rev. See Swete, also Charles *in loc.*

Ὁ *ληρός* is given by LS from Athenaeus xi. 49 (p. 474 fin.), and Is 63² (probably wrong—see Ottley *in loc.*). Thackeray quotes cursives of Gn 30^{28, 41}.

Λιβανωτός is written *-ον*, neut., in a few cursives at Rev 8⁶.

Λίθος is no longer fem. when meaning *gem* (Rev 21¹¹ etc.): so LXX.

Meisterhans 129 says the fem. is frequent from 385 B.C. If it is specifically Attic, and late at that, it would naturally get no footing in the *Κοινή*. Cf. *ῥαλος* below, and see Mayser 262.

Λιμός wavers in gender: the fem. was a Doric element in the *Κοινή* (Thumb *Hellen.* 67) and as such unstable.

Phrynichus says τὴν λιμὸν Δωριεῖς: Lobeck (p. 188) supports it convincingly. Moeris calls the fem. Hellenistic: Mayser (p. 8) emphasises this with evidence. It is sporadic in LXX (Thackeray 146). NT instances are indeterminate except in Luke: fem. is certain in Lk 15¹⁴ NABDL, Ac 11²⁸ NBD²; but in Lk 4²⁵ only 13–69 (Ferrari) evidences

μεγάλη. See *Prol.* 60 for a case of wavering in papyri written by the same hand, which excuses our seeking an explanation in varying sources used by Luke.

Νῶτος in Rom 11¹⁰ (LXX) replaces classical νῶτον.

So in LXX, exc. Gen 9²³ Jer 2²⁷ (Thackeray 155).

Σάρδιον is masc. in a good many cursives in Rev 21²⁰.

Στάμνος keeps fem. gender in Heb 9⁴: masc. in Ex 16^{3a} (exc. one cursive).

Mayser (p. 262) cites three papyri (Ptolemaic) for δ σ., and notes that Sextus Empiricus gives the masc. as Peloponnesian, fem. as Attic.

Τρίβος (only in a LXX citation) keeps fem. without variant.

It wavers very much in LXX (Thackeray 146).

*Υελος (or ὕαλος—see § 33. 1) fem. in Hdt. etc., masc. in Rev. 21¹⁸.

LS cite Theophrastus for the masc.

*Υοσωπος indeterminate in NT: see Thackeray 146.

Metaplasms and Heteroclisia.

§ 54. Fluctuations of gender within the Second Declension have been already dealt with: we present here only Greek nouns which appear in various declensions. Proper names and foreign nouns are treated separately.

A. Declensions I. and II.

-άρχης and -αρχος compounds. The Decl. I. form has encroached very largely on the Attic -αρχος. In NT only one word keeps -αρχος without wavering, viz. χιλίαρχος (as LXX). Ἐκατόνταρχος is overwhelmingly predominant in LXX, but WH accept it only 4 times out of 17 places (apart from ambiguous gen. sing. and plur.). Στρατοπέδαρχος appears in HLP *al.* at Ac 28¹⁶, but the clause (accepted by Blass for his β-text) has slender authority. No variants occur for ἐθνάρχης, πατριάρχης, πολιτάρχης and τετραάρχης. Ἀσιάρχης only occurs in gen. plur. (Ac 19³¹), but we should probably accentuate -ῶν (cf. -χην in *IM Ae* iii. 525, 526—Thera, ? ii/A.D.).

Ἐκατόνταρχος (excluding gen.) occurs in the great uncials in only five places viz. \aleph_{18}^2 , B_{18}^6 , A_{18}^4 , D_{18}^2 : WH give in Mt nom. -ος dat. -ης, in Luke -ης throughout, but acc. -ον. Such mixture is paralleled in papyri: see *CR* xv. 34, 434, xviii. 108, Mayser 256 f., where literature on the subject is given—add Thackeray 156. Mayser observes that -άρχης started in Ionic districts (so Herodotus), spread thence into Attic tragedy, and prevailed more and more in the Κοινή. New formations were almost exclusively of this form, while in compounds of numerals and old official titles the other kept its own until the Ptolemaic period was past. Thumb (*Hellen.* 59) calls attention to the significant fact that in Attica -αρχος persisted until A.D. (middle of i/A.D., to judge from *exx.* in Meisterhans⁸ 125): this will then be an element in the Κοινή decidedly traceable to non-Attic influences.

Δουακτέριον in Ac 28⁸ κAB *al.* for -ία, was Hellenistic according to Moeris.

Ἐνέδρον (for ἐνέδρα) occurs in LXX (Thackeray 156), but not in NT (Ac 23¹⁶ only HLP).

Ἥχος (masc.) replaces ἡχή from Aristotle down. So Heb 12¹⁹, and other places where it might be Decl. III. (see below, B (a)).

Θεά seems to have been the Κοινή fem. of θεός: in Ac 19³⁷ we find τὴν θεόν used as the regular *term. techn.* for the city goddess—see *Prolog.* 244.

Blass held that ἡ θεός was Hellenistic, except in the formula ἡ μεγάλη or ἡ μεγίστη θεά: inscriptional evidence from Magnesia strongly supports the other (Kuhring's) view. Ἡ θεά appeared in Attica itself in iii/B.C. (and earlier in direct antithesis to ὁ θεός): see Meisterhans⁸ 125.

B. Declensions I. or II. and III.

(a) Neuters in -ος have increased at the expense of the first and second declensions. This arises naturally from the coincidence of nom. sing. in the masc. and neut. -ος nouns, and their nearness in gen. sing., where an -ς was easily added or lost. Similarly even in classical times there was confusion between nouns in -ης gen. -ον (Decl. I.) and those in -ης gen. -ους (Decl. III.)—cf. G. Meyer *Gram.*⁸ 439 f. The confusion has developed in MGr: Thumb *Handb.* 64.

Δίψος and δίψα both occurred in Attic (Blass 28). NT only 2 Co 11²⁷, where B* has δίψη, and the rest δίψει.

P Flor ii. 176¹² (A.D. 256), an illiterate private letter, has gen. δίψης, while the medical fragment P Tebt ii. 272¹⁷ (late ii/A.D.) has τὸ δίψος.

*ελεος as neuter always in NT, nearly always in LXX.

See Thackeray's interesting evidence (p. 158) as to the literary character of ὁ εἶ. (Attic) in its few LXX occurrences. (Add that it alternates with τὸ εἶ. in Pss. Sol). Adjectives like ελεεινός and σκορεινός suggest that the neuter forms in these words were survivals. But to prove this we must postulate their coming into the Κοινή through some dialect that preserved the hypothetical old neuter: Brugmann (*Grd.*² II. i. 282) treats them as analogical extensions from φαεινός (= φαισ-νός) and the like. The adj. νηλεής however goes the other way. *ελεος masc. only survives in later uncials, with one appearance in C (Mt 23²³).

ελκος (τό) has acc. sing. ἔλκον in Rev 16² κ.

Ζῆλος is neuter in Ac 5¹⁷ B*, 2 Co 9² κB 33, Phil 3⁶ κ*ABD*FG: ὁ ζ. occurs in seven places (eight, if we followed κCD^cω in Gal 5²⁰).

*ὄζ rarely occurred in LXX. It is neuter in MGr, which makes for the view (WS 84) that the neuter was popular Greek in Hellenistic times.

*ἦχος is of Decl. II. in Heb 12¹⁹, of III. in Lk 21²⁵ (neut. or fem.).

In Lk *l.c.* WH (*App.*³ 165) accentuate ἦχους from ἦχώ f., Ln and Ti ἦχους from τὸ ἦχος. The existence of the latter is proved from LXX (Thackeray 159), and from several quotations collected by Schmiedel (WS 84 n.), who remarks that the meaning *sound* for ἦχώ is only poetical, except in Philo i. 588 and Job 4¹³ (see below). Whether ἦχώ survived in vernacular Greek can hardly be determined. Its influence may perhaps be traced in Job 4¹³, where ἦχῶ is fem.: should we accent ἦχῶ with ῶ for οἰ¹ (see § 36)? In Lk perhaps ἦχους is slightly more probable: the OT original (Ps 65⁷) to which WH assign it has ἦχους acc. pl.—gen. sing. is barely possible. (The ancient conjecture (?) ἦχούσης, found in D and Eusebius, would improve the construction.) *ἦχος is masc. in MGr.

θάμβος is neuter in NT, but θάμβου gen. in Ac 3¹⁰ C: θ. μέγας Lk 4³⁶ D.

It is masc. and neut. in classical Greek (Blass 28) and LXX (Thackeray 158).

Νίκος (τό) has supplanted νίκη in true Hellenistic, though the latter survives in 1 Jn 5⁴. Τὸ ν. in Mt 12²⁰, 1 Co 15^{54, 55, 57}.

Neut. in BGU iv. 1002¹⁴ (55 B.C.). The old fem. is literary in LXX

¹ Cf. Αηητῆ dat. in a Phrygian inscr. (*JHS* iv. 385) *ap.* Dieterich *Unters.* 163.

(Thackeray 157): cf. P Lond 1178¹² (=iii. p. 216), where it is used in a letter of Claudius. See Mayser 93 n.⁸ for exx.

Πλούτος is neut. in nom. and acc. 8 times in Paul: masc. (nom. acc. gen.) 5 times, and 7 times in other NT writers.

Neut. only once in LXX, Is 29² (but *ὁ π.* BQ). It is MGr.

Σκότος, formerly masc. and neut., is always neut. in LXX and NT.

The gloss σκόφ has intruded in late authorities at Heb 12¹⁸.

Στρήνος (τό) has gen. *στρήνου* in Rev 18³ C cu².

(b) Contracted masc. nouns of Decl. II. (substantives only) have passed into Decl. III., with which they already coincided in nom. and acc. sing. (*βοῦς, βούν*). Thus *νοῦς* makes gen. *νοός*, dat. *νοί*, πλοῦς gen. *πλοός*.

So even the Atticising writer of 4 Macc (Thackeray 160). To the inscriptional exx. in WS 84 n.⁷ add *ρόας* from *ρούς* P Oxy iv. 736⁵⁸ (c. A.D. 1). But *νόφ* BGU ii. 385⁵ (ii/iii A.D., an illit. letter), and *ἔπλοος* REGr xvii. 205 f. (Rhodes, ii/A.D.). See further evidence in K.BI. i. 516, G. Meyer 419, Crönert 166. The plural nom. *εἴνοος* is found in Attica as early as 300 B.C.: the analogy given above could not have produced this, which is presumably an accus. influencing nom. *Χοῦς* (liquid measure) was declined like *βοῦς* even in Attic, and this may well have affected the other *χοῦς*, "earth" (*χοός, χοί* in LXX) so starting the type: cf. *χοί* in *IM Ae* iii. 248 (ii/B.C.). See Mayser 257, whose papyrus evidence shows that the type had not developed far in the first (B.C.) period of the Κοινή.

(c) Miscellaneous instances under this heading are—

**ἄλων* (*ή*, gen. *ἄλωνος*) has replaced *ἄλωσ* (see above, § 53).

Thayer cites it from Aristotle. In papyri it occurs, but far less often than *ἄλωσ*: see Mayser 258 f., 287, and add the early instance P Lille 13⁸ (243 B.C.).

Γόης makes pl. after Decl. I. *γόηται* in 2 Ti 3¹³ D*.

Δάκρυον has the dat. pl. *δάκρυσιν* Lk 7^{38, 44}, a survival from the old *δάκρυ*, which agrees with *δάκρυον* in nom. acc. gen. pl. See below, p. 141.

Κατήωρ in Rev 12¹⁰ A is said (WS 85) to be only the Aramaic term *ܩܬܝܘܪ*, a Greek loan sent back in damaged condition. But cf. Thumb *Hellen.* 126.

Blass calls in the analogy of *ρήωρ*: the two types coincide in gen. pl. Schmiedel compares the late forms *διάκων* for *διάκονος* and *πάτρων*

for Latin *patronus* (a loan-word). But this is really an *alternative* to the explanation quoted from him above: these words, for which no foreign borrowing can be appealed to, must be explained by a mixture of declensions characteristic of the later periods of the *Κοινή*. This is Thumb's view.

Σάββατον was a Semitic word, and should properly come in below (p. 153). But its dat. pl. **σάββασιν** (once in LXX, always in NT) is on a good *Κοινή* model: cf. Lobeck *Par.* i. 175, where grammarians are cited showing that **πρόβατον** made **πρόβασιν** in dat. pl.—this case does not appear in NT.

WS 85 n.⁸ cites **σάββασιν** from *Jos. Ant.* xvi. 6⁴ and Meleager 83⁴. W. F. Moulton (WM 73 n.¹) gives **σαββάροις** (the LXX form) from Mt 12^{1, 12} B. See Schmidt *Jos.* 499 f.

(d) Heteroclisis in proper names (non-Semitic) may be noted in the following:—

Θυάτειρα is neuter pl. except in Rev 1¹¹ AC 046 **Θυάτειραν** acc. (-a κ and so WH text), 2²⁴ -ρη dat. κ^o vg, and even -ραις dat. pl. in late MSS.

Λύστρα similarly has acc. -αν, dat. -οις in the same context: see *Prolog.* 48, § 60 (10) below.

Μύρα is neut. pl. in Ac 27⁵, but 81 reads **Μύραν**, which Ramsay supports from the modern name: the gen. is **Μύρων** (or with ρρ).

Σαλαμίς (? nom. **Σαλαμίν** on analogy) has **Σαλαμίνη** as "a well attested substitute for" its regular dative (WH *App.*² 163): so in Ac 13⁶ κAEL and some Latin texts—cf. Reinhold 56 for late vernacular evidence. Suidas (p. 413a Bekker) gives **Σαλαμίνη** (in gen.) as the older name of Constantia in Cyprus: WS 94 also cites *Salamina-ae* from Justinus for the more famous Salamis near Athens.

THIRD DECLENSION.

§ 55. In this Declension are grouped together a great variety of stems, all ending in consonants or semivowels (ι or υ). As the semivowels and σ fall out between vowels, a good deal of contraction results. A marked feature of the declension is the (very limited) survival of "strong flexion," by which a stem varies through vowel-gradation (*Ablaut*) in

different cases. The proper case-terminations will be seen in the types of nouns with consonant stems which do not contract, nor show strong flexion.

A. Stems ending in Mutes.

	σαρκ- (ῆ) <i>flesh.</i>	μαστῖγ- (ῆ) <i>scourge.</i>	πνευματ- (τό) <i>spirit.</i>	παῖδ- (δ, ῆ) <i>boy, girl.</i>
<i>Sing. N.</i>	σάρξ	μάστιξ	πνεῦμα	παῖς
<i>A.</i>	σάρκα	μάστιγα	πνεῦμα	παῖδα
<i>G.</i>	σαρκός	μάστιγος	πνεύματος	παιδός
<i>D.</i>	σαρκί	μάστιγι	πνεύματι	παιδί
<i>Plur. N.</i>	σάρκες	μάστιγες	πνεύματα	παῖδες
<i>A.</i>	σάρκας	μάστιγας	πνεύματα	παῖδας
<i>G.</i>	σαρκῶν	μαστίγων	πνευμάτων	παιδῶν
<i>D.</i>	σαρξί(ν)	μαστίξι(ν)	πνεύμασι(ν)	παισί(ν)

N.B.—(1) Vocatives will be specially mentioned in this declension whenever separate forms occur. There are none here except γύναι: the classical παῖ is obsolete.

(2) Monosyllables transfer the accent to the last syllable in gen. and dat.: παιδῶν is an exception.

(3) The acc. sing. in -αν is conspicuous in the vernacular throughout the 3rd decl., but the culture level of the documents that exhibit it is decidedly lower than anything we find in NT. It does not appear in Attic inscriptions till the later Roman period: ¹ see Meisterhans³ § 50. 7. For its currency generally cf. Schweizer *Perg.* 156 f., Schmid *Attic.* iv. 586, Crönert 169 (and ref. there), Jannaris pp. 542 f., *CR* xv. 34 f., 435. We will deal separately with the rather different case of -ν added to acc. -η or -ῆ: see below, § 58 (d). In LXX (Thackeray 22) the phenomenon is almost confined to *κ* and *α*; nor is the case very different in NT, for Scrivener (*Collation* p. liv) cites ten exx. from *κ* in NT and fourteen more from Barnabas and Hermas, while *α* has at least five. The following list is perhaps sufficiently complete. Mt 2² ἀστέραν *κ** (for *ἀ. ἐν*), 2¹⁰ ἀστέραν *κ**C, 5³⁶ τρίχαν *κ**EL etc., 9¹⁸ χεῖραν L, 12⁴⁹ χεῖραν *κ**—so far of course *α* *hiat.* Mt 27²⁸ χλαμύδαν D, Mk 1⁴¹ χεῖραν Δ*, 6²⁷ σπεκοδάτοραν D*, 7³⁰ θυγατέραν D, 7⁸³ χεῖραν D, Jn 6⁵⁴ σάρκαν D, 20²⁵ χεῖραν *κ**AB, Ac 6⁶ Ἀντιοχείαν C, 14¹² Δίαν DE *al.*, 16⁸ Τρωάδαν 61, 17⁶ Ἰάσωναν D*, 21⁷ Προλεμαῖδαν *κ**, 22²³ ἀέραν *κ*, 1 Pet 5⁶ χεῖραν *κ*A, Heb 8⁶ δειχθένταν DE (10²¹ ἱερέαν L—but here there is -*ā* final, which brings the case near to those in § 58 (d) below), Rev 6⁹ and 9⁴ σφραγίδαν *κ* and *α* cursive or two, 12¹⁸ ἄρσεναν *α*, 13¹⁴ εἰκόναν *α*, 22² μῆναν *α*. On the case as it affects the NT, WH (*App.*² 164) pronounce generally that the *ν* is

¹ Δήμετραν is printed in the Teubner text of Plato *Cratylus* 404b, but silently emended in the Oxford text: its MS attestation can hardly be regarded as evidence here.

due to transcribers, both where added to -*ā* and in the contracted stems (p. 139). They are influenced by "the irregularity and apparent capriciousness of its occurrence," the generally scanty witness and especially "its extreme rarity in B." To this we may add the curious fact that it appears most often (except for Rev) in the writings where the Greek is good, while the papyri show it characteristically in documents of low culture. In later periods of the Κοινή the levelling process brought the final -*ν* everywhere into the acc. sing. in popular speech, to disappear again impartially except in certain dialects and under certain *sandhi* conditions. Thus in MGr we find τὴν πίστιν, τὴ μέρα, τὴν ἐρπίδα (πίστιν, ἡμέραν, ἐλπίδα): see Thumb *Hdb.* § 34.

(4) Acc. pl. m.f. in -*es*, encouraged by the identity of nom. and acc. in such flexions as πόλις, γραμματεὺς, πῆχυς, is fairly common in papyri of early and later periods. It was probably started by τέσσαρες, which in LXX and papyri is far the commonest instance (Thackeray 148): in some kinds of writing it outnumbers τέσσαρας; see *Prol.* 243 f., also 36, where it is noted that there is good uncial authority for -*es* in every NT occurrence of the accus. That δύο, τρεῖς, πέντε κτλ. have no separate accus. form is enough to account for this form. Apart from this there are no NT exx.

(1) Guttural Stems.

Ἄλωπεκ- (ῆ) *fox*, pl. ἀλώπεκες, has nom. sing. ἀλώπηξ. For gender see under SYNTAX (Vol. III).

Γυναικ- (ῆ) *woman* makes voc. γύναι (with final κ dropped), and takes for nom. sing. an old 1st decl. stem. γυνή (cf. Gothic *quīnō*). Its accent follows the monosyllables—γυναῖκα, γυναικός, etc.

Θριχ- (ῆ) *hair* is affected by the law which forbids successive aspirates: ¹N. θρίξ, A. τρίχα(ν) (see above) D.Pl. θριξί(ν) etc.

Κηρῦκ- (ὀ) *herald*, like Φοινῖκ- (ὀ) *Phoenician* Φηλικ- (ὀ) *Felix* and χουῖκ- (ῆ) *quart*, is variously accented in nom. sing. κῆρυξ (WH) and κήρυξ (Ti) according as we accept or reject express statements of ancient grammarians: see § 29, and especially K.Bl. i. 420.

Ὅρνιχ- (ῆ) *hen*, nom. sing. ὄρνιξ Lk 13³⁴ κD. ὄρνις (q.v.) is the reading of WH, but the rarer form has a strong claim.

Ὅρνιξι occurs six times in P Lond 131 (i/A.D.) (=i. 109-88). It was mentioned *Prol.* 45. An element drawn from Doric, it was probably

[¹ Aspirat-d tenues lost the aspirate in primitive Greek when the next syllable or next but one also began with an aspirate. Brugmann *Gr.* 4 122.—Ed.]

dialectic in the *Κοινή*, just as its descendant *δρνίχ* is local (Cappadocian) to-day. Photius (*ap. Ti*) says it was also used by the Ionians, with the oblique cases. This suits its modern survival very well. Crönert's instances of it (p. 174 n.) should be observed.

(2) *Labial Stems.*

Four nouns in π - and one in β - occur in NT. The nom. of course is in $-\psi$: there is nothing irregular or noteworthy.

(3) *Dental Stems.*

(a) Very many nouns make stem in $-\delta$. Those in $-\acute{\alpha}\delta\omicron\varsigma$ gen. $-\acute{\alpha}\delta\omicron\varsigma$, $-\acute{\iota}\delta\omicron\varsigma$ gen. $-\acute{\iota}\delta\omicron\varsigma$, $-\acute{\upsilon}\delta\omicron\varsigma$ gen. $-\acute{\upsilon}\delta\omicron\varsigma$, keep the accent on this syllable throughout. In *σφραγιῖδ-* (*ἡ*) *seal* the $\acute{\iota}$ makes all oblique cases (exc. gen. pl.) and the nom. pl. properispomenon (*σφραγιῖδα* etc.).

Συγγενιδ- (*ἡ*) *kinswoman*, nom. *συγγενίς*, serves as a Hellenistic fem. for *συγγενής*. By earlier rule only nouns in $-\tau\eta\varsigma$ cf. (*προφήτις*, *πρεσβύτες*) and $-\acute{\epsilon}\upsilon\varsigma$ could form such fem. If the rule is to be maintained for later Greek, we might observe that *συγγενής* has sundry forms from the $-\acute{\epsilon}\upsilon\varsigma$ flexion (see § 59 (3)).

Ποδ- (*ὁ*) *foot* keeps its irregular nom. *πούς*: the rest is normal.

(b) Barytones in $-\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ (gen. $-\acute{\iota}\tau\omicron\varsigma$ and $-\acute{\iota}\delta\omicron\varsigma$), being brought by their accent into association with the $-\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\iota}$ stems (§ 59 (1)) had in earlier Greek acc. sing. in $-\acute{\iota}\nu$. So in NT *προφήτιν* from *προφήτιδ-* (*ἡ*) *prophetess*. More or less stem-mixture appears in the following:—

Ἐριδ- (*ἡ*) *strife*. Acc. sing. *ἔριν* only, but also in pl. we find all the versions (exc. Eth.) supporting *ἔρεις* in Tit 3⁹ (so \aleph^o AC). WH reject it with \aleph^o D*G, one singular being easily assimilated to the plurals around. Where *ἔρεις* nom. pl. occurs, there is always a variant *ἔρις*, and we cannot feel any confidence in it. WH place it in margin "with hesitation" at Gal 5²⁰. But when $\acute{\epsilon}$ and $\acute{\iota}$ were identical in pronunciation it is unlikely that such a new form would oust the regular *ἔριδες* (1 Co 1¹¹—no *v.l.*), and produce a needless ambiguity.

Κλειδ- (*ἡ*) *key* was not originally a δ -stem: cf. Lat. *clāvis*—the gen. *κλη(ρ)ίδος* is however as old as Homer. It kept in Attic its proper acc. *κλείν*, pl. *κλείς* (K. Bl. i. 461): so in NT Rev 3⁷ 20¹ and 1¹⁶ respectively, without serious variant, also Lk 11⁵² D, Mt 16¹⁹ \aleph^o B²CD *al.* The LXX forms *κλείδα κλείδας* (Thackeray 150) stand in Mt 16¹⁹ \aleph^o B*L, Lk 11⁵² (exc D), and are introduced in cursives (exc Mt *l.c.*): *κλείδα* is expressly

said by Moeris to be Hellenistic, and it is also banned by Phrynichus, Thomas and the Antiatticists. But it is odd that Attic κλείν and κλείδα should appear as well as κλείδα -as in the papyri,¹ and odder still to find the author of Rev. among the Atticists, with the other NT writers using correct Hellenistic!

Νησιδ- (ὀ or ῆ) *fasting*, which strictly should be called an adj., shows in classical Greek the alternative stems νησι- and νησει-. Since the -i- stems are obsolete in Hellenistic, we may safely reject νήσις as nom. sing. in Dn 6¹⁸ or as acc. pl. in Mt 15⁸² Mk 8⁸: it is only Itacism for νήσις in the latter and νήσις in the LXX of Dn *loc.* The stem then may perhaps be set down best as νησει-; but Phrynichus (Lobeck 326) seems to imply that the Hellenistic word was νήσις: cf. *Syll.* 805⁹ (? i/A.D.), and the medical papyrus P Oxy viii. 1088⁴⁴ (early i/A.D.). Was the word heteroclitc, with 1st decl. forms in the sing. ? See WH *App.*³ 164.

Χαριτ- (ῆ) *grace* keeps Attic acc. χάριν some forty times, but has χάριτα Ac 24²⁷ N*ABC, 25⁹ A, Jude⁴ AB, which according to Moeris 213 was Hellenistic. It is well supported in the vernacular of the imperial age: see CR xv. 35; Thackeray 160; Mayser 271 f. and *ref.* there.

(c) Stems in -τ are mainly accounted for by the large class of neuters in -ματ-, and by the fem. abstracts in -τητ-. In the former the stem in -μη- has been extended by fusion with words in -μητο-. There is a small class of neuters in which hystero-genous -τ- forms have from an early period ousted more original ones from -ασ- base (see § 58 (3)): so κέρασ *horn*, τὰ κέρατα, πέρασ *end*, τὰ πέρατα, τέρας *marvel*, τὰ τέρατα. The types coincide in D. plur. τέρασιν. Cf. Meisterhans³ 143.

*Άλας (ρό) *salt*, gen. άλτος, has largely driven out the older ἄλας (δ). In Ptolemaic papyri and LXX ἄλας predominates (Mayser 286, Thackeray 152); but ἄλας is certain in 2 Esd 7²² Sir 39²⁶.² In NT ἄλας disappears, except for ἀλί Mk 9⁴⁹ D (from LXX) and ἄλα Mk 9⁵⁰ acc. But this last may belong to the variant nom. ἄλα (Lk 14³⁴ *bis* N*D, Mt 5¹⁸ N*bis* DW*bis*, Mk 9⁵⁰ L*Δbis* N**semel*), which appears also in Sir 39²⁶ NBC (ἄλας A). In Lev 2¹³ we find ἄλα and ἄλας in the same verse translating the same Hebrew,³ which starts a possible hint for the genesis of these forms. In 14 LXX occurrences of ἄλα and ἄλας accus. the article is absent, and there is nothing to show gender or number, if it were not for

¹ Mayser 272, CR xv. 35—add P Oxy iii. 502²⁴ (A.D. 164) θύρας καὶ κλείς.

² In a letter dated Jan. 10, 1911, Mr. Thackeray agrees with this statement, and adds that he would now regard "the other *exx.* of ἄλας (and perhaps ἄλα)" as "probably neuters. The only indubitable cases of the plural are in the local plural phrases ἡ θάλασσα (κοιλίς, φάραγξ) τῶν ἀλῶν. This looks as if the plur. was the regular form for salt-areas (salt-marshes etc.) in which the individual lumps or particles were widely distributed."

³ There are variants both ways, but not in the major MSS: see the Cambridge LXX *in loc.*

17 places where *ἀλός*, *ἀλί* and *ἀλῶν* appear. Very possibly the new noun arose from these ambiguous forms: it may have been encouraged by the formal similarity of two other food-names naturally associated with it, *γάλα* and *μέλι*, which were both neuter. According to ancient grammarians (K.Bl. i. 456) *γάλα* as well as *μέλι* had a gen. formed by simply adding *-τος*, which may have helped the new flexion. The old *ἀλός* can be cited as late as iii/A.D., in P Lond 1170 vs. 124 (= iii. p. 196): cf. WS 90 n.

Γαλακτ- (τό) *milk* has acc. *γάλα*, gen. *γάλακτος*. This and *νυκτ-* (ή) *night*, nom. *νύξ*, are the only stems in which *τ* follows a mute.

Γελωτ- (ό) *laughter* only occurs in nom. *γέλως*, as does *ιδρωτ-* (ό) *sweat*, nom. *ιδρώς*. For earlier flexion see K.Bl. i. 516 and 509 f.

Ἐσθητ- (ή) *clothing* has acc. *ἔσθητα* etc., but a heteroclitite dat. pl. *ἔσθήσεσι* in Lk 24⁴ (all exc. NBD, which have *ἔσθητι*), Ac 1¹⁰ NABC: Deissmann supports this with BGU i. 16¹² (159 A.D., as amended, p. 395), and Crönert (p. 173) adds several citations from MSS of *Κοινή* writers.

Φωτ- (τό) *light* has nom. acc. *φῶς*, and *χρωτ-* (ό) *skin*, gen. *χρωτός*, nom. *χρώς*. Both have considerable variation of stem in the earlier Greek: see K.Bl. i. 436, 511. *φῶς* is accented like *παίς*.

(d) The following neuter nouns with *-τ-* in oblique cases and plural have a divergent nom. acc. sing.:—

Γονατ- *knee* (i.e. *γονφ-αρ-*) has nom. *γόνυ*, a *-ῦ*-stem, which was declined throughout in early Greek.

Ἔστ-εωτ has in papyri of iii/ and ii/B.C. a nom. acc. *ἔς*, levelled from *οὔς* by the influence of *ᾠ-α*, *ὠσίν* etc. (Mayser 5). It is not found in NT.

Two remain of the very ancient declension which had *-ρ* in nom. acc. sing. and *-ατος* (= *-η-τος*) in gen.:—

Ἵδατ- *water* has nom. acc. *ἕδωρ*: the whole flexion occurs in NT.

Φρεᾶτ- (for *φρηᾶτ-*) *well*, nom. acc. *φρέαρ*, gen. *φρέατος*. It is rarely contracted (*φρήτος*) in the vernacular.

(e) One *-θ-* stem survives, *ὀρνιθ-*, which has specialised its meaning just as our *fowl* has. *ὄρνεον* or *πετεινόν* replace it in the wider sense *bird*. It only occurs once, Mt 23³⁷ *ὄρνις* nom.: the parallel passage in Lk 13³⁴ has probably (see (1) above) the dialectic variant *ὀρνίξ*.

In ABLR *al* the reading is assimilated to Mt. If WH are right in calling *ὀρνίξ* "Western," we have a small point which might go towards locating this type of text in Asia Minor, with Egypt (on the papyrus evidence) as an alternative. More probably *ὄρνις* is Mt's form and *ὀρνίξ* that of Luke, who has again refrained it would seem from altering an "incorrect" form of Q. But possibilities are many and evidence ambiguous, so that we must be cautious in inferences.

(4) *Stems in -ντ-*.

These form a special class, because of the phonetic results of the addition of *-σ-* suffixes: there is also the double type in nom. sing. from stems in *-οντ-*, which admits of more than one explanation—see Brugmann-Thumb *Gr.* 257.

	ἀρχοντ- (ὁ) ruler.	ὀδοντ- (ὁ) tooth.	ἱμαντ- (ὁ) strap.
<i>Sing. N.</i>	ἄρχων	ὀδούς	ἱμάς
<i>A.</i>	ἄρχοντα	ὀδόντα	ἱμάντα
<i>G.</i>	ἄρχοντος	ὀδόντος	ἱμάντος
<i>D.</i>	ἄρχοντι	ὀδόντι	ἱμάντι
<i>Plur. N.</i>	ἄρχοντες	ὀδόντες	ἱμάντες
<i>A.</i>	ἄρχοντας	ὀδόντας	ἱμάντας
<i>G.</i>	ἀρχόντων	ὀδόντων	ἱμάντων
<i>D.</i>	ἀρχουσι(ν)	ὀδοῦσι(ν)	ἱμᾶσι(ν)

There are no separate Vocatives. Under Adjectives and Participles will be found types of Neuters, and of stems in *-εντ-*, *-ωντ-* and *-ουντ-*. The flexion of the noun types *ὀδούς* and *ἱμάς* is incomplete in NT, but adjectives and participles justify their being printed as if complete.

Latin nouns in *-ent-* made nom. in *-ης* (Lat *-ens*): Κρήσκης = *Crescens* and Πούδης = *Pudens* (nom.), Κλήμεντος (gen.) = *Clementis* (K.Bl. i. 421).

B. Nasal Stems.

§ 56. In Greek these all end in *-ν*, through the influence of a final *μ* becoming *-ν* in nom. sing. by phonetic rule: thus the very few *μ-* stems (as *χιών*, *χθών*, *εἶς*) were assimilated.

1. Stems with Strong Flexion.

	ποιμεν- (ὁ) shepherd.	ἡγεμον- (ὁ) leader.	κυν- (ὁ) dog.
<i>Sing. N.</i>	ποιμήν	ἡγεμών	κύων
<i>A.</i>	ποιμένα	ἡγεμόνα	κύνα
<i>G.</i>	ποιμένος	ἡγεμόνος	κυνός
<i>D.</i>	ποιμένι	ἡγεμόνι	κυνί
<i>Plur. N.</i>	ποιμένες	ἡγεμόνες	κύνες
<i>A.</i>	ποιμένας	ἡγεμόνας	κύνας
<i>G.</i>	ποιμένων	ἡγεμόνων	κυνῶν
<i>D.</i>	ποιμέσι(ν)	ἡγεμόσι(ν)	κυσί(ν)

There are no Vocatives surviving here (classical in barytone words, as *δαίμων*, *κύων*). The voc. *ἄφρων* is presented in the

old form ἄφρον in Lk 12²⁰ KMSUVII etc., 1 Co 15³⁶ KL etc. : there can be no doubt that the better MSS spell here according to Hellenistic use.

(a) Κύων lost from the earliest times in Greek its *middle stem* in the acc. sing. and nom. pl., where historically it was in place. It is the only *ν*-stem surviving in NT which preserves the *weak stem*, except the isolated ἄρνας (acc. pl.) Lk 10⁸, which comes from the long obsolete nom. sing. Φαρήν (found only in two or three ancient inscriptions). In NT *lamb* is ἀμνός (= Lat. *agnus*—generally, as in classical Greek, in nom. sing.) or the derivative ἀρνίον : ἄρνα, ἀρνός etc. are common in LXX, but rare in papyri (Mayser 284). Dat. ἄρνασι occurs in literary Κοινή.

(b) The effects of strong flexion are seen, not only in the lengthened vowel of nom. sing., but in dat. pl., where the addition of -σι(ν) to the middle stem would have produced -εισι(ν), -ουσι(ν). The *weak stem* leaves its traces here, -άσι(ν) (= -η -σι) being assimilated in its vowel to the rest of the flexion.

(c) About a dozen nouns in NT are declined on these models, and a good many adjectives (like ἡγεμών). One or two late uncials in Lk 14¹³ 15⁶ spell γείτονας with ω.

2. Stems without Strong Flexion.

	Ἑλλην- (ὁ) <i>Greek</i> .	αἰων- (ὁ) <i>age</i> .	ὠδίν- (ἡ) <i>throa</i> .
<i>Sing. N.</i>	*Ἑλλην	αἰών	ὠδίν
A.	*Ἑλληνα	αἰῶνα	ὠδίνα
G.	*Ἑλληνος	αἰῶνος	ὠδίνος
D.	*Ἑλληνι	αἰῶνι	ὠδίτι
<i>Plur. N.</i>	*Ἑλληνες	αἰῶνες	ὠδίνες
A.	*Ἑλληνας	αἰῶνας	ὠδίνας
G.	Ἑλλήνων	αἰῶνων	ὠδίωνων
D.	*Ἑλλησι(ν)	αἰῶσι(ν)	ὠδίσι(ν)

There are no separate Vocatives here, either in classical or in Hellenistic Greek.

(a) One divergence here must be noted, the levelling of the old nom. ὠδίς *et sim.* to ὠδίν, so as to agree with the rest of the flexion. It is normal in Hellenistic (cf. Mayser 285, Thackeray 151), and is even found in Lucian (δελφίδιν, K.Bl. i. 415—as voc.), which strikingly shows how the old -ίς had faded out of even literary memory. (W and WS wrongly compare κλειδίον from a late writer : it is of course only the vernacular form of κλειδίον.)

(b) Two nouns in -ων are declined on the above model :—Μεγιστῶν- (ὁ) *magnate* (only plural)—nom. -ῶνες, dat. -ῶσι(ν). Μελᾶν- (τό) *ink* (only sing.)—gen. μέλανος, dat. μέλανι. It is the neuter of μέλας, μέλαινα, μέλαν *black* (see § 65 (3) a, p. 160).

(c) *Μην-* (δ) *month* has without variant the Attic nom. *μήν*, not the older *μείς*. Cases accented regularly, *μήνα*, *μηρί*, *μήνας*.

(d) Besides those already mentioned, there are fifteen nouns in NT declined like *αἰών*, together with the name *Σαλαμίν-* (ή), like *ὄδιν* (*Σαλαμίνι* dat.—for a heteroclitite variant see above, § 54 B (d)). The inferior uncials and D would add *μυλώνι* at Mt 24⁴¹. It is worth noting that foreign words (*ἀρ(ρ)αβών*, *λεγιών*, *κεντυρίων*, *χιτών*) and late formations make up the bulk of the list, in which *ἀγών*, *αἰών* (whose ancient locative *αἰέν* *esse* attests original strong flexion), *κλύδων* (*μυλών*), *χειμών*, *χιτών* are the only ones that claim classical antiquity. This is due of course to the fact that a simple flexion like this was naturally adopted for new words.

(e) Inferior uncials sometimes spell with *ο* for *ω* oblique cases of *ἀπρέμων*, *ἀφεδρών*, *κλύδων*.

C. Liquid Stems.

§ 57. **Als*, the only word with stem in *λ*, has been dealt with above (p. 132), so that we are exclusively concerned with stems in *ρ*, which are very numerous. In this class occur the most considerable survivals of vowel-gradation in the stem, especially in the old relationship-nouns.

(1) Nouns with Strong Flexion.

	<i>πατερ-</i> (δ) <i>father.</i>	<i>μητερ-</i> (ή) <i>mother.</i>	<i>θυγατερ-</i> (ή) <i>daughter.</i>	<i>ἀνερ-</i> (δ) <i>man.</i>
<i>Sing. N.</i>	<i>πατήρ</i>	<i>μήτηρ</i>	<i>θυγάτηρ</i>	<i>ἀνήρ</i>
<i>V.</i>	<i>πάτερ</i>		<i>θύγατερ</i>	<i>ἄνερ</i>
<i>A.</i>	<i>πατέρα</i>	<i>μητέρα</i>	<i>θυγατέρα</i>	<i>ἄνδρα</i>
<i>G.</i>	<i>πατρός</i>	<i>μητρός</i>	<i>θυγατρός</i>	<i>ἀνδρός</i>
<i>D.</i>	<i>πατρί</i>	<i>μητρί</i>	<i>θυγατρί</i>	<i>ἀνδρί</i>
<i>Plur. N. V.</i>	<i>πατέρες</i>	<i>μητέρες</i>	<i>θυγατέρες</i>	<i>ἄνδρες</i>
<i>A.</i>	<i>πατέρας</i>	<i>μητέρας</i>	<i>θυγατέρας</i>	<i>ἄνδρας</i>
<i>G.</i>	<i>πατέρων</i>	<i>μητέρων</i>	<i>θυγατέρων</i>	<i>ἀνδρών</i>
<i>D.</i>	<i>πατέρασι(ν)</i>	<i>μητέρασι(ν)</i>	<i>θυγατέρασι(ν)</i>	<i>ἀνδράσι(ν)</i>

In the vocative *μητερ* is not given, as it is rather unsafe to assume a vocative that does not actually occur. Thus in BGU iii. 846¹⁰ (ii/A.D.) (= Milligan no. 37) we have *μήτηρ* as voc. in an illiterate letter. *Πατήρ* and *θυγάτηρ* as vocatives appear three times each in the Synoptic Gospels in the best MSS (four times in Jn): there does not seem adequate reason (with WH) to accentuate this *πάτηρ* (*App.*³ 165), as it is simply a nom. used as voc. (cf. *υἱός* above, § 52).

Strong flexion originally required the lengthened stem in nom. sing., the middle in acc. and locative (here = dat.) sing.

and nom. plur., and the weak elsewhere. It will be seen that when we put the four nouns together these conditions appear in one or other of them throughout, except in dat. sing., where earlier Greek could use the middle stem (*μητέρι, ἀνέρι*). The weak stem *ἀνδρ-* has a transition sound *δ* between *n* and *r* (cf. our *thunder*). The *-ᾱ-* in dat. pl. represents vocalic *ῥ*.

Γαστερ- (*ή*) (*belly, womb*), is declined and accented like *πατήρ* but shows only dat. sg. *γαστρί* (and nom. pl. *γαστέρες* = *gluttons* in a quotation from Epimenides (vi/B.C.) at Tit 1¹²).

Ἄστερ- (*δ*) *star* might historically be placed here, though it has levelled away its gen. and dat. sing. into *ἀστέρος, ἀστέρι*, for its dat. pl. was *ἀστράσι(ν)*. But although this occurs in late writers, it cannot be shown to survive in the vernacular. In NT, where the whole flexion occurs except dat. sing. and pl., it is perhaps significant that *ἀστροῖς* appears in Lk 21²⁵, where *ἀστράσιον* would have served equally well. Crönert 173 quotes *ἀστήρσι* and *ἀστέροις* as MS readings in Geminus, a writer of i/A.D.

(2) Stems with partial Strong Flexion or none.

	<i>ῥήτορ-</i> (<i>δ</i>) <i>orator.</i>	<i>σωτηρ-</i> (<i>δ</i>) <i>saviour.</i>	<i>χειρ-</i> (<i>ή</i>) <i>hand.</i>	<i>μαρτυρ</i> (<i>δ</i>) <i>witness.</i>
<i>Sing. N.</i>	<i>ῥήτωρ</i>	<i>σωτήρ</i>	<i>χείρ</i>	<i>μάρτυς</i>
<i>A.</i>	<i>ῥήτορα</i>	<i>σωτήρα</i>	<i>χείρα</i>	<i>μάρτυρα</i>
<i>G.</i>	<i>ῥήτορος</i>	<i>σωτήρος</i>	<i>χειρός</i>	<i>μάρτυρος</i>
<i>D.</i>	<i>ῥήτορι</i>	<i>σωτήρι</i>	<i>χειρί</i>	<i>μάρτυρι</i>
<i>Plur. N.</i>	<i>ῥήτορες</i>	<i>σωτήρες</i>	<i>χείρες</i>	<i>μάρτυρες</i>
<i>A.</i>	<i>ῥήτορας</i>	<i>σωτήρας</i>	<i>χείρας</i>	<i>μάρτυρας</i>
<i>G.</i>	<i>ῥητόρων</i>	<i>σωτήρων</i>	<i>χειρῶν</i>	<i>μαρτύρων</i>
<i>D.</i>	<i>ῥήτορσι(ν)</i>	<i>σωτήρσι(ν)</i>	<i>χερσί(ν)</i>	<i>μάρτυσι(ν)</i>

No Vocatives are found.

(a) The classical type *ῥήτορ* is pointedly set aside in the recurrent LXX *κύριε παντοκράτωρ*; nor is the old *σῶτερ* (abnormal in a word with *-τήρ -τήρος*) traceable in LXX or NT.

(b) Papyri and inscriptions guarantee datives like *Φιλομήτορσι, Σωτήρσι*, and the gen. *σωτήρων*, which do not occur in NT.

(c) Two nouns in *-ήρ -έρος* may be declined after *ῥήτωρ mutatis mutandis*, but with no warrant for a dat. pl. (*φράτερσι* occurs in Attic). *Ἄερ-* (*δ*) *air* has nom. *ἀήρ*, acc. *ἀέρα*, gen. *ἀέρος*. For *ἀστήρ* see above, C (1).

(d) The real stem of *χείρ* is *χερσ-*, whence *χειρός* and *χεροί* came phonetically, the nom. being made up afresh from oblique cases (G. Meyer³ 414).

(e) Like *μαρτυρ-* (sing. only) is *πῦρ-* (*τό*) *fire*, with nom. acc. *πῦρ*, gen. *πυρός*, dat. *πυρί*. The nom. *μάρτυρ* occurs eight times in NT, with no sign of *μαρτυρ*: for the loss of *ρ* see Brugmann *Grundr.*² I. 435.

(f) There are five nouns in NT (one only in nom. sing.) with decl. after *σωτήρ*, and eight or nine after *ῥήτωρ*. The two in *-ῆρ* *-ερος* may be added, and a compound each of *χείρ* and *μάρτυρ*. On *κατήγωρ* see above, § 54 B (c).

D. Stems in *-σ-*.

§ 58. Since original *σ* disappeared in Greek between vowels, there are contractions of concurrent vowels in these stems everywhere except in nom. (acc. neut.) sing. and dat. pl. This class is in Hellenistic practically confined to one type, neuters in *-ος*, which in oblique cases show vowel-gradation (*-εσ-*).

(1) Stems in *-ος*: *-εσ-*.

<i>ἔθνεσ</i> (<i>τό</i>) <i>nation</i> .	<i>συγγενεσ-</i> (<i>ὁ</i>) <i>kinsman</i> .
<i>Sing. N.</i> <i>ἔθνος</i>	<i>συγγενής</i>
<i>A.</i> <i>ἔθνος</i>	<i>συγγενῆ</i> (= <i>-ε(σ)α</i>)
<i>G.</i> <i>ἔθνους</i> (= <i>-ε(σ)ος</i>)	<i>συγγενοῦς</i>
<i>D.</i> <i>ἔθνει</i> (= <i>-εσ-ι</i>)	<i>συγγενεῖ</i>
<i>Plur. N.</i> <i>ἔθνη</i> (= <i>-εσ-α</i>)	<i>συγγενεῖς</i> (= <i>-εσ-ες</i>)
<i>A.</i> <i>ἔθνη</i>	<i>συγγενεῖς</i>
<i>G.</i> <i>ἔθνων</i> (= <i>-εσ -ων</i>)	<i>συγγενῶν</i>
<i>D.</i> <i>ἔθνεσι(ν)</i> (= <i>-εσ-σι</i>)	<i>συγγενέσι(ν)</i>

(a) *Συγγενής* was properly an adjective: its flexion as such is given as a model below, p. 162. Note another dat. pl. of this word, *συγγενεῶσιν* Mk 6⁴ B*LΔ *al.*⁶ 33 1 etc. (13) etc. *al.*² (*-έσιν* NACD*W *al.*), Lk 2⁴⁴ LWXΔΔ 1 etc. 13 etc. 33 *al.*¹⁰ (*-έσιν* NABCD *al.*). Cf. 1 Mac 10²⁹. The MSS which give this form in Lk (where all the great uncials have the normal form) have evidently been influenced by Mk, whose use of this vernacular heteroclis is characteristic: since the passages are not parallel, Luke has not his common motive for using a popular form. The plurals of nouns in *-ής* and *-εύς* coincided in Hellenistic in nom. and acc., and the sing. in dat.; while fluctuating usage in contraction would bring together acc. sing. and gen. pl. as well. In this case the plural of *γορεύς* would be the principal force. For other exx. of *συγγενεῶσι*, also *συγγενῶν*, *συγγενέας* and acc. sing. *συγγενεία*, see Thackeray 153 n.³, Crönert 173. WS 89 cites an Atticist's ban as evidence for *συγγενεῶσιν*.

(b) The acc. pl. masc. and fem. is borrowed from the nom. : otherwise *-έας* contracted to *-ῆς* would have been found.

(c) Gen. pl. without contraction appears in *δρέων* Rev 6¹⁵, and *χειλέων* Heb 13¹⁵, apparently with no variants : contracted forms occurring are *ἔθων*, *ἐλκων*, *κτηνῶν*, *μελῶν* (*bis*), *ἔθνων* (43 times), *ἑτῶν* (14 times), and in the adjective formation *ἀσεβῶν* (*ter*), *ἀσθενῶν* (*bis*), *συγγενῶν* (*bis*). The disparity is very great, but in the two words affected the open form seems firmly established : it is always found in LXX (*δρέων* some seventy times, *χειλέων* forty), while *ἔτος* and *σκεῦος* have *-ῶν* but *τεῖχος* usually *-έων* (gen. pl. not in NT) : see Thackeray 151. For outside evidence see CR xv. 435, Mayser 17, 277, Crönert 172, Schweizer 153, Nachmanson 135. It seems clear that the uncontracted form was throughout kept mainly for certain words : *a priori* we should assume that these came into use in the Κοινή especially from districts (Ionic or other) in which the open forms were normal, but it would be hard to prove it. Schweizer himself expresses this as his opinion immediately after citing the evidence which shows that *-ῶν* was normal (even *τειχῶν*) in Pergamum—Ionic territory! Nachmanson's exx. prove the same for Magnesia : we may admit that neither touches *ἄρος* or *χείλος*. The infection did not reach Egypt, where P Tor 13¹⁴ *βλαβείων* (B.C. 137) is the only early example. See Thackeray 144, 151.

(d) The addition of *-ν* in acc. sing. masc. or fem. is distinguished from the case of *-ᾶν* (above, § 55) by the stronger influence of the 1st decl., combined with the strong tendency to add irrational final *ν* after long vowels. With short finals it was much less common. The *-ης* nouns in 1st and 3rd decl. agreed originally in nom. and dat. sing. (*ει* and *η* being identical in Attic, though not in Κοινή); and the dropping of the gen. *-ς* was as easy as the adding of *ν*. Hence even in iv/B.C. proper names of 3rd decl. preferred *-ην* : *Σωσθένην* in Ac 18¹⁷ is Attic. See K.B.I. 512f. But the later extension (*ἀσφαλῆν* etc.) is less obvious than it would seem, for the datives were no longer identical in sound—*η* and *η* alike were *ῆ*, while *ει* was *ῖ* (see § 24). More serious is the difficulty of the accent. If the analogy of Decl. I. was still the operative force, we should naturally write *συγγενήν*, like *κριτήν*; but it is hardly likely that the addition of so fugitive an element—added so recklessly, as we saw (§ 47), to all manner of long vowel endings—should have altered the circumflex to an acute. We may regard it then as a special case of "irrational *-ν*," encouraged largely by the analogy of other accusatives in *-ην* : cf. the raising of the "freak" *ῆν* into something like a regular flexion form by the fact that it coincided with an existing form in the conjugation of *εἶμι*. It is presumably only a coincidence that in Lesbian Aeolic the *-ης* proper nouns took a flexion modelled on 1st decl. (Thumb *Dial.* 262). The occurrences of this *-ῆν* acc. in NT may be summarised thus : *αἰσχροκερδῆν* Tit 1⁷ FG, *ἀσεβῆν* Rom 4⁶ ND*FG, *ἀσφαλῆν* Heb 6¹⁹ ACD*P, *αὐθαδῆν* Tit 1⁷ FG, *μονογενῆν* Jn 3¹⁶ cu³ (including 13-346) Heb 11¹⁷ D*, *ποδῆρην* Rev 1¹³ A cu¹, *συγγενῆν* Rom 16¹¹ AB*D*, *ιγιῆν* Jn 5¹¹ N*W, 7²³ L, Tit 2⁸ G.

(e) The Attic acc. sg. *ὕγιᾶ* occurs in three cursives (incl. 1) at Tit 2⁸.

(2) *Stems in -οσ-*.

One noun, once used, survives from this rare declension.

Αἰδοσ- (ἡ) *modesty*, makes nom. *αἰδώς*, gen. *αἰδοῦς* (= *-οσ-ος*). The type reappears among the adjectives and participles, where it accounts for the forms without *ν* in the *-ίων* comparative, and for some of the perf. partic. act. For these see § 65.

For the similarly declined *ἡχώ* see below, § 59 (6).

(3) *Stems in -ασ-*.

Two nouns show traces of this type, never common; and (as might be expected) levelling has worked even here. But see *Κοινή* instances in Schweizer *Perg.* 156.

Γηρασ- (τό) *old age* occurs in dat. Lk 1³⁶ *γήρει*—so all uncials and many cursives. Papyrus instances of *γήρ-ας-ως* and *-α* are given in *Vocab. s.v. Kaibel* 426 (Christian) has *γήρος* nom.

Γήρει is best taken as a simple assimilation to the *-ος* nouns. But it may be Ionic, for Herod. has *κέρεος κέρει* etc., and Homer *οὔθεος οὔδει* from *οὔδας*. Attic *κρέφας* has gen. *κρέφους*.

Κρεασ- (τό) *flesh* forms *κρέα* in Rom 14²¹, 1 Co 8¹³: the plural is collective. Herodian says the *Κοινή* pronounced *κρέα*, as from Homer down (K.Bl. i. 431). Other nouns of this class have passed into the *-τ-* class: see § 55 (3) *a*.

§ 59. *E. Stems in Semi-vowels.*(1) *Stems in ει : ι and ευ : υ.*

	πόλει (ἡ) <i>city.</i>	σινᾶπει- (τό) <i>mustard.</i>	πηγευ- (ὁ) <i>ell.</i>
<i>Sing. N.</i>	πόλις	σίναπι	πήγυς
<i>A.</i>	πόλιν	σίναπι	πήγυν
<i>G.</i>	πόλεως	σινάπεως	πήγεως or πήγεος
<i>D.</i>	πόλει	σινάπει	πήγει
<i>Plur. N.A.</i>	πόλεις		πήγεις
<i>G.</i>	πόλεων		πήγων (πήγεων)
<i>D.</i>	πόλεσι(ν)		πήγεσι(ν)

Both in form and in accent the flexion of the *πόλις* type presents obvious irregularities, which are however all classical. Nouns in *-teî* (*-σις*, except *πίσις*) form the bulk of this class, which includes also one masculine noun, *ὄφις* *snake*, and a few more feminines. The neuter only occurs in one form, and was never more than sporadic among nouns. The papyri show the nouns *ἄμι*, *σέσελι*, *στίμι*, *κόμμι*, *πέπερι*—all foreign, like *σίναπι* itself. For corresponding forms in *-εμ-* we have mostly to refer to the adjectives. The common noun *πῆχυς* is the only one occurring in NT, and there are hardly any others in Hellenistic: its flexion is guaranteed from other Hellenistic sources. *Ἄστυ* *city*, the only native neuter, was obsolete.

The influence of the commoner *-υ-* nouns is seen in the form *πήχυος* gen. P Oxy ii. 242¹⁵ (A.D. 77). The LXX gen. sing. is *πήχεος* (Thackeray 151), but *πήχεως* (as Attic) appears in BGU iii. 910^{11*} (A.D. 71). In the plural *πηχῶν* is always found in papyri, and has the additional recommendation of being *δεινῶς ἀνάπτικον* for Phrynichus: see Mayser 267. L. is suggestive that in P Flor ii. 262⁸ (ii/A.D.) *πηχεων* has the *ε* erased, The Attic form occurs often in LXX (Thackeray *l.c.*), and in Jn 21⁸ ΔW, Rev 21¹⁷ R.

(2) *Stems in -υ-*.

	σταχυ- (ὄ) <i>ear of corn.</i>	δοφυ- (ῆ) <i>loins.</i>	δάκρυ- (τό) <i>tear.</i>
<i>Sing. N.</i>	στάχυς	δοφύς	(δάκρυ)
<i>A.</i>	στάχυν	δοφύν	(δάκρυν)
<i>G.</i>	στάχυος	δοφύος	(δάκρυνος)
<i>D.</i>	στάχυϊ	δοφύϊ	(δάκρυνϊ)
<i>Plur. N.</i>	στάχυες	δοφύες	δάκρυα
<i>A.</i>	στάχυας	δοφύας	δάκρυα
<i>G.</i>	σταχύων	δοφύων	δακρύων
<i>D.</i>	στάχυσιν(ν)	δοφύσιν(ν)	δάκρυσιν(ν)

Δάκρυ is an isolated word, for which the heteroclitite sing. N.A. *δάκρυον* appears in NT. The sing. certainly was obsolete in the *-υ* form, and in the plur. it is only the dat. (also Attic) that fixes it here.

K.Bl. i. 438 f., 488 follows Herodian in circumflexing sing. N.A. of the oxytone words *ὁ ἰχθύς* *fish*, *ἡ ὄφρυς* *brow* and *ἡ ὄσφυς*. Brugmann *Grd.*² II. i. 137 does the same. Historically the *υ* is long in these

oxytona—cf. Skt. *bhrūis* brow—the dat. pl. being shortened to match the barytones. See also Chandler § 620. Ὁ βότρυς *bunch of grapes*, ἡ ἀχλὺς *mist*, ἡ ἰσχὺς *strength* and ἡ ὄσ *sow* are the only other words in this class. For small traces of the old acc. plur. in -ῶν for *ias* see Thackeray 147; there are no signs of it in NT.

(3) *Stems in -εῦ-*.βασιλευ- (δ) *king*.

<i>Sing. N.</i> βασιλεύς	<i>Plur. N.V.A.</i> βασιλεῖς
<i>V.</i> βασιλεῦ	<i>G.</i> βασιλέων
<i>A.</i> βασιλιᾶ	<i>D.</i> βασιλεῦσι(ν)
<i>G.</i> βασιλέως	
<i>D.</i> βασιλεῖ	

So a dozen common nouns in NT. The flexion is like that of the later Attic, with no sign of the old acc. pl. in -έᾶς. Note that δ ἀλιεύς *fisherman* dissimilates ι to ε before the ῑ sound in plur. ἀλειῖς, as in LXX (Thackeray 84). On heteroclite dat. pl. συγγενεῦσιν from συγγενής see above, § 58 (1). There are no traces of the not uncommon acc. sing. βασιλῆ.

The primitive noun Ζεὺς (*I.E. dyēus*, gen. διγός, with strong flexion) appears in the acc. Δία Ac 14¹² (Δίαν DEHLP²) gen. Διός.

(4) *Stems in -ου-*.βου- (δ) *ox*.

<i>Sing. N.</i> βούς	<i>Plur. N.</i> βόες
<i>A.</i> βούν	<i>A.</i> βόας
<i>G.</i> βόός	<i>G.</i> βούων
<i>D.</i> βού	<i>D.</i> βουσί(ν)

Ὁ νοῦς *mind*, ὁ πλοῦς *voyage*, ὁ χοῦς *dust*, have in Hellenistic transferred themselves to this class from Decl. II.: νοῦς is the only one in NT that has unambiguous forms of this flexion (G.D. sing.). See copious Hellenistic citations in WS 84 n., also Schmid *Attic*. iv. 24, 586.

(5) *Stem in -αῦ-*.

Ἡ ναῦς *ship* has acc. ναῦν in a passage which seems to be a literary reminiscence: cf. *Prol.* 25 f. The word with its medley of irregular forms naturally gave way to πλοῖον in the vernacular.

(6) *Stem in -oi.*

A few nouns, declined in sing. only, followed the norm of *πειθοι-* (*ῆ*) *persuasion*, which still is found in a papyrus of ii/A.D. (P Oxy iii. 474³⁷).

N. *πειθῶ* (or *-ῶ*)

G. *πειθοῦς* (= *-όιος*)

A. *πειθῶ* (= *-όια*: accent irreg.)

D. *πειθοῖ* (= *-όιμ*)

See K.B.L. i. 453 f. The flexion concerns us if we regard *ἦχους* in Lk 21²⁶ as *ἦχοῦς* from *ἦχώ sound*: so WH. See above, §§ 54, 58 (2). In 1 Co 2⁴ *πειθοῖ* is an extremely probable reading, involving only the dropping of *c* before another *c*, and the acceptance of the reading of FG omitting *λόγοις*. *Πειθοῖ* was read by the old Latin and the Sahidic and Peshitta: the adj. *π(ε)ιθός* cannot be proved to have existed at all. See § 35 (p. 78).

DECLENSION OF SEMITIC NAMES.

§ 60. The Greek Bible presents a very obvious contrast to writers like Josephus¹ in its treatment of Semitic names, which are very largely left indeclinable. Thackeray (*Gr.* 160) gives as the general rule for the LXX that

Names which in the Hebrew end in a consonant remain unaltered (*Ἀδάμ, Ἀβραάμ, Δαυείδ, Ἰσραήλ, Ἰωσήφ* etc.), while those which end in a vowel, especially in *יָ*, are in most cases declined like nouns of the first declension, the feminines requiring no addition in the nominative, the masculines taking on the termination *-ίας* and being declined like *Νεκίας*. Names ending in other vowels are either Hellenised by the addition of *ς* and form a new class of first declension names in *-ᾶς, -ῆς, -οῦς* etc. (*Ἰωνᾶς, Μωυσῆς, Ἰησοῦς* etc.), or remain indeclinable (*Ἡλείου*).

Since these rules may be transferred to the NT with little modification, it will be convenient to follow Thackeray's paragraphs and apply them successively.

A. Personal Names.

(1) *Indeclinables*.—The extent to which the use of indeclinable forms prevails is well seen in the genealogies of Mt 1 and Lk 3. In the former there are 46 names (42 men and 4 women), of which *Ἰούδας, Σολομών,*

¹ The contrast may be well seen in WS 91, where the Graecised proper names of Josephus and others are quoted in abundance. I have not thought it worth while to repeat them here.

Ούρίας, Ὀσείας, Ἐζεκίας, Μανασσῆς, Ἰωσειάς, Ἰεχονίας and Ἰησοῦς are declined: it is curious that Ἀβιδ (N.A.G.) is not treated like other names in πῑ, but the LXX (Ἀβιού in Kings, Ἀβιδ in Chr) does the same. Of the 75 names in Lk 3²³² none can be taken with perfect certainty out of the indeclinable category, though indecl. Ματθαίου (vv. 25, 26) has no LXX authority, and Ἰησοῦ and Ἰούδα bis are presumably also from nom. in -as. Δεσεί bis probably is as elsewhere from Δεσείς, but there is no strong reason for assigning to the Mixed Decl. (see (6) below) the other names with vowel endings. A summary may be added of Semitic names in NT (incl. Ἀκελδαμάχ, Βοανηργές, γέννεα, μωμωνᾶς, Σαβαώθ and χερουβείν) as in WH text:—

Ending in . .	a.	β.	γ.	δ.	ε.	η.	θ.	ι.	κ.	λ.	μ.	ν.	ρ.	ς.	τ.	υ.	φ.	χ.	ω.	
Persons, etc.	Decl. . .	10	1	1	..	57	= 69
	Indecl.	12	4	2	6	4	..	5	9	6	20	20	19	14	7	5	2	2	6	1
Places.	Decl. . .	15	2	3	..	3	= 23
	Indecl.	8	1	..	1	9	8	2	1	2	1

To these should be added 28 gentile names and the like derived from Semitic words: see (16).

(2) *Declension II.*—A few names have been Graecised in this way, viz. *(†) Ἀγαθος, Ἀλφάιος, * Βαρθολομαῖος, Βαρτίμαιος, * Ἐλισαῖος, † Ζακχαῖος, * Ζεβεδαῖος, Θαδδαῖος, † Ἰάειρος, * Ἰάκωβός (not the patriarch, nor the person named in Mt 1¹⁸²), Δάζαρος, Λεβθαῖος (in δ-text, perhaps a duplicate of Δεσείς), Μαθθαῖος, Μάλχος, * Σαῦλος (against Σαούλ as name of the king, and in a direct citation of Aramaic). Those marked * are names which are only indeclinable in LXX; in those with † the NT form is anticipated in LXX, with or without alternative. It should be added that Ἰάκουβος occurs once in LXX text (1 Es 9⁴⁸ A). We find Δανιήλου in Mt 24¹⁵ D, Γαμαλιήλου Ac 22⁸ B. (I have excluded Τιμαῖος above on the same principle as Σίμων in (7) below, q.v.: Βαρτίμαιος is counted.)

(3) *Feminines in Decl. I.*—Here we have Ἄννα (nom. only), Εὔα, Ἰωάννα (nom.), Μάρθα, Μαρία, Ῥεβέκκα (nom.), Σάρρα, Σουσάννα (nom.), also Σαλώμη. As in LXX the gen. and dat. are always -as -a: so Μάρθας Jn 11¹, as well as Μαρίας and Σάρρας.¹ The variations in the name Μαρία are complex. In the gen. Μαρίας stands “virtually without variation” (WH) for all the women so named; and “Mary of Clopas is always Μαρία (nom.⁸), as is (acc.¹) Paul’s helper (Rom 16⁶),” where, however, ND, read Μαριάμ. The mother of Jesus WH always give as Μαριάμ (nom., voc., acc., dat.), except in Mt 1²⁰ (BL p¹ 1), Lk 2¹⁹ (N*BDR); but even here NCDWω and ALWω could be quoted if we preferred to

¹ WS 92 quotes K. Bl. i. 381, where it is observed that names in Attic of foreign origin often keep -ā throughout. Cf. Αὔδδας in (10) below; also Ταμύσθης gen. in BGU iii. 883^b (ii/A.D.).

make the rule absolute. The name appears thus, except in the genitive, "usually without important variation." They make the same rule for Mary of Bethany, though here they are content once with 33 as sole authority. The perpetual variation of the uncials, even in a continuous narrative like Jn 11, is inexplicable. Thus for *Μαριάμ* nom. in Jn 11²⁰ there is nothing but 33, in ⁸² we have BC*EL 33; for it is as acc. the range is less remarkable. Again in Lk 10³⁹ *Μαριάμ* nom. is in NCLPΞW 1 33, against AB*Dω: in ⁴² B and 1 alone support it. Only two or three MSS are consistent: B 33 have -μ 8/10 while ΝW have -α -αν 9/10. For Mary of Magdala the case is still more complex: see WH *App.*³ 163, and add that W has -μ 3/13. Gregory (Ti iii. 116) notes that ΝD prefer the declined, and BLΔ the indeclinable form: it will be clear, however, that there are great inconsistencies, and a rule seems unattainable.

Σάπφειρα (dat. -η—see p. 118) belongs to this section if taken directly from Aram. ܣܦܦܝܪܐ "beautiful." If it is fem. of *σάπφειρος* it is Hebrew ultimately, for the name of the gem was naturalised in iv./B.C. Blass rightly prefers the former, but thinks the common noun influenced it (*Gr.* 7 n.: cf. WS 76).

(4) *Masculine names* in Π¹ (etc.), from the name ΠΗΠ. There are about a dozen of these in NT, declined like *Νικίας*, with voc. -α and gen. -ου. This is the Greek rule for -as *pure* (K.Bl. i. § 105. 9). So *Ἀνανία*; *Βαραχίου*, *Ζαχαρίου*, *Ἡσαίου*, *Ἰερεμίου*, *Ματθαίου*, *Οὐρίου*. The only question arises with *Ἠλείας*, which in Lk 11⁷ makes gen. *Ἠλεία* NBLW 565** (-ου ACD etc.), but in Lk 4²⁵ *Ἠλείου* without variant. (In both places late uncials accent -ού or -ού, reading the indeclinable form found in the LXX (historical books): that the later LXX books (Mal, Sir, 1 Mac) show *Ἠλείας* confirms the reading of the better MSS in NT). Thackeray 162 argues the -α genitive "vulgar and late": this difference of Greek culture between the sources which Luke reproduces in these two places would be quite in keeping with their style.

Other masculines of Decl. I. are *Μεσσίας*, *Ἰωάνης*, *Ἰσκαριώτης* (*Ἰσκαριώθ* in Mk and in Lk 6¹⁶).¹ Note the dat. *Ἰωάνει* § in WH: it will be explained like *Μωυσεῖ* below.

(5) The difficulty discussed under this section does not arise in NT. *Ἀβιά* Mt 1⁷ is necessarily indeclinable, not being gen.: the possible accentuation *Ἠλείου* or -ού was mentioned in (4).

(6) *Mixed Declension*.—This is a large type in NT, and need hardly be set down (with Thackeray) to Hebrew influence. For although it contrasts with the form prevailing in Egypt (*Ἰησοῦς Ἰησοῦτος* and the like), it tallies with a type used in Greek abbreviated names (*Δημᾶς -ᾶ* etc.) and in Roman masc. names like *Ἀκύλας* gen. *Ἀκύλας*.² It is moreover identical with the sing. flexion of a mass of MGr nouns—*γέροντας* A.G. *γέροντα*, *κλέφτης* A.G. *κλέφτη*, *παπᾶς* A.G. and Voc. *παπᾶ*, *παπποῦς*

¹ Note also *Σκαριώθ* Mk 3¹⁹ and Lk 6¹⁶ D. In Jn D has Ἰ. ἀπὸ *Καρυβώτου* (exc. 6⁷¹), and in Lk 22³ *Ἰσκαριώδ*.

² As early as Plato (*Phaedrus* 274d) we find the Egyptian name *Θαμούς* with acc. -όν, gen. -ού; but the crucial dat. does not occur there, so that Winer's citation is not decisive: it is only like *νοῦς*.

A.G. *παπποῦ*. Many of these make plur. in *-δες*, as *παπάδες*, combining these alternative flexions. *Βορράς* is an Attic prototype. The general formula is that the bare stem, in a long vowel or diphthong, forms the gen., dat., and voc. if any, while *-ς* is added for nom. and *-ν* for acc. Only a few call for note:—

(a) In *-ας* or *-ās*. *Ἰούδας* (with voc. *Ἰούδα*) is constant in NT, there being no sign of gen. *Ἰουδου* or of indecl. *Ἰουδά*. So *Ἄννας*, *Ἀρέτας*, *Καιάφας*, *Κηφᾶς*, *Βαρνάβας*, *Ἰωνᾶς*, *Κλωπᾶς*, *μαμωνᾶς*, *Σατανᾶς*, *Σκευᾶς*, *Χουζᾶς*, to mention only those that have the gen. *Σίλας* (*-αν -α*) (= *κ¹κ²κ³*) is not contracted from *Σιλουανός*, which is a case like *Σίμων* in (7) below (Dalman *Gramm.* 124).

(b) In *-ῆς*. *Μανασσῆς* may as well be counted here, though *-ν* is not attached in acc.: LXX has *Μανασσή* indecl. for the tribe, which is equally possible for Rev 7⁶. *Μωυσῆς* has been transferred from the Mixed Decl. (normal in LXX) to a new flexion universal in and after i/Δ.D., with very marked Hellenisation. We may conjecture that the dat. *-εῖ* began the type, as a natural dat. for a nom. in *-ῆς*, and that the circumflexed *-εῖ* led on to a gen. *-έως* and even an acc. *-έα* (Lk 16²⁹ all MSS), on the analogy of *βασιλεῖ -έως -έα*. The flexion thus agrees (as WS 94 notes) with that of *Ἄρης* in class. Gk. *Μωυσῆν* the ordinary acc., and *Μωυσῆ* (Ac 7⁴⁴, under LXX influence) are the only survivals of the Mixed flexion. See WH *App.*² 165. *Ἰωσῆς* makes gen. *Ἰωσῆ* Mt 27⁵⁶ ABC *al.*, Mk 6⁹ ACW, 15⁴⁰ κ¹ACW *al.*,⁴⁷ CW *al.*; but *Ἰωσήτος* Mk 6⁹ BDLΔ 33 13 etc. (Ferrari) 565, 15⁴⁰.⁴⁷ same (exc. D at 47). This last flexion has abundant analogues in papyri, but is solitary in NT, which makes for its genuineness.

(c) In *-εῖς*. *Λευεῖς* in NT conforms throughout to this type.

(d) In *-οῦς*. *Ἰησοῦς* has been assimilated to this class, the LXX dat. *Ἰησοῖ* yielding to *Ἰησοῦ* (as in the Freer MS of Dt).

(7) *Names in -ων*.—*Σίμων -ωνος* is declined fully, but it is rather a case of appropriating a Greek name of similar sound than adapting a Semitic one: *Συμεών* (indecl.) is the Semitic original. Similarly men named *Jēshū* could either adapt the name as *Ἰησοῦς* or appropriate the Greek *Ἰάσων*. The only other name in *-ων* that is declined is that of Solomon. Thackeray shows that the Hellenising of *יְהוֹשָׁפָט* took the following order:

(a) in orthography (1) *Σαλωμών* (2) *Σαλομών* (3) *Σολομών*, (b) in flexion (1) indeclinable (2) gen. *ῶντος* (3) gen. *-ῶνος*. (See his note as to the phonological meaning of the successive spellings.) Of (a) (1) and (2) we have some traces in NT: thus nom. *Σαλωμών* Ac 7⁴⁷ κ¹AC, and *Σαλομ.* in Mt 1⁶ κ¹ 1, Ac 3¹¹ A 5¹² κ¹. For (b) (1) there is only Mt 1⁶ *Σαλομών* acc. κ¹ 1, Jn 10²⁸ W. For (2) the evidence is considerable. *Σολομών* (so accent) *-ῶντος*, like *Ξενοφῶν -ῶντος* and several Egyptian names, is supported by late uncials generally, with WΔ in Mt 1⁶, C (*semel*) Δ Mt 12⁴², CKLW *al.* Lk 11³¹ *bis*, κ¹AKLW etc. Jn 10²⁸; and it must be read in Ac throughout—3¹¹ κ¹ABCP 1. 33 *al.* (*-ῶνος* DE 104), 5¹² κ¹A 33 *al.* (*-ῶνος* BDEP *al.*), 7⁴⁷ accent *Σολομών* (WH). The late uncials in accenting the nom. *parisponomenon* agree with their preference for *-ῶντος*, which may

have been due to LXX influence : it is the only declined form that has even begun to appear there.

B. Place Names.

(8) *Places and peoples.*—Thackeray notes that “the Hellenised forms largely predominate” here. The table in (1) so far bears this out for the NT, in that indeclinable forms outnumber inflected by 43 per cent. in place-names, but by 110 per cent. in person-names.

(9) *Place-names in -a feminine.*—So Γάζα -αν (LXX gen. -ης), Σαμαρία -ας,¹ Λύδδα -ας (but see (10)), Ἰδουμαία -ας, Ἀρμαθαία -ας, Βηθανία -ας etc. Χαρρά -ας is found twice in LXX, but χαρράν indecl. usually, and so in NT. As with the four feminine personal names in -a which only occur in the nominative (see (3) above), we are sometimes left without conclusive proof of their proper category : see (11) b. A place-name which almost becomes a common noun is γέεννα, gen. -ης (acc., gen., dat. sing.).

(10) *Towns in -a.*—Declined as neuter plural alone are Σόδομα (as LXX) and Σάρεπτα (acc. only, but LXX gen. -ων). Metaplasmus is conspicuous here. Λύδδα is twice acc. Ac 9³².³⁵ NAB 33 (hiat. v.³²), where CEω assimilate to the fem. form Λύδδας in v.³⁸ (Λύδδης there in Eω) : analogy of other forms proves this form Decl. II. and not indecl. (as Hort). Γόμορρα, in LXX and 2 Pet 2⁶ (Σοδόμων καὶ Γομόρρας), rather strangely fails to agree with its constant associate. In Mt 10¹⁸ however we have Γομόρρων. A non-Semitic NT name which behaves in the same way is Δύστρα, acc. -αν, dat. -οις. See Thackeray 167 f. and *Prol.* 48 for sundry parallels : add P Grenf ii. 74 (A.D. 302), where we have ἐν Τεντύρη *dis*, the village being elsewhere Τέντυρα neut. pl. Similarly the Zoroastrian capital Ragha appears in Tobit with Πάγας (acc.) and Πάγη, against Πάγων -οις. WS 93 notes the varying flexion in 1 Mac of Ἀδιδά (indecl., dat. -οις), Βαιθουρά (indecl., fem., neut. pl.), and Γαζάρα (fem. and neut. pl.).

Declined in 1st decl. only are Γάζα -αν, Βηθανία (but see (11) b), γέεννα, Σαμαρία (see also 14).

The examples of metaplasmus just given show that in foreign names it was rather the rule than the exception. This accounts for the flexion of the name *Jerusalem* when declined. Mt 2⁸ πᾶσα Ἱεροσόλυμα is of course fem., as in Tob 14⁴ B, and Mt 3⁵ may show the same. These are the only places where the word is nom., and the rule may be that Ἱεροσόλυμα in nom. follows the gender of ἡ Ἱερουσαλήμ, and passes into 2nd decl. for oblique cases.

(11) a. Ἱεροσόλυμα and Ἱερουσαλήμ.² The indeclinable continues the LXX tradition, for Ἱεροσόλυμα only appears in Tobit and Maccabees : even in these it is only invariable in 2-4 Mac (1 Mac 8⁴, Tob 1⁵, and not

¹ Σαμαρίας gen. in P Petr ii. p. 14, a 1 ap rus of iii/B.C., relating to a settlement of Jews in the Fayyám, mentioned by Josephus : see *Tebtunis Pap.* ii. p. 401.

For the breathing see above, § 40.

without variants). Usage in NT varies largely, and without very obvious motive. It may be presented thus :

	Mt.	Mk.	Jn.	Lk.	Ac 1-12	Ac 13-28	Rom.	1 Co.	Gal.	Heb.	Rev.	
Ἱερουσαλήμ N.	1	...	1	1	= 3
„ V.	1	1	= 2
„ A.	12	11	10	2	1	2	= 38
„ G.	9	4	1	1	1	= 16
„ D.	3	7	2	1	...	1	1	...	= 15
Total . .	1	26	22	14	4	1	2	1	3	= 74
Ἱεροσόλυμα N.	2	= 2
„ A.	7	7	3	3	1	11	3	= 36
„ G.	2	3	2	...	2	2	= 11
„ D.	6	1	2	5	= 14
Total . .	11	10	12	4	5	18	3	= 63

The figures are for WH *text*. The only places where variants have any real support are:—Ἱερουσαλήμ Mk 11¹ A *al*, Ac 15⁴ NCDE *al*. (against AB 81 *vg*), Ac 20¹⁶ NAE 33 *al*. (against BCD etc.), and some places where only the case is concerned. It should be added that the “We” passages of Ac have Ἱεροσ. 3 times and Ἱεροσ. 4; while Q shows Ἱερουσαλήμ *voc*. (Mt 23³⁷ = Lk 13³⁴), and according to Harnack also in Lk 4⁹ (where however Mt has not the name). In writers who use both forms—which does not include Mt, since his one instance of the indecl. comes from Q—it has been largely assumed that (as Grimm puts it) “a certain sacred emphasis . . . resides in the very name” where the indecl. form is used. This may account for a good many passages, but other forces are likely to have co-operated. Since Luke uses Ἱερουσαλήμ 48 times in the Palestinian narrative (Ev, Ac 1-12) against Ἱεροσόλυμα 9 times, while in Ac 13-28 the proportion is markedly reversed (14 : 18), it is clear that he keeps the LXX form as congruent with the atmosphere of his story till he emerges into the Gentile world, where the Jews’ capital was vaguely supposed to have some connexion with the Solymi (neighbours of the Lycians) and the name had been fixed by popular etymology.

(11) *b. Indeclinables in -a* are Δαλμανουθία (*στὶ ν.λ.*), Κανά, Μαγαδά (CM *boh al.*—the true reading is Μαγαδάν), Σινά. Βηθαβαρά¹ and Ῥαμί occur in the dative, and we could write -ᾱ if we liked; similarly ambiguous are Βηθζαθά with its variants (*nom.*), and Γαββαθά (probably *nom.*²). Γολγοθά is classed as indecl., though Γολγοθάν *acc* in Mk 15²² might be assigned to the *nom.* Γολγοθά of Jn 19¹⁷ and (probably²)

¹ The true reading is Βηθανία. Burkitt assigns the variant to the influence of *syr^{vt}*.

² The syntax is like that of Ἐλαιών in Lk 19²⁹: see *Proleg.* 69, 235, and Thackeray 23.

Mt 27³⁸. If it is indecl., the *-án* and *-á* forms will have the same relation as in the certainly indecl. *Βηθσαιδάν* and *-ά*: this account is more probable. *Βηθανία*, normally declined, occurs as *Βηθανιά* indecl. in Mk 11¹ B*, Lk 19²⁹ N*BD* 131, Mk 11¹² H. A special difficulty occurs with the name of Nazareth: it is written e.g. *Ναζαρά* (*ή*, indecl.) Mt 4¹³ B*Z 33, Lk 4¹⁶ NB*Ξ 33; *Ναζαρέτ* Mt 2²³ NDL, Lk 1²⁶ NBL, *Ναζαρέθ* Mt 21¹¹ NBCD etc., Ac 10³⁸ NBCE, and in Δ and other MSS sometimes *Ναζαράθ* (*-άτ*). See WH *App.*² 167, Ti on Lk 1²⁶. WH assert that the tangle "presents little ambiguity," and print *-ά* in Mt 4¹³ Lk 4¹⁶, *-έθ* later in the Gospel story (Mt 21¹¹) and Ac *l.c.*, with *-έρ* elsewhere "certainly or probably." Sanders (p. 21) says that in W *Ναζαρέτ* occurs four times in Lk, who has *Ναζαρέθ* once (4¹⁶): this however stands alone in the other Evv, except for Mt 21¹¹ *-έρ*. Dalman (*Gr.*² 152) appears to trace the two types to *נָרְזַי* (*Ναζαρά*) and *נָרְזַי* respectively. The exact Greek name of this obscure little place, which was never heard of till the Gospel story was current, might easily fluctuate in oral and written sources.

In *-η* there is only *Βηθφαγή* indecl. *Ίόππη*, a town in early contact with the outside world, naturally took a Greek flexion.

In *-ω* we find *Φαράω* and the place-name *Ίεριχώ* indecl.

(12) *Place-names in -ων*.—Thackeray makes the interesting point that these "are declined or indeclinable mainly according to their rank and situation on or away from the main routes." This obviously suits the NT names *Βαβυλών -ώνος*, *Σιδών -ώνος*; nor need *Σαρῶνα* from *Σαρών* rank as a serious exception, though indecl. in LXX. Uninflected are *Μαγεδών* (Rev 16¹⁶ after "Αρ—the compound phrase prob. nom.: see above, p. 148 n.²) and *Αινών, Σιών*. *Κεδρων* raises a difficulty in Jn 18¹. In A(S)YΔ 123 latt syrr arm we find *τοῦ Κεδρών*, which would represent the indecl. found in LXX. But N*DW a b sah aeth read *τοῦ κέδρου*, and all the other Greek MSS *τῶν κέδρων*, with boh Orig Chr. These would plausibly figure as independent attempts to regularise the reading of A, regarded as Greek; and so Lightfoot (*Bibl. Essays* 174) actually read. But it seems better with WH to accept *τῶν κέδρων* as a Greek popular etymology of Kidron: it is needless with them to labour a proof that this etymology was correct.¹ The Hellenised form starts in LXX, 2 K 15²³, 3 K 15¹³. An interesting parallel occurs in Ps 82¹⁰, where "some inferior MSS" (Lightfoot) have *τῶν κισσῶν*, making Kishon into "ivy brook."

(14)² *Names of countries or districts*.—Thackeray shows that these were normally expressed by feminine adjectives in agreement with *χώρα* understood. The oldest suffixes were *-ίς (-ίδος)*, *-(ε)ία (-ας)*, and *-ική (-ῆς)* which are used for places away from Palestine. *Ἀραβία, Σιδωνία* and *Συρία* are NT representatives, with *Σαμαρία* as an old name of a district within Palestine. *Φοινίκη* is also Semitic in origin, but is of course not formed in this way: it is not included in the table above, being naturalised very early in Greek language history. About 200 B.C. the

¹ O. Schrader, *Recherches sur d. idg. Altertumskunde*, 926, gives a very different account of *κέδρος*, which originally meant "juniper."

² (13) does not concern Semitic words; nor have we NT instances for (15).

old indeclinables for names of Palestiniian districts began to be replaced by adj. in *-αία* and *-(ε)ίτις* (*-ιδος*): for the latter we may quote the appearance in Ptolemaic papyri of adjectives like *ξύλιτις* (*γῆ*), *ἀμπελίτις* (*γῆ*) "land under trees" or "vines," and Greek names like *Τραχωνεΐτις*. So *αἰγιαλίτις γῆ* P Lond 924^r (A.D. 187-8) (=III. p. 134) = "land on the border of the lake." This last has no Semitic representative in NT: the *-αία* form appears in *Ἰουραία*, *Γαλιλαία*, *Ἰουδαία*, *Ἰδουμαία*. **Ἀβελιγηή* uses another adj. suffix.

(16) *Gentilic names*—of tribes, parties and inhabitants of towns or districts—are as in LXX formed largely with the adjective suffixes noted in (14), all of course native Greek. In *-αῖος* we have *Γαλιλαῖος*, *Ἑβραῖος* (fem. *Ἑβραῖς* as an adj.), *Ἰουδαῖος* (whence adj. *Ἰουδαϊκός*, and adv. *-κῶς*, and the verb *Ἰουδαΐζειν* and its derivative *Ἰουδαϊσμός*), *Κανααῖος*, *Ναζωραῖος*, *Σαδδουκαῖος*, *Φαρισαῖος*, *Χαλδαῖος*, *Χανααῖος*. In *-εΐτης*, *Ἑλαμείτης*, *Ἰεροσολυμείτης*, *Ἰσραηλείτης*, *Λευεΐτης*, *Νινευεΐτης*, *Σαμαρείτης* (fem. *Σαμαρείτις*). In *-ηνός*, *Γαδαρηνός*, *Γερασηνός* (*Γεργεσηνός*), *Δαμασκηνός*, *Ναζαρηνός*, *Μαγδαληνός* (only fem.): this is hardly represented in the LXX. The less used suffixes are (1) *-ος* in *Σύρος*, (2) *-ιος*, *Σιδώνιος*, *Τύριος*, (3) *-ισσα* (fem.), *Συροφουνίκισσα*, (4) consonant noun, **Αραψ*, n. pl. **Αραβες* (D* **Αραβοι*).

The variation between *Ναζωραῖος* and *Ναζαρηνός* has been the basis of much theorising: it must be left to the Semitist to find out loose stones in these structures.¹ The former is used exclusively in Mt, Jn and Ac, the latter in Mk. Lk has both, in 18³⁷ and in 4³⁴ 24¹⁹. Luke presumably took *-ηνός* over from Mk in 4³⁴, and from the sources of his Resurrection story in 24¹⁹. Mark's form is obviously more closely related to *Ναζαρά* (*-έτ*, *-έθ*): *Ναζωραῖος* seems to be coloured by some popular etymology, or to represent some other word. Dalman (*Gr.*² 178) makes *Ναζωραῖος* "reproduce *נָזָרַי*, from the by-form *נָזָרַי*, synonymous with *נָזָרַי*," from which "*נָזָרַי* would be expected."

DECLENSION OF NON-SEMITIC NAMES.

§ 61. There is not much to remark in the flexion of Greek names, or even of Latin or other foreign names outside the Semitic. They may be briefly classified according to their declension.

(a) **Decl. I and II.**—*Feminines* in *-ā* and *-η* are *Εὐδοία* (so certainly from the context in Ph 4²⁻³ (*αὐραῖς*)), *Βερνίκη*, *Χλόη* and such Latin names as *Ἰουλία*, *Κλαυδία*, with place-names *Ἀπολλωνία*, *Ἀχαΐα* etc., *Ἰταλία*, *Σπανία*, *Διβύη*, *Μισυλήνη*, *Ῥώμη* and various others, derived often from native names in sundry languages. In the *-ā* class (gen. *-ης*) we should

[¹ See now *The Beginnings of Christianity*, I. i. 426 ff., Appendix B, Nazarene and Nazareth, by G. F. Moore.—Ed.]

put *Νύμφα* (see *Proleg.* 48), *Σάπφειρα* (§ 60 (3)): ultimately, and perhaps immediately, Semitic), *Τρύφαινα*, *Τρυφῶσα*, and Latin names like *Πρίσκα* and *Πρίσκιλλα* (only nom. acc.), *Δρούσιλλα* (dat. -η);¹ *Ἀντιόχεια*, *Βέροια*. In some of these the complete equivalence of *ι* and *ει* in Hellenistic makes the spelling, and therefore the accent in nom. and acc., indeterminate. There is no adequate reason to alter the classical spelling where we have evidence of it: see *Proleg.* 46f. and § 35. The plural names *Ἀθήναι*, *Κεγχραεῖ*, *Κολοσσαί*, *Συράκουσαι* are classed here. Neuter plurals in *-α* are *Θνάτειρα*, *Λύστρα*, *Μύρρα*, *Πάταρα*. But metaplasmus is here strongly felt: see above, § 54.

Masculine person- or place-names in Decl. I. include (a) Greek names, normally declined, such as *Αἰνέας*, *Ἀνδρέας*, *Ἀδρίας*, *Ἄιδης*, *Λυσανίας*, *Ἡρόδης*, *Σωσθένης*, *Εὐφράτης* (old Persian *Ufrátīw*, in Greek since Herodotus), *Ἀσιάρχης* (see § 54) and two in *-ίτης*; (b) Greek and Latin names with gen. *-α* or *-ᾶ*, which might be classed with the Mixed Declension. See § 60 (6) above.

Second Declension names are naturally numerous. Masculine personal names in *-ος* call for no comment. Many of them of course are Latin, coming from Decl. II. names. Place-names of towns or islands in *-ος* are feminine, as *Ἄσσος*, *Ἐφεσος*, but plurals masculine, *Φίλιπποι* and *Ποτίοιοι* (both indeterminate in NT). Among names of countries we have *ὁ Πόντος* (gender indeterminate in NT), but *ἡ Αἴγυπτος* (Ac 7¹¹ and probably³⁶—Blass's "wrong reading" in the former only disagrees with his own conjectural emendation). Adjectives are numerous, as *Ἀδραμυνηνός*, *Ἀσιανός*, *Βεροιαῖος*, *Ἑλληνικός*. The Mixed Declension rather than the obsolete "Attic" is responsible for *Ἀπολλῶς* acc. *-ῶ* or *-ῶν* gen. *-ῶ* (Blass *-ῶς -ῶν -ῶ*), and for *ἡ Κῶς* acc. *Κῶ*: see § 52 C (c). Neuter place-names are *Ἰκόνιον*, *Ἰλλυρικόν* etc. *Πέργαμον* acc. may be from either *-ος* fem. or *-ον* neut.: "ἡ Π. in Xenophon, Pausanias and Dion Cassius, but τὸ Π. in Strabo and Polybius and most other writers and in the inscriptions" (Swete on Rev 2¹³).

(b) Decl. III.—Normal consonant nouns, Greek or Latin, such as *Φηλιξ -ίκος*, *Φοῖνιξ -ῖκα*, *Αἰθίοψ -οπος*, *Κρής -τός*, *Ἑλληνίς -ίδος*, *Καῖσαρ -αρος*, *Μνάσων -ωνος*, *Γαλλίων -ωνος*, *Ἑλλην -ος*, need only be named. On *Σαλαμίς* (metaplasmus) see above, § 54. With strong flexion we have *Μακεδών*, *Ἰάσων* and *Φιλήμων -ονος*, *Φλέγων -οντος*, *Νικάνωρ -ορος*. Stems in semi-vowels are *Νηρέυς*, *Ἀντιοχεύς* and other gentile adjectives; compounds of *πόλις*, declined like the noun;² *Σύρτις* and *Σάρδεις* (pl.); *Στάχυς* (acc. *-υν*) and *Ζεὺς* acc. *Δία* gen. *Διός*. It should be noted that in Ac 16¹¹ *Νέαν Πόλιω* *ΝΑΒΔ*² (against *CD*ω*) and Col 4¹³ *Ἱερᾶ Πόλει* (where MSS are indeterminate) the writing *divinism* agrees with earlier Greek rules: cf. *Ἄρειος Πάγος* Ac 17^{19.22} (whence regularly *Ἀρεοπαγείτης* ib.³⁴). See on this rule further § 106 below.

A special case under this heading is the name of the Mount of Olives,

¹ But note gen. *Σεκόνδας* P Oxy ii. 294⁹ (A. D. 22).

² *Ἱερὰ πόλις* and *Νέα πόλις* are best written *divinism*: see § 106. For *Πρόπολις* see *Proleg.* 228.

on which it will be enough to refer to the discussion in *Proleg.* 69, 23: (*Einkl.* 104 f.). There I have tried to show that Ἐλαιών, a common noun = oliveyard,¹ occurring very frequently in the papyri, is beginning to be used as a proper name to be a short substitute for τὸ ἔρος τῶν ἐλαιῶν: we are to print πρὸς τὸ ἔρος τὸ καλούμενον Ἐλαιών (nom.) or Ἐλαιῶνα with W in Lk 19²⁹ and (εἰς τὸ κτλ.) 21³⁷, and retain Ἐλαιῶνος with all MSS in Ac 1², the καλούμενον being an indication, common to Luke and Josephus, that the adaptation had not yet thoroughly established itself.

The Gender of Proper Names shows few irregularities. *Towns* are fem., except when the suffix determines otherwise; *streams* follow ποταμός² and *hills* ἔρος in gender, but instances are few. Among *personal names* naturally the gender determines itself; but there is the curious *Q'rt perpetuum* of ἡ Βάαλ Rom 11⁴, and always in LXX in the later books (Chron, Prophets and Tob): in Gen—4 K only thrice (4 K 1^{6, 16}, 21³) except as a variant in A only. (In *Proleg.* 59 (= *Einkl.* 88) I have unaccountably given it as occurring only three times in LXX.) The *Q'rt* is actually written in 3 K 18^{19, 23} οἱ προφῆται τῆς αἰσχύνης, and in the marginal gloss in Q at Jer 11¹⁸ τῆ αἰσχυνῆ θυσιαστηρια. The explanation, due to Dillmann, "has superseded all others" (SH on Rom 11⁴). Χερουβείν is neut. pl. in Heb 9⁵, as in Philo and generally in LXX, presumably following the association with ζῶα. LXX has χερουβείν sing. masc. four times, once neut.; χερουβίμ (when treated as pl.) masc. four times, neuter twenty. Josephus *Ant.* viii. 3⁷²² has τὰς χερουβείν. (In *Ant.* iii. 5¹³⁷ WS wrongly infers οἱ χ.: αὐτοὺς there refers to πρόστυποι.)

MISCELLANEOUS FOREIGN WORDS AND IRREGULAR FLEXIONS.

§ 62. In addition to the proper names already catalogued, there are a few Semitic words in NT, written in Greek characters, which may be collected here, though some of them are not nouns.

(a) *Indeclinable nouns, or vocatives.*—Ἀββᾶ (𐤀𐤁𐤁𐤀 Aramaic of 𐤁𐤁 in *stat. emphat.*) is exactly translated by ὁ πατήρ, used in address: see *Proleg.* 233; Παββεί (𐤀𐤁𐤁 Aram.) διδάσκαλε Jn 1³⁸ and Παββουεί (𐤀𐤁𐤁𐤀 Aram. "mein Gebieter," Dalman *Gramm.*³ 176); Πακά, an Aramaic term of contempt (𐤀𐤁𐤁, *ib.* 173)³—all these appear only in address, and do not develop into regular nouns. The question has been raised whether Μωρέ in Mt 5²² is to be read as Greek—so="Fool!" in the ethical sense (RV text)—or as the Hebrew מוֹרֵי: cf. Num 20¹⁰, where LXX οἱ ἀπειθείς. Field (*Notes in loc.*) observes that no other pure Hebrew word appears in

¹ How fertile this formation was in the vernacular may be seen in the list collected *s.v.* Ἐλαιών in *Vocabulary*.

² Thus τὸν Σιλωάμ *ter*: contr. Josephus *Wars* v. 4², 12², ἡ Σ., *sc.* πηγῆ.

³ Dalman suggests that the word took the form πακά instead of ρηκά because of similarity of sound to ράκος "rascal." It must be admitted that this is a sufficiently rare meaning of ράκος (*ib.* 173 n.²).

NT except through the medium of the LXX; while Zahn (*Matthäus* p. 225 n.) shows that Jewish Midrash writers took כּוּרָה in voc. as a Greek word. This seems decisive, added to the obvious consideration that Mt's Greek readers would naturally have been warned if the author had meant them to take the familiar word as Hebrew. Πάσχα (Aram. ܦܫܚܐ), μάννα (ܡܢܢܐ), and σίκερα (Aram. ܫܝܚܐ, according to Dalman¹ *Gr.*¹ 126 n.²) are indeclinables. So also the plural Χερουβείν (Heb. ܟְרֻבַיִם, with Aram. pl. ܦܝܢ): see above, § 61. This last has been included among the proper names. So has Ἀκελδαμάχ, in Ac 1⁹ tr. χωρίον αἵματος (ܟܘܪܝܘܢ ܐܝܡܘܬܐ), where Dalman 202 says the final -χ is sign of the indeclinable.³ The NT has no trace of declined forms πάσχα, μάννας or -ης, σίκερος or -αρος, οἱ or αἱ Χερουβείς, which are found in sundry writers (WS 91 f.); nor again of the Hebrew form פּאסעק for πάσχα (LXX.)

(b) *Nouns with Greek suffixes and flexion.*—Ἀρ(ρ)αβῶν, -ῶνος (see § 41) was borrowed in iv/b.c. from Phœnician (Heb. ܐܪܒܝܐ). Γέεννα (originally γαί, as in Jos 18¹⁶ B)=Heb. גֵּי הַחַיִּים, Aram. ܓܝܗܝܡ, with final ܢ dropped (Dalman² 183): it has been included among place-names above, as also *Saranās* among the person-names (Heb. ܫܪܢܐ, Aram. ܫܪܢܐ). So too μαμωνᾶς (=ܡܘܢܐ "deposit," according to Dalman² 170 n.), and σαβαώθ (pl. of ܨܒܐ "army"). Κορβανᾶς "treasury" (Mt 27⁶) is inflected (Aram. ܟܘܪܒܐܢܐ), while κορβάν, in Mk 7¹¹ tr. δῶρον, is in Dalman's view (*Gr.*² 174) a Hebrew word (קֶרְבַּן). In Decl. II. we have βάρος (ܒܪܐ), κόρος (ܟܘܪܐ) and σάρον (ܫܪܐ), all Hebrew measures, but the form of the last clearly depends on Aram. ܫܪܐܢܐ. So with the thoroughly Hellenised σάββατα—for decl. see § 54 c—which Dalman (² 160) thinks was spelt with τ for θ in virtue of its Greek ending. Συκάμνος is supposed to have been borrowed from Heb. ܫܘܟܐܡܘܢ, at least as early as Theophrastus (iv/b.c.): popular etymology doubtless affected it. That in OT it is exclusively plural suggests that an Aram. ܫܘܟܐܡܝܢ started the form: the sing. ܫܘܟܐܡܝܢ is cited in BDB.

(c) *Semitic quotations.*—Some fragments of original Semitic language appear in NT, simply transferred as spoken. From the *ipsissima verba* of Jesus we have Ἀββᾶ (glossed ὁ Πατήρ), ῥακά (see (a) above), ἐφθάθᾶ be opened (ܐܦܬܚܐܬܐ—Dalman² 278 n.), Ταλιθὰ κοῦμ (ܩܘܡ ܐܬܝܠܝܟ, in which the " had become silent—see Dalman² 150, 321), and Ἐλωὶ Ἐλωὶ λαμὰ σαβαχθαβει. In this last (Mk 15³⁴ WH) there has been slight Hebraisation, which D carries further by substituting ζαφθαβει for the verb. See Dalman² 156, 221, 365: he makes the Aramaic original to have been ܠܦܬܐ ܠܦܬܐ ܠܦܬܐ. The bearing of Mark's authentic record on the question of our Lord's ordinary language is obvious: had it been words

¹ Apparently dropped in ed.²—by oversight?

² See however WS 68 n., quoting Kautzsch.

of a sacred text that rose to His lips, we should have had Hebrew—the Aramaic attests the speech in which He most naturally expressed Himself when there was no question as to making others understand. In this category of *Dominica verba* we should include ἀμήν *truth!* It established itself in the Christian vocabulary because of its characteristic use by Jesus: Jn shows (cf. also Mt 5³⁷) that He was wont to double it for emphasis. Dalman² 183 gives ܡܝܢ as Aramaic, but notes (243) that Rabbinic literature has no parallel to such a phrase as ἀμήν λέγω ὑμῖν. Ὁσαυτά *save!* (ܢܝ ܘܨܝܗ, Dalman² 249) comes from the Gospel story, but was well established among the Jews. Another Jewish liturgical term taken over was ἀλληλουιά *praise ye Jah!* (= ܡܝܢ ܘܨܝܗ—Dalman² 191 n.²). Μαραναθά is of special interest, as found only in a letter addressed to Greeks (1 Co 16²²: cf. *Didache* 10⁶). Dalman (*Gr.*² 152 n.³) makes it ܢܝܢ ܢܝܢܝܢ *our Lord, come!* (ἔρχου Κύριε in Rev 22²⁰). See Findlay *in loc.* A password in a foreign language, which embodied the Christian hope so as to be unintelligible to the uninitiated, is a very natural and suggestive touch in the picture of the primitive Church. Dalman's note seems to dispose of an alleged grammatical difficulty.

Variants in MSS where these Semitic words are reported belong to a Semitic grammar: I have merely reproduced Dalman, with the ordinary pointing in place of the supralinear vowels.

(d) In a category by itself comes Rev 1⁴ ἀπὸ ὃ ὄν καὶ ὃ ἦν καὶ ὃ ἐρχόμενος. It is deliberately left in nom., after ἀπὸ “in order to preserve the immutability and absoluteness of the divine name from declension” (Moffatt). The writer aimed at focusing in a phrase the LXX and Targums view of Ex 3¹⁴: cf. also Heb 13⁸. A further *tour de force* makes “the He was” serve as correlative to the present ὃ ὄν, there being no participle to express the continuous past. A Greek might have said ἀπ’ ἐκείνου ὃς ἔστι καὶ ἦν καὶ ἔσται: cf. the well-known line—

Ζεὺς ἦν, Ζεὺς ἔστιν, Ζεὺς ἔσεται· ὃ μέγαλε Ζεῦ.¹

Winer's parallels from Greek philosophical writing—μετὰ τοῦ ἔν, χωρὶς τοῦ ἔν, τοῦ μηθέν (Aristotle *Politics* viii. 3¹⁰—Congreve² p. 347) etc. (WM 79)—illustrate the idea underlying the indeclinable, but the presence of the article regularises the grammar. Erasmus (supported subsequently by two cursives) performed the same service to the text by conjecturing ἀπὸ τοῦ ὃ ὄν. For the solecism deliberately conveying dogma we may compare Charles Wesley's couplet—

The Father, Son and Holy Ghost
Is ready, with the shining host.

¹ Cf. Preisigke *Sammelbuch* 1540, a tombstone of A.D. 408, beginning θεὸς ὁ πατοκράτωρ, ὃ ὄν προὖν καὶ μέλλων, which is a Christian translation of Rev 1⁴ into idiomatic Greek. Cf. also *Syll.* 757 (reign of Augustus), where Διῶν as a divinity is described, ὅποιος ἔστι καὶ ἦν καὶ ἔσται, and again ἀρχὴν μεσότητα τέλος οὐκ ἔχων.

LATIN NOUNS.

§ 63. Proper names are very numerous. We have *praenomina*, such as *Gaius*,¹ *Marcus*, *Lucius*, *Titus*, *Tiberius*, *Publius*; *nomina*, as *Quirinius*, *Sergius*, *Titius*, *Iulius*, *Porcius*, *Cornelius*; *cognomina*, as *Paulus*, *Caesar* etc.; *agnomina*, as *Augustus*; women's names, as *Prisca*, *Iunia*, *Drusilla*, *Iulia*. Words of the 1st and 2nd declensions in Latin fall naturally into the same class in Greek: masculines in -a make nom. -as, and gen. -a, as Ἀγρίππας -a (ultimately Greek), Ἀκύλας -a (in papyri—gen. does not occur in NT), Ἀδρίας (dat. -α). Names of the 3rd decl., as *Caesar*, *Felix*, *Gallio*, are generally simple: we need only note that -eus is transliterated -ης, in agreement with the pronunciation (*n* before *s* being evanescent), so that Κρήσκης and Πούδης nom., Κλήμεντος gen. belong to the same flexion. Place-names are also simple, but the Latin -ā is not maintained as it is in person-names. Hence *Roma* Ῥώμη: of course it is -a when pure, as *Kaisarīa* (so write, preserving the accent of *Caesareā*), Ἰταλία. Two Latin place-names form a link with the common nouns—Ἀππίου Φόρον = *Appi Forum* and Τρεῖς Ταβέρναι = *Tres Tabernae*, which are of the same kind as Καλοὶ Διμένες, *Market Drayton*, *Sevenoaks*, *Moses Gate*.

Common nouns borrowed from Latin include:—Decl. I. κολωνία, μεμβράνη,² κοστωδία (κοσ[τ]ωδε[ία] dat., P Oxy ii. 294²⁰), and the masculines κοδράντης (possibly starting from acc. κοδράντην = *quadrantem* ?), ξίστης (if this really is a Latin word);³ also the curiously transformed φελώνης, which NT and MGr (φελώνι) show for φαινώνης = *paenula*, which is found with the other in papyri. For the metathesis see Brugmann *KVG* 249. The Keltic (Gaulish) *rēda* passed into Greek (ῥεδών gen. pl. in Rev 18¹⁸) from Latin. Decl. II. includes κήσος, τίτλος, μίλιον (a new formation from the plural *mīlia* (passuum)), πραιτώριον and others. In Decl. III. are words in -ων, of which only λεγιών -ώνος need be named: in papyri λεγεών is also found, but λεγιών predominates.⁴ Σπεκουλάτωρ makes its acc. σπεκουλάτορα, according to the normal flexion of nouns in -ωρ.

ADJECTIVES.

§ 64. Adjective flexions need not generally be presented in full, as they simply combine types which have already appeared among the nouns. We have only to classify the types and note some irregularities.

¹ Not *Caius*, which is a pure blunder, due to the misunderstanding of the archaic abbreviation C.

² No early ex. of the sing. is quoted.

³ A vulgar Latin *sexta* = *sexta* might support a kind of metathesis: see Brugmann *Grd.*³ i. 871. But the difficulties are great—see also Brugmann-Thumb *Gr.* 159, where the connexion with ξίς is queried.

⁴ See *CR* xv. 33, 434: many more could be added—see *Vocab. s.v.*

I. SECOND AND FIRST DECLENSIONS. (Three Terminations.)

Thus *καλός noble, ἅγιος holy*, forming the commonest type:

N. *καλός καλή καλόν ἅγιος ἅγια ἅγιον*
V. *καλέ etc. ἅγιε etc.*

like *φίλος... φωνή... τέκνον* like *φίλος... ἡμέρα... τέκνον*

Contracted adjectives, from stems in which *ε* or *ο* precedes the termination, may be declined by combining the flexion of *διπλοῦς* (§ 52 *B*) with that of *γῆ* or *μῦα* (§ 51), according as the last syllable of the contracted word is impure or pure: thus *χαλκοῦς -ῆ -οῦν brazen, χρυσοῦς -ῆ -οῦν golden, ἀπλοῦς -ῆ -οῦν single, διπλοῦς -ῆ -οῦν double, τετραπλοῦς -ῆ -οῦν fourfold*, but *ἀργυροῦς -ᾶ -οῦν silvern, σιδηροῦς -ᾶ -οῦν iron: πορφυροῦς* (only in neut.) would follow the same flexion. For irregularities in this respect, and for the appearance of uncontracted forms, see §§ 51, 52 *B* (*b*). The contracted forms are perispomenon throughout. *Νέος* and *στερεός, ἰπήκοος* and *ἄγδοος* do not contract (the last-named sometimes *-ους* in papyri). On *ἴλεως* (only nom. sing. masc.), the solitary survival of the "Attic Declension," see above, § 52 *C* (*b*). *Ἀνίλεως merciless* appears in nom. sg. fem. in Jas 2¹³ *ω*, but *ἀνέλεος* (κABC etc.) is the true Hellenistic form. For a discussion of *στεῖρα* (Lk 1²⁶) see below, II. (*a*).

II. SECOND DECLENSION. (Two Terminations.)

An adjective flexion in *-ος -ου*, like those given above with the separate feminine dropped, belongs regularly to compound adjectives, e.g. *ἡ γυνή ἡ ἄγαμος* (1 Co 7³³) *the unmarried woman*. Exceptions were allowed especially where the fem. would be *-α* (pure), not *-η*. But there are also a few simplicia, which Brugmann (*Grundriss*² II. ii. 105) explains as being originally nouns. We should not press this in the case of adjectives falling into this class in the later language. It should be noticed that the tendency of the language set ultimately towards eliminating the class: in MGr "all adjectives have a separate form for masc. fem. and neut." (Thumb *Handb.* 67). We must pause for comment on

some compounds which have taken separate fem. form, and on simplicia falling into this class II., noting also variations from earlier Greek.

(a) *Simplicia with two terminations.*

Adjectives in *-ios* admit of both flexions, even when compound (Blass). Kalker p. 239 remarks that Polybius uses *παραπλήσιος* fem. simply to avoid hiatus: this will show that the choice was often very free. In this class are—

Αἰώνιος *-ov* very often (52 times, of which 43 with *ζωή*), as usually in Attic. But *αἰωνίαν* occurs twice, 2 Th 2¹⁶ (exc. FG), He 9¹³; also Mk 10³⁰ B, Ac 13⁴⁸ B, 1 Jn 2²⁵ B, 2 P 1¹¹ C*, 42.

Κόσμιος has dat. fem. *κοσμίῳ* 1 Ti 2⁹ N* A (*al. κοσμίως*): Att. *-q*.

Μάταιος has fem. *-os* in Tit 3⁹ and Jas 1²⁶, but *-a* in 1 Co 15¹⁷ and 1 P 1¹⁸: our classical texts show similar fluctuation even within the same book

Νηφάλιος has *-ous* acc. fem. pl. 1 Ti 3¹¹. So in Plutarch: normally *-os -a -ov*.

**Όσιος* apparently has acc. fem. pl. *-ous* in 1 Ti 2⁸, except in some cursives (incl. 33 and 1). Here Winer admitted the possibility of Fritzsche's construction (*δοσίους* with *ἐπαίροντας*): against this W. F. Moulton referred to Ellicott *in loc.* The fem. has no parallel here, not even in LXX, but an isolated slip, affected by the analogy of other adj. in *-ios* fem., is not strange.

Οὐράνιος (Att. fem. *-ia*) makes gen. fem. *-ov* in Lk 2¹⁸ (but *οὐρανοῦ* in B*D*), dat. *-φ* Ac 26¹⁹.

Σωτήριος, as in earlier Greek, has nom. fem. *-os* (Tit 2¹¹).

On the other hand—

Βέβαιος has fem. *-a* alone, Attic showing *-os* also. But

**Επάρχειος* dat. *-q* Ac 25¹ B*C is of course the noun *ἐπαρχία*, *ἐπαρχεῖα* N*A being the adj. in its regular form (*ἡ ε. sc. ἐξουσία*).

**Όμοιος* has fem. *-a* except in Rev 4⁸, where however the agreement of *ὁμοιος* with *ἴρις* is only an instance of the writer's normal defiance of concord: he has *θάλασσα ὑαλίνη ὁμοία κρυστάλλῳ* in v.⁶. Similarly in 9¹⁹ *ὁμοιοι* in two cursives needs no explanation.

Other two term. adj. in *-ios* are *αἰδιος*, *αἰφνίδιος*, *ἐπίγειος*, *ἐπουράνιος*, *παράλιος*, all in accord with earlier Greek.

Of adjectives not in *-ios* we find—

**Ερημος* fem. always *-os* (Attic also *-η*), but as a noun (*sc. γῆ*) except in Ac 1²⁰ 8²⁶ Gal 4²⁷

**Ετοιμος* fluctuates as in Attic—fem. pl. *-αι* in Mt 25¹⁰ (exc. A), elsewhere *-os -η -ov*.

Σεμνός has acc. fem. in *-ούς* 1 Ti 3¹¹ A—a mere casual slip.

Στείρος *-ov* (so in classical Greek) is a peculiar case. It seems best to regard the fem. as *στεῖρα* in NT, since *στεῖρα* would have made dat. *στεῖρη* (see p. 118). The assumption that the NT form is simply a new fem. attached to the old adj. of two terminations, and not the independent fem. noun *στεῖρα* (Hom., cf. Skt. *starī*), cuts out the only exception to the

rule that *-pā* makes *-ης -η*. Cf. Gothic *stairō* fem., which would answer to **στέρᾱ* in Greek.

Other simplicia with fem. in *-os* are *ἀμαρτωλός*, *βέβηλος*, *φλύαρος*, and those in *-ιμος* (*φρόνιμος*, *ὠφέλιμος*), all in accord with the sole or predominant usage in earlier Greek.

(b) *Compounds with three terminations* are—

Ἄργός (= *ἀ-τ-εργός*), nom. fem. *ἀργή* Ja 2²⁰, *ἀργαί* in 1 Ti 5¹³, as well as in the line of Epimenides Tit 1¹², which establishes it as older Greek if the reading has not been assimilated. The ban of Phrynichus rests on fem. *ἀργή*, which Rutherford (*NP* 185) thinks may be genuine in Xenophon: Lobeck, *Phr.* 104 f. gives plentiful exx. of *ἀργή* in later literature.

Αὐτόματος fem. *-η* in Mk 4²⁸, Ac 12¹⁰ ("not unclassical," says Blass).

Καθημερινός, like its classical predecessor *καθημέριος*, has three terminations (Ac 6¹).

Παραθάλασσιος Mt 4¹³ *-ιαν* (*-ιον* D, *παρὰ θάλασσαν* N*), but *ἡ παράλιος* Lk 6¹⁷.

III. THIRD AND FIRST DECLENSIONS. (Three Terminations.)

§ 65. Third decl. stems form their fem. with the suffix *-(ι)ῖᾱ*: *-ῖ-*, which in Greek becomes *-ῖᾱ* gen. *-ῖης*. It will be convenient to include participles here.

(1) *Stems in -ντ-* (cf. § 55 (4) above for the nouns).

(a) *Stems in -αντ-*.

	<i>πάντ- all. Sing.</i>			<i>Plur.</i>		
<i>Sing. N.</i>	<i>πᾶς</i>	<i>πᾶσα</i>	<i>πᾶν</i>	<i>πάντες</i>	<i>πᾶσαι</i>	<i>πάντα</i>
<i>A.</i>	<i>πάντα</i>	<i>πᾶσαν</i>	<i>πᾶν</i>	<i>πάντας</i>	<i>πάσας</i>	<i>πάντα</i>
<i>G.</i>	<i>παντός</i>	<i>πάσης</i>	<i>παντός</i>	<i>πάντων</i>	<i>πασῶν</i>	<i>πάντων</i>
<i>D.</i>	<i>παντί</i>	<i>πάσῃ</i>	<i>παντί</i>	<i>πᾶσι(ν)</i>	<i>πάσαις</i>	<i>πᾶσι(ν)</i>

So *ἅπας*, and all participles in *-ας*.

(b) *Stems in -εντ-*

So participles like *τιθέντ-* (pres.), *πεισθέντ-* (wk. aor.).

Nom. sing. *-εῖς -εῖσα -έν*; *gen.* *-έντος -είσης*; *dat. pl.* *-εῖσι(ν), -εῖσαις*.

Adjectives in *-εις -εσσα -εν* are not found in NT and seem to be obsolete.

(c) *Stems in -οντ-*.

So *έκοντ-* *willing*, *ἄκοντ-* *unwilling* (orig. participles) and

participles in *-οντ-*, as ἄρχοντ- *ruling* (pres.), ἰδόντ- (strong aor.) *having seen*.

Nom. sing. -ων -ουσα -ον; *gen.* -οντος -ούσης.

-ών -ούσα -όν; -όντος.

Dat. pl. -ουσι(ν) -ούσαις.

-οῦσι(ν).

One or two formations (from non-thematic verbs—see § 86) make *nom. sing. masc.* in *-ούς*, as διδούς pres., δούς aor., from δίδωμι *give* (stems διδόντ-, δόντ-).

(d) *Stems in -ουντ-* (= *-εουντ-* or *-οουντ-*).

From Contract Verbs in *-έω-* and *-όω-*: thus φιλονυτ- (*φιλέω love*), δηλονυτ- (*δηλόω make clear*).

Nom. sing. -ούσα -οῦν; *gen.* -οὔντος -ούσης; *dat. pl.* -οῦσι(ν) -ούσαις.

(e) *Stems in -ωντ-* (= *-αωντ-* or *-ηωντ-*).

From Contract Verbs in *-άω* and *-ήω*: thus τιμωνυτ- (*τιμάω honour*), ζωνυτ- (*ζήω live*—entered as ζάω in lexica).

Nom. sing. -ῶν -ῶσα -ῶν; *gen.* -ῶντος -ώσης; *dat. pl.* -ῶσι(ν) -ώσαις.

(f) *Stems in -υντ-*. Only two forms survive in NT, from participles like δεικνύς, *showing*.

Nom. sing. -ύς -ῦσα -ῦν; *gen.* -ύντος -ύσης; *dat. pl.* -ῦσι(ν) -ύσαις.

(2) *Participle stems in -μος-*: *-us-* (*-υοτ-*). On the primitive stem-mixture here see Brugmann *Grd.*² II. i. 563 ff. In addition to the normal form used in the perfect partic. act., there is a type of which ἐστῶς *standing* (from ἴστημι) is the only NT survival in which contraction has taken place, and a new fem. introduced from the present participle. So decline εἰδῶς *knowing* and ἐστῶς.

<i>Sing. N.</i>	εἰδῶς	εἰδυῖα	εἰδός	ἐστῶς	ἐστῶσα	ἐστός
<i>G.</i>	εἰδότος	εἰδυίης	εἰδότος	ἐστῶτος	ἐστῶσης	ἐστῶτος
<i>Pl. D.</i>	εἰδόσι(ν)	εἰδυίαις	εἰδόσι(ν)	ἐστῶσι(ν)	ἐστῶσαις	ἐστῶσι(ν)

On εἰδυίης see above, § 49 (2) a. Ἐστός shortens its proper ω (from *-ατο-*) by analogy. In Rev 5⁶ Ⲭ and some cursives have a neuter ἐστηκῶς, which if genuine will be due to the writer's peculiar concord: ω and ο were

hardly distinguished even in his day (§ 34 (4)). So also *ἰστῶς* neut. Mt 24¹⁵ D*ω; Rev 14¹ in 046 and a dozen cursives.

(3) *Stems in -n-*.

(a) *Μελαν-* *black* is thus declined:

Sing. N. μέλας μέλαινα μέλαν; *G.* μέλανος μελαίνης;
Plur. D. μέλασι(ν) μελαίνοις.

(b) An old noun (*μέγα*) μέγα = *greatness* appears to have produced the adjective flexion nom. masc. μέγας neut. μέγα *great*, acc. masc. μέγαν (Brugmann *Grd.*² II. ii. 656). The rest of the flexion of this adjective is still in NT supplied by the stem *μεγαλο-*, declined like *καλός*, which in MGr supplies the whole of the flexion, regularly formed (Thumb *Handb.* 69).

(4) *Stems in -ευ- : -u-*.

(a) One very common adjective may be named first, in which Brugmann (*l.c.*) holds that an old neuter noun *πολύ* *plenty* has produced a nom. masc. πολὺς neut. πολὺ *much* (pl. *many*), acc. masc. πολύν. The rest of the flexion is from the ordinary stem *πολλο-* -η- like *καλός*: the adj. is thus parallel altogether to μέγας above, *q.v.*, except that here the old irregular flexion survives in MGr (Thumb *Handb.* 71).

(b) Adjectives in -ύς form a class which has maintained and even extended its ground in MGr: see Thumb *Handb.* 70 f. Thus decline *ὄξύς* *sharp*.

<i>Sing. N.</i>	ὄξύς	ὄξεια	ὄξύ	<i>Pl.</i>	ὄξεις	ὄξειαι	ὄξέα
<i>A.</i>	ὄξύν	ὄξειαν	ὄξύ		ὄξεις	ὄξειας	ὄξέα
<i>G.</i>	ὄξέως	ὄξειας	ὄξέως		ὄξέων	ὄξειῶν	ὄξέων
<i>D.</i>	ὄξει	ὄξεία	ὄξει		ὄξέσι(ν)	ὄξειαις	ὄξέσι(ν)

In this class the NT shows a few forms each of *βαθύς* *deep*, *βαρίς* *heavy*, *βραδύς* *slow*, *βραχύς* *short*, *γλυκύς* *sweet*, *εὐθύς* *direct*, *θῆλυς* *female*, *πλατύς* *broad* (only fem., esp. as a noun = *broad way, street*), *πραῦς* *unassuming* (the Attic masc. *πρᾶος* is obsolete), *ταχύς* *swift*, *τραχύς* *rough*.

The Attic gen. sing. in -έος occurs in inferior MSS: *βαθίος* Lk 24¹ later uncials (-έως *ABCDL* etc.), *πραίος* 1 Pet 3⁴ ACP (-έως *NBKL*). For variations in LXX see Thackeray 179.

The neut. pl. *βαθία* in Rev 2²⁴ AC 046 is replaced by *βάθη* *NP*, which is however not a contraction but the pl. of *βάθος*.

Nom. sing. neut. *θῆλυν* occurs in D* at Mt 19⁴ Mk 10⁶, and *πολύν* Ac

18²⁷. For *ἡμους* (derived from the neuter noun *ἡμισυ*, which may even have survived in popular speech, being very common in the papyri) see § 73.

IV. THIRD DECLENSION. (Two Terminations.)

(1) *Stems in η.*

(a) *Stems in -ov- and -ev-.*

These are declined like *ἡγεμών* and *ποιμήν* above (§ 56. 1), except for the addition of a neuter. Thus *σώφρων σοδερ*, *ἄρσην male* (*ἄρρην*—see § 42).

<i>Sing. N.</i>	<i>σώφρων</i>	<i>σώφρον</i>	<i>ἄρσην</i>	<i>ἄρσεν</i>
<i>A.</i>	<i>σώφρονα</i>		<i>ἄρσena</i>	
<i>Plur. N.</i>	<i>σώφρονες</i>	<i>σώφρονα</i>	<i>ἄρσeneς</i>	<i>ἄρσena</i>
<i>A.</i>	<i>σώφρονας</i>		<i>ἄρσenas</i>	

In Rev 12⁵ by the usual neglect of concord we have the neut. *ἄρσεν* in apposition to *υἰόν*: contrast *τὸν ἄρσena v. 13*.

(b) Comparatives in *-ων* (like participles in *-ώς* above) combine two stems in their flexion, viz. (*-ῖ*)-*ίος*-: (*-ῖ*)-*ίος*- and the same in weak gradation with a nasal stem added, *-is-on*-. See Brugmann *Grd.*² II. i. 547 ff. for the details.¹ Forms in Hellenistic are restricted to those in *-ίος*- and those in *-ιον*-. Thus:

	<i>Sing.</i>		<i>Plur.</i>	
<i>N.</i>	<i>μείζων</i> <i>μείζον</i>		<i>μείζονες</i>	<i>μείζονα</i>
			and <i>μείζους</i> (= <i>-ο(σ)ες</i>)	and <i>μείζω</i> (= <i>ο(σ)α</i>)
<i>A.</i>	<i>μείζονα</i> <i>μείζον</i>		<i>μείζονας</i>	<i>μείζονα</i>
	and <i>μείζω</i> (= <i>-ο(σ)α</i>)		and <i>μείζους</i> (= <i>nom.</i>)	and <i>μείζω</i>
<i>G.</i>	<i>μείζονος</i>		<i>μείζόνων</i>	
<i>D.</i>	<i>μείζονι</i>		<i>μείζουσι(ν)</i>	

(1) The shorter forms occur in Mt 26⁵³, Lk 21² DW, Jn 1⁵¹ (exc. B), 2¹⁰, 4¹, 5³⁶ (exc. D), Ac 13³¹ (not D), 19³², 21¹⁰, 23¹⁸, 31, 24¹¹, 25⁶ (not B),¹⁴

(2) The form in *-ω* has in Hellenistic an indeclinable use, of which there are one or two traces in NT. See for this *Proleg.* 50 and Thackeray 186. So Mt 26⁵³ *ΝΒΔ παραστήσει μοι πλείω δώδεκα λεγιῶνας ἀγγέλων*, Mt 23¹⁹ *Δ τί γὰρ μείζω*; P Leid C *νοσο* u. 17 (p. 118—B.C. 160), *πλήω μου ἔχει χαλκοῦς*, P Oxy vii. 1029²⁴ *πλείω τούτων (νιεν) μὴ εἶναι* etc. In Jn 1⁵⁰ *ΜΧΔ*, 5³⁶ *ΑΒω* etc. *μείζων*, and 2¹⁰ *Γ ελάσσων*, we find irrational *ν* added to the acc. sing or neut. pl.

¹ As the old mistake by which *-ous* was supposed to be contracted from *-ους* is still found in WS 88, the warning against this impossibility is not needless.

(2) *Stems in es.*

These answer to the noun flexion *συγγενής* in § 58: we only have to add neut. sing. *συγγενές* and pl. *συγγενῆ* (= *-ε(σ)α*). There are some sixty adjectives in NT belonging to this class, which has however rather strangely vanished in the modern vernacular, though that in *-ύς*, which it outnumbers five times or more in NT, has survived. See Thumb *Handb.* 72 f.

Πλήρης has considerable traces of an indeclinable use, which is often found in LXX uncials, and must probably be read in Mk 4²⁸ (C* cu²—it alone explains the variants), Jn 1¹⁴ (all but D), and—if we must follow the MSS—Ac 6⁶ (all but B). Add Mk 8¹⁹ AFGM *al.*, Ac 6³ AEHP *al.*, 19²⁸ AEL 33 cu¹, 2 Jn⁸ L. The vernacular evidence will be given in full in *Vocab. s.v.*: meanwhile see Thackeray 176 f. and references in *Prol.* 50 n. Despite the rather abundant instances in MSS, Thackeray is not inclined to accept the indecl. for the LXX, unless in Sir 19²⁶ and Job 21²⁴ (where a *σ* follows, and the mere transcriptional account mentioned above, § 31, may be applied). Deissmann *LAE* 125–7 thinks the evidence from papyri early enough to justify acceptance in Jn: his view that “in the Gospels and in St. Paul popular forms have always a fair claim to preference” leaves us free to exclude it from Ac. Then why follow the MSS in one place and not in the other? Can Luke have been faithfully copying the popular Greek of his source? But it must be admitted that early evidence is local and scanty. P Leid C verso ^{ll.} 14 (p. 118—B.C. 160) is much the oldest. Next comes a mun. my label in Preisigke *Sammelb.* 2632, which Deissmann dates from Augustus. P Lond recto 131¹³⁸ (= i. p. 174—A.D. 78–9) has *πληρῶ* acc. pl. This is all I know from i./A.D. and earlier.

V. MISCELLANEOUS. (Mainly One Termination.)

The remaining adjectives found in NT only occur in one or two forms.

Ἀμήτωρ and *ἀπάτωρ* (only N. sing.) make gen. *-ορος*: so *ἀπάτορος* gen. “with father unknown”—see *Vocab. s.v.* The neut. would be *-ορ* (with *τέκνον* or the like), but I have not seen it.

Ἄρπαξ, nom. pl. *ἄρπαγες*, *ravening*.

Ἀυτόχειρ, nom. pl. *αὐτόχειρες*, *with one's own hand*.

Νήστis fasting, acc. pl. *νήστεις*: see above, p. 132.

Πένης poor, dat. pl. *πένησι(ν)*, might as well be called a noun (stem in *-τ*). Similarly declined is

Πλάνης wandering, planet (with *ἀστéρες*), nom. pl. *πλάνητες* Jud 1⁸ B: other MSS have *πλανήται* (1st decl.), an alternative form found like *πλάνης* in earlier Greek in this connexion.

Τετράπους quadruped is only used as a neuter noun, in plural, *τετράποδα -ων*.

ADVERBS.

§ 66. As might be expected, the normal termination *-ως* extends its borders considerably in Hellenistic. (It has receded since almost entirely: see Thumb *Handb.* 77.) In NT there are about a hundred of these, fully a third of the total number of adverbs (not counting adverbial phrases) occurring there. The empiric rule that the adverb may be formed by changing the final *-ων* (*-ῶν*) of the gen. pl. masc. of an adjective into *-ως* (*-ῶς*) holds as in earlier Greek. They are attached to adjectives of all kinds, including participles used adjectivally (as *ἴσως*, *ὑπερβαλλόντως*, *ὁμολογουμένως*, *φειδομένως*). *Νουνεχῶς* (from *-ῆς* adj.) may be noticed as replacing the classical *νουνεχόντως* (in Plato even *ἐχόντως νοῦν*!) from Aristotle down. *Πρώτως* (Aristotle) occurs in Ac 11²⁶ (KBD² and some cursives) for the still far commoner classical *πρώτον*: cf. P Tebt ii. 295⁷ and 472 (ii/A.D.), and Rutherford *NP* 366. There is also some tendency to bring *-ως* into cpve. and superl.: thus in NT *ἐσχάτως* (not obviously superl. in form: it is moreover as old as Hippocrates), *σπουδαιότεως*, *περισσοτέρως*. Radermacher (p. 54) asserts that the extension of *-ως* belongs essentially to the written language: we might note the appearance of the new adverb *δλίγως* (2 Pet 2¹⁸) as characteristic of the writer's bookish style—Aquila and the Anthology appear to be its only supporters.

In the vernacular, where as Völker notes¹ *-ως* differed less and less from *-ος*, the tendency was (as in MGr) to extend the adverbial use of the accus. neut. Thus *πολλά*, *πάντα*, *οὐδέν* (whence MGr *δέν*), *ἑξάπινα*, *μέσον*, *ἐνώπιον*. In cpve. and superl. this was traditional: *ἐκτενέστερον*, *κάλλιον*, etc. (see below, § 67), follow classical rule, so do *μάλιστα*, *ἦδιστα*, *τάχιστα*, *πλείστα* (parr. *passim*).

Other case-endings appear in adverbial use: only a few instances need be named, since case-consciousness disappeared centuries before our period in nearly all of our exx. The fem. accus. appears in *μακράν* (sc. *ὁδόν*), *ἀκμήν*, *δωρεάν*. Old instrumentals have been recognised in *λάθρα*, *πάντη* (formed on the analogy of *ταύτη*, Brugmann *Grd.*² II. ii. 713), *εἰκῆ*, *πεξῆ*, *κρυφῆ*, *πόρρω* etc. Since there are adverbial datives, like *ἰδίᾳ*, *δημοσίᾳ*, and the ancient inscriptional witness shows some confusion, we cannot be perfectly certain whether to write *εἰκῆ* or *εἰκῆ̄*. See Brugmann's discussion *Grd.*² II. ii. 705: it is of course a mere matter of orthography for Hellenistic. Forms in *-ω* have no claim to the *ι*, and in the rest we may leave the matter open. Locatives are recognisable in *αἰεί* (from the stem *αἰγω-*, cf. Lat. *aeuom*), *πανοικί*, and with short *-ῑ* (cf. Brugmann *l.c.* 710) in the special class in *-ιστί*, answering the question *in what language?*, viz. *Ἑλληνιστί*, *Ῥωμαϊστί*, *Ἑβραϊστί*, *Λυκαονιστί*, *Συριστί* (*in Aramaic*) etc. Add the old word *πέρρωσι* (see § 106).

¹ *Papyrorum gr. Syntaxis Specimen*, p. 9—quoted with approval by Radermacher, *l.c.*

Accretions of *-s* are found in ἑγγύ-*s*, εὐθύ-*s* (orig. neut. acc. sing.), μέχρι-*s*, ἄχρι-*s* (see the chapter on Prepositions), πολλάκι-*s* and the numeral adverbs. An originally quasi-ablative *-θεν* has been attached in ἐκεῖθεν, πόρρωθεν, παντοθεν etc., and in a noun (παιδιόθεν), where the strengthening with ἐκ (Mk 9²¹) reminds us that the original force of the suffix is wearing thin. The suffix *-δον* should be noted in βουζιηδόν, ὀμοθυμαδόν, σχεδόν.

For *Compound adverbs* and *Prepositions*, see under WORD-FORMATION; and for *adverbial phrases* the sections on the several cases in the SYNTAX (Vol. III).

COMPARISON OF ADJECTIVES AND ADVERBS.

§ 67. The syntactical developments which have affected so seriously the comparison of adjectives and adverbs have been described in *Proleg.* 77 ff. (= *Einkl.* 120 ff.). They affect us at this point by driving out of use many forms that were largely employed in the classical period: the mixture of compar. and superl. has also produced some strengthened forms. There are two forms of comparison, surviving from the classical period, one of them of Indo-European antiquity, and the other partially so. Adjectives will be given in the nom. sing. masc., so that adverbs can be distinguished by their ending.

(1) *With suffix -ίων or γων, -ιστος.*

One new formation appears frequently in papyri and Hellenistic writers,¹ and four or five times in NT, viz. τάχειον (better τάχιον), which takes the place of θάσσων or θάπτων (= θαχ-ιον—Brugmann, *Grd.*² I. 363). This fell by its form out of association with the positive and superlative, and a new form was made on the model βέλτιον : βέλτιστα, κάλλιον : κάλλιστα etc. There is no reason whatever for assuming (with WS) that a "more original" form emerged for the first time in later Greek, though ταχίων and θάσσων might have coexisted (*-ιον-* as *lento-* form, *-γων-* as *allegro*): where analogy formation explains so easily, we cannot assume antiquity without any evidence. The remaining forms are all classical. Their obvious shrinking foreshadows their disappearance in later times: only κάλλιον survives in MGr (Thumb *Handb.* 74).

* ἄσσων nearer, from ἄγχι (cf. Ger. *enger*).

βέλτιον better, used as cpve. of εὖ (relative in 2 Ti 1¹⁸, Ac 10²⁸ D).

* ἔγγιστα nearest (Mk 6³⁶ D), sup. of ἑγγύς, which has cpve. ἐγγύτερος in class (2).

{ ἑλάσσων lesser, ἐλάχιστος. See below, (3). On the *-ων-* form see § 43. Cf. *Proleg.* 236.
 { ἑλαππων less.

¹ Rutherford *NP* 150; *CR* xv. 35.

*Ἡδίστα *most gladly*, sup. of ἡδέως (elative), Ac 13^d D, 2 Co 12^h 1^s.

{ *Ἥσσων *worse*. The -σσ- is in all the good uncials.

{ *Ἥσσον *worse, less*.

Κάλλιον *very well*. From καλῶς. See above.

{ Κρείσσων, κρείττων *better*, κράτιστος. Sup. only as title. For -ττ- see § 43. The most frequent cpve. of ἀγαθός in LXX.

{ Κρείσσον, κρείττον *better*.

Μᾶλλον *more, rather*, μάλιστα. Positive μάλα not in NT. Sup. generally not elative.¹

{ Μείζων *greater, greatest*, μέγιστος. Sup. only once (2 Pet 1^d, elative, as always in Κοινή).

{ Μείζον *more* (only Mt 20³¹).

{ Πλείων, πλέων *more*, πλείστος. Sup. only four times, of which two at least are elative: so sometimes πλείων. The forms without ε occur in Lk 31^s, Jn 21¹⁵ & BCD (adv.), Ac 15²⁸ (exc. D cu⁴), and in one or two primary uncials at Mt 5²⁰, Mk 12⁴³, Lk 7⁴²⁻⁴³ 11³¹ 12²³ 21³, Jn 7³¹, 2 Co 2⁶. MGr πμό or πλιό (from πλείων rather than πλέων) takes the place μᾶλλον had in forming comparatives.

{ Πλείον, πλέον *more*.

Τάχιον *faster* (see above), τάχιστα. Sup. only in Ac 17¹⁵. Positive τάχα or ταχέως.

*Υψιστος *highest*. Exc. in the phrase ἐν τ. ὑψίστοις, only used as title of God.

Χείρων *worse*, used as cpve. of κακός.

(2) *With suffix -τερος -τατος.*

§ 68. The following forms are found in NT:

(1) Compar.: ἀκριβέστερον, ἀλυπότερος, ἀναγκαίστερος, ἀνεκτότερος, ἀσθενέστερος, ἀτιμότερος, βαρύτερος, βεβαιοότερος, δεισιδαιμονέστερος, διαφορώτερος, διπλότερος, ἐγγύτερον, ἐκτενεύστερον, ἐλαχιστότερος, ἐλευνότερος, ἐντιμότερος, εὐγενέστερος (εὐθυμότερος T.R.), εὐκόπωτερος, ἰσχυρότερος, καινότερος, κομψότερον, μακαριώτερος, μειζότερος, μικρότερος, νεώτερος, περισσότερος -ον -ως, πολυτιμότερος, πονηρύτερος, πρεσβύτερος, πυκνότερον, σοφώτερος, σπουδαιότερος -ως, τελειώτερος, τολμηροτέρως or -ον, τομώτερος, ὑψηλότερος, φρονιμώτερος (χρησιμώτερος T.R.)—see also (3) below.

(2) Superl.: ἀγιώτατος, ἀκριβέστατος, τιμιώτατος.²

The formations here are altogether upon the old models. As may be expected, there are occasional substitutions of -ώτερος for -ότερος, and *vice versa*: the two were equivalent long before the later uncials were written, and the traditional

¹ There are places where μᾶλλον appears to be elative, as Mt 6²⁶. In 1 Co 7²¹ we may translate "by all means seize (the opportunity)": cf. *Prolog.* 247.

² Overlooked by Blass, p. 33 (also by Debrunner, p. 36).

distinction meant no more than it does in MGr (cf. Thumb *Handb.* 73). The three superl. in *-τατος*, of which only *ἀκριβέστατος* is true superl., tell of the vanishing of this form, which is however still common in the papyri: ¹ Thumb *l.c.* shows how it has a limited elative use to-day. Among the details note—

(a) *Διπλότερος* Mt 23¹⁵ is irregular (cf. class. *ἀπλούστερος*): it occurs in Appian (ii/A.D.) *Praef. Hist. Rom.* 10 *διπλότερα τούτων*. The form *ἀπλότερος* occurs in *Anth. Pal.* vi. 185, and *διπλός* *ib.* x. 101. Cf. Lat. *duplus*, and see Lobeck *Phryg.* 234.

(b) On comparative adverbs in *-ως* instead of *-ον* see K.Bl. i. 577 n.¹. Both are classical.

(c) *Double comparison*.—*μειζότερος* 3 Jn ⁴ and its parallels² are best explained (like Eng. *more, lesser, worsser*, Ger. *mehrere*) as efforts to add fresh strength to a form the comparative force of which was somewhat blunted through its not having the normal termination. MGr *π(λ)εϊότερος* and *χερότερος*, from *πλείων* and *χείρων*, *πρωτίτερος* from *πρῶτος*, continue the tendency. *Ἐλαχιστότερος* in Eph 3⁸ is on the other hand, when compared with 1 Co 15⁹, a kind of *tour de force* in expression, like Aristotle's *τοῦ ἐσχαίου ἐσχατώτερος* (*Metaph.* ix. 4).³ To this heading practically belongs also the frequent use of pleonastic *μᾶλλον* with *cpve*.

(3) *Miscellaneous.*

§ 69. (a) A number of comparative formations in *-τερος* from adverb bases may be put in a class together:

¹ *Ἀνώτερον* *higher*, from *ἄνω*.

² *Ἐξώτερος* *outer*, from *ἔξω*.

³ *Ἐσώτερος* *inner*, from *ἔσω*.

{ *Κατώτερος* *lower*, from *κάτω*, Eph 4⁹. There is a significant alteration of this to *κατώτατα* (*μέρη*) when quoted by sundry Greek fathers.

{ *Κατώτερω* *lower*.

Περαιτέρω *further*, from *πέραν*.

Πορρώτερον *further*, from *πάρω*. So BA, *-ρω* & D etc.

¹ As in Hermas (Blass 33, Bl.-Debr. 36): Blass's suggestion that the *Κοινή* at Rome differed in this respect from that found elsewhere (as in Egypt) is thus seen to be unproved.

² WS wrongly cft. *θεομακαριστότατος* Ignat. *Polyc.* 7²: *θεομακάριστος* is not a superl. (see Lightfoot *Ignat.* ii. 292). Does this suggest the origin of the MGr superl. formations beginning with *θεο-* (Thumb *Handb.* 74)? One compares *ἀστέιος τῷ θεῷ*, which is assumed to be Hebraic. An early ex. in Minnervus (fr. 11⁹—vii/cent.) *ἀμεινώτερος*. Exx. from papyri in CR xv. 35. See Hatzidakis 177, K.Bl. i. 573.

³ We have however *ἐλαχιστότατος* in Sextus Empiricus (iii/A.D.).

Πρότερος *former*, from πρό: see below.

{ *Υστερος *later, last*. From the adverb which appears in Skt. as *ud* and in English as *out*.
 { *Υστερον *afterwards, last*.

(b) Two superlatives are formed with suffix -ατος, viz. πρῶτος (from *πρωτός, Skt. *pūva* "former") and ἔσχατος (from *ἔσχος, akin to ἐξ—Brugmann *Gr.*⁴ 241). Cf. ὑπατος (ἀθύπατος *proconsul*) from ὑπό. On the relations of πρότερος and πρῶτος see *Proleg.* 79.

(c) Many of the substitutes for comparison must be left to the Syntax; but one word deserves quoting from MGr, περισσότερος as cpve. of πολὺς. That περισσός and its cpve. are practically *suppletiva* for πολὺς is clear in NT.

NUMERALS.

§ 70. The following occur in NT: see § 71 (b) for their combinations.

Value.	Sign.	Cardinals.	Ordinals.	Adverbials.
1	ᾱ	εἰς <i>one</i>	πρῶτος <i>first</i>	ἅπαξ <i>once</i>
2	β̄	δύο	δύτερος	δῖς
3	γ̄	τρεις	τρίτος	τρίς
4	δ̄	τέσσαρες	τέταρτος	τετράκις
5	ε̄	πέντε	πέμπτος	πεντάκις
6	ϛ̄	ἕξ	ἕκτος	
7	ζ̄	ἑπτὰ	ἕβδομος	ἑπτάκις
8	η̄	ὀκτώ	ὀγδοος	
9	θ̄	ἐννέα	ἕνατος	
10	ῑ	δέκα	δέκατος	
11	ιᾱ	ἑνδεκα	ἐνδέκατος	
12	ιβ̄	δώδεκα δεκαδύο	δωδέκατος	
14	ιδ̄	δεκατέσσαρες	τεσσαρεσκαδέκατος	
15	ιε̄	δεκαπέντε	πεντεκαδέκατος	
16	ιϛ̄	δέκα ἕξ		
18	ιη̄	δέκα ὀκτώ	οἱ δέκα καὶ ὀκτώ	
20	κ̄	εἴκοσι(ν)		
30	λ̄	τριακόνα		
40	μ̄	τεσσαράκοντα τεσσεράκοντα		
50	ϛ̄	πεντήκοντα	πεντηκοστος	
60	ξ̄	ἑξήκοντα		

70	̅ζ	ἑβδομήκοντα	ἑβδομηκοντάκις
80	̅π	ὀγδοήκοντα	
90	̅ϙ	ἐνενήκοντα	
100	̅ρ	ἑκατόν	
200	̅σ	διακόσιοι	
300	̅τ	τριακόσιοι	
400	̅υ	τετρακόσιοι	
500	̅ϕ	πεντακόσιοι	
600	̅χ	ἑξακόσιοι	
1,000	̅α	χίλιοι	
2,000	̅β	δισχίλιοι	
3,000	̅γ	τρισχίλιοι	
4,000	̅δ	τετρακισχίλιοι	
5,000	̅ε	πεντακισχίλιοι ἢ ὀχλιάδες πέντε	
7,000	̅ζ	χιλιάδες ἑπτὰ ἢ ἑπτακισχίλιοι	
10,000	̅μ	μύριοι ἢ δέκα χιλιάδες	
12,000	̅νβ	δώδεκα χιλιάδες	
20,000	̅μ	εἴκοσι χιλιάδες ἢ (δισμύριοι—see below, § 71 b (4))	
50,000	̅μ	μυριάδες πέντε	
100,000,000		μυριάδες μυριάδων. [For the sign see below.]	

Those which do not happen to occur in the NT may be supplied.

Cardinals: 700 $\bar{\psi}$ ἑπτακόσιοι—800 $\bar{\omega}$ ὀκτακόσιοι—900 $\bar{\chi}$ ἑνακόσιοι.

Ordinals: 20th $\bar{\epsilon}$ εἰκοστός, 100th $\bar{\epsilon}$ ἑκατοστός, 400th $\bar{\tau}$ τετρακοσιοστός (*et sim.* for the rest), 1000th $\bar{\chi}$ χιλιόστός.

Adverbial: 6 times $\bar{\epsilon}$ ἑξάκις, 8 $\bar{\delta}$ ὀκτάκις, 9 $\bar{\epsilon}$ ἐνάκις, 10 $\bar{\delta}$ δεκάκις (*et sim.*), 20 $\bar{\epsilon}$ εἰκοσάκις, 100 $\bar{\epsilon}$ ἑκατοντάκις, 1000 $\bar{\chi}$ χιλιάκις, 10,000 $\bar{\mu}$ μυριάκις.

Since many of these are on the way to become obsolete (see below), we cannot expect always to find actual instances in Hellenistic texts. All the supplements just mentioned occur in the LXX, except the ordinals 1,000th and 10,000th and the adverbials 9 times, 100 times, 1000 times, and 10,000 times. In the case of the higher numbers this is probably not accidental: it is suggestive that we find $\bar{\mu}$ μυριάκις $\bar{\mu}$ μύριοι otherwise expressed in Rev 5¹¹ 9¹⁶.

A. Signs.

Three supplementary signs, drawn from older forms of the alphabet, made the available ciphers 27: these were $\bar{\sigma}$ σίγμα for 6 (σ , in papyri C), $\bar{\kappa}$ κόππα for 90 (ρ or q), $\bar{\sigma}$ σάν or $\bar{\sigma}$ σαμπι for 900 (ρ or τ). The signs thus fell into three sets of nine each; $\bar{\alpha}$ – $\bar{\theta}$ units, $\bar{\iota}$ – $\bar{\eta}$ tens, $\bar{\rho}$ – $\bar{\tau}$ hundreds. These horizontal straight strokes (in MSS sometimes curled thus ~, as in D) preserve the ciphers from confusion with the letters in their ordinary use; but their employment was not essential. From 1000 to 9000 the unit ciphers are used

over again, differentiated in papyri by a large curved flourish at the top ($\wedge A$), in MSS by a sloping line below (together with the other line sometimes), as $\tilde{\epsilon}$, 5000 (D). The ciphers were usually, but not necessarily, placed in order of magnitude with the highest at the left, as $\overline{aqis} = 1916$. From 10,000 upwards the system started afresh, the signs being written over a large M, the initial of *μυριάδες*: thus $\overset{M}{M} = 50,000$.

In printed books ordinary accents are usually employed for the horizontal line.

(a) "In this way the Greeks could express by symbols any number less than a hundred millions . . . ; and hence perhaps we may understand why it was that in nations which used this system of notation, the next highest number, ten thousand times ten thousand, was used to represent a multitude which no man could number, as in Dn 7¹⁰, Rev 5¹¹."¹

(b) The dropping of the horizontal line, which in ordinary arithmetic was not needed, made these series of ciphers exactly like words, the more so as their order did not matter, and they could be arranged very often so as to be pronounceable. Hence no doubt arose the link between numbers and names, which on the one side produced mystic words like *αβρασαξ*, the number of the year (since $1+2+100+1+200+1+60=365$), and on the other made a name numerically significant, as *Ἰησοῦς*=888. For the Greek custom as applied to Rev 13¹⁸, see Deissmann *LAE* 275-7: see also Moffatt *EGT*, or Charles *ICC*, *in loc.*, for the view which finds a Hebrew "gematria" here.

(c) Fractions could be expressed in words or in the alphabetic notation. Sometimes both are found together, as in P Ryl ii. 202 (a)². 10 (A.D. 108) (*πυροῦ*) *ὀκτὼ τρίτου*(ν) *ἰβ'*, (*γίνεται*) (*πυροῦ*) *ἡγ' ἰβ'* "eight and a third and $\frac{1}{2}$ artabae of wheat, total $8\frac{5}{2}$ of wheat." $\frac{1}{2}$ was abbreviated \angle : neither this nor γ' nor δ' is found in NT. See Mayser 52 for further information.

B. Cardinals.

§ 71. (a) *Declension and Orthography*.—Cardinals are indeclinable, except the first four, and those in the table above from *διακόσιοι* onward: these are ordinary plural adjectives, while *χιλιάς* and *μυριάς* are singular collective nouns (gen. *-άδος*). The first four are thus declined:

N.	<i>εἷς</i>	<i>μία</i>	<i>ἓν</i>	<i>δύο</i>	<i>τρῆς</i>	<i>τρία</i>	<i>τέσσαρες</i>	<i>τέσσαρα</i>
A.	<i>ἕνα</i>	<i>μίαν</i>	<i>ἓν</i>	<i>δύο</i>	<i>τρῆς</i>	<i>τρία</i>	<i>τέσσαρες</i>	<i>τέσσαρα</i>
G.	<i>ἑνός</i>	<i>μῆς</i>	<i>ἑνός</i>	<i>δύο</i>	<i>τριῶν</i>		<i>τεσσάρων</i>	
D.	<i>ἐνί</i>	<i>μῆ</i>	<i>ἐνί</i>	<i>δυσί</i> (ν)	<i>τρισί</i> (ν)		<i>τεσσαρσί</i> (ν)	

¹ "The Employment of the Alphabet in Greek Logistic," by J. G. Smyly *Mélanges Nicole* 519.

These flexions are followed also when standing at the end of a combination, as *δεκατεσσάρων*.

(α) Like *εἰς* are *οὐδεὶς οὐδεμία οὐδέν* and *μηδεὶς*: for the alternative forms (masc. and neut.) *οὐθείς μηθείς* see § 46.

(β) The disappearance of the dual flexion of *δύο* is in line with the general development of *Κοινή* Greek: see *Prol.* 77 ff. *Δύω* (pre-classical) is found in Ptolemaic papyri by Mayser (p. 313), probably a sheer mistake. NT shows neither the gen. *δυῶν* (Mayser 314) nor the literary Hellenistic *δυεῖν* (late Attic), which appears in some parts of LXX (Thackeray 187), as in Josephus, and not seldom in papyri. *Δύο* indecl., a primitive form, was ousted from the dative in Hellenistic by the pluralised form *δυσί(ν)*. This appears first in Hippocrates, and is traced by Brugmann (*Grd.*² II. ii. 9) to Ionic. It is regular in literary *Κοινή* from Aristotle's time, and in papyri from the end of ii/B.C.: see ref. in Mayser 314. *Δυσί(ν)* is of course lost in MGr., which has sometimes *δυῶ(ν)* (Thumb *Handb.* 81). See *Vocabulary s.v.* for the papyrus record.

(γ) (1) *τέσσαρες* is found as accus. extremely often in papyri, and is actually normal in LXX (Thackeray 148). We should have expected it in NT uncials, where however it is not adequately attested: see citations in *Prol.* 36 n. WH (*App.*² 157) make Rev 4⁴ (2nd) the one occurrence out of eight where there is not some good authority for *τέσσαρες* acc.: cf. also *ib.* 138, and *Prol.* 243, where its predominance in Egyptian business documents is noted. It is rather tempting to connect it specially with Egyptian *Κοινή*, in view of its record (α) in LXX, (β) in papyri and ostraca, (c) in *Ⲛ*,¹ the Alexandrian origin of which is becoming more and more probable. To associate it with the acc. in *-ες* as an element drawn from Achæan-Dorian *Κοινή* (as *Prol.* 36) is on the whole a less probable account of its origin than we get by calling in the influence of *δύο* and *τρεις*, neither of which has a separate acc. form. But both causes may have operated.

(2) *τέσσαρα* appears in Jn 19²³ *ⲚALM* (not BW), Rev 4⁶ A (not *ⲚP* 046), 4⁸ *ⲚA* (not P 046), 5⁸ *ⲚA*, 5¹⁴ A, 19⁴ *ⲚAC*: the word itself does not occur elsewhere. WH are clearly justified in editing it for Rev., on the principle that the MSS are to be followed: it is not so easy to admit it in Jn. *τέσσαρες* and *τέσσαρας* (Rev 4⁴ A) have in any case no place in NT, nor in LXX, where *τέσσαρα* is normal (Thackeray 187). We cannot therefore regard *τέσσαρα* as Ionic, as the other Ionic forms would have accompanied it, recommended further by uniformity. But even *τέσσαρα* does not appear in papyri till ii/A.D., and then but rarely.² The Ionic sphere of influence, Asia Minor, behaved in this matter quite

¹ Curiously enough, it is B which shows it in LXX (Octateuch), *Ⲛ* only having it twice (Thackeray, 73).

² In *CR* xv. 33 I quoted *τέσσαρας* from OPR 242 (A.D. 40), but it must be corrected to *τέσσαρες* acc. Mr. Thackeray also fell into a slip on this matter, in his statement (*Gr.* 74) that the form starts in i/A.D.: he admits it in a letter to me (Dec. 1910). An Egyptian inscr. of i/B.C., in *Archiv* i. 209, no. 22, has *δεκατέσσαρα*, and the same word occurs in BGU i. 133⁹ (A.D. 144-5).

differently: see Schweizer *Perg.* 163. If we could assume that a strictly localised phonetic change produced *ερα* out of *αρα*, in the period just preceding that of *κ*, we might explain the absence of *τέσσαρες* by the prevalence of the nominative form (above (1)). The normal acc. thus was *τέσσαρες*, *τέσσαρα*, which constrained scribes within its area to forsake the *αρα* of the LXX and NT autographs.

(3) *Τεσσάρων* is invariable in LXX and NT, and *τέσσαροι(ν)* is normal in both (5 times in NT). But the Homeric and poetical *τέτρασι(ν)* appears in Ac 10¹¹ E Orig, 11⁵ D Epiph, Rev. 20⁸ κ (Jud 9⁸⁴ B); Crönert shows (p. 199) it was common in literary Hellenistic. In Rev 7² κ has the indeclinable form *τοῖς τέσσαρες*. MGr preserves the distinction in vocalism between nom.-acc. and gen., the former usually being *τέσσερις*, the gen. always *τεσσάρων(ν)* (Thumb *Handb.* 81).

(8) (1) Between 13 and 19 the forms in the table are firmly established from iii/B.C. down. These were in use as far back as v/B.C. in Attic, in places where the substantive preceded the numeral (Thumb *Hell.* 82). In LXX it alternates with the other form (*τρεῖςκαίδεκα* etc.), but it is almost universal in NT, and MGr has no alternative. Lk 13¹⁶ has *δέκα καὶ ὀκτώ ἔτη* (D ἔτη ἡ), while *ἔτη δέκα ὀκτώ* in v.¹¹ happens to preserve the classical rule mentioned above: the agreement is mere coincidence, as the frequency of such numerals preceding the noun in NT shows. *Δέκα καὶ ὀκτώ*—which is also found in Lk 13⁴ AW, ¹¹ AL—is a compromise form found sometimes in LXX (Thackeray 188): the old *ὀκτωκαίδεκα* is reversed by the influence of the cipher ἡ, the commonest way of writing.¹ Whether we should write *δεκαοκτώ* as well as *δεκατέσσαρες* and *δεκαπέντε* as one word is hard to determine. Ti.-Gregory (p. 109) give *δεκαοκτώ* on the witness of the cursives: WH make an exception and print *δέκα ὀκτώ*, which is perhaps supported by the fact that the numeral may be *δέκα ὀχτώ* as well as *δεκοχτώ* in MGr, like *δεκαννιά* or *δέκα ἔννιά* for 19 (Thumb *Handb.* 80).

(2) Analogy attempted to extend the rule to 11 and 12. For the former *δεκαμίαν* in an ostrakon of ii/B.C. and *δεκαμῆς* in P Oxy ii. 248 (i/A.D.) are isolated instances. But *δεκαδύο* flourished during the Ptolemaic age, from which Mayser (p. 316) can only cite one instance of *δώδεκα*. *Δεκαδύο* appeared in Attica about B.C. 100, and in Asia Minor a little earlier. Polybius has it, and sometimes MSS of Josephus.² But it died out rapidly, for *δώδεκα* predominates already in Wilcken's ostraca (*Proleg.* 246), and MGr has only *ἔντεκα* and *δώδεκα*. Wellhausen³ states about D that "twelve, in the two places where the number is written out, is *δεκαδύο*, not *δώδεκα*." There are in fact eight instances of *δώδεκα* in D,⁴ with *δεκαδύο* in Mt 19²⁸, Lk 9¹⁷, and ιβ in 38 places (Lk 8⁴⁸ βι). *Δεκαδύο*

¹ The great frequency of this writing in such a MS as D suggests the probability that the autographs used symbols rather than words for numbers. So in our oldest papyrus scrap (p¹ in Souter) we find *ιδ ter* in Mt 17.

² Meisterhans³ 159; Schweizer *Perg.* 164; Schmidt *Jos.* 508.

³ *Einleitung* ¹ 11: cf. *Proleg.* 96 and Thackeray *Gr.* 188. It does not always do to trust in German accuracy without verifying references!

⁴ See the facsimile in Mt 9²⁰ 11¹, Lk 9¹², Jn 6¹³. 67. 71 11⁹, Ac 19⁷.

appears also in Ac 19⁷ 24¹¹ HLP ω : Ti on the former passage cites very scanty cursive witness in six places. As we might expect, δεκαδύο makes a rather better show, though still a poor one, in LXX (Thackeray 188).

(ε) Τεσσαράκοντα is much better supported in papyri than the corresponding forms of *four*, and in NT the uncials give decisive testimony. No single quotation of -ap- can be made from \aleph ABC, except Rev 7⁴ A. D wavers, having -ep- once and -ap- twice (often $\bar{\mu}$, after its manner). W has -ap- twice in Mt 4², and $\bar{\mu}$ elsewhere (*ter*). The papyri however tell a very different tale; ¹ and MGr σαράντα, the only form given in Thumb *Handb.* 80, shows that the ε infection was not lasting. It is not probable that it appeared in the NT autographs. If they had $\bar{\mu}$, as suggested above, we can assign the uncial tradition to an age when the -ep- form was temporarily established. The fact that *forty* had the syllable before the accent, and *four* after it, was noted in § 33 as the probable cause of the difference between them.

Note σεράκοντα in Ac 7³⁰ C—a first step in the vernacular towards the apocopated form of MGr. An ostracon of vi/vii A.D., now in the Rylands Library, Manchester, shows the numerals from 44 to 49 written out as “μζ σερακονταεπτα” etc. A yet more remarkable anticipation was developing in the first centuries A.D. Dieterich *Unters.* 186 cites τράντα from an early inscr., and by ix/A.D. σαράντα and the rest of the series were established as they are now.

(ζ) Ἐνεήκοντα in several cursives at Mt 18^{12z} and Lk 15⁴⁻⁷ is written ἐννεν. : it was natural that ἐννέα should sometimes assimilate the other 9 forms in which the single ν was correct.

(b) Arrangement.

(1) The order which Hellenistic has adopted for the 'teens is kept up usually in higher combinations, as 99 ἐνεήκοντα ἐννέα, 153 (gen.) ἑκατὸν πενήκοντα τριῶν, 616 ἑξακόσιοι δέκα ἔξ. In four places καί is added, as in Lk 13¹⁶ above, viz. Jn 2²⁰ 5⁵ (where B and minor uncials omit), Ac 13²⁰, Gal 3¹⁷. It is probably not accidental that all five are in time-reckonings with ἔτη: there are however exceptions enough to make any rule doubtful—thus Lk 2³⁷ 13¹¹, Gal 2¹, 2 Co 12². In Rev 11² and 13⁵ we have μῆνας τεσσαράκοντα [καί] δύο: the καί is dropped by \aleph P, with C in 13⁵. Ptolemaic papyri agree with NT usage, with καί proportionately rare. The rule was for the numeral to follow the noun (Mayser 316 f.). This however does not hold in NT Greek,

¹ Τεσσαρ. seems to appear first in BGU iv. 1105¹², 1170⁶, both Alexandrian, from about B.C. 10. P Lond 262¹ (A.D. 11) (=ii. p. 177) has τεσσαρακοστοῦ, but also τεσσαρ. bis. Lists kindly lent me by Mr. Thackeray (completed in 1906) show -ap- in i/ A.D. 21 : 2, in ii/ 18 : 13, in iii/ 8 : 7. See § 33 for fuller notes.

where for the earlier numbers the other order predominates: from 14 on the numeral more often follows.

(2) The old method of representing by subtraction numbers ending in 8 and 9 has not survived, except in 2 Co 11²⁴ *τεσσαράκοντα παρὰ μίαν forty less one*. It is not found in MGr.

(3) Arithmetical processes are not represented in NT. We may just note that an addition sum ends with *γίνεται* (usually abbreviated) = *comes to*: cf. Ac 4⁴ *ἐγενήθη ἀριθμὸς τῶν ἀνδρῶν ὡς χιλιάδες εἰ* (D). *Ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό* also has an arithmetical connotation,¹ which suggests itself in Ac 2⁴⁷. *Προσθεῖναι ἐπὶ* c. acc. may be noted in Mt 6²⁷ = Lk 12²⁵ (cf. Rev 22¹⁸). *Ἐπὶ* is often multiplicative, as *χιλιάδες ἐπὶ δεκάδας γίνονται μυριάδες* (= *ἐπὶ ἰ/Μ*) 1000 × 10 = 10,000. This use of *ἐπὶ* is not unlike Phil 2²⁷ *ἵνα μὴ λύπηνη ἐπὶ λύπηνη σχῶ*.

(4) It is noteworthy that *χίλιοι* with numeral adverbs is supplanted after 5000 by *χιδιάδες* with cardinal: in Ac 4⁴ we have this for 5000 as well. It is curious therefore that in Ro 11⁴ the *ἑπτὰ χιλιάδας* of LXX should be deliberately replaced by *ἑπτακισχιλίους*. In MGr *χιλιάδες* has driven *χίλιοι* out, except for *χίλιοι* 1000. Just so in NT we note that *χιλιάς* does not come in for the single thousand: it begins where it has to be plural. In Rev 14³ it is still an inflected fem. noun, and in 5¹¹ it keeps its substantive constr.; but in 7^{4ff.} and elsewhere it is already, as in MGr, an adjective agreeing with its noun, expressed or understood.² Similarly *μύριοι* gives place to *μυριάδες* after the unit, but the latter retains its substantive character. (So even in late papyri, as P Oxy vi. 896¹⁷ (A.D. 316) [*ἀργυρίου δηναρίων μύριαδαν μίαν*].³) In Rev 9¹⁶ we have it qualified by an adverb, as if *δισμύριοι*; but as it has a dependent genitive following it is better to write *δὲς μυριάδες*, a noun, or to follow *κ* and two or three cursives with *δύο*. The autograph may well have had *β̄*. *Μύριοι* and *-άς* are obsolete in MGr.

C. Ordinals.

§ 72. It is significant that no ordinals beyond *fifteenth* occur in the NT. *Πεντηκοστή* was specialised as a feast-

¹ [For another explanation of this phrase see *Harvard Theol. St.* i. 10 ff. (C. C. Torrey); also discussions in *JBL* xxxvii. 105 ff. For further treatment see the Appendix on Semitisms.—ED.]

² Rev 21¹⁶ is ambiguous, but 14²⁰ makes the adj. more probable.

³ Cf. for this common combination P Oxy vii. index, p. 256.

name: in papyri it and *ἐκατοστή* similarly survive, as names of taxes. MGr on the same lines uses *πέφτη* *fifth* as the name of Thursday; but neither this nor the higher ordinals are now found, the cardinals supplanting them after *τέταρτος*. This use apparently goes back to Byzantine times, but it does not occur in NT, except in the case of *εἰς*. That this use of *εἰς* is not due to Hebraism, apart from a modicum of influence due to "translation Greek," may be inferred from considerations set forth in *Prol.* 96. We may add to them the fact that the locution *εἰς καὶ εἰκοστός* or *εἰκάς* does not go beyond the first unit: *ἡ μία καὶ εἰκάς* is *the 21st* (day of the month), but *ἡ ἕκτη καὶ εἰκάς* *the 26th*.

The ordinals in the 'teens are formed from the old cardinals in which *δέκα* stands last, after *καί*. Thackeray gives them as "possibly of Ionic origin." They were at any rate found in Boeotian: thus *ἐνακηδεκάτη* (Larfeld 16¹⁷²—iii/ii B.C.), *ἑσκηδεκάτη* (Thumb *Dial.* 231) etc. We may note that compounds also prefer this older form of the cardinal as base: so the series with *ἔτος*, as *ἑπτακαιδεκαετής*. What NT writers would have used for ordinals between 21st and 99th we might infer from such forms as *δυστριακοστόν* 32nd (P Ryl ii. 157⁸—A.D. 135), *τετρακαιεξηκοστόν* 64th, *τεσσαρακοσθόγον* 48th. We have also *ἐκατοπεντηκοστόν* 150th.

The type *εικοστός πρῶτος* still retains signs of life in LXX (Thackeray 189), but neither this nor *εἰς δεύτερος καὶ εἰκοστός*—found in Ptolemaic papyri (Mayser 318)—appears in NT. In the later LXX books there was a tendency to reverse the order, conforming to the normal order of the alphabetic signs, which had already affected the cardinals. Thus in a petition of iv/A.D. (P Oxy vi. 889¹⁷) we find *ἑβδομηκοστόν καὶ τρίτον*. Sundry eccentric forms survived: $\frac{3}{4}$ is *τετρακαιεκοστόν* in early Ptolemaic papyri, and is seen still in ii/A.D. (as P Fay 82 and 83) and even in iv/A.D. (P Lips 87⁶ *τετρακαικοστόν*). Ordinals in fractions and days of the month were so often written with symbols—as $\overline{\eta}$ = *the 18th*, $\kappa' \varsigma' = \frac{1}{28}$ etc.—that the papyri present us with relatively few written out in full.

The absence in NT of *τετράς*, *εἰκάς*, *τριακάς* (words of the same class as *χίλιás*) to denote the 4th, 20th, and 30th of the month is only due to lack of opportunity. They were used in LXX as in classical Greek, and in papyri well after the NT period. *Τετράς* was transferred to name a day of the week (Ps 94 (93) title), and *τετράδη* to-day means *Wednesday*. The only sign of obsolescence is that they were unused by Theodotion and his school (Thackeray 189); but the frequency even of *τριακάς* in papyri—

note for example P Oxy vi. 967, a private letter of ii/A D.—disposes of any inference.

The forms of ordinals that do occur in NT are in other respects normal. "Ογδοος is nowhere contracted, as (rarely) in papyri. Τεσσαρεσκαίδεκατος in Ac 27^{27. 33} is written τεσσαρασκ. in 81, perhaps under the influence of τεσσαρακ., which occasionally appears in papyri. B³ writes τεσσαρισκ., as does H the second time: this is found frequently in LXX in correctors of B, and once in B* A (Thackeray). It is assimilated to τρισκαίδεκατος, an orthographic variant of τρισκ.; but we may remember that τέσσαρις is the normal MGr for the cardinal *four*. In πεντεκαδεκάτω Lk 3¹ L drops the -και-.

The ghost-word δευτεροπρώτω Lk 6¹ (all but **π**⁴ NBLW, some important cursives, and the best versions) will be dealt with under Word-composition (§ 104).

D. Adverbials.

That in MGr these multiplicatives have disappeared from ordinary use—there are survivals like τριςβαθος "thrice deep," i.e. "very deep"—makes their fewness in NT easily intelligible. There is no sign among NT MSS (so far as Ti records) of the forms in -κι, found rarely in LXX and papyri (Thackeray 136, Mayser 244): Crönert p. 143 f. gives a considerable list of instances from MSS, especially in Josephus.

In Mt 18²² εβδομηκοντάκις ἑπτά is in any case abbreviated for ἑπτάκις (which is read by D). But the question arises whether the -κις has not been added to the wrong element: see *Prolog.* 98. W. C. Allen (*Comm. in loc.*) accepts the allusion to Gn 4²⁴ (first noticed by Tertullian), but suggests that in the LXX there and in Mt *loc.* we should alike translate *seventy times seven*. In that case the LXX mistranslated the Hebrew. Origen took it as 77 times, as McNeile notes *in loc.* Mr. H. Scott notes the reference in the Testaments, *Benj.* 7⁴, where the phrase is quoted with 70 × 7 as the meaning.

E. Distributives.

Two each, etc., are expressed by δύο δύο, or by ἀνά δύο or κατὰ δύο—sometimes the two forms are combined. On these

see *Prolog.* 97; also Thumb *Handb.* 83 for the corresponding usage in MGr. Further discussion is reserved for the Syntax: see also the Semitism examined in the Appendix.

F. Other Numeral Series.

§ 73. Definite compounds with extant words (such as τετράμηνος κτλ., διετής κτλ.) will be reserved for the section on Word-composition (§ 107); but we may bring in here those series in which the numerals are specialised for certain uses by agglutinative suffixes—for their history see the section on Word-formation by suffixes.

Abstract numerals, like τριάς *triad*, do not occur in the NT, except for those like χιλιάς, μυριάς, which have been appropriated for a different purpose: on these see above, *B.* They survive in MGr only in specialised senses, as ἡ Τριάδα *the Trinity* (Thumb *Handb.* 84). A derivative τετράδιον occurs (Ac 12⁴), meaning *a company of four*: it is an instance of the specialising force of the suffix -ιον (Petersen *Greek Diminutives in -ιον*, p. 84 ff., where τετράδιον is not mentioned).

Multiplicative numeral adjectives are found with the suffixes -πλοῦς (ἀπλοῦς, διπλοῦς, τετραπλοῦς) and -πλασίων (akin to our *-fold* (ἐκατονταπλασίων). It is significant that *30-fold* and *60-fold* are otherwise expressed in Mk 4⁸, though τριακονταπλάσιος (and -ων) had existed: analogy had clearly ceased to be productive. Ἀπλός, διπλός still survive, and διπλός makes a new series τριδίπλος etc. (Thumb *Handb.* 83).

Of the n-th day is expressed by a series in -αῖος: so in NT δευτεραῖος, τεταρταῖος, and cf. ὀκταήμερος, which shows that the series did not develop in popular Greek. Polybius has the regular ὄγδοαῖος, and literary Greek shows a large number of these forms.

Fractions scarcely appear in NT. τὸ τρίτον $\frac{1}{3}$ (sign γ') occurs in Rev 8 *sexies*, and τὸ τέταρτον $\frac{1}{4}$ (δ') in Rev 6⁸. We have also the word for *half* (sign ∟), ἡμίσιος, in classical Greek declined -εῖα -υ regularly. It is derived from the proethnic *sēmi-* (ἡμι-, Lat. *sēmi-*, O.E. *sām* (in Shakespeare's *sandblind*) with the suffix -tu. Ἡμι- occurs in many compounds, as ἡμίωρον *half an hour*, ἡμιόλιος *one and a half* (adj.). Some curious features arise in the spelling and declension of ἡμίσιος

in NT times. The fem. *ἡμίσεια* has been cut loose from the declension, and is only used as a noun (*sc. μοῖρα*); while *ἡμισυς*, as an adj. of two terminations, or even as an indeclinable quasi-numeral *ἡμισυ*, is almost entirely confined to the forms *ἡμισυ* (*ἡμισου*) and (much less frequently) *ἡμίσους* and *ἡμίσει*.

(a) The spelling *ἡμισυς -v* is common between iv/ and i/B.C., the second syllable being assimilated to the third: very rarely it is carried into forms where *-v* does not form part of the suffix "In the Ptolemaic papyri this form predominates in iii/B.C., in ii/i B.C. *ἡμισυς* and *ἡμισυς* are represented by nearly equal numbers" (Thackeray 95): he adds that the absence of *ἡμισυ* from the LXX is unfavourable to the trustworthiness of the uncials.¹ Its absence from the NT will, on the same showing, be a good sign, for with the rapid movement of *v* towards the simple *i*-sound *ἡμισυ* became obsolete: only six instances can be cited from the imperial age by Crönert, and in NT it is represented only by τὰ *ἡμισυ* (*-οι = -v*) in Lk 19⁸ D*—indecl., with *ἡμίση* in correction: see § 35.

(b) Another peculiarity is thus noted by WH (*App.*² 165): "In Ap³ *ἡμισυ* each time has the *v.l.* *ἡμίσου* (A^a, B^a, C^a: cf. Is 44¹⁶ B), which likewise is one of the variants for *ἡμίσους* Mc¹." In Mk 6²³ LΔW read *ἕως ἡμισυ*, and it seems better to regard *ἡμίσου* (? *ἡμισου*) there as the same reading: for this curious form see (c) below. The indecl. *ἡμισυ* appears also in Lk 19⁸ τὰ *ἡμισυ* AD* (*ἡμισυ*) RΔ 69: cf. Tob 19¹⁰ B.

(c) Τὰ *ἡμίσεια* Lk 19⁸ B^a*Q 382 and L (*-εια*) may be supported by a Pisidian inscr. of the imperial age (*Papers of Amer. School* iii. 204), whence Crönert cites *ἡμισυῖος*. It is obviously useless to cite *fem* forms in *-σια* (with WH). W. F. Moulton (WM 75 n.¹) compares *ὄξεια χρέμισαν* in Hesiod Sc. 348, and *θήλεια* neut. in Aratus 1068: WS 87 adds from Meisterhans a neuter *πλατεῖα* dated B.C. 358. Thackeray 179 gives LXX parallels. MGr, which has developed the adj. in *-ύς*, makes plur. *βαθειοί -ές -ά*, which is the descendant of these forms.

(d) The older forms of the gen do not appear in NT uncials, except for *ἡμίσεως* Mk 6²³ S and *ἡμίσεος ἰδ. II*.

(e) Some account of general papyrus usage may be added, drawn mainly from Mayser (294 f.), supplemented from an analysis of a large number of documents dated A.D., containing about 90 occurrences. In these last no plural occurs—the Hellenistic *ἡμίσεις* and *ἡμίση* are barely quotable A.D.—and *ἡμίσεια* (so spelt, 8 times) is only used as a noun. (It is absent altogether in LXX.) Τὸ *ἡμισυ*, with or without *μέρος*, increases in frequency. 'Ἠμίσους gen. and (less frequently) *ἡμίσει* dat. occur freely, and may agree with fem. nouns, as ἀρούρη[s ἡ]μίσους BGU ii. 422¹² (ii/A.D.). "Ἠμισυ (*-ου*) indecl. is in these documents restricted to the position following an integer, as ἀρταβῶν ἑβδομήκοντα δύο ἡμισυ BGU ii. 538³³ (100 A.D.), another hand having already written the same phrase with

¹ To his one ex. (Dn Θ 7²⁶ B) Crönert adds Nu 28¹⁸ in a palimpsest edited by Tischendorf; also one from Cod. G of the Octateuch (iv/v A.D.).

ἡμῖσους. Evidence for its wider use may be seen in Thackeray p. 180. For *ἡμῖσους* (Thackeray 180 n.¹) five documents may be cited from ii/iii A.D.: add a papyrus cited by Crönert (*Mem.* 23) with *οἴμισον* (A.D. 261), and NT uncials as above.

(f) The MGr *μῶς* is prepared for in the Doric *ἡμῶσος* (*Syll.* 594 bis, 598⁸⁸, both ii/B.C.), and *ἡμῶσαι* *IM Ae* iii. 168 (i/B.C.), *Syll.* 493¹¹, τὸ *ἡμῶσον* *Syll.* 596⁷ (ii/B.C.): we might even accent this derivative oxytone, as in MGr.

(g) No instance can be quoted in which *καί* links *ἡμῖσους* with an integer preceding. It is natural therefore that 046 and a good many cursives should omit the irregular conjunction in Rev 11⁹ *ἡμέρας τρεῖς καὶ ἡμῖσους*: it is significant that in v.¹¹, where the order is changed to *τρεῖς ἡμέρας καὶ ἡμῖσους*, only two cursives omit. This is of course only one more irregularity added to the special grammar of this Book: we need not suspect the reading. Note that the idiomatic use of *ἡμῖσους* indecl. following an integer survives in MGr, as *δύο ἡμῖσους* 2½, *τρεῖς ἡμῖσους* 3½ (*Thumb Handb.* 82).

PRONOUNS.

§ 74. The Pronoun system retains one or two special flexions which from prehistoric times differentiated it from the Noun. Chief among them is the nom. acc. neut. sing. in *-α(δ)*, with which we compare the form surviving in Skt. *tad*, Lat. *istud*, Eng. *that*, etc.

Demonstrative Pronouns include *ὁ* (the Definite Article), *οὗτος* *this*, *ὃδε* *this*, *ἐκεῖνος* *that*, *τοιούτος* *such*, *τοσοῦτος* *so much*, *τηλικούτος* *so great*, *τοιόσδε* *such*.

Thus decline

<i>Sing. N.</i>	<i>ὁ ἢ τό</i>	<i>οὗτος</i>	<i>αὕτη</i>	<i>τούτο</i>	<i>ἐκεῖνος ἐκείνη ἐκεῖνο</i>
	<i>A.</i> (see § 48)	<i>τούτον</i>	<i>ταύτην</i>	<i>τούτο</i>	and the rest like <i>καλός</i>
	<i>G.</i>	<i>τούτου</i>	<i>ταύτης</i>	<i>τούτου</i>	
	<i>D.</i>	<i>τούτῳ</i>	<i>ταύτῃ</i>	<i>τούτῳ</i>	
<i>Plur. N.</i>		<i>οὗτοι</i>	<i>αὗται</i>	<i>τάυτα</i>	
	<i>A.</i>	<i>τούτους</i>	<i>ταύτας</i>	<i>τάυτα</i>	
	<i>G.</i>	<i>τούτων</i>			
	<i>D.</i>	<i>τούτοις</i>	<i>ταύταις</i>	<i>τούτοις</i>	

"*Ὁδε* (rare) is declined as *ὁ* with enclitic *δε* added: similarly *τοιόσδε* is *τοιός* like *ἅγιος* with *δε* (only once found 2 Pet 1¹⁷). The others are like *οὗτος*: eject the initial *τ* and prefix *τοι-*, *τοσ-*, *τηλικ-* respectively.

They may however take *-ον* in nom. acc. sing. neut.: thus *τοσοῦτον* Heb 12¹, *τηλικούτον* *ib.* 8*, but *τοσοῦτο* Heb 7²² 8* ABCD*P 33 cu³; in

Mt 18⁶ τοιοῦτο **BLW** *al.*, τοιοῦτον D etc. In Heb. Blass might have regarded it as significant that τοσοῦτον precedes a vowel, and τοσοῦτο a consonant. Both are inherited from earlier Greek.

* Ἄλλος -η -ο (otherwise like καλός) *other*, and ἕτερος (like ἄγιος) *different* (sometimes still *other of two*).

Ὁ δεῖνα *so-and-so* (A τὸν δεῖνα, Γ τοῦ δεῖνος, D τῷ δεῖνι) occurs once (in acc. Mt 26¹⁸).

* Ἐκαστος *each* (like καλός).

§ 75. **Relative** Pronouns are ὅς and ὅστις *who* (see SYNTAX), ὃς-γε and ὃς-περ (*i.e.* ὃς with enclitics—see SYNTAX), οἷος *of which kind, such as*, ὅσος *as many as, as much as*, ὁποῖος *such as*: the last three are declined like καλός or ἄγιος regularly.

Interrogative Pronouns are τίς *who?*, ποῖος *of what sort?*, πηλίκος *how great?*, πόσος *how many?* (like ἄγιος and καλός).

The **Indefinite** Pronoun is τις *some, any* (enclitic).

Thus decline:

<i>Sing. N.</i>	ὅς ἢ ὃ	ὅστις ἤτις ὅτι	τίς	τί	τις	τι
<i>A.</i>	ὃν ἢν ὄ	(ὃς with enclitic	τίνα	τί	τινά	τι
<i>G.</i>	etc., like	δτου	τις)	τίνος	τινός	
<i>D.</i>	Article,			τίνι	τινί	
<i>Plur. N.</i>	but accented	οἷτινες αἷτινες ἅτινα	τίνες	τίνα	τινές	τινά
<i>A.</i>	and without τ.		τίνας	τίνα	τινάς	τινά
<i>G.</i>			τίνων		τινῶν	
<i>D.</i>			τίσι(ν)		τισί(ν)	

* Ὅστις is only used in nom. (and acc. neut.), apart from the old additional gen. neut. ὄτου, surviving in the stereotyped phrase ἕως ὄτου (*as far as what*) *until*, and in Lk 13²⁵ ἀφ' ὄτου D. Its oblique cases are rare in vernacular Κοινή: sometimes we have them with additions equivalent to our *-soever*, as ὄντιναδηποσούν *whomsoever*. The neuter ὅτι is often (very needlessly) printed ὃ τι or even ὃ,τι to distinguish it from ὄτι *that*.

§ 76. **Personal** Pronouns are ἐγώ *I*, σύ *thou*, αὐτός -ή -ό *he, she, it*.

Thus decline:

<i>Sing.</i>	<i>N.</i> ἐγώ	<i>N. V.</i> σύ	<i>N.</i> αὐτός	-ή	-ό
	<i>A.</i> ἐμέ με	σέ σε	αὐτόν	-ήν	-ό
	<i>G.</i> ἐμοῦ μου	σου σου	αὐτοῦ	-ῆς	-οῦ
	<i>D.</i> ἐμοί μοι	σοί σοι	αὐτῷ	-ῆ	-ῷ
<i>Plur.</i>	<i>N.</i> ἡμεῖς	<i>N. V.</i> ὑμεῖς	<i>N.</i> αὐτοί	-αί	-ά
	<i>A.</i> ἡμᾶς	ὑμᾶς	αὐτούς	-άς	-ά
	<i>G.</i> ἡμῶν	ὑμῶν	αὐτῶν		
	<i>D.</i> ἡμῖν	ὑμῖν	αὐτοῖς	-αῖς	-οῖς

For the use of the enclitic forms see the SYNTAX. After prepositions the enclitic forms are not used, except with *πρός* (generally).

Αὐτός is properly demonstrative, and has an adjective use = *self, same*, for which see SYNTAX.

§ 77. The **Reflexive** Pronouns are *ἐμαυτόν -ήν myself, σεαυτόν -ήν thyself, ἑαυτόν -ήν -ό* (rarely *αὐτόν -ήν -ό*) *himself, herself, itself*. Thus decline:

<i>Sing.</i>	<i>A.</i> ἐμαυτόν -ήν	σεαυτόν -ήν	ἑαυτόν -ήν -ό
	<i>G.</i> ἐμαυτοῦ -ῆς	σεαυτοῦ -ῆς	ἑαυτοῦ -ῆς -οῦ
	<i>D.</i> ἐμαυτῷ -ῆ	σεαυτῷ -ῆ	ἑαυτῷ -ῆ -ῷ
<i>Plur.</i>	<i>A.</i> ἑαυτούς -άς -ά	} all persons	
	<i>G.</i> ἑαυτῶν		
	<i>D.</i> ἑαυτοῖς -αῖς -οῖς		

For the vernacular spelling *ἐμαῶν* see § 37.

The shortened forms *σαντόν* and *αὐτόν* occupy a somewhat ambiguous position. The former is non-existent in NT, except for one appearance in B (Jas 2⁸) and one in a few cursives (Rom 14²²). But the latter is read by WH in some twenty places, and the strength of their case seems irresistible: in Jn 2²⁴ *αὐτὸς δὲ Ἰησοῦς οὐκ ἐπίστευεν αὐτὸν αὐτοῖς*, and Lk 23¹² *προϋπήρχον γὰρ ἐν ἔχθρᾳ ὄντες πρὸς αὐτούς*, it is simply impossible to read the ordinary demonstrative. The *h* was faint at this time, but still heard; and in spite of serious difficulties it seems imperative to believe it could sometimes differentiate the pronouns as in much earlier Greek. See *Vocabulary s.v. αὐτοῦ*.

The difficulty lies mostly in the fact that our outside evidence proves overwhelmingly the disappearance of the dissyllabic forms of 2nd and 3rd person reflexives before the age of the NT. In Attic inscr. *ἑαυτ.* has to

αὐτ. the ratio 31 : 23 from B.C. 403 to 300, while from 300 to 30 it rises to 100 : 7 (Meisterhans^s 153). In Egypt, in the Ptolemaic inscrr. and papyri included in Mayser's survey (p. 305 f.), *αὐτ.* outnumbers *ἐαυτ.* by 3 : 1 in iii/B.C., the proportion is reversed in ii/B.C., and in i/B.C. *ἐαυτ.* stands alone. In Pergamon during the pre-Roman period *ἐαυτ.* stands at 24 : 5 above *αὐτ.*, while under Roman rule it rises to 18 : 2 (Schweizer *Perg.* 162). In Magnesia no certain instance of *αὐτ.* is forthcoming (Nachmanson *Magn.* 144). These statistics suffice to show that *αὐτ.* was very near extinction before A.D. But as we look at Mayser's analysis for the second half of the Ptolemaic period, we find that the large majority against *αὐτ.* is secured by official papyri and inscrr. : in private documents there is absolute equality. *A priori* we should expect to find *αὐτ.* vanish first in a country where psilosis was complete, since it would no longer be distinguishable from *αὐτ.* This is true of Asia Minor, as Pergamon and Magnesia attest. But the *h* may have survived elsewhere, and the actual citations that are given from Egyptian documents show that *αὐτ.* had not yet ceased to make sporadic appearances. Thackeray (*Gr.* 190) shows that *αὐτοῦ* still exists in LXX, though scantily). Against Blass's denial, we must leave room for the possibility of very occasional retention of the dissyllabic form. See *Vocab. s.v. ἐαυτοῦ* for post-Ptolemaic instances of *αὐτοῦ*.

For the plural of the reflexive, *ἐαυτούς* stands alone in the Hellenistic age. A survival of *ὑμῶν αὐτῶν* may be noted in 1 Co 5¹⁸, which is quoted from the Pentateuch: in this part of the LXX (Thackeray 191) these forms were still current. On *ἐαυτούς* as the common plural for all persons, coupled with the exclusion of *ἐαυτόν* from 1st and 2nd person, see *Proleg.* 87. 1 Co 10²⁹ has *τὴν ἐαυτοῦ* where *τὴν σεαυτοῦ* might have stood (so D₂^{*}); but we may render impersonally "one's own."

Only negligible MSS violate this rule, except in Jn 18⁸⁴, where A and W join the crowd with *ἀφ' ἐαυτοῦ* "of thyself," and Jn 14²² *ἐμφανίζειν ἐαυτόν*, read by three Ferrar cursives and therefore presumably their archetype. In Mk 14⁴ W has *δείξον ἐαυτόν*, and in Lk 23³⁹ actually *σῶσον καὶ αὐτόν καὶ ἡμᾶς*. The LXX citation in Lk 10²⁷ has *ὡς ἐαυτόν* in A, as elsewhere in inferior uncials. See Thackeray 190 f.

§ 78. The **Reciprocal** Pronoun is *ἀλλήλους -ων -οις* : no fem. or neut. forms occur in NT. *Ἐαυτούς* is also used, and sometimes phrases with *ἄλλος* or *εἷς*—see the SYNTAX.

Possessive Pronouns, attached to the Personal, are *ἐμός my*, *σός thy*, *ἡμέτερος our*, *ὑμέτερος your*, all declined as regular adj. *Ἰδιος own* belongs to the same category.

§ 79. Pronouns indicating duality, as *πότερος which of*

two?, *ἐκάτερος* each of two, against *τίς* which and *ἕκαστος* each, are obsolete in the vernacular: see the SYNTAX. The NT has only *ἀμφότεροι* both, and *ἕτερος* other; but the former has begun to lose its duality, and the latter has almost entirely lost it—see *Prol.* 79 f. and further in SYNTAX. For this place also will be reserved tables of Correlative Pronouns and Pronominal Adverbs.

VERBS.

§ 80. The verb in Hellenistic Greek has been simplified in many directions, as compared with earlier profusion of forms; but except for the complete elimination of the Dual no category has been definitely removed. MGr has entirely lost two Moods, the Optative and (except dialectically) the Infinitive. It has also treated the Middle Voice and the verbs in *-μι* just as Latin treated them in prehistoric times. A few survivals serve as exceptions to prove the rule. These and other tendencies, the issue of which is seen in MGr, were all at work early in Hellenistic; but they had not travelled far enough to relieve the accidence of much grammatical lumber, once significant but now outworn. A brief summary may be given before we present the paradigms.

Conjugations.—For practical purposes the verb may still be divided into the familiar categories of Simple *-ω* Verbs, Contract Verbs, and verbs in *-μι*. The last-named are being largely replaced by forms of the other two classes; and among the Contract Verbs there is a tendency towards the fusion of *-άω* and *-έω* forms, which however has not yet gone far.

Voice.—The Middle and the Passive have drawn closer together in form, while Active endings have replaced a good many Middle where there was no clear distinction of function.

Mood.—The Optative has very largely disappeared, being restricted to a few uses; but for a semi-literary predilection in the Lucan writings, we might leave it out of the paradigms and merely set down isolated forms.

Tense.—The Strong Aorist survives (in one or more Voices) in less than seventy verbs, and most of its occur-

rences are accounted for by the commonness of a verb's use preserving ancient forms. The Weak Aorist is constantly encroaching; and its endings are steadily driving out those special to the Strong Aorist, even in the verbs which keep the old root form. Weak Aorist endings moreover tend to oust the proper suffix of the 3rd plural Perfect Active, and so complete the identity of person-endings between these tenses. In past tenses of the Indicative a weakening of the Augment's hold has begun in compound verbs.

CONJUGATION AND TENSE STEMS.

§ 81. The complexities of the Greek verb are due mainly to the survival of conjugation stems, which give great variety to the present tense and its attendant imperfect. In prehistoric Indo-Germanic these stems may have carried some functional distinctions; but it is difficult to prove these distinctions in all cases, and most of them were obsolete before Hellenistic Greek arose, even if they could be claimed for earlier stages. A brief sketch of the historical classification of present stems may be given, so far as concerns words occurring in NT: for a full account reference may be made to Brugmann-Thumb *Gr.* 316 ff., or to Giles 425 ff. from which the numeration of the classes is taken.

The primary division is that between Thematic and Unthematic formations, which accounts for the obvious classes of $-\omega$ verbs and $-\mu\iota$ verbs, and for other peculiarities of I.E. verb-systems. Thematic formations show the vowel o in the 1 sing. and plur. and 3 plur. (exc. imper.) and e in 2 sing. and plur. and 3 sing. In unthematic formations the person-ending is added directly to the root or the tense-stem. We need not here discuss whether the $o : e$ is historically a part of the root, ejected in unthematic formations by the prehistoric action of accent, or a functional suffix: all these questions belong to a period which was over for Greek ages before Homer. The study of the Hellenistic verb soon shows that unthematic formations were receding fast before thematic, which in MGr cover the whole field except for the substantive verb. This moreover is of Middle form; and Hellenistic largely retains unthematic Middles where the Active has become thematic.

A. Conjugation Classes, Present Stem.

The following are the conjugation classes: in each case (a) is thematic, and (b) unthematic. Where no unthematic forms survive in Hellenistic, no distinction is attached.

I. Person suffixes are added to the root—

(a) with thematic vowel.

Thus ἔλυο-ν, ἔλυε-ς, λυό-μεθα, λύε-σθε.

(b) without thematic vowel.

Thus ἔσ-τι, pl. εἰσί (for ἐντί, i.e. *sentī*);
ἔφη-ν, pl. ἔφᾶ-μεν, mid. ἐφᾶ-μην.

The singular active had strong root-form, the plural and the whole middle had it weakened: thus φη : φᾶ, εσ : σ. Here levelling has obliterated much of a distinction which served no special purpose.

Ia. Reduplicated forms (with ι in redupl. syllable).

(a) thematic.

Thus πί-πτ-ο-μεν (√ *pet*), ἰ-ζ-ε-τε (= *si-zd-*,
√ *sed*).

(b) unthematic.

Thus ἰ-στη-μι, pl. ἰ-στᾶ-μεν, mid. ἰ-στᾶ-μαι
τί-θη-σι, pl. τι-θέ-ασι, mid. ἐ-τι-θέ-ντο.

II. With formative suffix in -ν-.

(a)

(a) suffix νο : νε or ανο : ανε.

(i.) added to root.

Thus αύξ-άνο-μεν, τέμ-νε-ται.

(ii.) added to root with a nasal inserted (only -άνω).

Thus λαμ-βάνο-μεν (λαβ-εἶν), ἐλάνθ-ανε (λαθ-εἶν), λαγχ-άνε-τε (λαχ-εἶν).

(b) suffix νη : νᾶ added to root.

Thus δύ-νᾶ-ται.

(β)

(a) (i.) suffix ννο : ννε.

Thus δεικ-νύε-τε etc.: verbs in -ννμι from classical times thus tended to become thematic.

(ii.) suffix *νο* : *νε*.

Thus *φθά-νο-μεν*, *τί-νε-τε*.

(iii.) suffix *νεφο* : *νεφε*.

Thus *κινούμεθα* (= *-νεφό-μεθα*), *ἀφικνεῖτο*
(= *-νεφε-το*).

(b) suffix *νῦ* : *νῦ* (from *νευ* : *νυ*) added to root.

Thus *δείκ-νῦ-μι*, *εἰδείκ-νῦ-τε*, *δεικ-νῦ-μεθα*.

III. With formative suffix in *σο* : *σε*.

Thus *κλά-(σ)-ω*, *σπά-(σ)-ω* *αὔξ-ω* (= *αυγ-σο-*).

IV. *Stems in sko* : *ske*.

The suffix is added to simple or reduplicated stems, sometimes with *ι* before it.

Thus *βό-σκω*, *εὐρ-ίσκω*, *δι-δά(κ)-σκω*, *γι-(γ)νώ-σκω*.

V. *Stems in to* : *te*.

This class may be ignored for our purpose. Verbs in *-πτω* do not belong to it: see VII.

VI. *Stems in θο* : *θε*.

Thus *πρή-θω*, *ἔσ-θω*: it is very small.

VII. *Stems in γο* : *γε*.

This is a very large class, varying greatly in form according to the consonant or vowel preceding. A large proportion of these verbs are formed from nouns. Among the principal types are:

(i.) with *γο* : *γε* added to root.

Thus *βαίνω* (= I.E. *g*ḡ-ḡo-*), *χαίρω* (*-τ-ḡo-*).

(ii.) added to another suffix.

Thus *κρίνω* (*κρίν-γω* : *κριν* = *κρι-ν*).

(iii.) added to the stem of a noun.

Thus *φυλάσσω* (*κγ*), *ἀστράπτω* (*πγ*), *ποιμαίνω*
(*ηγ*), *ἐλπίζω* (*δγ*), *μαρτύρομαι* (*ῥργ*), *τιμάω* (*ᾱγ*)
ζήω, *φιλέω* (*εγ*), *μεθύω*, etc.

TENSE STEMS.

§ 82. These are essentially of the same nature as the conjugation stems; but having developed definite functions, they

came to be formed from roots belonging to any one, or more than one, of the stems given above.

B. Strong Aorist.

This is a special use of formations already described under A. I. In the indicative it has of course only the augmented form.

(a) = I. (a) with weak gradation in the root.

Thus ἔλιπο-ν ($\sqrt{\lambda\epsilon\iota\pi}$), ἐσπάρ-ην ($\sqrt{\sigma\pi\epsilon\rho}$, with $\tau\tau$ in weak gradation, and passive suffix), ἔπαθο-ν ($\sqrt{\pi\epsilon\nu\theta}$, with $\alpha = \eta$), ἔσχο-ν ($\sqrt{\sigma\epsilon\chi}$).

Sometimes the rule of weak gradation is broken, when the present stem is differentiated by the formative of another class. Thus αἰσθέ-σθαι from αἰσθ-άνο-μαι, ἔτεμο-ν from τέμ-νω, ἔπεσο-ν (for ἔπετον) from πί-πτ-ω, εὔρο-ν from εὔρ-ίσκω, ἐγενό-μην from γίνομαι (= γι-γν-).

(b) = I. (b).

Thus ἔστη-ν, ἔθε-μεν, δό-σθε, γνῶ-θι.

The Strong Aorist in the passive is not thematic, being formed with an η which has no connexion with the thematic vowel.

C. Weak Aorist.

The stem is formed by adding σ to the root, with the suffixes attached directly. Forms answering to this description have disappeared from Greek, except for the 1st sg. (ἔδειξα = *édeiks-η*), and in active and middle, apart from the subj. and two or three other forms, the characteristic of the tense is $\sigma\alpha$. After liquids this σ is obscured.

Thus ἔλεξα ($\sqrt{\lambda\epsilon\gamma}$), ἐλυσά-μεθα ($\sqrt{\lambda\upsilon}$), ἔκρινα ($\kappa\rho\dot{\iota}\nu$), ἔσπειρα ($\sqrt{\sigma\pi\epsilon\rho}$), ἔνειμα ($\sqrt{\nu\epsilon\mu}$), ἔκτεινα ($\sqrt{\kappa\tau\epsilon\nu}$), ἔστειλα ($\sqrt{\sigma\tau\epsilon\lambda}$).

The Weak Aorist in the passive is formed in a wholly different way. A new formative $\theta\eta$, drawn originally from a middle person-ending (2nd sing.) $-\theta\eta\varsigma$, has extended through the whole tense system, with endings following those of the Strong Aorist.

Thus ἐδό-θη, κρι-θῆ-ναι.

D. Future Stems.

The Future is partly extended from the Weak Aorist subj., which before the analogy of the pres. subj. of thematic verbs affected it had the flexion λύσω -εις -ει -ομεν -ετε -ουσι, and similarly in the middle. Probably there was also some influence from a special future stem in *sgo* : *syē*, found in Aryan and Lithuanian, which coincided in form. In most verbs accordingly the Future act. and mid. coincide in stem with the Weak Aorist, but keep -σω when the aorist has a special form, as δώσω (aor. ἔδωκα).

In verbs with Liquid stems, and in a few others which may be sought in the Table, the Future stem is formed with -έ(σ)ω instead of -σω, and a flexion results identical with that of the Contracta in -έω. Thus from κρῖν (κρῖνέ(σ)ω) κρινῶ, from σπερ σπερῶ, from ἐλπίζω ἐλπιῶμαι.

In LXX and occasionally in papyri and inscriptions we find a similar future from stems in -άζω : thus ἐργᾶται from ἐργάζομαι. The absence of this in NT is marked, and shows a dialectic distinction : thus in 1 Co 2¹⁶ the LXX συμβιβᾶ is altered to συμβιβάσει. The formation is found in Ionic : see Thumb *Dial.* 358.

In the Passive the Future is formed from the (Strong and Weak) Aorist stems by adding -σομαι to the characteristic (θ)η. Thus κριθήσομαι, ἀνοιγήσομαι. The "Third" Future, or Future Perfect, is obsolete ; but the form κεκράξομαι (from κέκραγα) is on the same model.

E. Perfect Stem.

This stem is unthematic, and in the earliest period (as in classical Sanskrit, and in our own speech-family up to the Middle English period) had vowel gradation, with strong root in singular active and weak elsewhere. So in classical Greek οἶδα, 2 pl. ἴστε, just as in Chaucer's English *I wot, we witen*. In Hellenistic this verb is assimilated to other perfects ; and the only trace of gradation is that the middle stem sometimes differs from the active.

The Perfect stem (except in the verb οἶδα) is reduplicated, with ε in the reduplicating syllable. It has in the Active two formations, Strong, with internal change as in our own Strong Perfect, and Weak, with a formative suffix ε. Thus λέλοιπα from λείπω is historically parallel with our

rode from *ride*. Roots with radical ϵ show \omicron in its place in the Strong Perfect active, except when combined with υ ($\pi\acute{\epsilon}\phi\epsilon\upsilon\gamma\alpha$ from $\phi\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\gamma\omega$). The suffix κ only appears when the verb stem ends in a vowel or a dental mute: thus $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\upsilon\text{-}\kappa\alpha$ from $\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\text{-}\omega$, $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\iota\text{-}\kappa\alpha$ from $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\iota\theta\omega$.

The past tense of this stem, called Pluperfect, has (usually) the augment, and a special set of person-endings with the connecting vowel $\epsilon\iota$, which in Hellenistic goes right through.

The Middle and Passive have one set of forms, Perfect and Pluperfect, which are normal unthematic forms from the Perfect stem.

F. Verbals.

Two adjectives are formed from verbal roots, unconnected with the tense system. One in $\text{-}\tau\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$, historically identical with the Latin perf. partic. passive in $\text{-}tus$ ($\text{-}sus$) and our English $\text{-}d$ participle, is extended to derived verbs and attached to their stem: the form can usually be deduced empirically by putting $\text{-}\tau\omicron\varsigma$ for the $\text{-}\sigma\omega$ of the Future. For the function of this verbal adjective, see *Proleg.* p. 221 f.

The gerundive in $\text{-}\tau\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\varsigma$, formed in the same way, is very rare in Hellenistic (only once in NT—Lk 5³³).

VERBS.

AUGMENT AND REDUPLICATION.

1. Augment with η .

§ 83. The augment with η is found in later Attic (since 300 B.C.) in the verbs $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\omega$, $\delta\acute{\upsilon}\nu\alpha\mu\alpha\iota$, $\beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$, probably by analogy of $\eta\text{-}\theta\epsilon\lambda\omicron\nu$, where $\eta\text{-}$ was a preposition (Lat. \bar{e} , Skt. \bar{a}).¹ Of these forms $\eta\beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda$ never occurs in NT (exc. κ in Philem¹⁸, HLP in Ac 28¹⁸ and cursives in 2 Jn¹²), though sometimes in LXX, and once in a i/A.D. papyrus (P Oxy ii. 281¹⁶). So also in patr. often, esp. in aor. $\eta\mu\epsilon\lambda\lambda\omicron\nu$ and $\xi\mu\epsilon\lambda\lambda\omicron\nu$ alternate: WH print $\eta\mu$ always in Lk and Ac, exc. Ac 21²⁷, but in Jn both forms about equally. $\delta\acute{\upsilon}\nu\alpha\mu\alpha\iota$ has aor. $\eta\delta$. (often with variant $\acute{\epsilon}\delta$.), but great fluctuation in the impf.: $\eta\delta$. is read by WH 7 times and $\acute{\epsilon}\delta$. 12 times. See on both MG *s.v.* and WH *App.*² 169. $\Theta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omega$ (never $\acute{\epsilon}\theta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omega$) makes $\eta\theta$. always, as in class. Gr. To the same class are generally assigned $\acute{\epsilon}\omega\rho\omega\nu$, $\acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\epsilon}\phi\alpha$ (and other forms from $\acute{\alpha}\nu\omicron\iota\gamma\omega$), $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\alpha}\gamma\eta\nu$, in which by "quantity metathesis" $\eta\omicron$ etc. would become $\epsilon\omega$, $\epsilon\acute{\alpha}$

¹ See for its extent Meisterhans³ 169; for its origin, Brugmann *Grd.*² II. ii. § 634, Giles³ 408. It appears occasionally in earlier poetry: see Veitch *s.vv.*

εἶ.¹ Ἐώρων only Jn 6³ ΚΓ etc. where ἐθεώρουν BDL(W) is the better reading. Ἀνοίγω (διανοίγω), as the simple verb became obsolete, took an augment in the preposition, either with or without that in the root syllable: hence the triple types ἤνεφ. (with inf. ἀνεφχθῆναι), ἦνοι., ἀνεφ. For the distribution of forms between the types see WH *App.*² 168. Κατάγνυμι has aor. κατέαξα, pass. -εαγην, but in the latter the augm. is continued in subj. κατεαγῶσι Jn 19³¹ (as in ἀνεφχθῆναι above). Veitch quotes κατεάξαντες from Lysias and κατ-εαγῆ -εαγείη -εαγείσι from the Ionic Hippocrates. A more difficult peculiarity is the fut. κατεάξω Mt 12²⁰ (= Is 42³, but not LXX), which must go with the nouns κατέαγμα (BGU ii. 647 bis, P Amh ii. 93¹⁹, both ii/A.D.), ξαγμα (*ap.* G. Meyer³ 165). Possibly -εάξας -εάξω -εαγμα may be explained side by side with ἐθελήσας ἐθελήσω ἐθελήμους, on which see *reff.* above.² In LXX (Hab 3¹² *al.*) the fut. is κατάξω, but κατεάξω in Symm. Ps 47⁸.

2. Double Augment.

Ἀποκαθίστημι (as in LXX)³ in Mk 8²⁵ ἀπεκατέστη, Mk 3⁵ = Mt 12¹⁸, Lk 6¹⁰ ἀπεκατεστάθη, inserts an augment after both prepositions, which seems a well-established vernacular usage. So ἀντεκατέστητε Heb 12⁴ L* (WH alt.), (παρεσυνεβλήθη Ps 48 (49)^{13, 21} AT). The forms of ἀνοίγω described in (1) above are the only surviving *exx.* of augment attached both to verb and preposition. See the list for Attic in Rutherford *NP* 83: of these only ἀνέχεσθαι shows double augment even as a variant in NT. Cf. Ac 18¹⁴, where Ν*Β support ἀνεσχόμεν, the form attested by Moeris as Hellenistic (Ti *in loc.*)⁴ From ἀφήμι the impf. is read by WH with ἦφ. in Mk 1³⁴ 11¹⁶: this form is perhaps not Attic (Meisterh.⁵ 173, but only one *ex.*, which is not decisive). Note ἐπροεφήτευσεν Mk 7⁶ W.

3. Syllabic Augment for Temporal.

In verbs which originally began with *s* or *w* the primitive syllabic augment often leaves its traces behind, contraction following the loss of the consonant: thus εἶχον (not ἦχον) for ἔ-εχον (= ἔσεχον), εἶλκυσα for ἐ-ελκυσα. In Attic ὠθέω and ὠνέομαι normally augmented ἐω. (from ἐ-ω.); but ἐξέωσεν Ac 7⁴⁶ Ν*Ε (Ti) is the only trace in NT of such forms.⁵ Ἐργάζομαι and cpds. have ἦργ. in Attic,⁶ which prevails in NT;

¹ See Brugmann-Thumb *Gr.* 310.

² Various unsatisfactory explanations of the word have been given; by Thom. Mag. (who would accent κατεάγωσι as perf. subj. act.), by W. (who thinks differentiation from fut. of κατάγω adequate—see WM 82), and by G. Meyer *l.c.* (see *CR* xv. 36). See Cobet on the word (*NT Vatic.* lxxix).

³ Add *Lehr.* 525 (ii/A.D.) and other parallels in WS § 12. 7 n. But ἀποκατεστάθη P Oxy i. 38¹² (i/A.D.). See Dieterich 213.

⁴ Ἐροχλέω retains double augment in perf. as late as ii/B.C. (P Amh ii. 37⁹, ἠνώχλησαι). Cf. Reinhold 68.

⁵ The perf. ἐώνημαι is found twice in papyri of ii/A.D. (P Oxy ii. 252⁶, P Amh ii. 68⁸).

⁶ Perhaps from ἦ-Ἔργ., which would account for the different form in the perfect. See Meisterhans³ 171; *CR* xv. 35.

but the aor. *κατεργ.* (mid. and pass.) is read by WH with κ^* four times in Paul, B* however thrice opposing.

4. Dropped Augment.

In the *pluperfect* the augment is usually dropped: so Mt 7²⁶, Mk 14⁴⁴ 15⁷.¹⁰ [Mk] 16⁹, Lk 19¹⁵, Jn 11⁵⁷, Ac 4²² 14²⁸, 1 Jn 2¹⁹, and temporal augment dropped Jn 11³⁰ 14⁷. Among these passages only Ac 4²² (*ἐγγράφει* NAEP *al.*) shows respectable attestation for the augmented form. It appears however unquestionably in Lk 11²² 16²⁰, Jn 9²² 11⁴⁴ (D*om.), Ac 26³² (AL om.). In Attic writers the temporal augment is omitted, but not the syllabic, MSS and edd. notwithstanding (see *e.g.* Ti on Ac 4²², Shilleto on Dem. *FL* p. 38). Attic inscr. down to iii/B.C. show 6 augmented forms and no omissions (Meisterh.³ 170); and Ptolemaic papyri in P Tebt, P Amh and P Fay show 5 augmented against 2 unaugmented.¹ The evidence in Schweizer also goes strongly against omission. In such a point the evidence of MSS cannot be trusted far, but it may be noted that Jos. (according to Schmidt) prefers omission in act., retention in pass. of compound verbs, while in simplicia omission is fairly common though not preponderant, even where hiatus is not concerned. In Polybius the augment greatly preponderates in simplicia, though often dropped in compounds, esp. in act. forms.² The pluperf. of *ἵστημι* is a case by itself. The augmentless *ἕστηκεν* occurs Rev 7¹¹ C, and is not uncommon outside NT. WH accept throughout the spelling *ἵστηκεν*, in which they think the analogy of the present is to be recognised, and not mere itacism. WS brings strong arguments against this view, which must be regarded as decidedly questionable. As in the case of *ἴδον* below, the complete identity of *ε* and *ι* in popular speech makes it only a question of the extent to which the literary tradition was remembered.

Omission of *syllabic* augment in other tenses occurs only in *προσάρωμην* Ac 2²⁵ = Ps 15 (16)⁸ LXX. Here also, since *εἶδον* arises from *ε̄-φιδον*, would be placed the more than dubious *ἴδον* in Rev (Ti, WH alt.) and LXX: it seems as though editors and commentators will persist in this writing, whatever grammarians say.³ Those who will may consult Gregory's tabular statement in his *Proh.* 89. In Jn 5⁹ 10²³ AL read *περιπάτει*, and in Rom 5¹⁸ A has *ἐλλογᾶτο*: such omissions became frequent in later times.

Temporal augment is more often dropped, but only in compounds, for we should not accept *ὁμοιώθημεν* Rom 9²⁹ AFGLP = Is 1⁹ (LXX) AQ*Γ. So *διερμήνευσεν* Lk 24²⁷, *διεγείρετο* Jn 6¹⁸ BGL *al.*, *ἀνέθη* Ac 16²⁶, *ἀφέθησαν* Rom 4⁷ = Ps 31 (32)¹ B, *ἀφέθη* Mk 13³ W, *ἀνορθώθη* Lk 13¹⁸ ABD *al.* The first two out of this short list are directly paralleled in

¹ Cf. Mayser p. 333 f.

² Wackernagel (reviewing Hultsch) *Idg. Fors. v. Anz.* 59.

³ Schweizer 170 and Reinhold 11 may be referred to. If the MSS were any evidence on the question of this itacism, we might not unreasonably call in the principle of levelling as a *vera causa* of indic. assimilated to infin. But who that has read the papyri would care to build anything on such evidence?

papyri (*CR l.c.*) and in Reinhold's exx. (p. 66), which casts doubt on Blass's "clerical error." Historically *ᾠφελον* is a case of dropped augment.

5. Temporal Augment for Reduplication.

What has been said of the temporal augment applies to the nearly always identical form taken for reduplication by verbs with initial vowel. An original distinction is still preserved faintly in the difference between the perf. *εἴργασμαι* and the impf. and aor. *ἤργ*—see 2 above. In *ἀφομοιωμένος* Heb 7^s ODELP, *ἀπαλλάχθαι* Lk 12⁵⁸ *ΑΔ* (neither in Ti nor WH), the redupl. is dropped.¹ WH (*App.*² 179) would add *εἰοδῶται* 1 Co 16² *κ*Β al.*, which they suggest is a perf. subj. mid., comparing those noticed in KBl. § 224. 2 (ii. p. 100): the verb is regularly un-augmented in LXX. But the present subj. is exegetically sound (see Findlay EGT *in loc.*), and this perf. subj. type, except for one word from Hippocrates,³ is entirely confined to verbs where the long vowel is radical (*κεκῶμαι* = *κεκῆ-ομαι*, etc.). Nor is that vowel in Attic ever *ω*, so that the link for an analogy-process is wanting, and without such a process a late denominative verb could never have made such a form. Hort favoured this account of *εἰοδῶται* as fitting in with his view of the pres. subj. of *-ῶ* verbs (*App.*³ 174), on which see below, p. 200.

6. Initial Diphthongs.

The short diphthongs are found as follows in the matter of augment (reduplication):—*Αι.* normally augmented, except *ἐπαισχύνθη* 2 Ti 1¹⁶ *κ*ACDLP al.* (WH). The spelling *ει* for *η*, common in papyri,³ is found in some MSS of 2 Co 9⁷.—*Ει.* unchanged Gal 2⁵ *εἴξαμεν*, Mk 15⁴⁶ *ἐνείδησεν*, as in Attic.⁴—*Οι.* was augmented *ω*, except *κατοίκησεν* Mt 4¹⁸ D, *ἐνοίκησεν* 2 Ti 1⁵ D₂* 17, *οικοδομήθη* Jn 2²⁰ *κ*Β*TW 33*, *ἐποικοδόμησεν* 1 Co 3¹⁴ *κ*AB* al.* (*ω B*C*). The omission was Attic only when *οι* preceded a vowel. It is common in patr. In *οικοδομέω* WH accept *οι.* in Ac 7⁴⁷, and gave it as alt. form everywhere exc. Mt 21³⁸, Lk 4²⁹. Cf. *Logion* 7 (P Oxy i. 1).⁵—*Αυ.* augmented regularly *ηυ.* in parts of *αὐλίσσμαι*, *αὐλίζομαι*, *αὐξάνω*, occurring 12 times. Once (Ac 12²⁴) *εὔξαγε* in D*, with the identically pronounced *ευ* for *ηυ*: cf. Blass *Pron.* 44, who thinks the grammarians chiefly responsible for the maintenance of *ηυ.*⁶—*Ευ.* without augment usually, as in Attic inscr. since 300 B.C.: so *εὐπορέομαι*, *εὐφορέω*, *εὐθυδρομέω*, *εὐνουχίζω*, *εὐλογέω* (with var.). *Εὐφραίνομαι*, *εὐχαιρέω*, *εὐχαριστέω* show *ηυ.* in Ac 2²⁶ 17²¹, Ro 1²¹, *εὐ.* elsewhere (one

¹ Parallels in papyri in *CR l.c.* (4 above).

² *ἠκῶται* (so in K. Bl., but perhaps *ἠλκῶται* is better for Ionic), which in H has *βεβρῶται* to set the type.

³ Cf. Meisterh.³ 38 f., Blass *Pron.* 47.

⁴ But see Meisterh.³ 171, Rutherford *NP* 244.

⁵ Blass notes that *φ* (pron. *δ*) "no longer bore much resemblance to *α*" (Ger. *δ*, pron. nearly like *υ*).

⁶ In *Gr.*² § 15. 4 n. 1 he further notes that *ηυ* was in later times dissyllabic, as seen in the writing *ηυ* in *κ*Α*.

each). In *εὔχομαι* and *προσεύχομαι* *ἡν.* is general, with var. occasionally (*εὔ.* twice in Ti, Ac 26²⁹ & 27²⁹ B*). In the impf. of *εὕρισκω* WH read *ἡν.* Mk 14⁶⁵, Lk 19⁴⁸, Ac 7¹¹, Heb 11⁵ with alt. each time, but *εὔ.* in the other tenses.¹ In *εὐδοκῶ* they read *εὔ.* in the Gospels, noting that *ἡν.* is sometimes well supported: in the Epp. *ἡν.* 5 times, *εὔ.* 6. For words with *εὔ-* followed by a vowel see 7 below.

7. Augment and Reduplication in Compounds.

The primitive rule that in a verb compounded with one or more prepositions the augment or reduplication falls between the last preposition and the verb has produced a tendency to place them thus where there is no real composition,² and even where the presence of the preposition is imaginary. So *δικαίνου* (denom. from *διάκονος*), *ἀπεδήμησα* (*ἀπόδημος*), *ἀπελογούμην* (*ἀπόλογος*) *ἐπεθύμησα* (**ἐπιθυμος*), *ἐπεχείρησα* (*ἐπὶ χεῖρα* sc. *βάλλω*), *κατηγόρου* (*κατήγορος*), *συνήργου* (*σύνεργος*). Sometimes the association with the original noun was so vividly present that the rule was resisted. Hence *ἐπροφήτευσα* (*προφήτης*: Attic *προεφ.*, often in LXX, normal in Jos., and as var. in NT, as Jude 14 AC *al.*), *ἐπερίσσευσα* (*περισσός*, a deriv. from *περί*: Phr. mentions *ἐπερίσσευσε* (cf. *περιέσσειον* Ac 16⁵ E) as a solecism).³ In some words the presence of the preposition was forgotten (the simple verb being obsolete), and augment (redupl.) put at the beginning: *ἐκάθειδον*, *ἐκάθισα*, *ἐκαθεζόμεν*, *ἐκαθήμην*, *ἡμφισμένος* (class.), also *ἤφιον* (above), *ἐκάμμυσα* (*κα(α)μύω*). This process became commoner in Byzantine Greek,⁴ and survives in MGr. The combination of the two tendencies produces the Attic verbs with double augment (2 above). The treatment of *εὔ* as a preposition for this purpose—seen in *εὐηγγελιζόμεν* and aor., *εὐηρεστηκέναι* Heb 11⁵ & DEP *al.* (Ti) ⁵—is due to the frequency with which it is used separately with verbs, as *εὔ ποιῶν* etc.

8. Reduplication.

On analogy of *εἴλω*, the denominative *εἴλω* (originally with init. *F*: cf. Lat. *ulcus* reduplicates *εἴλω*. Lk 16²⁰ in all older uncials. In *βεραντισμένοι* Heb 10²² & ACD* *al.* and Rev 19¹³ (where WH suspect *βεραμμένοι* and Ti reads *περιβεραμμένοι* with N*) verbs with init. *ρ* have analogical redupl.:⁶ so D in Mt 9³⁶ *βεριμμένοι*. WH print *ῥ* (*Arrp.* 2 170):⁷ ancient

¹ Reinhold 65 notes that two MSS which most faithfully represent common speech entirely avoid *ἡδρον*. *Ἡθρισκον* once in Hermas (N) not elsewhere.

² See list in K. Bl. § 204 n. 1 (ii. p. 34); also Rutherford NP 79 ff.

³ K. Bl., followed by WS, gives *ἐπαρρησιασάμην* here, but the old etym. from *παρ* is unexceptionable. Blass corrects this in *Gr.* 39 n. 2.

⁴ See Hatzidakis 67 f.

⁵ It is only found when *εὔ-* precedes a short vowel: cf. the usage in Att. described by Rutherford NP 245.

⁶ Moeris 459 app. (ed. Koch 417) expressly mentions *βερανται* as a solecism. *Βεριμμένοι* Jer 43 (37)³⁰ A (*ἐριμ.* B) Jdth 6¹⁸ (3) A. As early as Homer (*Od.* 6³⁰) we find *βερπωμένα*, and in Pindar *βεριφθαι* (*Frag.* 314 Bergk).

⁷ So Lachm. Lobeck (*Par.* 14 n.) favours *βερ*.

authorities vary—see K.Bl. § 67. 3 n. 5, § 200. 1 n. 2. In the latter place K.Bl. gives classical parallels for this kind of redupl. Verbs in ρ . usually redupl. $\epsilon\rho\rho$. (orig. $\sigma\epsilon\text{-}\sigma\rho$. or $F\epsilon\text{-}\epsilon\rho$.): so Lk 17², Ac 15²⁹, Eph 3¹⁷, Col 2⁷. See G Meyer⁸ 237, also 624. The $\rho\rho$ was ultimately made single, to resemble other augments: so $\epsilon\rho\rho\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\iota$ Mt *l.c.* $\aleph\text{BCL}$ (Ti WH), $\epsilon\rho\rho\iota\tau\alpha\iota$ Lk 17² Π^* *al.* (WH alt.). The substitution of syllabic augment for redupl. appears as in Attic in various verbs with init. consonant group. So (with var.) $\epsilon\mu\acute{\eta}\sigma\tau\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\iota$ Lk 12⁷ $\aleph^*\text{AB}^*\text{LW}$, 2⁶ $\aleph^*\text{AB}^*\text{C}^*\text{DW}$ (Ti WH): $\mu\epsilon\mu\nu$. Diodorus *al. ap.* Veitch, and in LXX, on anal. of $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\mu\eta\eta\mu\alpha\iota$. For later encroachments of augment on redupl. see Dieterich 214 f., CR xv. 36. The classical perfect is maintained in two words with init. cons. The distinctive $\epsilon\iota$ in the perf. $\epsilon\dot{\iota}\rho\gamma\alpha\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$ (= $F\epsilon\epsilon\rho\gamma$.) Jn 3²¹, 1 Pet 4³ is practically without variant. Cf. Schweizer 170 f. WH read $\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\rho\alpha\kappa\alpha$ ($F\epsilon\epsilon\rho\alpha$.) in Paul (1 Co 9¹ $\aleph^*\text{B}$ *al.*,¹ Col 2¹ $\aleph^*\text{C}$, 2¹⁸ $\aleph\text{B}^*$ *al.*), and as alt. (with B*), 7 times in 1 and 3 Jn; but $\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\rho\alpha\kappa\alpha$ (- $\epsilon\iota\nu$) 24 times in Gospels and Ac. 'Εόρακα is Attic and original: $\acute{\epsilon}\omega\rho$. (from pluperf. $\acute{\epsilon}\omega\rho$. = * $\acute{\eta}\omega\rho$.) is well attested in MSS of Attic prose writers. The double reduplication curiously known as "Attic" is maintained intact: so $\acute{\alpha}\kappa\eta\kappa\omicron\sigma\alpha$, $\acute{\alpha}\pi\delta\acute{\omega}\lambda\alpha$, $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\gamma\eta\gamma\epsilon\mu\alpha\iota$, $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\acute{\eta}\lambda\alpha\kappa\alpha$, $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\acute{\eta}\lambda\upsilon\theta\alpha$, $\pi\rho\sigma\epsilon\nu\acute{\eta}\nu\omicron\chi\alpha$. Neither this nor the ordinary redupl. is ever dropped, as so often in later times. From $\lambda\alpha\mu\beta\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega$ we have only the original $\epsilon\dot{\iota}\lambda\eta\phi\alpha$, $\epsilon\dot{\iota}\lambda\eta\mu\mu\alpha\iota$ (= $\sigma\epsilon\text{-}\sigma\lambda$). (The similar aor. $\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\dot{\iota}\lambda\acute{\eta}\phi\theta\eta$ in [Jn] 8⁴ seems only a mistake of ϵ : WS wrongly accuses Ti of endorsing it.)

9. Augmented Tenses of Verbs in ρ .

As noted in § 41, and for the reduplicated tenses in 8 above, the single ρ prevails over the double. So from $\rho\alpha\beta\delta\dot{\iota}\zeta\omega$ 2 Co 11²⁵, $\rho\alpha\nu\tau\dot{\iota}\zeta\omega$ Heb 9^{19, 21}, $\rho\alpha\pi\dot{\iota}\zeta\omega$ Mt 26⁶⁷, $\rho\acute{\eta}\sigma\sigma\omega$ and cpds. Lk 5⁶ 6^{48^e} (but $\epsilon\rho\rho$. Mt 26⁶⁸, Lk 9⁴³), $\rho\dot{\iota}\pi\tau\omega$ Mt 15²⁰, Ac 27¹⁹, $\rho\acute{\upsilon}\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ 2 Co 1¹⁰, Col 1¹³, 2 Ti 3¹¹ 4¹⁷, 2 Pet 2⁷ (Ti twice $\epsilon\rho\rho$). 'Ερρέθην always.

A. PRESENT STEM.

(a) THEMATIC.

ACTIVE VOICE.

Stem:

$\lambda\nu\sigma/\epsilon$	$\tau\iota\mu\alpha\sigma/\epsilon$	$\zeta\eta\sigma/\epsilon$	$\phi\iota\lambda\epsilon\sigma/\epsilon$	$\pi\lambda\epsilon\text{F}\sigma/\epsilon$	$\delta\eta\lambda\omicron\sigma/\epsilon$
<i>loose</i>	<i>honour</i>	<i>live</i>	<i>love</i>	<i>sail</i>	<i>make clear</i>

§ 84. Present Indicative—

<i>Sg.</i> 1	$\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\omega$	$\tau\iota\mu\acute{\omega}$	$\zeta\acute{\omega}$	$\phi\iota\lambda\acute{\omega}$	$\pi\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omega$	$\delta\eta\lambda\acute{\omega}$
2	$\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\epsilon\iota\varsigma$	$\tau\iota\mu\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$	$\zeta\acute{\eta}\varsigma$	$\phi\iota\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\iota\varsigma$	$\pi\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\iota\varsigma$	$\delta\eta\lambda\omicron\iota\varsigma$
3	$\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\epsilon\iota$	$\tau\iota\mu\acute{\alpha}\tilde{\epsilon}$	$\zeta\acute{\eta}$	$\phi\iota\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\iota$	$\pi\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\iota$	$\delta\eta\lambda\omicron\iota$
<i>Pl.</i> 1	$\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu$	$\tau\iota\mu\acute{\omega}\mu\epsilon\nu$	$\zeta\acute{\omega}\mu\epsilon\nu$	$\phi\iota\lambda\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu$	$\pi\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu$	$\delta\eta\lambda\omicron\upsilon\mu\epsilon\nu$
2	$\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\epsilon\tau\epsilon$	$\tau\iota\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\epsilon$	$\zeta\acute{\eta}\tau\epsilon$	$\phi\iota\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\iota\tau\epsilon$	$\pi\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\iota\tau\epsilon$	$\delta\eta\lambda\omicron\upsilon\tau\epsilon$
3	$\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota(\nu)$	$\tau\iota\mu\acute{\omega}\sigma\iota(\nu)$	$\zeta\acute{\omega}\sigma\iota(\nu)$	$\phi\iota\lambda\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota(\nu)$	$\pi\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota(\nu)$	$\delta\eta\lambda\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota(\nu)$

¹ In *App.*² 170 $\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\rho\alpha\kappa\alpha$ as *alternative* reading here is presumably a misprint for $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\omega}$.

Imperfect Indicative—

<i>Sg.</i> 1 ἔλυον	ἐτίμων	ἔζων	ἐφίλουν	ἐπλεον	ἐδήλουν
2 ἔλυες	ἐτίμας	ἔζης	ἐφίλεις	ἐπλεεις	ἐδήλους
3 ἔλυε(ν)	ἐτίμα	ἔζη	ἐφίλει	ἐπλει	ἐδήλου
<i>Pl.</i> 1 ἐλύομεν	ἐτιμῶμεν	ἐζῶμεν	ἐφιλοῦμεν	ἐπλέομεν	ἐδηλοῦμεν
2 ἐλύετε	ἐτιμᾶτε	ἐζήτε	ἐφιλεῖτε	ἐπλείτε	ἐδηλοῦτε
3 ἔλυον	ἐτίμων	ἔζων	ἐφίλουν	ἐπλεον	ἐδήλουν

NOTE.—1. In 1 *sg.* impf. the form *ἔζην* is found in Rom 7^o B (where 33 has *ἔζουν*, with the mixture noted under 5 below): it occurs in LXX, and in all MSS but one of Demosth. *Timocr.* 7. See Mayser 347. The analogy of flexions like *ἔβην-ν*, *ἔβης*, *ἔστην ἔστης* accounts for it.

2. Sporadic instances of the *ἔλυα* type (weak aor. ending) begin to appear in the plural: WS p. 112 cites *εἶχαν* Mk 8^r (NBDΔ), Ac 28² (NAB), Rev 9⁸ (NA), Lk 4⁴⁰ (D), Ac 8¹⁰ (N), Jn 15^{22.24} (D*); *εἶχαμεν* 2 Jn 5 (NA), *εἶχατε* Jn 9⁴¹ ("als Var."—but it does not appear in Ti), *ἔλεγαν* Jn 11⁵⁶ (D) 9¹⁰ 11³⁶ (N*), to which Blass adds Ac 28⁶ B. Scrivener's list (*Codex Bezae* p. xlvi) shows that the search has been imperfect: he adds from D *ἔκραζαν* Mt 21⁹, *ἔλεγαν* Jn 7^{31.41} 8²² 9¹⁶ 10²⁴, Lk 23³⁵ 24¹⁰, *ὑπέστρεφον* Lk 23⁴⁸, *εἶχαν* Mk 8¹⁶, Ac 19¹⁴, *ἔστυραν* [which however might be aorist] Ac 14¹⁹ 17⁶, *ἤθελαν* Ac 16⁷. Outside D, accordingly, this imperfect is limited to two common verbs, and that mainly in N. It appears very sparingly before *ii/A.D.* (see Crönert 210, Thackeray 212, Mayser 369, Reinhold 81), but ultimately established itself, as in MGr. Mk 8^r is the only instance that is at all likely to be original. (For *-a-* forms in flexion of *ἦκω*, due to its perfect meaning, see *Prol.* 53 and below, § 92.)

3. Older than this infection is the 3rd *pl.* impf. in *-σαν*, which is well attested for a non-contract verb in *εἶχουσαν* Jn 15^{22.24} NBL*N* 1. 33 (D* *εἶχαν*): WH *App.*² 172 note that "in a few other places forms in *-σαν* [impf. or aor.] have some Western attestation"—thus Mk 1³² *ἐφῆρουσαν*, 6¹⁴ *ἐλέγουσαν* (Scrivener).¹ Instances for the strong aorist are discussed below, § 88 (p. 209). Thackeray 213 f. observes that "these forms in *-σαν* are exceedingly frequent in LXX, being distributed over all the translations (except [1-4 K.] from the Hexateuch to 2 Esdras." The question therefore is how to explain their almost complete absence from NT. The extension of the suffix *-σαν* began in the *-μ* verbs in the earliest Greek, and passed into *-ω* verbs in the dialects of Phocis and Delphi (in the NW Greek group): see Thumb *Dial.* 191, Valaori *Delphische Dialekt* 60. We may probably regard it as a dialectic form in the *Κοινή*, which ultimately failed to establish itself.

4. In Contract Verbs the *-σαν* form becomes rather more prominent, though it leaves even less trace in NT. There are about 30 places in NT where the 3rd *pl.* impf. act. of an *-άω* verb is read by one or more of the authorities given in MG; but nowhere does Ti cite a form in *-ώσαν*. From *-έω* verbs Blass cites *ἐθορυβοῦσαν* Ac 17⁵ D, and doubtfully *κατοι-*

¹ We may add *ἐτίθησαν* Ac 8¹⁷ B, as a clear step towards thematising.

κοῦσαν Ac 2⁴⁶ D,¹ with two instances from Hermas. We may add διηκονοῦσαν Mk 15⁴¹ W. In one place only is there an imperfect from the -ώ verbs, and that is ἐδολιοῦσαν (Rom 3¹⁸).² But this is a quotation from the LXX, where these forms are common (Thackeray 214).³ See *Proleg.* 52. In NT Greek the -σαν form was even ousted from the -μι verbs, ἐτίθουν and ἐδίδουν largely replacing ἐτίθεσαν and ἐδίδουσαν. Clearly therefore this type was still dialectic, though destined to survive into MGr.

5. Incipient passage of -άω into -έω forms shows itself here in the MSS, as in some other parts of the verb: we may deal with it here in advance. Radermacher (p. 73) remarks that it did not extend far till iii/A.D., though some traces of the opposite tendency may be found earlier. In 3rd plur. impf. we find ἠρώτων Mt 15²³ NBCDX, Mk 4¹⁰ NC, Ac 16³⁹ A, κατεγγέλλον Lk 8⁵³ D*KX, ἐπετίμουν Lk 18⁹⁹ AG; but among the older uncials only C shows the form frequently (ἐπηρώτων Mk 9²⁸ 10². 10¹², ἠρώτων Jn 4³¹, Ac 1⁶, ἐσιώπων Mk 9³⁴ with N). It is noteworthy that C does not show the form in Lk (once in Ac). A few later uncials and cursives give -ουν forms in a dozen places. Note the reverse change in θεωρώσιν Mk 5¹⁵ L, ἐθεώρων Jn 6² A 13, ἐλεῖ Rom 9¹⁸ DFG: see further p. 196 ff. below. Sometimes the variant -ον has support in inferior authorities. Hort and Radermacher are probably right in refusing to consider the claim of any of these except in Mt 15²³. Κοπιούσιν Mt 6²⁸ B 33 is not accepted even by WH: see *App.*² 173. For other instances see p. 197. MGr has taken -έω forms into 1st and 3rd plur. (and 1st sing. mid.) of all -άω verbs, and the whole of the impf.: see Thumb *Handb.* § 237 ff.

6. Verbs in which original *f* prevented contraction of εω, εου, εοι, εο, εη, are πλέω, δεῖ (impers.), δέομαι, ζέω, πνέω, (ρέω), (-χέω).⁴ The NT forms are not numerous, but except for πνέει Jn 3⁸ L Chrys and ἐδέετο Lk 8³⁵ N*C*ω (see below) there is nothing to suggest deviation from Attic norm: early papyri likewise preserve this (Mayser 346). Lobeck *Phryg.* 220 ff. collects a good many instances of uncontracted forms from later literature, which are more likely to be assimilations of πλέω type to λύω than a survival of Ionic, as Phrynichus suggested.

7. Διψάω and πεινάω have left the -ήω class, which in Hellenistic only retains ζήω and χρήομαι. Πεινᾷ 1 Co 11²¹.³⁴ stands without variant.

Imperative—

<i>Sing.</i> 2	λῦε	τίμα	φιλεῖ	δήλου
	3 λυέτω	τιμάτω	φιλείτω	δηλούτω
<i>Plur.</i> 2	λύετε	τιμάτε	φιλείτε	δηλούτε
	3 λυέτωσαν	τιμάτωσαν	φιλείτωσαν	δηλούτωσαν

¹ Cf. κατακοῦσαν (ii/v.c.) *Magn.* 17⁸, ἀξιοῦσαν 47⁴ (Nachmanson 148). The accent is proved by Wackernagel *ThLZ*, 1908, p. 638.

² Perhaps we should add παραδιδούσαν Ac 16⁴ C.

³ Note that ἐώσαν is not the only -άω form: there is ἐγεννώσαν from γεννᾶν in Gn 6⁴.

⁴ The new present -χύνω probably stands alone in the active, where it avails to prevent confusion with fut. χεῶ. Συνέχεον Ac 21²⁷ may be imperf.: see § 95.

NOTE.—1. The imperative of ζήω does not happen to occur. In LXX we find ζῆθι (Thackeray 242), ζήτω.

2. The old Attic 3rd pl. in -όντων, -όντων, -ούντων, disappeared even from Attic in iii/B.C., with an isolated exception: see Meisterhans* 167 f.

3. Ἐλλάγα Phm 18 κ*ACD*FG 33 (cf. Rom 5¹⁸ and p. 198 below) is an instance of -έω form yielding to -άω. So is ἐλεῖτε Jude 222 κB (see p. 197 below).

4. Ἐκχέετε Rev 16¹ κACP is discussed under χέω in § 95.

Subjunctive —

<i>Sing.</i> 1	λύω	φιλῶ	πλέω	and the rest
2	λύῃς	φιλής	πλής	as pres. indic.
3	λύῃ	φιλήῃ	πλήῃ	
<i>Plur.</i> 1	λύωμεν	φιλωμεν	πλέωμεν	
2	λύητε	φιλήτε	πλήτε	
3	λύωσι(ν)	φιλωσι(ν)	πλέωσι(ν)	

NOTE.—1. The above statement is somewhat doubtfully true about the subjunctive of δηλώω: see *Proleg.* 54. That in 1 Co 10²² παραζηλοῦμεν and Gal 4¹⁷ ζηλοῦτε are subjunctive seems the most probable view: it has been accepted by Radermacher 67 n., who remarks on the assistance given to this fusion at a later period by the convergence of ου and ω in pronunciation, which he dates in iii/A.D. See below, § 85 (p. 200).

2. Πεινᾶ Rom 12²⁰ and διψᾶ *ib.* and Jn 7²⁷ (Orig.¹ διψῆ) continue the evidence that these verbs have left the -ήω class: the LXX of Prov 25²¹ supplies the forms in Rom *l.c.*

Optative—

<i>Sing.</i> 1	λύοιμι	<i>Plur.</i> 1	λύοιμεν
2	λύοις	2	λύοιτε
3	λύοι	3	λύοιεν

NOTE.—1. Optatives of Contract Verbs are not quotable in the NT. The forms in Hellenistic included according to Moeris (p. 208) ποιῆῃ, after the model of τιμῆῃ. See further Schmid *Atticismus* iv. 587 f., Schweizer *Perg.* 191.

2. The paradigm even of the uncontracted verb cannot be completed from NT, but its forms are not doubtful. In 3rd pl. we find εὔροισαν (strong aor.) in Ac 17²⁷ D*, according to a type common in LXX (Thackeray 215). Blas *Gr.* 46 f. thinks this "may be correct, . . . since the scribes of D and of its ancestors certainly did not find the optative in the living language." This statement is very questionable, for before the date of D there was a curious recrudescence of the optative even in illiterate papyri. On the whole it seems better to link D with the evidence of the LXX, and regard the -σαν as a dialectic element (here as in p. 194, n. 3) which has not touched the NT. Were the phenomenon less isolated, it would be tempting to seek light on the history of D. See *Proleg.* 56 n.

Infinitive—

λύειν τιμᾶν ζῆν φιλεῖν πλεῖν δηλοῦν

NOTE.—1. Since *-ειν* is historically from *-(σ)ειν*, and therefore does not contain *iota*, the contraction from the first shows no *ι*. *Δηλοῦν* is unchallenged for the period before *iv/A.D.*, with two or three isolated exceptions: see the discussion in *Prol.* 53, and add Thackeray 244. Crönert 220 n. gives a number of instances of *-οῖν* from late MSS. Though in five NT occurrences of the infin. B has *-οῖν* thrice, we cannot regard this as evidence for the autographs. How the late form arose is explained in *Prol. l.c.*

2. The printing of *ι* *subscr.* in *τιμᾶν* and *ζῆν* is wholly wrong for classical texts: ¹ it never appears in Attic inscriptions—see Meisterhans ³ 175—nor in papyri during the age when the presence or absence of *ι* *subscr.* counted for anything (Mayser 347). In NT times of course it is a mere orthographical question, but there is no reason whatever for retaining the *ι*.

3. Inf. *πεινᾶν* Phil 4¹².

Participle. (For declension see § 65.)

λύ-ων -ουσα -ον τιμ-ῶν -ῶσα -ῶν φιλ-ῶν -οῦσα -οῦν
 πλέ-ων „ „ ζῶν „ „ δηλῶν „ „

NOTE.—Passage of *-άω* into *-έω* occurs in *νικούντι* Rev 2¹⁷ AC 2^r A, *νικούντας* 15³ C, *προσδοκούντων* Ac 28⁶ A 25, *πλανούντων* 1 Jn 2²⁶ A; *ἐλεῶντος* Rom 9¹⁶ SAB*DFGP *al.* (cf. above, p. 195), and *θεωρώντων* Ac 28⁶ N* afford instances of the converse.

MIDDLE AND PASSIVE VOICE.

§ 85. Present Indicative—

		χρη ^ο /ε use	δεF ^ο /ε entreat			
Sg. 1	λύομαι	τιμῶμαι	χρῶμαι	φιλοῦμαι	δέομαι	δηλοῦμαι
2	λύῃ	τιμᾶσαι	χρᾶσαι	φιλεῖ	δέῃ	δηλοῖ
3	λύεται	τιμᾶται	χρᾶται	φιλεῖται	δεῖται	δηλοῦται
Pl. 1	λύομεθα	τιμῶμεθα	χρῶμεθα	φιλοῦμεθα	δέομεθα	δηλοῦμεθα
2	λύεσθε	τιμᾶσθε	χρᾶσθε	φιλεῖσθε	δεῖσθε	δηλοῦσθε
3	λύονται	τιμῶνται	χρῶνται	φιλοῦνται	δέονται	δηλοῦνται

NOTE.—1. In 2nd sing. the suffix *-ει* of later Attic takes the place of *-ῃ* in the word *βούλει* (Lk 22⁴²): the two were no longer equivalent in sound as in Attic, for *ῃ* was identical with *η* (see p. 97). Since *βούλομαι* was not a “literary” word, as Blass supposed,² we cannot interpret the variation by the help of this assumption; but *βούλει* may have been

¹ The “high authorities” to whom Hort appeals (*Introd.* 2 314) lived unfortunately before the days of scientific philology.

² See *Gr.* 47.

stereotyped in general use from use in phrases derived from literature. **ὄψῃ* (future) has been levelled (p. 97): its Attic orthography was *ὄψει*.

2. In the *-άω* verbs—and probably in the one *-ήομαι* verb—the 2nd sing. has established a new analogy form in *-σαι*, drawn from the model of the Perfect and from the present of verbs in *-αμαι*. So in NT *καυχάσαι*, *δδυνάσαι*, in five places, with no exx. of *-ῆ*: Blass quotes *πλανᾶσαι* and *ἐπισπάσαι* from Hermas. The other contracta did not follow suit in NT. Blass notes *αἰτείσαι* from Hermas 10^r κ: the *-ῆ* form is however found in that book, as in Lk 23⁴⁰ *φοβῆ* (where he suggests that *φοβείσαι* for *φοβῆ* *σύ* would be an easy correction). The LXX has very small traces of this formation. Thackeray 218 gives *κᾶσαι* Sir 6^r and *ἀποξενούσαι* 3 K 14⁶ Aquila (*ἀπεξ.* in the MS) as the only certain exx. from Contract Verbs. Moeris contrasts the Attic *ἀκροᾶ* with Hellenistic *ἀκροᾶσαι*; but this is witness no older than the NT, and the same is true of Phrynichus. Apart from the solitary form *χαριείσαι* (P Grenf ii. 14 (c)^r—iii/B.C.), which may be a mere blunder,¹ there is accordingly no real evidence of this form, outside the LXX, before the second period of the Κοινή, which dates roughly from A.D. Wackernagel *ThLZ*, 1908, p. 639 thinks it started from the future form *πίεσαι*, which alone is steadfast in LXX: this he derives from the analogy *ἴεται*: *ἴεσαι*: *πίεται*: *π.* Thence naturally *φάγεσαι* followed, but not in the earliest stratum of LXX:² both are firmly established in NT. The future *χαριέσαι* may perhaps be accepted in P Oxy ii. 292⁹ (25 A.D.). The extension of the form from the *-άω* verbs to the other contracta may have taken place in i/A.D. Later writers show it in abundance (see Hatzidakis p. 188), and it stands in MGr now.

3. *Χρήομαι* is entered tentatively as assimilated to *τιμάω*. Only one material form occurs in NT, and that is in subj., where the *η* of the non-contracta may have exercised influence. Hermas *Vis.* iii. 6^r has *χρᾶσαι* for 2 sg., and Moeris expressly says *χρῆται Ἀττικοί, χρᾶται Ἕλληνες.*³ Traces of the old flexion appear in some of its moods sporadically.

4. Mixture of classes occurs in *ἐλλογᾶται* Rom 5¹⁸ κ* (accepted by WH—rest *-είται*): the impf. appears in A *ἐλλογᾶτο* and κ* *ἐνελογεῖτο*. Cf. above, p. 196, and see p. 198, n. 3, below. Of a rather different kind is *ἐμβρομόμαι* (simplex once in Xen.), as evidenced by *ἐνεβρομούντο* Mk 14⁶ κC*W (rest the normal *-ώντο*) and ptc. (*q.v.*). See below, p. 201.

Imperfect—

<i>Sg.</i> 1	<i>ἐλυόμην</i>	<i>ἐτιμώμην</i>	<i>ἐχρώμην</i>	<i>ἐφιλοσύμην</i>	<i>ἐδέομην</i>	<i>ἐδηλούμην</i>
2	<i>ἐλύου</i>	<i>ἐτιμῶ</i>	<i>ἐχρῶ</i>	<i>ἐφιλοῦ</i>	<i>ἐδέου</i>	<i>ἐδηλοῦ</i>
3	<i>ἐλύετο</i>	<i>ἐτιμᾶτο</i>	<i>ἐχρᾶτο</i>	<i>ἐφιλείτο</i>	<i>ἐδέιτο</i>	<i>ἐδηλοῦτο</i>

¹ Grenfell and Hunt thought it "due to a confusion of *χάρισαι* with *χαριᾶ*": they may be right.

² Wackernagel says its appearance in A (*ter*) is to be reckoned among the vulgarisms of that MS.

³ Brugmann *Gram.*⁴ 348 says, "The Ionic flexion with a for η . . . , which from Aristotle's time passed over into Attic, . . . is explained by assimilation to verbs in *-αω*."

<i>Pl. 1</i>	ἐλυόμεθα	ἐτιμώμεθα	ἐχρώμεθα	ἐφιλούμεθα	ἐδέομεθα	ἐδηλούμεθα
2	ἐλύεσθε	ἐτιμᾶσθε	ἐχρᾶσθε	ἐφιλείσθε	ἐδεῖσθε	ἐδηλοῦσθε
3	ἐλύοντο	ἐτιμῶντο	ἐχρῶντο	ἐφιλοῦντο	ἐδέοντο	ἐδηλοῦντο

NOTE.—1. There is no decisive reason in NT why we should not make *ἐδεόμεν* follow *ἐλυόμεν* throughout, and *ἐχρώμεν* take *ῆ* in 3 sg. and 2 pl. *Ἐδεῖσθε* is absent, and for *ἐδεῖτο* in Lk 8⁸⁸ BLX 33 *ἐδέετο* is read by N*C*ω : AP have the conflate *ἐδεεῖτο*. Phrynichus gives the uncontracted forms as Ionic in two articles out of three : see Rutherford *NP* 296 f. There is good LXX evidence (Thackeray 243) for all three types. See *Prol.* 54 and 234. Late forms like *καλέω*, there quoted, do not invalidate Schweizer's argument (*Perg.* 174 n.) that in *ἐδέετο et sim.* we have new analogy forms rather than survivals of Ionic. WH *App.*² 173 quote also Jn (3⁸) πνέει L Chrys¹, and inf. πλέειν Ac 27² 112 and 137. Their assertion that *ἐδεῖτο* in Lk *l.c.* is "better attested" than *ἐδέετο* may only mean that it is in B, or that it is more "correct." Of the impf. of *χρῆμαι* only 3 pl. occurs. A noteworthy form *ἐχρήμεθα* occurs in Gn 26²⁹ A (not noted by Thackeray) : it is tempting to accept it as parallel to *ζῆν* (above, p. 194), but Brooke and McLean make A the solitary witness, and *ἐχρησάμεθα* matches the surrounding aorists.

2. No sign appears of the impf. 2 sg. *-ᾶσο*, corresponding with *-ᾶσαι* above. Tenses with *-μην -σο -το* were in much more limited use than those in *-μαι -σαι -ται*, and the force of analogy was therefore much less powerful. Grammarians give *ἠκροᾶσο* (see Hatzidakis 188), but we have no reason to believe that it was at all widely used.

3. For mixture of classes see p. 198, n. 4.

Imperative—

<i>Sg. 2</i>	λύου	τιμῶ	χρῶ	φιλοῦ	δέου	δηλοῦ
3	λύεσθω	τιμᾶσθω	χρᾶσθω	φιλείσθω	δεῖσθω	δηλούσθω
<i>Pl. 2</i>	λύεσθε	τιμᾶσθε	χρᾶσθε	φιλείσθε	δεῖσθε	δηλοῦσθε
3	λύεσθωσαν	τιμᾶσθωσαν	χρᾶσθωσαν	φιλείσθωσαν	δεῖσθωσαν	δηλούσθωσαν

NOTE.—1. The Attic 3 pl. in *-σθων* has gone the way of the active in *-όντων*.

2. From *χρῆμαι* we have only 2 sg. *χρῶ* in NT. *Χρᾶσθω* can be cited from P Oxy vi. 912¹⁶ (235 A.D.), vii. 1036²⁵ (273 A.D.), and *χρᾶσθωσαν* from P Giss i. 49²⁶ (mid. iii./A.D.) and Viereck *Sermo Graecus* 16⁸⁹ (81 B.C.).

3. *Νικου* Rom 12²¹ A is a case of mixture. *Ἐυράσθω* 1 Co 11⁶ B must be aorist like *κειράσθω* : see below, p. 200, n. 3.

Subjunctive—

<i>Sing. 1</i>	λύωμαι	τιμῶμαι	χρῶμαι	φιλῶμαι	δηλῶμαι
2	λύῃ	τιμᾶ	χρῆ	φιλῆ	δηλοῖ
3	λύηται	τιμᾶται	χρήται	φιλήται	δηλώται
<i>Plur. 1</i>	λυώμεθα	τιμώμεθα	χρώμεθα	φιλωμεθα	δηλώμεθα
2	λύησθε	τιμᾶσθε	χρήσθε	φιλήσθε	δηλώσθε
3	λύωνται	τιμῶνται	χρῶνται	φιλῶνται	δηλώνται

NOTE.—1. The contracta have 2 sg. set down in the old form: evidence fails for forms in *-σαι*. The solitary form *χρήται* in 1 Ti 1⁸ accounts for the flexion given: see p. 198, n. 3 above.

2. As in the active, there is strong reason to believe that the *-ω* verbs made subj. identical with indic. pres., at any rate in the plur.: see *Prol.* 54. Hort (*WH App.*² 174) takes thus *φυσιοῦσθε* 1 Co 4⁶ and *διαβιβαιούνται* 1 Ti 1⁷, as well as the active forms cited above. This is certainly true of the former, though it can hardly be admitted that Rom 8²⁶, an unambiguous *conj. deliberat.*, enforces the same construction in Ti *l.c.*: the indic. gives as good sense. On the other hand Hort's view (*ib.* 179), that *εὐοδῶται* in 1 Co 16² is anything but pres. subj., can safely be rejected: see *Prol.* 54 (also above, p. 191).

Optative—

<i>Sing.</i> 1 λυοίμην	<i>Plur.</i> 1 λυοίμεθα
2 λύοιο	2 λύοισθε
3 λύοιτο	3 λύοιντο

NOTE.—Literature and late papyri,¹ during the period when the optative enjoyed a brief resuscitation, warrant the setting down of the old forms.

Infinitive—

λύεσθαι τιμᾶσθαι χρᾶσθαι φιλείσθαι δείσθαι δηλοῦσθαι

NOTE.—1. Itacism produces in MSS many spellings with *-ε*, some of which raise the question whether the imperative may be read: *e.g.* Lk 14¹⁷ *ἔρχεσθαι* all Greek MSS, 19¹⁸ *πραγματεύεσθαι*, Gal 4¹⁸ *ζηλοῦσθε* NB 33 (where the infin. seems decidedly more probable)—see *WH Introd.*² 309 f.

2. The well-attested Hellenistic infin. *χρᾶσθαι* appears (*καταχ.*) in 1 Co 9¹⁸ A 33 Orig.: correct *Prol.* 54 n.³. Early exx. are *Syll* 177⁶⁰.⁵⁹ (303 B.C., a rescript of Antigonos), *OGIS* 214¹⁹ (iii/B.C., a dedication by Seleucus I. (?)). But *χρησθ[αι]* can be quoted from BGU iv. 1130¹⁵ (4 B.C., Alexandria). In Attica itself *χρᾶσθαι* prevailed from ii/B.C., though instances of *χρησθαι* can be quoted: see Meisterhans³ 175. From Pergamon Schweizer quotes an ex. of *χρησθαι* from 135 B.C. (p. 175).

3. The accentuation of *ξυρασθαι* in 1 Co 11⁶ is questioned. It is most generally read *ξυράσθαι* ("to go shaven"), with the mixed form found in the same verse in B—see above, p. 199, n. 3: it is quoted from Diodorus. *Ξυρέω* accounts for all the other tenses. In view of the association with the aor. *κείρασθαι*, Heinrici² proposed to read *ξύρασθαι*, aor. of *ξύρω*, which seems (*Lobeck Phryn.* 205 n.) to have quite as good Hellenistic warrant as *ξυράω*: cf. Veitch *s.v.* Since *ξυράω* has no probable place in NT, and the change to the present seems without

¹ See Harsing, *De Optativi in Chartis Aegyptiis Usu*.

² Not however in ed.³

adequate motive, we may follow WH (*App.*³ 173) in preferring *ξύρασθαι*, which occurs in Plutarch *Mor.* 336 E and [Lucian] *Dea Syra* 55 (active in Diodorus and Hippocrates).

Participle—

λυόμενος -η -ον τιμώμενος χρώμενος φιλούμενος δεόμενος δηλούμενος

NOTE.—'Εμβριμούμενος Jn 11³⁸ NAU, -όμενος BDL *al.*: see p. 198, n. 4.

(b) UNTHEMATIC.

ACTIVE VOICE.

§ 86. [*N.B.*—In these obsolescent forms bold type implies that the type so printed actually occurs in NT. Forms printed otherwise are quotable or inferable from other Hellenistic sources.]

Active forms on these models occur to some extent in NT from *φημί* (1); *ἀνίημι*, *ἀφίημι*, *παρίημι*, *συνίημι* (2); *ἀμφιέννυμι*, *ἀποκτέννυμι*, *ζώννυμι*, *δμνυμι*, *σβέννυμι* (4).

(1) *ίστη/ᾶ φη/ᾶ* (2) *τιθη/ε ιη/ε* (3) *διδω/ο* (4) *δεικ-νῦ/νῦ* (5) *ἔσ*

Present Indicative—

<i>Sg.</i> 1	<i>ίστημι</i>	<i>φημί</i>	<i>τίθημι</i>	<i>δίδωμι</i>	<i>δείκνυμι</i>	<i>εἰμί</i>
2	<i>ίστης</i>		<i>τιθης</i>	<i>δίδως</i>	<i>δείκνῦς</i>	<i>εἶ</i>
3	<i>ίστησι(ν)</i>	<i>φησί</i>	<i>τίθησι(ν)</i>	<i>δίδωσι(ν)</i>	<i>δείκνῦσι(ν)</i>	<i>ἔστι(ν)</i>
<i>Pl.</i> 1	<i>ίσταμεν</i>		<i>τίθεμεν</i>	<i>δίδομεν</i>	<i>δείκνῦμεν</i>	<i>ἔσμεν</i>
2	<i>ίστατε</i>		<i>τίθετε</i>	<i>δίδοτε</i>	<i>δείκνῦτε</i>	<i>ἔστέ</i>
3	<i>ίστάσι(ν)</i>	<i>φασί</i>	<i>τίθεᾶσι(ν)</i> (-ιᾶσι(ν))	<i>διδόασι(ν)</i>	<i>δεικνῦᾶσι(ν)</i>	<i>εἰσὶ(ν)</i>

Imperfect—

<i>Sg.</i> 1	<i>ίστην</i>		<i>ἐτίθην</i>	<i>ἐδίδουν</i>	<i>ἐδείκνῦν</i>	<i>ἦμην</i>
2	<i>ίστης</i>		<i>ἐτίθεις</i>	<i>ἐδίδους</i>	<i>ἐδείκνῦς</i>	<i>ἦς, ἦσθα</i>
3	<i>ίστη</i>	<i>ἔφη</i>	<i>ἐτίθει</i>	<i>ἐδίδου</i>	<i>ἐδείκνῦ</i>	<i>ἦν</i>
<i>Pl.</i> 1	<i>ίσταμεν</i>		<i>ἐτίθεμεν</i>	<i>ἐδίδομεν</i>	<i>ἐδείκνῦμεν</i>	<i>ἦμεν</i> <i>ἦμεθα</i>
2	<i>ίστατε</i>		<i>ἐτίθετε</i>	<i>ἐδίδοτε</i>	<i>ἐδείκνῦτε</i>	<i>ἦτε</i>
3	<i>ίστασαν</i>		<i>ἐτίθεσαν</i>	<i>ἐδίδοσαν</i>	<i>ἐδείκνῦσαν</i>	<i>ἦσαν</i>

To these should be added the few surviving forms of the mainly literary verb *εἶ/ε*, viz. 3 pl. pres. -ιᾶσι(ν), 3 sg. impf. -ῆει, 3 pl. ῆσαν.

NOTE.—1. Forms from the Thematic conjugations invaded these Unthematic survivals even in the classical period, as *ἐρίθεις* -ει, *ἐδίδουν* -ους -ου, and many forms from *δεικνύω*. In NT none of the models given here can be completely evidenced.

(α) From *ἴστημι* occur 1 sg. (only Rom 16¹ in good MSS) and 3 sg. pres., but no impf. act. Forms occur from *-ιστάνω* and *-στάνω*: the latter is not in LXX, but ultimately secured a permanent place—it is MGr. (see *Prol.*³ 55 n.). The impf. *καθίστη* appears in a fragmentary (and rather literary) papyrus of the Roman age, CP Herm 6⁹. From *φημί* we have in NT only the four forms noted above. In the imperf. the analogy of *ἔστην* and *ἔζην* naturally produced levelling of vowel: hence such forms as *ἔφημεν* in Justin Martyr. In papyri we have some middle forms, like *φάμενος*: their prominence in Herodotus suggests that they may have been an Ionic element in the *Κοινή*. How far the old forms *ἔφαμεν*, *ἔφατε*, *ἔφασαν* survived in the spoken language is questionable: these and other forms not found in NT are omitted above.

(β) From *τίθημι* occur 1 sg. and 1 and 3 pl. pres., and from impf. 3 pl., as well as 3 sg., which is already of the contract type. This was extended into 3 pl. *ἐτίθουν* (Ac 3² 4²⁵ 8¹⁷ D*EHL P *al.*, Mk 6³⁶ ADN X *al.*). Apparently *τιθεῖ* in Lk 8¹⁶ D is *τιθεῖ*, for *τίθησι*. Mixed forms appear in *-ετίθουσιν* B *-ετίθεισαν* C (Ac 8¹⁷). The five compounds of *ἵημι* show between them 1 and 3 sg. and 2 and 3 plur. pres., but no impf. Non-contract forms from *-ίω* are common, as *ἀφίωμεν*, impf. *ἤφιον*. Late uncials restore the classical *ἀφίεμεν* in Mt 6¹². Neither in LXX (Thackeray 250 f.) nor NT are there contract forms, unless we are to recognise with WH (so WS §§ 14, 16) a type *-ίω*, formed from the future *-ήσω* in *ἀφείς* Rev 2³⁰ and *συνεῖτε* Mk 8¹⁷ B*: cf. *ἀφῶ* in OGIS 201¹² (vi/A.D., rescript of the Nubian king Silko), and *ἐπαφῶ* in a Lycian inscr. But I agree with Thackeray in treating *ἀφείς* as a regular contraction for *ἀφείς*: see *Prol.*³ 45, where add *ἀνασεῖς* from *ἀνασεῖω*, *Zauberpap.* p. 116. In that case *συνεῖτε* would be aor., which is quite idiomatic, and even a plausible reading as differing from *συνίετε* in v.²¹; but accidental transposition of letters is more probable. Evidence for *-ίω* is wholly inadequate, and for *-ιέω* nil, though the latter is sometimes brought in by faulty accentuation (as by Ti in Mt 13¹³, Rom 3¹¹).

(γ) From *δίδωμι* we find 1, 2 and 3 sg. and 3 pl. pres. and 3 sg. and pl. impf. But while *ἐδίδουσιν* survives in Mk 4⁹ C, Jn 19³ κB, Ac 16⁴ κABDE 33 40 61 68 (*παρεδιδούσαν* C—see above, p. 195, n. 4), even the risk of confusion with 1 sg. has not kept out the form *ἐδίδουν* (Mt 13⁵ D, Mk 3⁶ BL, 15²³, Jn 19³ AD *al.*, Ac 4³³ (*ομν.*) 16⁴ HLP 27¹ (A has sg.)). Contract forms like *ἐκδιδῶι* (Arrian *Anab.* i. 3. 2) do not happen to occur in NT, except for *διδῶ* Rev 3⁹ AC. This might be written *δίδω* (as MGr.). Mk 4⁸ *ἐδίδει* W follows *ἐρίθει*: cf. *ἐδείδε* in BGU ii. 602⁶ (ii/A.D.), and see CR xv. 37.

(δ) From classical times forms with *-νίω* supplanted those in *-νυμι* very largely, especially in active. From NT we can quote only 1 sg. *δεικνυμι* 1 Co 12³¹ (-νῶ 33); 3 sg. *δεικνυσι* Mt 4⁸ (-ύει κ), Jn 5²⁰ (-ύει D* *semel*, -ουσι *semel*); *ἀμφιέννυσι* Mt 6³⁰ (Lk 12²⁸ has the vernacular *ἀμφιζίει*

B or -έζει DLT, no doubt from Q¹). There is no impf. (ἐζώνυες Jn 21¹⁸, ἐστράωννον Mt 21⁸, Lk 19⁸⁶). In LXX ἀπόλλυμι has still some active forms (Thackeray 246).

2. (α) Ἔστι retains its accent at the beginning of a sentence, and when it = *exists* or *is possible*; also after οὐκ, μή, εἰ, ὡς, καί, ἀλλά, τοῦτο. Only εἶ, among the present forms, is never enclitic.

(β) Middle forms in the flexion of εἶμι began to come in very early in the dialects: cf. *Prol.* 55 f. In MGr εἶμαι εἶσαι etc., they have invaded the pres. Class. ἦν 1 sg. has been entirely thrust out by ἦμην (except in Ac 20¹⁸ D), and ἦμεθα stands side by side with ἦμεν: in Gal 4⁸ both appear. The active is some three times as frequent: and ἦσο, ἦρο, have not yet begun to show themselves.

(γ) For ἔστι in practically identical sense occurs in Hellenistic² (Paul⁸, Jas¹) ἔνι (=έν, used in the sense of ἔνεστι or ἔνεισι). In MGr this has thrust out ἔστι and εἰσί: the change of each vowel in its new form εἶναι (*ine* for *ene*) is caused by assimilation to εἶμαι εἶσαι.

(δ) ἦσθα, an old perfect form, was used in Attic (Rutherford *NP* 226) for the genuine impf. ἦς of some other dialects. Both survive in the Κοινή, but the latter is commoner in NT, where ἦσθα occurs only in Mk 14⁶⁷ (ἦς 1 etc. 13 etc. Eus.) and its parallel in Mt 26⁶⁹, against seven instances of ἦς. The reverse was the case in LXX (Thackeray 256). Is it possible that this ἦσθα started in Mt under LXX influence, and that the text of Mk was harmonised?

Imperative—

<i>Sg.</i> 2 ἴστη	τίθει	δίδου	δείκνυ	ἴσθι (ἴσο)
3 ἰστάτω	τιθέτω	διδότω	δεικνύτω	ἔστω or ἦτω
<i>Pl.</i> 2 ἴστατε	τίθετε	δίδοτε	δείκνυτε	(ἴστε)
3 ἰστάτωσαν	τιθέτωσαν	διδότωσαν	δεικνύτωσαν	ἔστωσαν (ἦτωσαν)

Add -ίθι from -εἶμι.

NOTE.—1. No form from ἴστημι occurs. Ἐπιτίθει (1 Ti 5²³) and τιθέτω (1 Co 16²), ἀφιέτω (1 Co 7^{12c}) and ἀφιέτε συνίετε coincide with contract and non-contract -ω verbs respectively, and were thus naturally preserved. Δίδου, δίδωτω and δίδοτε remain, though in 1 Co 7⁸ A has ἀποδιδέτω. Among the -νυμι verbs σβέννυτε 1 Th 5¹⁹ stands alone—contr. ἀπόλλυε, ὀμνύετε: cf. ὑποδίκνυ P Oxy vii. 1066²¹ (iii/A.D.).

2. Ἔστε appears to have become obsolete, or very nearly so. It does not occur, in LXX or NT, where γίνεσθε or ἔσεσθε replaces it: see also *Prol.* 180. It can be quoted from *Test. Reuben* 6¹, in one recension, and from Eph 5⁶ D^cKL *al.* τοῦτο γὰρ ἔστε γινώσκοντες, as Blass would read (p. 320). But ἴστε is overwhelmingly supported, and can be well explained as imper.: see *Prol.*³ 245. Blass (p. 308) would make ἦτε in 1 Co 7⁶ imperative, which would suit very well if any instance of this

¹ Harnack *Sayings of Jesus* 140, overlooks this certain ex. of the stylistic emendation of Mt. See my note in *Cambridge Biblical Essays*, 486.

² Late, says Wackernagel *Hellen.* 6 n.

form were quotable. For *ἦτω*, *ἦτωσαν* and *ἔσο* (the last two not in NT, *ἦτω* in Jas 5¹³, 1 Co 16²²) see Radermacher *Gram.* 82, WS 117 n. and CR xv. 38, 436: their existence in i./A.D. Hellenistic is not very certain. But see Thackeray 256 f.

Subjunctive—

<i>Sing.</i> 1	ἰστῶ	τιθῶ	διδῶ	δεικνύω	ᾶ
2	ἰστῆς	τιθῆς	διδῶς or διδοῖς	δεικνύης	ῆς
			διδῶ or διδοῖ		

and so on like *λύω*, except for accent: in *διδῶ* the *η* is replaced by *ω*.

NOTE.—1. Since *ῆς* and *ης* are only orthographic variants, and *ν* was easily added after a long vowel, the subj. only differed from impf. in 1 sg. and 1 and 3 pl. Hence in the papyri *ῆν*, i.e. *ῆ(ν)*, is very often subjunctive: see CR xv. 38, 436, xviii. 108, *Prol.*³ 168, to which a good many more instances may be added now. From this start we get *ἐάν ἦσθα* (*Prol.*³ l.c.) in LXX and a papyrus of iii/B.C., and *ἐάν ἦσαν* P Oxy viii. 1157¹⁸ (iii/A.D.), P Tebt ii. 333¹⁸ (iii/A.D.), where a past tense is excluded by the context. In NT we find *ῆν* subj. in Mt 10¹³ C*, Mk 5¹³ B*Δ, Lk 5¹⁴ D*, 20²⁸ N*, 1 Co 16⁴ A, 2 Jn 1³ N*.

2. Forms from *ἰστημι* do not occur in NT. From *ἀφίημι* we have *ἀφίῃ* Mk 11²³ X, *ἀφίητε* Jn 16²² L, *συνιώσι* Lk 8¹⁰, Mk 4¹² (where D*¹LW 1 etc. read *συνῶσι*), which of course might equally well come from (*ἀφ*)*ίω*, were there any particular reason for so accentuating. *τίθημι* only gives us *τιθῶ* Lk 20⁴³ D and *παρατιθῶσι* Mk 6⁴¹ (-θῶσιν AD) 8⁶ (-θῶσιν ADNWA—probably right, the other being assimilated to 6⁴¹). From *δίδωμι* comes 3 pl. *παραδιδῶσι* Mt 10¹³ Cω (*leg. aor. or fut.*), and 3 sg. *διδῶ* or *διδοῖ*. These forms remind us of the Hellenistic variations between *α* and *φ* described in § 36c; but *διδοῖ* of course comes easily enough from the contract type found in indic. as early as Herodotus. The evidence is in no case unanimous: for -*φ* we have 1 Co 14⁷ D¹ELPω and 15²⁴ N¹ADEP 67***, for -*οῖ* 1 Co 15²⁴ BFG (ω read aor.). BGU iv. 1127⁴⁰ (18 B.C.) has *προσαποδιδῶ*.

Optative—

There are no forms in NT, except 3 sg. *εἴη* *undecies* in Lk and Ac, and in Jn 13²⁴ N¹ADWΓΔΔΠ *al.* 13 etc. The Hellenistic forms of the plural have discarded the primitive *εἴμεν*, *εἴτε*, *εἴεν*, in favour of *εἴημεν*, *εἴητε*, *εἴησαν* (as in Ionic), due to levelling from the singular: *εἴεν* has however a better record than the 1st and 2nd pl. of the longer form.

Infinitive—

ἰσθάναι	τιθέναι	διδόναι	δεικνύναι	εἶναι
---------	---------	---------	-----------	-------

NOTE.—1. *-ιστάναί* occurs in 1 Co 13² NBDEFG 33 (*-ιστάνευ* ACKL) and in 2 Co 3¹ FG (*-ιστάνευ* NAC *al.*). In 2 Co *l.c.* a contract form *συνιστᾶν* is read by BD* 33, and has a good claim.

2. *Ἀφίεναί* and *τιθέναί* have no rivals, nor has *διδόναί*,¹ nor *εἶναί*. For the *-ύναί* type may be cited *δεικνύναί* Mt 16²¹ B (rest *-ύειν*), *ὀμνύναί* Mk 14⁷¹ BL unc⁷ (*-ύειν* NACWΔ *al.*), while *-ύειν* also occurs in Mt 26⁷⁴ (*sine var.*): *ἀπολλύειν* occurs in Rom 14¹⁵ FG.

Participle—

<i>ιστάς</i> (like <i>πᾶς</i>)	<i>τιθείς</i> <i>-εῖσα -έν</i> (§ 65. 1b)	<i>διδούς</i> <i>-ούσα -όν</i> (§ 65. 1c)	<i>δεικνύς</i> <i>-ύσα -ύν</i> (§ 65. 1f)	<i>ὄν</i> <i>οὔσα ὄν</i> like <i>λύων</i>
------------------------------------	---	---	---	---

NOTE.—1. *Ἐμπίπλημι* makes *ἐμπιπλῶν*, from *-άω* type. *-ΐστάς* is found in 2 Co 4³ NCD*FG 33 *al.* (*-άνοντες* A probably, BP 424**—*-ώντες* rest), 6⁴ N*CD*FG 33 (*-άνοντες* BP cu²—*-ώντες* rest): WH reasonably choose the form *-άνοντες*, which was certainly the prevailing conjugation, though *-άω* forms had a temporary vogue (cf. Thackeray 245), starting in old Ionic.

2. *Ἀνιέντες* Eph 6⁹ and *συνιέντος* Mt 13¹⁹ (DF(L) *συνιόντος*) *συνιείς* 13²⁵ NBD (*συνιών* CLWω) stand against *συνίων* (etc.) in Mk 4⁹ D vt lat Rom 3¹¹. Neither here nor in indic. do accents in late MSS justify our bringing in a type *-ιέω*, which never shows itself in distinct contracted forms. *Τιθείς* stands in Mk 10⁶ (*τιθῶν* 1 28 13-346), Lk 4⁴⁰ BD vg, Jude⁴: cf. *ὑποτιθοῦσα* BGU i. 350 (ii/Δ.D.), *ἐπιτιθα(ύντι)* P Oxy vi. 986 (i/Δ.D.), and LXX once (1 Es 4⁸⁰ BA) *ἐπιτιθοῦσαν*.

3. *Διδούς* naturally prevails, since except for nom. sg. m. its flexion is identical with that of *λύων*. But *ἀποδιδούν* Rev 22² A *al.* (a correction to secure concord), *παρὰδιδῶν* Mt 26⁴⁸ κ*, Mk 14⁴² D: *διδῶς* in Jn 6³³ D is a case of virtual itacism, like *ἐδίδων* 3 pl. impf. in Mk 15²⁵ M*. Thackeray 250 gives *διδούντι* from Pr 26⁸ κ (*-όντι* BA). Cf. *διδούντος* BGU i. 86²², *ἀντιδιδούντα* ἰδ. 44, P Oxy iii. 532¹¹—all ii/Δ.D.

4. *Ἀπόλλυμι*, as in its whole active flexion, makes a thematic ptc. (Rev 9¹¹), but *-ύς* is found in other verbs. Thus *ὑποζωννύσας* Ac 27¹⁷, *δεικνύσας* Rev 22⁸ κ cu¹¹ (*-ύσας* A 046 *al.*), *ἐπιδεικνύς* Ac 18²⁸, *ἀποδεικνύσας* 2 Th 2⁴ (*-ύσας* AFG). In Rev the *-ύων* type is a *priori* more probable.

MIDDLE AND PASSIVE VOICES.

§ 87. Present Indicative—

				<i>ἦσ σῆ</i>	<i>κεῖ λῆ</i>
<i>Sing.</i>	1 <i>ἴσταμαι</i>	<i>τιθέμαι</i>	<i>δίδομαι</i>	<i>δεικνύμαι</i>	<i>κάθημαι</i> <i>κεῖμαι</i>
	2 <i>ἴσασαι</i>	<i>τιθεσαι</i>	<i>διδουσαι</i>	<i>δεικνυσαι</i>	<i>κάθη</i> <i>κεῖσαι</i>
	3 <i>ἴσεται</i>	<i>τιθεται</i>	<i>διδουται</i>	<i>δεικνυται</i>	<i>κάθηται</i> <i>κεῖται</i>
<i>Plur.</i>	1 <i>ἴσάμεθα</i>	<i>τιθέμεθα</i>	<i>διδόμεθα</i>	<i>δεικνύμεθα</i>	<i>καθήμεθα</i> <i>κεῖμεθα</i>
	2 <i>ἴσασθε</i>	<i>τιθεσθε</i>	<i>διδουσθε</i>	<i>δεικνυσθε</i>	<i>κάθησθε</i> <i>κεῖσθε</i>
	3 <i>ἴσονται</i>	<i>τιθενται</i>	<i>διδονται</i>	<i>δεικνυνται</i>	<i>κάθηνται</i> <i>κεῖνται</i>

¹ Προσδιδέμαι BGU iv. 1115⁴⁸ (13 B.C.).

Imperfect Indicative—

<i>Sing.</i> 1	ἴσάμην	ἐτίθέμην	ἐδιδόμην	ἐδεικνύμην	ἐκάθημην	ἐκείμην
2	ἴσασο	ἐτίθεσο	ἐδίδοσο	ἐδείκνυσο	ἐκάθησο	ἐκεισο
3	ἴσάτο	ἐτίθετο	ἐδίδοτο	ἐδείκνυτο	ἐκάθητο	ἐκειτο
<i>Plur.</i> 1	ἴσάμεθα	ἐτίθεμεθα	ἐδιδόμεθα	ἐδεικνύμεθα	ἐκάθημεθα	ἐκείμεθα
2	ἴσασθε	ἐτίθεσθε	ἐδίδοσθε	ἐδείκνυσθε	ἐκάθησθε	ἐκεισθε
3	ἴσαντο	ἐτίθεντο	ἐδίδοντο	ἐδείκνυντο	ἐκάθηντο	ἐκειντο

NOTE.—1. As in LXX and Ptolemaic papyri (Thackeray 245, Mayser 351 f.) the unthematic forms are much better preserved in the Middle than in the Active. Additional verbs of these classes, besides some of those named under the Active, are (1) *δύναμαι, δύναιμαι, κρέμαμαι, ἐπίσταμαι, πίμπραμαι*, (4) *μίγνυμαι, ῥήγνυμαι, ἀπόλλυμαι*.

2. Two roots, peculiar in that they appear in the Middle (in Sanskrit as well as Greek) without vowel-reduction, have a partial flexion in this class, preserved mainly by virtue of their similarity to the Perfect. *Κείμαι* is common and presents no irregularities: 2 sg. and pl. pres. and 1 and 2 sg. and pl. impf. do not happen to occur in NT. From the root *ἦσ* only *κάθημαι* has survived, and augment and accent alike show that it was not felt to be a compound. The impf. only occurs in 3 sg. (*undecies*) and 3 pl. (Mk 3²³ Δ *al.*). In LXX the regular 2 sg. *κάθησαι* still occurs, but *κάθη* (from *κάθομαι*—cf. imper.) appears without variant in Ac 23⁸, the only NT occurrence: cf. P Oxy i. 33 ^{ll} 18 (ii/A.D.).

3. The two tenses can be made up for the *ἴσταμαι* type out of the four verbs that contribute forms, except for the 2 sg. impf., the form of which is not quite certain: Dt 28⁶⁴, Is 48⁸ have *ἠπίστω* preserving an old classical alternative (Kühner² l. ii. § 213, n. 1), which Moeris even calls Attic against Hellenistic *-σο* (Schweizer *Perg.* 168, who quotes *δίστω* from Pergamum). *Δύνασαι* is normal, appearing six times without variant: *δύνη*, from *δύνομαι*,¹ occurs in Mk 9²² ⁸BDLWΔ (*-σαι* ACNX),²³ ²³ ²³BDNWΔ (*-σαι* ²³ACLX), Lk 16² ²³BDPW (*al.* future), Mk 14⁰ B (*-σαι* ²³ACDL *al.*), Rev 2². Similarly for (*ἐξ*) *-ἐκρέματο* Lk 19⁴⁸ ADLQRW we have *ἐξεκρέματο* ²³ B.

4. From *ἀφίεμαι* we have 3 sg. and 3 pl. pres. *Ἀφίενται* is in Mt 9².⁵ ²³ NB, Mk 2⁵ B 28 33, 2⁹ ²³ NB 28 565, Jn 20²³ W and later uncials, Lk 7⁴⁷ W; while we find *ἀφίονται* Jn 20²³ B*, Mk 2⁵ Δ, Lk 7⁴⁷ F. *Τίθεμαι* shows 1 sg. and 2 pl. pres., 3 sg. and pl. impf. *Προσετίθοντο* is read by cu.⁴ (incl. 1) in Ac 5¹⁴. Cf. *παρακατατίθομαι* BGU i. 326 (ii/A.D.).

5. *Δίδομαι* has 3 sg. and 1 pl. pres., but in impf. *διεδίδετο* Ac 4³⁵ ²³ NB*ADE, *παρεδίδετο* 1 Co 11²³ ²³ NB*ACDEFGK 33, with P and late authorities for *-σο*. See under the Aorist, and cf. LXX in Thackeray 250.

6. For *-νυμαι* forms may be quoted *ἐνδείκνυνται* Ro 2¹⁵, *ῥήγνυνται* Mt 9¹⁷, *διεῤῥήγνυτο* Lk 5⁶ A unc¹³, *ἀπόλλυμαι* Lk 15¹⁷, *-νται* 1 Co 8¹¹ ²³ NBBDP 33, Mk 2²² BL, *-ύμεθα* Mt 8²⁵, Mk 4³⁵, Lk 8²⁴, *-νται* Mt 9¹⁷ ²³ NB 1 13, *ἀπόλλυντο* 1 Co 10⁹ ²³ NBA, 10¹⁰ A, *σβέννυται* Mk 9⁴⁸, *-νται* Mt 25⁵. The are no *-ύω* forms at all.

¹ WS 118 wrongly calls it contracted. The type *δύνομαι* occurs fairly often in papyri: see Thackeray 249, Mayser 355, *CR* xviii. 112.

Imperative—

<i>Sing.</i> 2	ἵστασο	τίθεσο	δίδοσο	δείκνυσο
3	ἱστάσθω	τιθέσθω	διδόσθω	δεικνύσθω
<i>Plur.</i> 2	ἵστασθε	τίθεσθε	δίδοσθε	δείκνυσθε
3	ἱστάσθωσαν	τιθέσθωσαν	διδόσθωσαν	δεικνύσθωσαν

NOTE.—1. The imper. *κάθησο*, still found in LXX, is supplanted in NT by *κάθου* (as from *κάθουμαι*), which occurs six times with no trace of the older form. No other imper. appears; nor any imper. of *κείμαι*. *Καθήσθω* etc., and *κείσο* etc., may be postulated as the only conceivable forms if the tense was ever wanted.

2. *ἵστασο* (*περι- bis, ἀφ- semel* in late MSS) has no variant form. (See p 206, n. 3.) *Παρατιθέσθωσαν* 1 P 4¹⁹ is the only quotable part of *τίθεσο*; while *συναναμίγνυσθε* 2 Th 3¹⁴ *Εω* (an itacism) alone represents the other types. *Ἐπιτιθοῦ* (as from a contract verb) occurs in 1 Ti 5²² D: we might equally well write *ἐπιτίθου*, as from *-τίθουμαι*.

Subjunctive—

<i>Sing.</i> 1	δύνωμαι	τιθῶμαι	διδῶμαι	δεικνύωμαι	καθῶμαι
2	δύνη	τιθῆ	διδῶ	δεικνύη	καθῆ

and so on like *λύωμαι*, except for accent: in *διδῶμαι* the *η* is replaced by *ω*.

NOTE.—*Καθῆσθε* Lk 22³⁰ B*ΤΔ represents the subj. of *κάθουμαι*. From the rest no forms occur except *δύνηται* *δύνονται*.

Optative—

<i>Sing.</i> 1	δυναίμην	<i>Plur.</i> 1	δυναίμεθα
2	δύναιω	2	δύναισθε
3	δύναιτο	3	δύναιντο

NOTE.—The only optative from which forms occur (1 sg. and 3 pl.) is cited by itself, as there is no evidence that NT writers would have used any of the rest.

Infinitive—

ἵστασθαι τίθεσθαι δίδοσθαι δείκνυσθαι καθῆσθαι κείσθαι

NOTE.—All these types occur without alternatives. This fact makes it very improbable that we should accent *πιμπρᾶσθαι* or *ἐμπιπρᾶσθαι* in Ac 28⁶ as if from a contract verb, which we should naturally accept in the active.

Participle—

ἱστάμενος τιθέμενος διδόμενος δεικνύμενος καθήμενος κείμενος

NOTE.—All these are well represented in NT, and there are no alternative forms.

B. STRONG AORIST STEM.

§ 88. On the formation of this stem see above, § 82. It only concerns non-contract $-ω$ verbs and the verbs in $-μ$. There is no present tense for this stem.

(a) Thematic, (b) Unthematic.

(a) βαλδ/ε cast; (b) (1) στῆ/(a) stand, (2) θῆ/ε place, (3) δω/ο give, (4) δῦ sink.

(b) Like (1) are ἔβην from βαίνω and (opt. only) ὠνάμην from ὀνύνημι.

Like (2) are compounds of ἵημι.

Like (3) is ἔγνω from γινώσκω, but varying strongly in parts.

In (4) ἔδυν is nearly obsolete, and ἔφυν (from φύω) seems wholly so.

ACTIVE VOICE.

Indicative—

<i>Sing.</i> 1	ἔβαλον	ἔστην	sing. supplied by	ἔγνω	ἔδυν
2	ἔβαλες	ἔστης	1st aor.,	ἔγνως	ἔδυσ
3	ἔβαλε(ν)	ἔστη	ἔδωκα	ἔγνω	ἔδου
<i>Plur.</i> 1	ἐβάλομεν	ἐστήμεν	ἔθεμεν	ἔδομεν	ἔγνωμεν
2	ἐβάλατε	ἐστήτε	ἔθετε	ἔδοτε	ἔγνωτε
3	ἔβαλον	ἔστησαν	ἔθεσαν	ἔδοσαν	ἔγνωσαν

NOTE.—1. In Thematic Verbs there is a large infusion of Weak Aorist terminations, as in other parts of the system. It began in Attic, where εἶπον is inflected $-ον$ $-ας$ $-ε(ν)$, $-ατον$ $-άτην$, $-ομεν$ $-ατε$ $-ον$: similarly ἤνεγκον (from φέρω), but with 1 pl. $-αμεν$ (Rutherford NP 219f.). In these verbs the double tenseformation was primitive: see Brugmann Gr.⁴ 322. Cf. Prol. 51,¹ and Thackeray 210 f., who shows that except in these two verbs the $-α$ forms did not become common till i/A.D., when the papyri begin to show them freely: cf. CR xv. 36, xviii. 110. In NT these two verbs are almost exclusively found with $-α$ in indic.: εἶπες Mk 12⁸² NDL al., Jn 4¹⁷ NB*, with εἶπον 1 sg. usually, are about the only exceptions, with εἶπον 3 pl. rarely. Ἔπεσα $-ατε$ $-αν$ were helped towards predominance by the $σ$; ἤλαθμεν $-αν$ and once $-α$ (Rev 10⁹) are found; εἶδαμεν $-αν$ and less certainly $-ατε$, with εἶδα in Rev; εὔραμεν and $-αν$, but only $-ον$ in 1 sg.; $-εἶλατε$ $-αν$: in other verbs the instances are more isolated—ἔβαλαν (ἐπ-) is thrice provisionally accepted by WH, with ἐξεβάλαμεν rejected in Mt 7²², ἐλάβαμεν $-ατε$ $-αν$ in Lk 5⁶, 1 Jn 2²⁷, Jn 1¹², ἔπιαν in 1 Co 10⁴, ἀπέθαναν in Mt 8³², Lk 20³¹, Jn 8⁵². See WH App.³ 171 f., WS 111 f., and for exx. in D see

¹ Correct the total given there for verbs forming strong aor. act. or mid.: there are over forty.

Scrivener *Codex Bezae* xlvi. The increasing prominence of these forms, especially in the plural, is thus well seen. The MGr aorist flexion *-a -es* (§ 89) *-ε -αιε -ερε* (and *-αρε*) *-αν*, shows how these forms lived on. Cf. on impf. above, p. 194, n. 2.

2. In 3 pl. the suffix *-σαν*—as in the impf. (p. 194, n. 3, 4)—obtained a footing for a time, but it makes no claim in the NT for the aorist except in *παρελάβοσαν* 2 Th 3^s *Ν*AD** 33. BGg read *παρελάβετε*, which WH put in their text, remarking that the uniqueness of this termination in Paul renders it “somewhat suspicious”: the mistake may have arisen from an ocular confusion if *ΠΑΡΑΛΟCΙΝ* stood in the line above just over *παρελαβετε*. Blass 46 argues that this and the impf. are probably authentic, since they could not have been very familiar to the scribes except in contract verbs. Scrivener cites from D *ἤλθοσαν* Mk 8¹¹ 9²⁸, *εἶδοσαν* 9⁹. As observed above, the form had only a temporary vogue, except in the *Contracta* (impf.), where it remains in MGr.

3. The aor. indic. of *-ἴημι* is supplied wholly by *ἀφήκα*, as is that of *τίθημι* by *ἔθηκα*, and of *δίδωμι* by *ἔδωκα*, with the significant exception of *παρέδοσαν* in Luke’s literary Preface (1²): contrast the Middle below. In Mk 7¹⁸ W reads *παρέδοτε*, whence *ἔδοτε* is marked as NT above. **Ἔστην* and *-έβην* between them form a complete flexion (exc. 2 sg.), and *ἔγνω* is complete. **Ἔδυν* occurs in 3 sg. Mk 1²² *ΝΑCΛWΓΑΠ al.* (*ἔδυσεν* BD 28), and in 3 pl. *παρεισέδυσαν* Jude 4 *ΝΑCΡ* etc. (*-εδύσαν* B alone). If we read *ἔδυσεν* in Mk *l.c.*, both passages show the weak aorist dropping the transitive sense, which is likely enough. The aor. pass in Jude 4 is parallel to *ἐφίην* which has supplanted *ἔφυν*, and it is quoted by Veitch from Hippocrates and Hesiod (?). Whichever reading be adopted, the solitary survival of *ἔδν* in Mk *l.c.* seems highly improbable.

Imperative—

Sg. 2	βάλε	στήθι } -στα }	-βηθι } -βα }	θέε	ἄφεε	δόε	γνώθι
3	βαλέτω	στήτω	-βάτω	θέτω	ἄφέτω	δότω	γνώτω
Pl. 2	βάλετε	στήτε	-βατε	θέτε	ἄφετε	δότε	γνώτε
3	βαλέτωσαν	στήτωσαν	-βάτωσαν	θέτωσαν	ἄφέτωσαν	δότωσαν	γνώτωσαν

NOTE.—1. From *εἶπον* the imper. has exclusively weak aor. endings, except that *εἰπέ* also occurs: *εἰπόν*¹ is said by WH (*App.*² 171) to stand chiefly before consonants. They accept *-ένεγκε* four times, *-ένεγκον* once (Mt 8⁴), and *ένέγκατε* without variant. From *ἔπεισον* however *-πίσει* and *πίσετε* are best attested; from *ἤλθον* *ἔλθατε* *ἐλάβατ*, though B has *-ε*-five times.

2. In compounds *-στηθι* and *-στᾱ*, *-βηθι* and *-βᾱ* alternate without very clear rationale. The short forms are found in Attic poets (Blass² 50 n.)

¹ The imper. *εἰπέ*, *ἐλθέ*, *εἰπέ* were oxytone in Attic and the *Κουή*, as were *ιδέ* and *λαβέ* in Attic: see Kühner² § 217. 3. a (i. ii. 84). It is a survival of the original accent: cf. Brugmann *Gr.*⁴ 183, who accepts *πίε*, *φαγέ* as well. Blass 45 follows Lobbeck *Phryn.* 343 in accenting the imper. *εἶπον*.

but *v. inf.*—and in MGr: so Hatzidakis 101, where *ἀνέβα ἀνεβᾶτε*, *ἔμβα ἐμβᾶτε* and the like are cited. But in some MGr dialects *ἀνεβῆτε* etc. appear (*ib.*). This suits the fact that the *η* forms sg. and pl. still survived in ancient *Κοινή*: in LXX exclusively in *-βαίω*, though *-στα* occurs as well as *-στηθι*.¹ In NT *στήθι* occurs thrice simple and eight times compound; *-σῆ* occurs Ac 12⁷, Eph 5¹⁴, Ac 9¹¹ B, 10²⁰ D*, 11¹⁹ D* (against *ἀνασῆς*). For *-βα* we have Rev 4¹ (exc. A), Mk 15³² L, Mt 17²⁰ NB 1 etc. 13 etc. (against *-βηθι* CDω); for *-βηθι* also Mt 27⁴⁰, Lk 14¹⁰ 19⁵, Jn 4⁴⁹ 7⁸, Ac 10⁴⁰. The other persons are always in *η* with *στήρω* etc.; but the analogy of *τίμα τιμᾶτε* has made *καταβάρω* five times (only Mk 13¹⁵ XΔ *-βήρω*) and *ἀνάβητε* Rev 11² NACP (only 046 *-βητε*).² The accent of *τίμα τιμᾶτε* combines with MGr *ἀνέβα ἀνεβᾶτε* (see above) to make it probable that we should write *ἀναβᾶτε* in Rev 11², instead of following the older *ἀνάβητε*. It may be noted that *ἀνάβα* appears on an Attic vase-painting: see Kretschmer *Vasenschriften* p. 197. Its occurrence in Attic comedy (as Arist. *Ran.* 35, *ἔμβα ib.* 377) suggests that it was Attic vernacular already, and not really poetical, though used by Euripides.

3. *ἄφες ἄφετε* became a quasi-auxiliary: see *Prol.* 175. *Θέεις θέετ, δός δότω δότε, γνώθι γνώτω γνώτε*, show no signs of obsolescence. The 3rd pl. does not happen to occur. MGr *θέεις, δός* and *ἄς* (= *ἄφες*) show that the 2 sg. was the most firmly rooted.

Subjunctive—

<i>Sg.</i> 1	βάλω	στῶ	θῶ	ἄφῶ	δῶ	γνῶ
2	βάλῃς	στῆς	θῆς	ἄφῆς	δῶς, δοῖς	γνῶς
3	βάλῃ	στῆ	θῆ	ἄφῆ	δῶ, δοῖ, δέῃ	γνῶ, γνοῖ
<i>Pl.</i> 1	βάλωμεν	στῶμεν	θῶμεν	ἄφῶμεν	δῶμεν	γνώμεν
2	βάλῃτε	στῆτε	θῆτε	ἄφῆτε	δῶτε	γνώτε
3	βάλωσι	στῶσι(ν)	θῶσι(ν)	ἄφῶσι(ν)	δῶσι(ν)	γνώσι(ν)

NOTE.—1. *στῶ* suffers somewhat, like the rest of the paradigm of *ἔστην*, from the competition of the weak aor. pass., but it occurs (3 sg. and pl., and 2 pl.) six or seven times. *-βῶ* is found in 3 sg. From *τίθημι* and *-ἵμι* forms are common, and abundant from the two *-ω-* verbs.

2. Where *φ* occurs in the flexion of *δῶ* and *γνῶ* there was a strong Hellenistic bias towards *οῖ*: in papyri it affects 2 sg. as well as 3 sg.,³ and D shows this in Lk 12⁵⁰. The analogy of contract verbs might work directly on an aor. form—cf. *ἀναβᾶτε* just discussed—and there would be a natural tendency to eject unique subj. forms like *-φς* and *·φ*. But it may be also observed that there are several instances of Hellenistic *ο* replacing earlier *φ*: see *CR* xv. 37, 435. The figures for NT MSS are interesting. *κ* has *δοῖ* $\frac{1}{2}$ times, B $\frac{1}{6}$, A $\frac{1}{2}$, C $\frac{1}{2}$, D $\frac{1}{2}$, L $\frac{1}{11}$, W $\frac{1}{2}$ in the

¹ Thackeray 254: he says *-στα* is poetical in LXX.

² [Against this we have *ἀνάβητε* without variant in Jn 7⁸.—ED.]

³ See *Prol.* 55 n.³ and add—e.g. *Md. Nic.* 185 (Ptol.), P Tebt ii. 409^a (A.D. 5).

Gospels: in Paul \aleph 1, B 1, A 2, C 1, D₂ 1, G 2 KLP 2. (These last only stand for $\delta\omega\acute{\iota}$: in Paul we have to add the places where $\delta\acute{\omega}\eta$ appears, viz. \aleph 2, B 0, A 2, C 1, D₂ 5, G 3 and KLP 2.) Thus the δ -text shows $\delta\omega\acute{\iota}$ most, importing it even into Lk (22^a D): otherwise Luke and Paul show no trace of it (exc. in 1 Th 5¹⁵, where \aleph joins DG). An obviously vernacular form—as its papyrus record shows—it may safely be assumed right in Mk 4²⁹ \aleph BD, 14^{10c} BDW, 8³⁷ \aleph B, Jn 13² \aleph BD and perhaps Jn 13²⁹ D. Though a late form of the opt. coincides with it, there is not the slightest syntactical reason for doubt that in NT it is always subj., as W. F. Moulton proved long ago (WM 360 n.). With $\delta\omega\acute{\iota}$ goes $\gamma\omega\acute{\iota}$, read by WH in Mk and Lk (Mk 5⁴³ ABDLW, 9³⁰ \aleph BCDL, Lk 19¹⁵ \aleph BDL 33) against $\gamma\omega\phi$ in Jn 7⁵¹ 11⁵⁷ ($\gamma\omega\acute{\iota}$ D*) 14³¹, and as *v.l.* in Mk and Lk *l.c.* (A *bis*, \aleph and C *semel*, W *bis*).

3. A third form, $\delta\acute{\omega}\eta$, occurs in Paul: \aleph 2, B 2, A 2, C 1, D₂ 5, G 2, and even KLP 2—cf. Jn 15¹⁶ in 33 and late uncials. For proof that the form $\delta\omega\eta$ is subj. as well as opt.—the different placing of *ε* *subscr.* is only orthographical—see *Proz.* 55 and 193 f.: a clear instance of $\gamma\omega\acute{\omega}\eta$ subj. is there cited from Clement, with a ref. to Reinhold 90f. for $\delta\acute{\omega}\eta$ in apocrypha, and to a new reading (*ἀποδοῦη*) in a pre-Christian papyrus.¹

Optative—

The 3 sg. $\delta\acute{\omega}\eta$ occurs in Paul⁴ (Rom 15⁵, 2 Th 3¹⁶, 2 Ti 1^{16.18}), and in late texts of 2 Ti 2⁷ 4¹⁴. $\Delta\omega\acute{\iota}$ was also a Hellenistic form. From thematic verbs the flexion was *βάλομι -οις -οι, -οιμεν -οιτε -οιεν* with no possible alternatives except in 3 pl. Here the form in *-σαν* appears in *εὔροισαν* Ac 17²⁷ D*, as in LXX: see above, § 84, p. 196.

Infinitive—

βαλεῖν στήναι -βῆναι θεῖναι ἀφείναι δοῦναι γῶναι

NOTE.—1. All these are well represented, and there are no signs of variants (such as *σάναι, -βάναι, δῶναι, γῶναι*, due to mixture with present forms, and confusion between the two *-ω-* roots), which appear in papyri: see *CR* xv. 37, 435.

2. *Ἀνερέγκαι* 1 Pet 2⁵ is the only weak aorist form.

Participle—

βαλῶν στάς βάς θεῖς ἀφείς δούς γούς
-οῦσα -όν -άσα -άν -εῖσα -έν -οῦσα -όν

NOTE.—*Ἐῖπας* appears, though rarer than *εἰπών*: the two occur together in Jn 11²⁸ BC*. WH reject the oblique cases.

¹ [Mr. H. Scott cites *Test. Simeon* 4⁵ *ἴνα δῶ ὁ θεὸς χάριν, v.l. δῶη, δῶει. Test. Reuben* 4¹ *ἕως οὗ ὁ κύριος δῶη ὑμῖν σύζυγον.*—ED.]

MIDDLE VOICE.

Indicative—

ἐβαλόμην	ἐθέμην	ἐδόμην
ἐβάλου	ἔθου	ἔδου
ἐβάλετο	ἔθετο	ἔδοτο
ἐβαλόμεθα	ἐθέμεθα	ἐδόμεθα
ἐβάλεσθε	ἔθεσθε	ἔδοσθε
ἐβάλοντο	ἔθεντο	ἔδοντο

NOTE.—1. Forms of the thematic verb with *a* include *ἀπειπάμεθα* 2 Co 4², and (as in act.) the quotable forms of the aor. of *αἰριῦμαι*: *ἐξειλάμην*, *εἶλατο* and *ἀν-* and *ἐξ-* *εἶλατο*. In this word the resemblance to the weak aorist of a liquid verb no doubt helped the mixture: see under the Participle.

2. Mk 8¹⁴ B has *ἐπελάθεντο*, which occurs 8 times in LXX, according to Thackeray, who calls in the analogy of *ἐτίθεντο*, and the occasional 3 pl. *-εσαν* for *-οσαν*. That the variation affects this verb only, and in LXX as well as NT, makes some special cause probable.

3. *Ἐξέθεντο* Ac 18²⁶ D shows thematising, also *συνεπειθοντο* Ac 24⁹ 33 and 23²⁰ *συνέθεντο* H*.

4. For thematic *ἔδετο* there is quotable *ἀπέδετο* Heb 12¹⁶ AC, *ἐξέδετο* Mt 21²⁸ N*B*CL, with A added in the || Lk 20⁹, and AK in Mk 12¹. In Heb *l.c.* the "correct" form is read by NDKLP 33, and is what we expect: in Mk 12¹ the vernacular flexion is equally to be expected, and we find Mt and Lk faithfully copying it. W has *ἐξέδοτο* only. None of the other moods of *ἐδόμην* occur in NT.

Imperative—

βαλοῦ	θοῦ
βαλέσθω	θέσθω
βάλεσθε	θέσθε
βαλέσθωσαν	θέσθωσαν

NOTE.—The three occurrences of *-θοῦ* and *θέσθε* are in Luke and Paul.

Subjunctive—

βάλωμαι	θῶμαι
βάλῃ	θῇ
βάλῃται	θῇται
βάλώμεθα	θώμεθα
βάλῃσθε	θῃσθε
βάλωνται	θῶνται

NOTE.—*Ἀποθώμεθα* in Rom 13¹² is the only occurrence.

Optative—

In the NT no forms occur from unthematic verbs except *δανάμην* (Phm 20) from *δανάμαι*: cf. *δναιντο* in *Audolent* 92³ (iii/B.C.). *Γένοιτο* from *γίνομαι* is also a living form in the vernacular, esp. in the expression *μη γένοιτο*. *Δάβουνο* can be quoted from a very illiterate Christian letter of iv/v A.D., P Giss 54¹². The forms are the old ones throughout, so far as they survive at all.

Infinitive—

βαλέσθαι θέσθαι

NOTE.—*Εύρασθαι* can be cited from P Oxy ix 1204¹³ (299 A.D.). There are no NT parallels: see below.

Participle—

βαλόμενος θέμενος

NOTE.—*Εύράμενος* (Heb 9¹²) is a well-attested form, whose passage into the weak flexion is explained, like *είλατο* etc. above, by the closeness of the weak aor. in liquid verbs. So *γενάμενος*, which is plentiful in papyri, but very rare in good NT texts (e.g. Lk 22⁴⁴ N, 24²² B): see *Proleg.* 51 n.¹

PASSIVE VOICE.

Indicative—

ἡλλάγην	ἡλλάγημεν
ἡλλάγης	ἡλλάγητε
ἡλλάγη	ἡλλάγησαν

Imperative—

ἀλλάγηθι	ἀλλάγητε
ἀλλαγήτω	ἀλλαγήτωσαν

Subjunctive—

ἀλλαγῶ	ἀλλαγῶμεν
ἀλλαγῆς	ἀλλαγῆτε
ἀλλαγῆ	ἀλλαγῶσι(ν)

Optative—

Not found in NT: it runs *ἀλλαγ-είην -είης -είη -είημεν -είητε -είησαν*.

Infinitive—

ἀλλαγήναι

Participle—

ἀλλαγείς -εῖσα -έν

NOTE.—Twenty-five roots are found in NT with this strong aorist, and some of them belong to the post-classical age, so that the formation was still alive. Sometimes it even ejected an older weak aorist: e.g. ἡγγέλην for ἡγγέλθην—a denominative like ἀγγέλλω could not make strong tense-stems in earlier Greek.

C. WEAK AORIST STEM.

§ 89. For the general formation of this stem see above, § 82. It proved in later Greek a pivot of the verb, very frequently producing new present stems. See Thumb *Handb.* 143 f.

NOTE.—1. The development in the MGr verb throws much light on tendencies already visible in NT Greek. Strong and weak aorists are now fused, and the characteristic *a* of the weak aorist endings dominates the active, banishing completely the endings with *-o-*. The impf. has taken the same set of endings—*-a -es -ε, -αμε -ερε* (and *-ατε*) *-αν(ε)*. Accordingly the Hellenistic tendency to assimilate the two aorists, and at the same time to keep the imperfect in touch with the aorist, has worked itself out to a symmetrical result. The same historical connexion is seen in the stems. Thumb (*l.c.*) remarks that the MGr aor. act. “corresponds exactly” to its old Greek predecessor. “Only in a few cases the sigmatic aorist has encroached upon the territory of the non-sigmatic; thus ἐκέρδεσα fr. κερδαίνω, ἐσύναξα fr. συνάγω (συνάξω), ἐπρόσεξα fr. προσέχω, ἀμάρτησα fr. ἀμαρτάνω.” All these have parallels in the Κοινή. NT Greek shows κερδῆσαι as well as κερδᾶναι, συνάξει as well as συναγαγεῖν, and ἡμάρτησα beside ἡμαρτον (cf. MGr ἡμαρτο=“beg pardon!”); while προσέξει can be illustrated from papyri.¹ Thumb goes on to say, “While in general the ancient aorist has maintained its place, the present [MGr] stem has been quite frequently remodelled, and that on the basis of the aorist.” This process can be easily recognised in NT. The present suffix *-νω*, extremely productive in MGr, has made new present stems in δύνω (ἔδυσα), *-κτέν(ν)ω* (*-ἔκτεινα*, like MGr σπέρνω : ἔσπειρα etc.), λιμπάνω (ἔλιπον), *-χύν(ν)ω* (*-εχύθην*), *-σάνω* (ἔσάθην—see § 95): some of these began to appear in classical times. The simplification of present stems under an impulse from the aorist may be seen also in classical or Hellenistic exx. such as κυλίω (ἐκύλισα), νίπτω (ἔνιψα), ῥήσσω (ἔρηξα), στείλω (Ac 7⁸⁴—ἔστειλα), σκέπτομαι (ἔσκεψάμην, which secured the victory of its present over the Attic rival σκοπέω), ἀμφιάζω or *-έζω* (ἡμφίεσα—see § 33. 2), κρύβω (Lk 12⁴ ?—see § 95—ἐκρύβην), βλαστᾶω (ἔβλαστησα), δπτάνομαι (ἔφθην).

2. Verbs in *-αίνω* and *-αίρω* make weak aorist in *-ᾶνα, -ᾶρα*, without regard to the sound preceding this suffix: this is explained by Brugmann-

¹ Cf. παρέξασθαι CPR 175¹⁸ (ii/A.D.) *ad.*

Thumb *Gr.* 39 as due to the analogy of verbs in which the *ā* was "pure." Perhaps the working of this analogy, in the opposite direction to the general tendency of the *Κοινή*, may have been helped by the quality of the *a* vowel which kept its place in the rest of the verb.

3. *Χύν(ν)ω* (the older *χέω*) forms an abnormal aorist *ἔχεα*, best taken as a primitive strong aorist (*ἔχε- Ϝπ*, with weakened root in mid. *ἐχύμην*, *ἐχύθης*, *ἔχυτο*): see Thumb in Brugmann *Gram.*⁴ 676. This is the regular form in NT: on some ambiguities see the List, § 95.

ACTIVE VOICE.

Indicative—

ἔλυσα	ἐλύσαμεν	ἔκρινα	ἐκρίναμεν
ἔλυσας	ἐλύσατε	ἔκρινας	ἐκρίνατε
ἔλυσε(ν)	ἔλυσαν	ἔκρινε(ν)	ἔκριναν

NOTE.—The infection of strong aor. endings is found in 2 sg. (from the influence of the common 3 sg. *-ε*) in illiterate papyri of the Roman age, as P Oxy vii. 1067⁵ (iii/A.D.) *ἀφήκες*, i. 119² (ii/iii A.D.) *ἐποίησες* ¹¹ *ἔπεμψες* ¹⁸ *ἔπλευσες*, etc.: it is fixed in MGr. It appears in Rev 2⁴ *ἔφῃκες*, Mt 11²⁶ D *ἀπεκάλυψες*, *ἔδωκες* Jn 17⁷ *ἔδωκες*, ⁸ B, and even *ἀφῃκετε* in Mt 23²⁸ B. Apparently it began in the Perfect, which accounts for its appearance at first mainly in *-κα* aorists: see § 92.

Imperative—

λύσον	λύσατε
λυσάτω	λυσάτωσαν

NOTE.—1. The MGr type *δέσε*, *δέσετε* is foreshadowed by some late forms in vernacular *Κοινή*: cf. Dieterich *Unters.* 248. Radermacher suggests that the middle *λύσαι*, pronounced as *λύσε*, may have started the assimilation to the present.

2. There is no trace in Hellenistic of the 3rd pl. *λυσάντων*, which is regular in Attic until 300 B.C. (Meisterhans⁸ 167).

Subjunctive—

λύσω	λύσωμεν
λύσῃς	λύσῃτε
λύσῃ	λύσωσι

Optative—

λύσαιμι	λύσαιμεν
λύσαις	λύσαιτε
λύσαι	λύσειαν or <i>-αιεν</i>

NOTE.—1. In papyri (Harsing 14) the 3 sg. is *λύσειε(ν)* more often than *λύσαι*, but the exx. of *-ειε(ν)* are all from iii/A.D. or later (except one of ii/B.C.), and belong accordingly to the period in which the language

of the schools gave the optative a short spell of renewed life. It seems that *-αι* was the suffix in the natural vernacular before this revival, and this is the only form evidenced in NT, unless we count Lk 6¹¹ ποιήσκειν in *NAW* cu⁵, Ac 17²⁷ ψηλαφήσειεν in *NE* cu⁹, which are ruled out by the demand for a 3 pl. Cf. Crönert *Mem.* 213, Meisterhans³ 166 ("the so-called Aeolic forms in the aorist do not occur" in Attic inscr.), Thackeray 215.

2. In the pl. the evidence is somewhat conflicting. Lk 6¹¹ ΒΛΔ 1 etc. 13 etc. 33 *al.* has ποιήσαιεν (ω -ειαν, *NAW* -ειεν), but Ac 17²⁷ ΑΒω ψηλαφήσ(ε)ιαν (see note 1), where only cu⁵ have -αιεν. Here D reads -αισαν, which Blass wanted to accept, mainly because it is regular in LXX (Thackeray 215). It must be remembered however that the LXX has other extensions of the 3 pl. -σαν which are not shared by NT, and may be dialectic variations: the MS attestation is not strong enough to force this form on a writer of Luke's Greek culture.

Infinitive—

λύσαι

NOTE.—There is a strong tendency in vernacular Κοινή to substitute the ending of the pres. inf. in act. and mid., so that the aor. infin. may be confused with the practically obsolete fut. infin. See *Prolog.* 204 n.², where it is noted that ἔσεσθαι is the only fut. inf. in NT except καταστήσειν Ac 26⁷ B, εἰσελεύσεσθαι Heb 3¹⁸, and χωρήσειν Jn 21²⁵ *NBC*. Heb *l.c.* is the only clear fut. here: the other two are probably mere aorists. The aor. inf. would carry the same meaning, and the -ῆσαι of the other MSS is best taken as a correction.

Participle—

λύσας -ασα -αν

§ 90. MIDDLE VOICE.

Indicative—

ἐλυσάμην

ἐλύσω

ἐλύσατο

ἐλυσάμεθα

ἐλύσασθε

ἐλύσαντο

Imperative—

λύσαι

λυσάσθω

λύσασθε

λυσάσθωσαν

Subjunctive—

λύσωμαι

λύση

λύσῃται

λυσάμεθα

λύσησθε

λύσωνται

Optative—

λυσαίμην	λυσαίμεθα
λύσαιο	λύσαισθε
λύσαιτο	λύσαιντο

NOTE.—*Εὐξαίμην* is the only quotable instance, but the rest of the tense could have no other form.

Infinitive—

λύσασθαι

NOTE.—The substitution of *-εσθαι*, making the form identical with that of the obsolete future, is parallel with that noted under the active; but there is no instance in NT.

Participle—

λυσάμενος

PASSIVE VOICE.**Indicative—**

ἐλύθην	ἐλύθημεν
ἐλύθης	ἐλύθητε
ἐλύθη	ἐλύθησαν

Imperative—

λύθητι	λύθητε
λυθήτω	λυθήτωσαν

NOTE.—The 2 sing. *-τι* is for *-θι* by aspirate dissimilation.

Subjunctive—

λυθῶ	λυθῶμεν
λυθῆς	λυθῆτε
λυθῆ	λυθῶσι(ν)

Optative—

λυθείην	λυθείημεν
λυθείης	λυθείητε
λυθείη	λυθείησαν

NOTE.—A few instances occur in NT—*πληθυνθείη* (1 Pet 1², 2 Pet 1², Jude²), *λογισθείη* (2 Ti 4¹⁶), *τηρηθείη* (1 Th 5²³)—but the forms in Hellenistic are certain. Even the Atticisers hardly show the primitive (and Attic) short forms *λυθείμεν -είτε*, though Moeris commended them. Cf. Scham *Opt. bei Clem. Alex.* 34; Harsing 22; whence it appears that the 3rd pl. *-είεν* survived where *-είμεν -είτε* did not.

Infinitive—

λυθῆναι

Participle—

λυθείς -είσα -έν

D. FUTURE STEM.

§ 91. For the formation of Future Stems see above, § 82.

ACTIVE AND MIDDLE VOICES.

From the earliest times in Greek the Future has a large proportion of Middle forms, there being whole categories of verbs in which a present active took a future middle without any ascertainable reason. On this subject, and on the assimilations which took place in Hellenistic, see *Proleg.* 154 f. Notes on the individual verbs will be found in the List.

Verbs in *-ίζω* show some wavering between the *-σ-* and the *-ε(σ)-* formation. Moeris (see Schweizer *Perg.* 178) makes *-εῖται* Attic and *-σεται* Hellenistic. The more normal form naturally secured a lead over its rival, which held its own perforce in the liquid verbs. All cases where the Contracted Future is found in NT will be noted in the List. WH (*App.*² 170 f.) make *-ῶ* $\frac{1}{3}$, *-σει* habitually (exc. twice (*δια*)καθαριεῖ), *-σομεν* $\frac{2}{3}$, *-οῦσι* except *γνωρίσουσι*, *-σεται* $\frac{2}{3}$ or $\frac{3}{3}$, *-εἶσθε* $\frac{1}{3}$. See the note above on the difference between LXX and NT in the future of verbs in *-άζω* (§ 82).

Indicative—

<i>Active.</i>		<i>Middle.</i>		
λύσω	κρινῶ	λύσομαι	ἔσομαι	κρινούμαι
λύσεις	κρινεῖς	λύση	ἔση	κρινῆ
λύσει	κρινεῖ	λύσεται	ἔσται	κρινεῖται
λύσομεν	κρινούμεν	λυσόμεθα	ἐσόμεθα	κρινόμεθα
λύσετε	κρινεῖτε	λύσεσθε	ἔσεσθε	κρινεῖσθε
λύσουσι(ν)	κρινούσι(ν)	λύσονται	ἔσονται	κρινούνται

Subjunctive—

Alleged exx. of this imaginary mood are *δώση* Jn 17^s, Rev 8^s, *ἔψησθε* Lk 13²⁸, which are only new aorists made from the future stem by the usual analogy.

Optative—

This mood, which in classical Greek only existed for one syntactical category, the representation of a fut. indic. in *orat. obl.* in past sequence, is entirely obsolete in Hellenistic, except for one or two artificialities of a late period.

Infinitive—*Active.*

λύσειν κρινεῖν

Middle.

λύσεσθαι ἔσεσθαι κρινεῖσθαι

NOTE.—This form can hardly be said to have any real vernacular existence; see § 89. In Jn 21²⁵ χωρήσειν was probably an aor., as far as the writer's consciousness went; ¹ and the substitution of -ασθαι in many places where so clear a future as ἐπελεύσεσθαι appeared in a formula shows that even this was felt as an aorist. Ἔσεσθαι is the one real exception, and even this only occurs in Ac: μέλλειν ἔσεσθαι (*ter*) is a set phrase, and 23³⁰ μηνυθείσης δέ μοι ἐπιβουλῆς εἰς τὸν ἄνδρα ἔσεσθαι is in an official letter in stilted style. Outside Ac and Heb (and Jn 21²⁵—see above) the infin. is not found: cf. Heb 3¹⁸, Ac 26⁷ B.

Participle—*Active.*

λύσων -ουσα -ον κρινῶν -οῦσα -οῦν λυσόμενος ἐσόμενος κρινούμενος

NOTE.—This also is very rare, but shows more signs of life than the infin. The only warrant for the contracted form is κατακρινῶν (Rom 8³⁴), which might as well be present, and κομοιούμενοι 2 Pet 2¹⁸ ACω vg syr^{hl} sah boh, which is certainly corrupt; but of course these forms would be used if the future ptc. of a liquid verb were wanted. As before, the Lucan writings and Heb show the survival most.

PASSIVE VOICE.

The Strong Future (ἀλλαγῆσομαι etc.) agrees exactly with the model of the Weak, which alone need be given.

Indicative—

λυθήσομαι

λυθησόμεθα

λυθήσῃ

λυθήσεσθε

λυθήσεται

λυθήσονται

NOTE.—Καυθήσωμαι in 1 Co 13⁸ CK *al.* seems to be a mere fusion of the *vv.ll.* καυθήσομαι and καυχῆσωμαι—if indeed we should take it as seriously as even this; it does not in any case provide us with a future subj.!

¹ Blass's remark about "the spurious concluding verse" of Jn (*Gr.* 202 n.) rests on no evidence at all: see Lake's introduction (*Cod. Sin.* p. xx) for the supposed hostile witness of K*.

Infinitive—

λυθήσεται

NOTE.—Not in NT, but quotable e.g. from P Tebt i. 61 (a)¹⁸⁶ (land survey, B.C. 118).

Participle—

λυθησόμενος

NOTE.—Found once (Heb 3⁵), and quotable from papyri.

E. PERFECT STEM.**ACTIVE VOICE.**

§ 92. The formation of the Strong Perfect Active is described above, § 82 *E*; its frequent intransitive use, which caused it in old grammars to be counted as a middle, is noted in *Prol.* 154, with the theory that its unique person-endings betray a formation which in its prehistoric stages was neither active nor middle.

Perfect stems with the *o*-gradation (historically identical with the proethnic Germanic vowel in *sat*, *rang*, *wrote* etc.) are still numerous in Hellenistic. Thus *οἶδα*, *λελοιπα*, *πέποιθα*, *γέγονα*, *ἐνήνοχα*, *πέπονθα*. In the other vowel-series there are no traces left of the corresponding gradation, except *εἶωθα* compared with *ἦθος*. Thus *εἶληφα* has the same vowel as *λήμψομαι*, *κέκράγα* as *κράζω*, *σέσηπα* as *σήπω*. The roots with *eu* do not seem to preserve any *o* forms in the perfect: *φεύγω* makes *πέφευγα*, while *τέτυχα* keeps the weak gradation, originally characteristic of the plur.: cf. Eng. *wrung*, and the perfects *begun* etc., which were normal a few generations back. So *γέγραφα*, *τέταχα*, *ἐλίλυθα*.

In two cases an old Perfect has produced in Hellenistic a new Present Stem: *στήκω* from *ἔστηκα stand*, and *γρηγορέω* from *ἐγρήγορα am awake*.

The Person-endings in Hellenistic are levelled so as to be identical with those of the Weak Aorist in the indicative, except for the 3rd pl.: on this see below. The difference of gradation in the root of sing. and plur. no longer survives even in *οἶδα*.

Strong and Weak Perfects may be taken together, their terminations being identical.

Indicative—*Perfect.*

οἶδα	οἶδαμεν	λέλυκα	λελύκαμεν
οἶδας	οἶδατε	λέλυκας	λελύκατε
οἶδε(ν)	οἶδασι(ν)	λέλυκε(ν)	λελύκασι(ν)

NOTE.—1. The old forms of *οἶδα*, 2 sg. *οἶσθα* and pl. *ἴσμεν*, *ἴστε*, *ἴσασι(ν)*, were obsolete in vernacular Hellenistic. Moeris (ed. Pierson) p. 205 writes: “*ἴσασι*: Ἀττικῶς: *οἶδασι* κοινῶς, and cf. Phryn. (ed. Lobeck) p. 236 f., where instances of *οἶδας* from older Greek are cited.” It appears as early as B.C. 255 in P Petr ii. 4 (7)² (9)⁸, but *οἶσθα* in P Lille 11⁴ (mid iii/B.C.), an official letter, and even P Oxy viii. 1119¹⁶ (A.D. 254)—cf. also Thackeray 278. *οἶδας* appear 11 times in NT without variant, and the “regular” pl. very frequently in all persons, again agreeing with papyri: see *Prol.* 55, where Ionic is noted as the source of the levelled flexion. There is one certain ex. of the old forms, Ac 26⁴ *ἴσασι* (no v.l.): Heb 12¹⁷ *ἴστε* may also be a mark of this literary survival, appropriate in Heb, and in the speech of an educated man before a court. Cf. BGU i. 163¹⁴ (A.D. 108) also official. See further under Imper.

2. Assimilation to the 3rd sg., on the lines of Impf. and Strong Acz., produced in the lower vernacular a 2nd sg. in *-εσ*, which passed on into the Weak Aor.: § 89. It is rare in earlier papyri: see Thackeray 216, and some later exx. in *CR* xv. 36, xviii. 110, also Mayser's note p. 321. In NT we find it plausibly read in Rev 2³ AC *κεκοπιακες*, ² κ *πέπτωκες*, 11¹⁷ C *εἰληφες*—also in Jn 8⁵⁷ B* *έώρακες*, Ac 21²³ B *εἰλήλυθες*, which last at any rate is highly improbable.

3. In 3rd pl. the Weak Aor. *-αν* secured a firm hold in the vernacular, being the last remaining difference between the aor. and perf. endings. (In some illiterate papyri the perf. *-ασι* invaded the aor.) It seems to begin in ii/B.C., and is found widely spread through the *Κοινή*: see *Prol.* 52, Thumb *Hellen.* 170, Mayser 323 f., Thackeray 212, *CR* xv. 36, 435, xviii. 110. In NT we find it in Ac 16³⁸, Rom 16⁷, Lk 9⁸⁶, Col 2¹ (see *Prol.* l.c.), with Rev 21⁶ A, 19³ *ΝΑΡ*, 18³ AC, Jn 17⁷ ABCDL *αἱ*, 17⁶ BDLW, Jas 5⁴ BP—too good a record perhaps to justify the suspicion I expressed: I must admit moreover that I aspersed unfairly the culture of some early papyri showing *-αν*.

4. The verb *ἦκω* “I have come,” which is a perfect in meaning, and by its *κ* suggests a formal connexion also with the perfect tense, developed a corresponding flexion in the pl. Thus *ἦκαμεν* P Par 48⁹ (B.C. 153), *ἦκατε* P Grenf ii. 36¹⁸ (B.C. 95), *ἦκασι* Mk 8³ *ΝΑΔ*W syr² lat² *αἱ*. (BLΔ boh substitute *εἰσίν*). Thackeray 269 and Mayser 372 show how well established this flexion is throughout, except in sing. indic. It is probably to be accepted in Mk l.c.: see *Prol.* 53.

Pluperfect.

ἦδειν	ἦδειμεν	(έ)λελύκειν	(έ)λελύκειμεν
ἦδεις	ἦδειτε	(έ)λελύκεις	(έ)λελύκειτε
ἦδει	ἦδεισαν	(έ)λελύκει	(έ)λελύκεισαν

NOTE.—1. The past tense of *οἶδα* has been assimilated to the other pluperfects. The sound of its initial vowel was in our period decidedly less removed from that of *οἶδα* than in Attic had been the case.

2. The characteristic *ει* runs through the tense in NT forms. There are a few isolated irregularities in papyri: thus *εἰώθησαν* BGU i. 250⁷

(ii/A.D.) (= *Chrest.* i. p. 114), *εἰρήκης* (pap. *εἰρήκαις*) P Par 32¹⁶ (B.C. 162), *ὀμωμόκεμεν* P Par 46¹² (B.C. 153). See Mayser 324.

3. On the dropping of the augment in pluperf. see § 83.

Imperative—

<i>ἴσθι</i>	<i>ἴστε</i>
<i>ἴστω</i>	<i>ἴστωσαν</i>

NOTE.—1. No perf. act. imper. forms occur in NT. In LXX we find such forms as *κεκραγέτωσαν*, *πεποιθατε*, *πεποιθέτω* (Job 12⁶).

2. It is best, except perhaps in Heb 12¹⁷ (see above, p. 221), to treat *ἴστε* as imper. wherever it occurs. In Jas 1¹⁹ Mayor expresses a preference for indic., as also in Eph 5⁵ and Heb *l.c.* But the only justification of this literary survival would be a clearly proved tendency in the author's general style; and *οἴδατε* in Jas 4⁴ matches the Greek of the writer. "Be sure of this," Mayor's alternative, is decidedly preferable; and so in Eph *l.c.* (on which see *Prolog.* 245 also p. 22 f. above).

Subjunctive—

<i>εἰδῶ</i>	<i>εἰδῶμεν</i>
<i>εἰδῆς</i>	<i>εἰδῆτε</i>
<i>εἰδῆ</i>	<i>εἰδῶσι(ν)</i>

NOTE.—The ordinary verb makes its subjunctive by combining participle and the verb *εἶναι*, as *πεποιθὼς εἶ*.

Infinitive—

<i>εἰδέναι</i>	<i>λελυκέναι</i>	<i>ἑστάναι</i>
----------------	------------------	----------------

NOTE.—The old strong perf. *ἑστάναι* occurs three times in NT, *ἑστηκέναι* never.

Participle—

εἰδώς -υῖα -ός *λελυκώς* *ἑστώς -ῶσα -ός* (gen. *ἑστῶτος*)

NOTE.—1. On the gen. sing. fem. *συνειδυῖης* see above, §§ 37, 51.

2. The strong ptc. *ἑστώς*, in simplex and compounds, maintains itself without serious challenge: it occurs in NT 57 times to 18 instances of *ἑστηκώς*, apart from places where the MSS are divided. Mk has 3:5, but all other writers use *ἑστώς* more frequently—except that Heb has *ἑστηκώς* in the one occurrence. The Lucan books show *ἑστώς* 22 times, and *ἑστηκώς* only twice; Rev has 9 *ἑστώς* against only 2. It is therefore no consequence of literary style one way or the other.

3. Both *ἑστηκώς* (Rev 5⁶ N) and *ἑστώς* (Mk 13¹⁴ late uncials, Rev 14¹ 046 and cu¹¹⁺) appear sporadically in neut. Since in both cases *ad sensum* construction would produce *ἑστηκότα -ῶτα*, this probably belongs to the general levelling of participial flexion: cf. § 65 (2).

MIDDLE AND PASSIVE VOICE.

§ 93. The flexion of this tense system depends on the character of the sound which ends the stem. Stems ending in a consonant have to use periphrastic 3 pl. in perf. and pluperf. indic.: the old forms with *-αται -ατο* (= *-ηται -ητο*), like *τετάχαται*, were liable to be mistaken for 3 sg., and did not survive in the *Κοινή*. Hence types like *πεπεισμένοι -αι -α εἰσίν, ἦσαν*, had to supply the place.

Vowel	Guttural	Labial	Dental	Liquid	Nasal
Stems.	Stems.	Stems.	Stems.	Stems.	Stems.
λελυ-	τεταγ-	γεγραφ-	πεπειθ-	ἔσταλ-	μεμιαν-

Indicative—

Perfect.

λέλυμαι	τέταγμαί	γέγραμμαί	πέπεισμαί	ἔσταλμαι	μεμιάμμαί
λέλυσαι	τέταξαι	γέγραψαι	πέπεισαι	ἔσταλσαι	μεμιάνσαι
λέλυται	τέτακται	γέγραπται	πέπεισται	ἔσταλται	μεμιάνται
λελύμεθα	τετάγμεθα	γεγράμμεθα	πεπείσμεθα	ἔστάλμεθα	μεμιάμμεθα
λέλυσθε	τέταχθε	γέγραφε	πέπεισθε	ἔσταλθε	μεμιάνθε
λέλυνται					

Periphrastic

NOTE.—1. The last column is not quite certain, and some persons do not occur. Tit 1¹⁵ *μεμαμμένοις*, Mk 3¹ 11²⁰ *ἐξηραμμένην*, together with *μεμαραμμένοις* and *κατησχυμμένοις* in *Hermas* and *κατασσημημμένα* in P Oxy i. 117¹⁴ (cited by Blass) justify the *μ* against earlier *σ*; but note *συνκαθυφασμένα* Is 3³⁸ *al.* (Thackeray 224). The rest of the flexion may be assumed to be as in Attic.

2. Stems in *σ*, as *τετελεσ-*, are like the dental stems.

Pluperfect.

(ἐ)λελύμην	(ἐ)τετάγμην	(ἐ)γεγράμμην	(ἐ)πεπείσμην	ἔστάλμην
(ἐ)λέλυσο	(ἐ)τέταξο	(ἐ)γέγραψο	(ἐ)πέπεισο	ἔσταλσο
(ἐ)λέλυτο	(ἐ)τέτακτο	(ἐ)γέγραπτο	(ἐ)πέπειστο	ἔσταλτο
(ἐ)λελύμεθα	(ἐ)τετάγμεθα	(ἐ)γεγράμμεθα	(ἐ)πεπείσμεθα	ἔστάλμεθα
(ἐ)λέλυσθε	(ἐ)τέταχθε	(ἐ)γέγραφε	(ἐ)πέπεισθε	ἔσταλθε
(ἐ)λέλυντο				

Periphrastic

NOTE.—Some of these forms are inferred. No form of the (ἐ)μεμιάμμην type occurs.

Imperative—

λέλυσο	λελύσθω	λέλυσθε	λελύσθωσαν
--------	---------	---------	------------

NOTE.—The form *πεφίμωσο*, from *φίμωσι μισίσι*, can be quoted. The tense is very rare: if speakers of the *Κοινή* had occasion to use it

they presumably used the old forms, which can be inferred from the flexions given.

Subjunctive—

Like the Optative, this was periphrastic (λελυμένος ᾶ etc.) in earlier and later Greek.

Infinitive—

λελύσθαι τετάχθαι γεγράφθαι πεπεισθαι ἐστάλθαι

Participle—

λελυμένος τεταγμένος γεγραμμένος πεπεισμένος ἐσταλμένος μεμιαμμένος

F. VERBALS.

§ 94. One form of the gerundive in -τέος can be quoted from NT, viz. βλητέον from βάλλω (Lk 5³⁸): see *Prol.* 222. In form it agrees with the verbal in -τός, the meaning of which is discussed in *Prol.* 221 f.

Papyrus instances of the gerundive are P Giss i. 40^{14, 22} (A.D. 215) διὰ τοῦτο οὐκ εἰσιν κωλυτέοι, P Tebt i. 61 (b)^{220 f.} (B.C. 118—a land survey) εἰ [α]ὐτῇ [ἀνταναι]ρετέα [ἄλλη δέ] ἀπὸ ὑπολόγου ἀνταναιρεθείσα ἀποκαταστατέα (the whole formula elsewhere), P Par 63 (ii/B.C.)⁵⁸ χρηστέον, ¹¹⁹ ἐνγραφτέον, ¹²⁰ μεριστέον. These are all official, and in themselves inadequate warrant for really vernacular use.

Verbal adjectives in -τός have recessive accent when compounded. There are about 150 of them in NT, and the formation seems to be still living, so that it can be made from new verbs. The -τός suffix in non-derivative verbs was originally added to the weakened root, as we may see in θετός, πιστός, φθαρτός, -ιτός (ἀπρόσιτος): contract verbs add it to the long vowel seen in future, as ἀγαπη-τός, ἀλάλη-τος, μισθω-τός, and other derivative verbs to the bare stem, as βδελυκ-τός, σιτισ-τός, etc.

LIST OF VERBS.

§ 95. This list includes all verbs occurring in NT (or in good MSS thereof), except—

- (1) regular Contracta.
- (2) regular verbs in -ύω and -άζω, and those in -ίζω which show no future act. or mid.

(3) verbs with no forms outside the present stem, and with nothing noteworthy to record.

“Regular” reduplication of verbs with initial σ implies $\sigma\epsilon\sigma$ - where a vowel follows, $\epsilon\sigma$ - where a consonant.

Verbs are set down in the simplex, preceded by a hyphen when the form only occurs in a compound. The list of quotable compounds is appended in each case. A few Compound Verbs are given in their alphabetic place for points affecting the preposition. The prepositions are given in the assimilated form for the present indicative, according to classical orthography.

Roman numerals attached to the present stem denote conjugation classes.

An obelus denotes a form apparently not older than the Hellenistic age. When placed on the extreme left it means that the whole verb is late. Suppletives are enclosed in square brackets.

The indicative form stands for anything occurring in the tense paradigm. Occasionally the mood form is quoted for special reasons.

The regular tense-formations of verbs not included in this List (see above) are as follows:—

PRESENT.	WEAK AORIST.	FUTURE.	PERFECT.
(1) -άω (<i>a pure</i>)	-ᾶσα	-ᾶσω	-ᾶκα
	-ᾶσάμην	-ᾶσομαι	-ᾶμαι
	-ᾶθην	-ᾶθήσομαι	
-άω (<i>a impure</i>)	-ῆσα etc.	-ῆσω etc.	-ῆκα etc.
-έω			
-όω	-ωσα etc.	-ώσω etc.	-ωκα etc.
-ίζω	-ισα etc.	[in List]	-ικα
	-ίσθην		-ισμαι
(2) -ύω (<i>αύω</i> etc.)	-ουσα etc.	-ύσω etc.	-υκα etc.
-άζω	-ᾶσα	-ᾶσω	-ᾶκα
	-ᾶσάμην	-ᾶσομαι	-ᾶσμαι
	-ᾶσθην	-ᾶσθήσομαι	

A. PRESENT. B. STRONG AORIST. C. WEAK AORIST. D. FUTURE. E. PERFECT.

† ἀγαλλιάω (VII)		ἡγαλλίασα		
<i>εαυτί</i>		ἡγαλλιασάμην		
ἀγαλλιώμαι		ἡγαλλιάσθην		
		ἡγαλλιάσθην (Jn 5 ²⁵ BL)		

"A Hellenistic variation on ἀλλάσθαι after ναυτιῶν, κοπιῶν ἀγωνιῶν," etc. (Blass-Debrunner).

ἀγγέλλω (VII.) -ἠγγέλην † ἠγγεῖλα -ἀγγελῶ -ἠγγεῖμαι
announce ἠγγεῖλάμην

-ἠγγέλλον

COMP. ἀν-, ἀπ-, δι-, ἐξ-, ἐπ-, κατ-, παρ-, προ-επ-, προ-κατ-

-ἄγνυμι (II. β. b) -ἐάγην -ἔαξα -ἐάξω †
break Subj. κατεαγῶσιν † See § 83 (1).
 Jn 19³¹; see § 83 (1).

COMP. κατ-

-ἄγχω (I. a) ἠγξάμην
choke

COMP. ἀπ-

ἄγω (I. b) ἠγαγον -ἠῆξα ἄξω ἠγμαι
lead Not Attic, but ἀχθήσομαι
 ἠγον old. Found
 ἄγομαι in illiterate
 ἠγόμεην papyri.

VERBAL -ἄκτός ἠχθην

COMP. ἀν-, ἐπ-ἀν-, ἀπ-, συν-ἀπ-, δι-, εἰσ-, παρ-εἰσ-, ἐξ-, ἐπ-, κατ-,
 μετ-, παρ-, περι-, προ-, προσ-, συν-, ἐπι-συν-, ὑπ-

αἰνέω (VII.) -ἠνεσα -αινέσω
praise

-ἠνου

VERBAL -αινετός

COMP. ἐπ-, παρ-

Ἐπαινέσω in 1 Co
 11²² is prob.
 aor. subj.

αἰρέω (VII.) -εἶλον (εἰλεῖν) ῥέθην ἐλῶ † -ἠρημαι
take εἰλόμην (LXX and On the general
 papp.— Κοινή spell-
 f r o m ing -εἶρημαι,
 aor.). see above,
 αἰρήσομαι § 83 (6).
 -αἰρεθήσομαι

VERBAL -αίρετός

COMP. ἀν-, ἀφ-, δι-, ἐξ, καθ-, περι-, προ-

αἶρω (VII.) ἦρα (ἄραι) ἄρῶ ἦρκα
raise ἦρθην ἄρθήσομαι ἦρμαι

αἶρομαι

COMP. ἀπ-, ἐξ-, ἐπ-, μετ-, συν-, ὑπερ-

From *φαίω*: not contracted
from cognate *αίρω*. The
aor. must not be written
with *ε* subscript.

αἰσθάνομαι ἥσθόμην
(II. a)
perceive

-αἰσχύνω (VII.)
shame

αἰσχύνομαι
ἥσχυνόμην

VERBAL -αἰσχυντός
COMP. ἐπ-, κατ-

ἥσχύθη αἰσχυθήσομαι
(-αισχ.: see § 83 (6))

ἀκούω (VII.)
hear

ἤκουον

ἀκούομαι

COMP. δι-, εἰσ-, ἐπ-, παρ-, προ-, ὑπ-

ἤκουσα
ἤκούσθη

ἀκούσω † ἀκήκοα
ἀκούσομαι
ἀκουσθήσομαι

ἀλείφω (I. a)
anoint

ἤλειφον

COMP. ἐξ-

ἤλειφα
ἤλειψάμην
-ἤλειψθη

(Ac 3¹⁹ ἐξαλι-
φθῆναι WH:

see § 35).

ἀλίσκομαι: see ἀναλίσκω
VERBAL -άλωτός

-ἀλλάσσω (VII.) -ἠλλάγγην
change

-ἠλλάσσον

-ἀλλάσσομαι

COMP. ἀπ-, δι-, κατ-, ἀπο-κατ-, μετ-, συν-

ἠλλάξα

ἀλλάξω -ἠλλαγμαί
ἀλλαγήσομαι

ἄλλομαι -ἠλόμην
loap

(-a forms: see
§ 88).

COMP. ἀν-, ἐξ-, ἐφ-

ἀμαρτάνω (II. a) ἠμαρτον
sin

VERBAL -ἀμαρτητός

COMP. προ-

ἠμάρτησα †
(see § 89).

ἀμαρτήσω † ἠμάρτηκα

ἀμύνομαι (VII.)
take revenge

ἠμυνάμην

ἀμφιέννυμι (II. β. b)

ἡμφίεσμαι

ἀμφιάζω † (VII.)

(See § 83 (7))

clothe

The simplex ἔννυμι had long been obsolete : so was the II. β present-stem except in semi-literary language. On the variant Κοινή presents -άζω and -έζω, both found in good uncials of Lk 12²⁸, see *Vocabulary*, s.v., and *supra*, p. 68.

ἀναλίσκω (IV.)

ἀνήλωσα

ἀνᾶλώσω

ἀνᾶλώω † (VII.)

(ἀνᾶλώσαι)

spend, destroy

ἀνηλώθην

COMP. κατ-, προσ-

A very early compound (ἀνα-Φαλίσκω), with αφα contracted to ᾶ : cf. ἀλίσκομαι. The late "regular" present (2 Th 2⁸ κ*) is a back-formation from the future and aorist.

ἀνοίγω (I. a) ἠνοιγην †

ἀνέψα

ἀνοίξω

ἀνέψα

open

ἠνοιξα

ἀνοιχθήσομαι † ἀνέψομαι

ἀνοίγομαι

ἠνέψα †

ἀνοιγήσομαι † ἠνέψομαι †

-ἠνοιγον

(ἀνοίξαι)

ἠνοιγομαι †

COMP. δι-

ἀνεώχθην

See *Vocabulary*, s.v.

ἠνοιχθην †

For the strange irregularities of augment and reduplication, see § 83 (1).

The simplex οίγω or οίγνυμι (on which see Brugmann ⁴ 310 n.) was extinct in Hellenistic.

-ἀντάω (VII.)

-ἦντησα

-ἀντήσω †

-ἦντηκα

meet

(cl. -ομαι)

COMP. ἀπ-, κατ-, συν-, ὑπ-

The simplex became obsolete early.

ἀπτω (VII.)

ἦψα

grasp, kindle

ἦψάμην

ἀπτομαι

ἦφθην

ἦπτόμεν

COMP. ἀν-, καθ-, περι-

ἀρέσκω (IV.)

please

ἤρεσκον

VERBAL ἀρεστός

ἤρεσα

ἀρέσω

ἀρκέω (VII.)

suffice

VERBAL ἀρκετός

COMP. ἐπ-

ἤρκεσα

ἀρκέσω

ἀρκεσθήσομαι †

ἀρμόζω † (VII.)

fit

The Attic pres. was ἀρμόττω.

ἤρμοσάμην

ἀρπάζω (VII.) ἤρπάγην †

seize

ἤρπασα

ἤρπάσθην

ἀρπάσω †

-ἤρπάκειν

ἀρπαγήσομαι †

see Rutherford

NP 407.

COMP. δι-, συν-

On the mixture of guttural and dental stem see *Proleg.* 56; also Brugmann *Gr.* 4 359.

ἄρχω (I. a)

be first

ἄρχομαι

-ἤρχον

COMP. ἐν-, προ-εν-, ὑπ-, προ-υπ-

ἤρξάμην

ἄρξομαι

ἀστράπτω (VII.)

lighten

COMP. ἐξ-, περι-

-ἤστραψα

αὔξάνω (II. a)

αὔξω (III.)

was

ἠὔξανον

αὔξάνομαι

COMP. συν-, ὑπερ-(αυξάνω)

ἠὔξησα

ἠὔξήσθην

αὔξήσω

ἀφήμι, imperf. ἤφιον: for other forms see under -ιημι.

-βαίνω (VII.) -έβην (§ 88)

go

-ἔβαινον

CAUSAL -βιβάζω (ἀνα-, ἐμ-, ἐπι-, κατα-, προ-, συν-), conjugated regularly.

VERBAL -βατός

-βήσομαι -βέβηκα

COMP. ἀνα-, ἀπο-, δια-, ἐκ-, ἐμ-, ἐπι-, κατα-, μετα-, παρα-, προ-,
προσ-ανα-, συμ-, συγ-κατα-, συν-ανα-, ὑπερ-

The simplex was very nearly extinct in common speech when the
Κοινή arose. See *Vocabulary*, s.v.

βάλλω (VII.)	ἔβαλον	ἐβλήθην	βαλῶ	βέβληκα
<i>cast</i>	-ἔβαλόμην		-βαλοῦμαι	-βεβλήκειν
βάλλομαι	(For -α forms		βληθήσομαι	βέβλημαι
-ἔβαλλον	see § 88.)			ἔβεβλήμην

VERBALS -βλητός, βλητός

COMP. ἀμφι- ἀνα-, ἀντι-, ἀπο-, δια-, ἐκ-, ἐμ-, ἐπι-, κατα-, μετα-,
παρα-, παρ-εμ-, περι-, προ-, συν-, ὑπερ-, ὑπο-

βαπτίζω (VII.)	ἔβαπτισα	βαπτίσω †	βεβάπτισμαι
<i>baptize</i>	ἔβαπτισάμην	βαπτισθήσο-	
βαπτίζομαι	ἔβαπτίσθην	μαι	
ἔβαπτίζον			
ἔβαπτίζόμην			

βάπτω (VII.)	ἔβαψα	βάψω	βέβαμμαι
<i>dip</i>			(Rev 19 ¹⁸ A)
COMP. ἐμ-			

βαρέω † (VII.)	-ἐβάρησα †		βεβάρημαι
<i>burden</i>	ἔβαρήθην †		
βαροῦμαι			

COMP. ἐπι-, κατα-

The verb was apparently a back-formation from the perf. pass.

The alternative βαρύνω is found in Lk 21⁸⁴ βαρυνθῶσι DH and
Mk 14⁴⁰ καταβαρυνόμενοι.

βασκαίνω (VII.)	ἔβασκᾶνα
<i>bovitch</i>	

βαστάζω (VII.)	ἔβάστασα	βαστάσω
<i>carry</i>		
ἔβάσταζον		

VERBAL -βαστακτός

The guttural forms are not found in NT exc. in verbal and in
Rev 2³ βαστάξαι P 1, 38 : they are frequent in papyri.

βδελύσσομαι (VII.)	ἔβδελυγμαι
<i>loathe</i>	
VERBAL βδελυκτός	

βιβρώσκω (IV.)	βέβρωκα
<i>eat</i>	
VERBAL -βρωτός	

- βιῶ** (VII.) **ἔβιωσα**
live supplanted strong
 Supplied in earlier Greek aor. **ἔβίων**.
 an aorist to ζήω.
- βλάπτω** (VII.) **ἔβλαψα**
hurt
- βλαστάνω** (II. a) **ἔβλάστησα**
βλαστᾶν †(VII.) Perhaps Ionic (Hippocrates): re-
grow places strong aor. **ἔβλαστον**.
- βλαστᾶ** (Mk 4³⁷) is an instance of confusion between the two classes of Contracta which make fut. in -ήσω (see § 84): the back-formation **βλαστῆναι** is perhaps quotable even in Aeschylus.
- βλέπω** (I. a) **ἔβλεψα** **βλέψω †**
ἔβλεπον, *look* **-ἔβλεψάμην †** Herodotus has **ἀναβλέψω**.
βλέπομαι
 COMP. ἀνα-, ἀπο-, δια-, ἐμ-, ἐπι-, περι-, προ-
 The simplex appears once in aor. and once in fut., over hundred times in present stem, as the suppletive of εἶδον (so βλέπω, εἶδα in MGr).
- βούλομαι** (II. a) **ἔβουλήθην**
wish
ἔβουλόμην
 Blass's statement (cf. *Gramm.*⁴ § 66³, also p. 58) that this verb is "taken from the literary language," fits badly with its abundance in the papyri: see *Vocabulary*, s.v. On its augment see § 83 (1), on βούλει, § 85.
- βρέχω** (I. a) **ἔβρεξα**
wet, rain
- γαμέω** (VII.) **ἔγημα** **γεγάμηκα**
marry **ἐγάμησα †**
ἐγάμουν **ἐγαμήθην**
- The use of **γαμοῦμαι** = *nubo* is obsolete, except occasionally in legal documents: see *Prol.* 159. Cf. the derivative present stems **γαμίζω †** and **γαμίσκομαι**.
- γελᾶω** (VII.) **γελᾶσω †**
laugh
-ἐγέλω
 COMP. κατα-
- γηράσκω** (IV.) **ἐγήρασα**
grow old Trans. in older Greek, as against strong aor.

γίνομαι (I. a. a)	ἐγενόμην	ἐγενήθην	γενήσομαι	γέγονα
	become	For -a forms		(ἐ)γεγόνειν
ἐγενόμην	see § 88.			γεγένημαι

COMP. ἀπο-, δια-, ἐπι-, παρα-, συμ-παρα-, προ-

The older form γί-γν-ομαι passed phonetically into γῆν. in Ionic—
see Thumb, *Gr. Dial.*, p. 352—and thence spread in the Κοινή.

It is most frequently γείνομαι in MSS: see WH *App.*² 160.

W still shows γιγν. sometimes.

γινώσκω (IV.)	ἔγνων (see § 88)	ἐγνώσθην	γνώσομαι	ἔγνωκα
	perceive		γνώσθήσομαι	ἐγνώκειν
γινώσκομαι				ἔγνωμαι
ἐγίνωσκον				

VERBAL γνωστός

COMP. ἀνα-, δια-, ἐπι-, κατα-, προ-

For γι-γνώ-σκω (Attic), as with γίνομαι above, and like it spelt
γειν. (Γιγν. in W sometimes).

γνωρίζω (VII.)	ἐγνώρισα	γνωρίω (Col
	ἐγνωρίσθην	4 ^o N*)
γνωρίζομαι		γνωρίσω †
COMP. ἀνα-, δι-	(only Lk 2 ¹⁷ APω)	

†γογγύζω (VII.)	ἐγόγγυσα
grumble	
-ἐγόγγυζον	
COMP. δια-	

γράφω	ἐγράφην	ἔγραψα	γράψω	ἔγραφα
write		-ἐγραψάμην		ἔγραμμαι
γράφομαι				-ἔεγραμμην
VERBAL γραπτός				

COMP. ἀπο-, ἐγ-, ἐπι-, κατα-, προ-

δεῖ (I. a)
impers. must
ἔδει

The only other forms occurring are δέη subj., and δέον δέοντα ptc.

See δέομαι.

δείκνυμι (II. β. b)	ἔδειξα	δείξω	δέδειγμα
show	-ἔδειξάμην		
δείκνυμαι	ἐδείχθην		

COMP. ἀνα-, ἀπο-, ἐν-, ἐπι-, ὑπο-

For forms as from δεικνύω, see § 86.

δέομαι	ἐδεήθην
need	
ἐδεόμην	

COMP. προσ-

For flexion see § 85. The active forms the impersonal δει.

δέρω (I. a)	ἔδειρα	δαρήσομαι
<i>beat</i>		

δέχομαι (I. a)	ἐδεξάμην	δέξομαι	δέδεγμαι
<i>receive</i>	-ἐδέχθην		
-ἐδεχόμεν			

VERBAL δεκτός

COMP. ἀνα-, ἀπο-, ἀπ-εκ-, δια-, εἰσ-, ἐκ-, ἐν-, ἐπι-, παρα-, προσ-, ὑπο-

δέω (VII.)	ἔδησα	δήσω	δέδεκα
<i>bind</i>	-ἐδησάμην		δέδεμαι
	ἐδέθην		-ἐδεδέμην

COMP. κατα-, περι-, συν-, ὑπο-

The present stem (inflected like φιλέω) is not found in NT.

διᾱκονέω (VII.)	διηκόνησα †	διακονήσω
<i>minister</i>	(inf.) διακονη-	
διακονοῦμαι	θήναι	
διηκόνου		

Attic used doubly augmented forms, ἐδιηκόνουν, etc.

διδάσκω (IV.)	ἔδίδαξα	διδάξω
<i>teach</i>	ἔδιδάχθην	

ἔδιδασκον

VERBAL διδακτός

δίδωμι (I. a. b) (pl.)	ἔδομεν	ἔδωκα	δώσω	δέδωκα
<i>give</i>	-ἔδόμεν	(subj.) δώσω ?	-δώσομαι	δέδομαι
δίδομαι		(§ 91)	δοθήσομαι	(†)δεδώκειν
δίδουν	ἔδόθην			
-ἐδιδόμεν				

VERBAL -δοτός

COMP. ἀνα-, ἀντ-ἀπο-, ἀπο-, δια-, ἐκ-, ἐπι-, μετα-, παρα-, προ-

See for flexion, and for later thematic forms in present stem, §§ 86-88.

διψάω (VII.)	ἔδιψησα	διψήσω
<i>thirst</i>		

Inserted here because no longer from stem διψη- (inf. διψῆν) as in cl. Gr. It is now like τιμάω.

διώκω (I. a)	ἔδίωξα	διώξω	δεδιώγμαι
<i>persecute</i>		διωχθήσομαι	
διώκομαι			
ἐδίωκον			

COMP. ἐκ-, κατα-

√δρεμ *run*—see under τρέχω, to which it acts as suppletive.

δοκέω (VII.)

surprise

ἐδόκουν

εἶδοξα

δύναμαι (II. a. δ)

can

ἐδυνάμην

ἠδυνάμην

On the augm. see § 83 (1).

VERBAL δυνατός

ἠδυνήθην

δυνήσομαι

ἠδυνάσθην

The latter was Ionic: the two forms represent varying dialects contributing to the Κοινή.

δύω (II.)

ἔδυν (§ 88)

εἶδυσα

-εἶδυμαι

-δύω

-εἶδυσάμην

plunge

-δύομαι

COMP. ἀπ-εκ-, ἐκ-, ἐν-, ἐπι-, ἐπ-εν-, παρ-ειω-

From the same root the new present stem ἐνδιδύσκω (IV.) †

ἰάω (VII.)

allow

εἶω

COMP. προσ-

† ἐγγίζω (VII.)

approach

ἠγγιζον

COMP. προσ-

A Κοινή verb, starting in Polybius.

ἐγείρω (VII.)

rouse

ἐγείρομαι

-ἐγειρόμην (§ 83 (4))

COMP. δι-, ἐξ-, ἐπ-, συν-

† ἐδαφίζω (VII.)

raze

ἐθίζω (VII.)

accustom

εἶθω

be wont

The present stem only occurs in ptc. (twice in Homer).

* Φειδ

εἶδον (-α, see § 88)

εἶδήσω

οἶδα (§ 92)

perceive

ἦδειν

COMP. ἀπ-, ἐπ-, προ-, συν-, ὑπερ-

This root forms no present stem: *εἶδον* is used as aor. to *βλέπω*, and *οἶδα* makes a separate verb.

* *φεικ**ῥοικα**resemble*

Like $\sqrt{\text{φειδ}}$, this root forms no present stem. The present only occurs in one NT writer (Jas 1^{6. 23}).

-*εἰκω* (I. a)*εἶξα**yield*COMP. *ὕπ-*-*εἰμι* (I. b)*go*-*ῆειν*VERBAL *-ιτός*COMP. *ἄπ-, εἶσ-, ἔξ-, ἔπ-, σύν-*

For the flexion of the few surviving forms, see § 86.

εἰμί (I. b)*ἔσομαι**be*3 sg. *ἔσται*, otherwise regular.*ἦμην †*COMP. *ἄπ-, ἔν-, ἔξ(εστι), πάρ-, συμ-πάρ, σύν-*

For the flexion see § 86.

εἶρω (VII.)*ἑρρέθην* (inf. *ἑρῶ**εἶρηκα**say**ῥηθῆναι*, ptc.*εἶρήκειν*VERBAL *ῥητός**ῥηθείς*).*εἶρημαι*COMP. *προ-*

The *ε* (Ionic) is only found in indic.

The present stem in use is *λέγω*, *q.v.*; the aor. act. *εἶπον*—see

* *φειπ-*. The present *εἶρω* is obsolete early.

ελαύνω (VII.)-*ἤλασα**ἐλήλακα**drive**ελαύνομαι**ἤλαυνόμην*COMP. *ἀπ-*

The root is *ελα-*: the difficult present stem is held by Brugmann (*Gramm.*⁴ 221) to be a denominative from a noun **ελαυνός*.

ελέγχω (I. a)*ἤλεγξα**ελέγξω**convict**ἤλέγχθην**ελέγχομαι*

COMP. *δια-κατ-, ἐξ-* (Jude¹⁵, a few cursives only).

ελεῖω } (VII.)*ἤλεησα**ελεήσω**ἤλεημαι**ελεάω †* }*ἤλεθήην**ελεηθήσομαι**pity*

On the variation in present stem see § 84.

ελίσσω (VII.)

roll up

ελίσσομαι

The ("poetic, Ionic and late prose") pres. *ελίσσω* (= *ελελίσσω*) is found in Rev 6¹⁴ P cu^m. Blass (Kühner ii. 417) shows that spir. lenis is older, but the analogy of *ἐλιξ*, etc., produced *ἐ* in later times.

ελίξω

ελκώ (VII.)

make sore

είλωμαι

ελω (I. a)

drag

είλωκον

COMP. *ἐξ-*

είλωσα

ελκώσω †

The addition *-σα* is due to the analogy of the synonym *είρουσα*: in its turn it produced a new future.

† ελλογώ (VII.)

*impute*ελλογούμαι and *-ώμαι*

On the variation in present stem see § 85.

ελπίζω (VII.)

hope

ἤλπιζον

ελπίζομαι

COMP. *ἀπ-* (*ἀφ-*, see p. 98), *προ-*

Veitch notes that "the early Greeks . . . were chary in expressing confidence in the future." Ἐλπῶ is a late form built on Attic models.

ἤλπισα

ελπῶ †

ἤλπισε

ἐμβριμέομαι

and *-έομαι* (VII.)*groan*

ἐνεβριμησάμην

ἐνεβριμήθην †

Cited for varying present stem: see § 85, pp. 198, 201.

ἐμέω (I. a)

vomit

ἤμεσα

Probably a very early thematising of **φέμεμι* (Skt. *vámiti*).

ἐμφανίζω (VII.)

manifest

ἐνεφάνισα

ἐνεφανίσθην

ἐμφανίσω

A denominative from *ἐμφανής*: on the place of the augment see § 83 (7).

ἐπιορκέω (VII.)

perjure

ἐπιορκήσω

ἐφι. Mt 5³³ κ: see p. 99.

ἐπίσταμαι (I. b)

understand

For flexion see § 87. In NT only in present stem. It is an aorist-present from the middle of *στήναι*.

* *ἔειπεν speak* εἶπον (-α: § 88).

COMP. ἀντ-, ἀπ-, προ-

The aor. (a reduplication, the *ει* constant accordingly in the moods) is used for λέγω and the family of (εἶρω), *q.v.*

-ἔπομαι (I. a)

follow

-εἰπόμην

COMP. συν-

† ἐραυνάω (VII.)

ἠραύνησα

search

VERBAL -ἐραυνητός

COMP. ἐξ-

The older form ἐρευνάω occurs in the mass of MSS: see § 37 and *Prol.* 46 n.².

ἐργάζομαι (VII.)

ἠργασάμην (εἰργ.)

εἰργασμαι

work

-εἰργάσθην

ἠργαζόμην

COMP. κατ-, περι-, προσ-

On the augment see § 83 (3).

ἐρείδω (I. a)

ἤρεια

stick fast

ἐρεύγομαι (I. a)

ἐρεύξομαι

utter

ἐρίζω (VII.)

ἐρίσω †

strive

ἐρμηνεύω (VII.)

-ἐρμήνευσα

interpret

On dropped aug-

ἐρμηνεύομαι

ment see § 83 (4).

VERBAL -ἐρμηνευτός

COMP. δι-, μεθ-

ἐρχομαι (I. a) ἦλθον (-α, § 88)

ἐλεύσομαι

ἐλήλυθα

come

ἐληλύθειν

ἠρχόμην † (διέρχοντο Jn 20³ DA*—see § 83 (4))

(§ 83 (4))

VERBAL -ἠλυτός

COMP. ἀν-, ἀντι-παρ-, ἀπ-, δι-, δι-εξ-, εισ-, ἐξ-, ἐπ-, ἐπ-αν-, ἐπ-εισ-, κατ-, παρ-, παρ-εισ-, περι-, προ-, προσ-, συν-, συν-εισ-

The conjugation is made up from three roots, ἐρθ, ἐλυ and ἐνθ

(Doric *ἦνθον*), which have influenced one another's forms. On Attic usage of present and future stems, see Rutherford *NP* 103 ff.

ἔρωτάω (-έω †) (VII.) <i>ask</i> ἠρώτων (-ουν †) COMP. δι-, ἐπ-	ἠρώτησα ἠρωτήθην	ἔρωτήθω	
	On the present stem see § 84.		
ἔσθίω (VII.) [ἔφαγον]		[φάγομαι †]	
ἔσθω (VI.) <i>eat</i> ἤσθιον COMP. κατ-, συν-		Κοινή form, made (like φύγομαι and λάβομαι) on the analogy ἔπιον : πίομαι :: ἔφαγον : φάγομαι — see Brugmann <i>Gr.</i> ⁴ 383. Cf. § 85 above.	
*Ἐσθῶ (whence ἔσθίω by addition of a further suffix) is as old as Homer: it appears five times in ptc. and once (Lk 22 ³⁰) in subj. The suppletive τρώγω is used in present stem.			
εὐ- For augment of verbs in εὐ- see § 83 (6)—the variants will not be noted here, forms being given as in WH.			
εὐαγγελίζω † (VII.) <i>evangelize</i> εὐαγγελίζομαι εὐηγγελισμένη COMP. προ-	εὐηγγέλισα † εὐηγγελισάμην εὐηγγελίσθην	εὐηγγέλισμαι	
† εὐαρεστέω (VII.) <i>please</i> εὐαρεστοῦμαι	εὐαρεστήσαι	εὐαρέστηκα (εὐήρ. — see § 83 (7)).	
εὐθύνω (VII.) <i>straighten</i> COMP. κατ-	εὐθύνα (in moods)		
εὐδοῶ (VII.) <i>give a fair way</i> εὐδοῦμαι	εὐδοκῶ (1 Co 16 ³ AC <i>al.</i>)	εὐδοκῆσομαι	
On Hort's proposal to read the pres. subj. εὐδοῶται as perf. see § 83 (5).			
εὐρίσκω (IV.) <i>find</i> εὐρίσκομαι πύρισκον (εὐρ.) πύρισκόμενη COMP. δι-	εὐρέθην	εὐρήσω εὐρεθήσομαι	εὐρηκα
	forms see § 88).		

- εὐφραίνω (VII.) ἠεφραίνθη εὐφρανθήσομαι
gladden
- εὐφραίνομαι
εὐφραινόμεν
- εὐχομαι (I. a) εὐξάμην -εὐξομαι
pray
- ἠυχόμεν (εὐ.)
COMP. προσ-
- ἔχω (I. a) ἔσχον ἔξω ἔσχηκα
have ἔσχομεν ἔξομαι
- ἔχομαι
εἶχον
εἶχομεν
- VERBAL -έκτός and -σχετός
COMP. ἀν-, ἀντ-, ἀπ-, ἐν-, ἐπ-, κατ-, μετ-, παρ-, περι-, προ-, προσ-,
προσ-αν-, συν-. ὑπερ-, ὑπ-
- On -a forms in imperf. and aor. see §§ 84, 88; on εἶχουσαν § 84,
p. 194.
- ζεύγνυμι (II. β. b) -ζεύξω
yoke
- COMP. συν-
- ζέω (I. a)
boil
- VERBAL ζεστός
For ζέσω, but inflected like πλέω (only ptc.).
- ζήω (VII.) ἔζησα † ζήσω
live (The strong ζήσομαι
aor. ἐβίω, from a cognate stem, was
used in Attic.)
- COMP. ἀνα-, συν-. For flexion see § 84.
- ζωγρέω Periphr. ἐζώγημαι
take alive (ἔση ζωγρῶν)
- ζώννυμι (II. β. b) -ζώσω ζώσω -ζώσομαι
gird ἐζώσαμην -ζώσομαι
- ἐζώννου
- COMP. ἀνα-, δια-, περι-, ὑπο-
- For flexion of present stem, and thematic forms in it, see § 86.
- ἦκω (I. a) ἦξα ἦξω
have come
- ἦκον
COMP. ἀν-, καθ-
- For perfect endings in the present indic. see § 92.

ἡσώσω (VII.) ἡττάω „ <i>defeat</i> ἡττώμαι	ἡσώσθην	ἡττημαι	
For variation of σσ and ττ see § 43; for confusion of classes of Contracta § 84.			
θάλλω (VII.) <i>bloom</i> COMP. ἀνα-	-ἔθαλον †		
θάπτω (VII.) <i>bury</i> COMP. συν-	ἐτάφην	ἔθαψα	
θέλω (I. a) <i>will</i> ἤθελον (§ 83 (1)) never ἐθέλω	ἠθέλησα	θελήσω	
θεμελιώω (VII.) <i>found</i>	ἐθεμελίωσα	θεμελιώσω	τεθεμελιώμαι τεθεμελιώμην (on augm. see § 83 (4)).
θερίζω (VII.) <i>reap</i>	ἐθέρισα ἐθερίσθην	θερίσω †	
θιγγάνω (II. a) <i>touch</i>			
θλάω (I. a) <i>crush</i> COMP. συν-		-θλασθήσομαι	
θλίβω (I. a) <i>press</i> θλίβομαι -ἔθλιβον COMP. ἀπο-, συν-			τέθλιμμαι
-θνήσκω (IV.) <i>die</i> -ἔθνησκον VERBAL θνητός COMP. ἀπο-, συν-απο-	-ἔθανον	-θανοῦμαι	τέθνηκα ἔτεθνήκειν Never com- pounded : see <i>Prot.</i> 114. <i>Inf.</i> τεθνήναι <i>Ac</i> 14 ¹⁹ <i>D.</i>

θραύω (I. α) <i>bruise</i>			τέθραυμαι
θύω (VII.) <i>sacrifice</i> θύον θύομαι VERBAL θυτός	θύσσα έτύθην		τέθυμαι
-ίημι (I. β. β) <i>send</i>	-είναι (not in- dic.—see § 88, p. 209). (4)	-ήκα -έθην (see § 83 (4))	-είκα (Lk 10 ⁸⁰ C*) -έωμαι (indic.) -είμαι (ptc.)
Imperf. see άφίημι VERBAL -έτός COMP. άν-, άφ-, καθ-, παρ-, συν-			
For flexion of present and strong aor. stems see § 86 ff.			

-ικνέομαι -έκόμεν
(II. β. α. iii.)
arrive
COMP. άφ-, δι-, έφ-

ιλάσκομαι (IV.)
propitiate ιλάσθην

-ίστημι (I. β. β) <i>stand</i> -ιστάμην VERBAL -στατός	ίστησα ίστάσθην	στήσω στήσομαι σταθήσομαι	έστηκα (ε)ίστήκειν -έστώς (ptc.) (§§ 65, 92) -έστακα †
--	--------------------	---------------------------------	--

COMP. άν-, άνθ-, άντι-καθ- (augm., § 83 (2)), άφ-, άπο-καθ- (-κατ- § 83 (2)), δι-, έν-, έξ-, έξ-αν-, έφ-, έπ-αν-, καθ-, κατ-εφ-, μεθ-, παρ-, περι-, προ-, συν-, συν-εφ-

For the flexion of present and strong aorist stems, and thematic substitutes occurring there, see § 86. Present, weak aor. and future act. are transitive, as is the new perf. -έστακα. From the intrans. perf. έστηκα comes a new verb στήκω *stand* (intr.), and from the present two new verbs ιστάνω and στάνω *stand* (tr.): cf. the early formation άλέκω from άλώλεκα, etc.

καθαίρω (VII.) <i>cleanse</i> VERBAL καθαρτός COMP. δια-, εκ-	εκάθαρα † see § 89, p. 214, n. 2.	κεκάθαρμαι
A denominative from καθαρός		

καθαρίζω (VII.) καθαίρισα † καθαριῶ κεκαθήρισμαι
cleanse ἐκαθερίσθην † (-ίσω I Jn 1^o A 33)

COMP. δια-

Forms where augment or reduplication appear show in good MSS an ε after θ (K $\frac{0}{8}$, B $\frac{2}{7}$, A $\frac{7}{7}$, C $\frac{4}{8}$, D $\frac{0}{8}$, L $\frac{4}{8}$), which is certainly felt to be a second augment following what popular etymology took to be κατά. It seems better not to allow any phonetic cause here, despite Thackeray 74. Such a combination as Mk 1⁴² καθαρίσθητι . . . ἐκαθερίσθη seems decisive (see § 33).

καθίζομαι (VII.) -καθεσθείς

sit

ἐκαθεζόμεν

COMP. παρα-

The simplex ἴζομαι was extinct, and the compound was not felt to be such: cf. κάθημαι.

καθεύδω (I. a)

sleep

ἐκάθευδον

Another verb with simplex extinct.

καθίζω ἐκάθισα καθίσω κεκάθικα †
sit (seat) καθίσομαι

COMP. ἀνα-, ἐπι-, παρα-, περι-, συγ-. See on καθίζομαι.

καίω (VII.) -έκάν ἔκαυσα καύσω κέκαυμαι
burn ἐκαύθην καυθήσομαι

καίομαι

-ἔκαιον

COMP. ἐκ-, κατα-

-καήσομαι
There is no reason for following Veitch in parsing καυσόμενα (2 Pet 3¹⁰) as a future. Καυσώ is extant in medd. and elsewhere.

The present stem κᾶω (not κᾶω), found often in Attic, is obsolete.

καλέω (VII.) ἐκάλεσα καλέσω † κέκληκα
call ἐκαλεσάμην καλέσομαι † κέκλημαι
καλοῦμαι ἐκλήθην κληθήσομαι (ἐ)κεκλήμην
ἐκάλουν Fut. a. m. is developed
VERBAL κλητός from the aor. (Att.
COMP. ἀντι-, εἰς-, ἐγ-, ἐπι-, μετα-, παρα-, καλῶ, -οῦμαι), perhaps
προ-, προσ-, συν-, συμ-παρα- in class. times.

καλύπτω (VII.) Papyri have ἐκάλυψε καλύψω κεκάλυμμαι
cover instances of ἐκαλύφθη καλυφθήσομαι

καλύπτομαι ἐκαλύφην.

VERBAL καλυπτός

COMP. ἀνα-, ἀπο-, ἐπι-, κατα-, παρα-, περι-, συγ-

† καμύω (VII.) ἐκάμμυσα
shut (eyes)

For κατα-μύω, from the dialectic form κατ-; it was dissociated from κατά by its abnormal form, and its compound character forgotten.

κάμνω (II. a) ἔκαμον
grou weary

κάμπτω (VII.) ἔκαμψα κάμψω
bend

COMP. ἀνα-, συγ-

καυχόμαι (VII.) ἐκαυχῆσάμην καυχῆσομαι κεκαύχημαι
boast

COMP. ἐγ-, κατα-

For 2 sg. pres. καυχᾶσαι see § 85.

κείμαι (I. b)
lie

ἐκείμην

COMP. ἀνα-, ἀντι-, ἀπο-, ἐπι-, κατα-, παρα-, περι-, προ-, συν-ανα
For flexion see § 87.

κείρω (VII.) ἔκειρα
shear ἐκειράμην

-κέλλω (VII.) -ἔκειλα
run ashore

COMP. ἐπι-

In Ac. 27⁴¹ ἐπώκειλαν appears in ω (against κ AB*C 33): this is from δκέλλω, probably in origin a compound (*ῶ = Skt. ā-, seen in ὠκεανός, ὀδύρομαι etc.).

κεράννυμι (I. β) ἐκέρασσα κεέρασομαι †
mix κέραμαι

VERBAL -κράτος

COMP. συγ-

κερδαίνω (VII.) ἐκέρδανα κερδαῖνῶ
gain ἐκέρδησα κερδήσω
κερδηθήσομαι

These alternatives occur together even in one context (1 Co 9²¹, where read κερδάνω).

κινέω (II. β) <i>move</i> κινούμαι VERBAL -κινήτός COMP. μετα-, συγ-	ἐκίνησα ἐκινήθην	κινήσω	
The root is κί- : the older non-thematic present <i>κίνυμαι</i> may have stood in the quotation adapted in Ac 17 ²⁸ (see <i>Cambr. Bibl. Essays</i> 481).			
κίχρημι (I. a. b) <i>lend</i>	ἔχρησα		
κλαίω (VII.) <i>weep</i> ἔκλαιον The Attic κλάω (cf. on καίω above) is obsolete.	ἔκλαυσα	κλαύσω† κλαύσομαι	
κλάω (III.) <i>break</i> κλώμαι COMP. ἐκ-, κατα-	ἔκλασα ἐκλάσθην		
κλείω (VII.) <i>lock</i> COMP. ἀπο-, ἐκ-, κατα-, συγ-	-ἔκλεισα -ἐκλείσθην	κλείσω	κέκλεισμαι
κλίνω (VII.) <i>lean</i> COMP. ἀνα-, ἐκ-, κατα-, προσ-	ἔκλινα ἐκλίθην	κλινῶ κλιθήσομαι	κέκλικα
κομίζω (VII.) <i>carry</i> -ἐκομιζόμην COMP. ἐκ-, συγ-	ἐκόμισα ἐκομισάμην	κομίσομαι† κομιούμαι	
κόπτω (VII.) -ἐκόπη <i>beat</i> κόπτομαι ἔκοπτον ἐκοπτόμην COMP. ἀνα-, ἀπο-, ἐκ-, ἐγ-, κατα-, προ-, προσ-	ἔκοψα ἐκοψάμην	κόψω κόψομαι κοπήσομαι	
κορέννυμι (II. β) <i>satiate</i>	ἐκορέσθην		κεκόρεσμαι
κράζω (VII.) <i>cry</i> ἔκραζον COMP. ἀνα- See <i>Prol.</i> 147.	ἔκραξα ἐέκραξα	κράξω κεκράξομαι	κέκρᾶγα

κρέμαμαι (I. υ)

hang

-ἐκρέμετο

COMP. ἐκ-

For the flexion see § 87: the imperfect is thematised.

κρίνω (VII.)

judge

κρίνομαι

ἔκρινον

ἐκρινόμην

VERBAL -κρίτός

COMP. ἀνα-, ἀντ-απο-, ἀπο-, δια-, ἐγ-, ἐπι-, κατα-, συγ-, συν-υπο-, ὑπο-

κρύπτω (VII.) ἐκρύβην †

-κρύβω † (I. α)

hide

-ἔκρυβον

VERBAL κρυπτός

COMP. ἀπο-, ἐγ-, περι-

Present stem only in *περιέκρυβεν* (Lk 12⁴), which is probably impf., and not a newly-formed aorist.

-κτείνω (VII.)

-ἔκτεινα

-κτενῶ

-κτέννω (II.)

-ἐκτάνθη

-κτέννυμι (II.)

kill

COMP. ἀπο-. The simplex is obsolete. See *Vocabulary*, s.v. *ἀποκτείνω*, for the strange absence of this verb from vernacular sources till late. The pres. stem in -ννυμι, a modification of the classical *ἀποκτείνυμι* (Kühner-Blass 469) under the influence of the ε found in the future, is quotable from Mk 12⁵ B, where κ*ACD have *ἀποκτείνοντες* and κ^c the older *ἀποκτινύντες*: B is presumably right here, but the -εννο- may be recognised in Lk 12⁴ κA, unless D be followed with -εννο- — here B adopts the normal form and is probably wrong. We may explain -κτένω as developed from *ἔκτεινα* by the proportion *ἔμεινα* : *μένω*. -Κτέννω is possibly a thematising of *κτέννυμι*. The welter of variants in present stem may perhaps be linked with the word's record, which is not at all clear. See for these forms the *app. crit.* at Mt 10²⁸ 237, Mk 12⁵, Lk 12⁴ 13²⁴, 2 Co 3⁶ and Rev 6¹¹.

κτίζω (VII.)

found

ἔκτισα

ἐκτίσθη

ἐκτισμαι

-κύνω (VII.) -έκύνησα

-κύνω (VII.)
bring forth

COMP. ἀπο-. The simplex was not obsolete: see *Vocabulary*, s.v. ἀποκύνω. The NT occurrence of the present is not decisive between κύνω and κύνω: ἐκύνομεν in Is 59¹⁸ encourages us to accent ἀποκύνει (with Ti) in Jas 1¹⁵.

-κυλίω (VII.) -έκυλίσα -κυλίω -κεκύλισμαι
roll

έκυλιόμην

COMP. ἀνα-, ἀπο-, προσ-. The pres. stem, reformed from the aorist (*έκυλινδ-σα) as early as Aristophanes, has naturally ousted such forms as κυλίνδω (etc.): cf. Brugmann-Thumb *Gr.* 360.

-κυνέω (II. β. α) -έκύνησα -κυνήσω
kiss

-έκύνουν

COMP. προσ-. The simplex is obsolete, and the stem-forming suffix -νε- has been taken over in other tense-stems, so that προσκυνέω has the normal flexion of a contract verb. (Aor. έκυσα as late as Aristotle.)

-κύνω (VII.) έκυψα
stoop

COMP. ἀνα-, κατα-, παρα-, συγ-

λαγχάνω έλαχον
(II. α. α)
draw by lot

λάκνω (VII.) έλάκησα
burst

Blass (on Ac 1¹⁸) compares διαλάκνωσα in Aristoph. *Nub.* 410, as giving a better meaning than λάσκω (aor. έλακον, weak aor. έλάκησα), to which the NT word is usually referred.

λαμβάνω	έλαβον	έλήμφθην †	λήμψομαι †	είληφα
(II. α. α)	(-α, p. 208)		-λημφθή-	είλημμαι
<i>take</i>	έλαβόμεν		σομαι †	(3 sg. -είληπ- ται.)
λαμβάνομαι				
έλάμβανον				

VERBAL -λημπτός †

COMP. ἀνα-, αντι-, ἀπο-, έπι-, κατα-, μετα-, παρα-, προ-, προσ-, προσ-ανα-, συλ-, συν-αντι-, συμ-παρα-, συμ-περι-, ύπο-

The intruded μ (from present stem) is firmly established in fut. and weak aor., and in the verbal: see *Prol.* 56. Literary influence produced numerous relapses in late MSS: cf. also Mt 21²² C, Jn 14⁸ CL 16²⁴ C, 1 Co 3⁸ C, Jas 1¹² C.

λάμπω (I. a) <i>shine</i> COMP. ἐκ-, περι-	ἐλαμψα	λάμψω		
λανθάνω (II. a. a) <i>escape notice</i> COMP. ἐκ-, ἐπι-	ἐλαθον -ἐλαθόμεν			-λέλησμαι
λέγω (I. a) <i>say</i> λέγομαι ἐλεγον ἐλεγόμην VERBAL -λεκτός COMP. ἀντι-, δια-, ἐπι-, προ- For its suppletives see under εἶρω and √ <i>φει</i> .	-ἐλεξάμην -ἐλέχθην			
λέγω (I. a) <i>gather</i> -λέγομαι -ἐλεγόμην VERBAL -λεκτός COMP. ἐκ-, ἐπι-, κατα-, παρα-, συλ-	-ἐλεξα -ἐλεξάμην	-λέξω		λέλεγμαι
λείπω (I. a) λιμπάνω (II. a. a) <i>leave</i> ἐλειπον ἐλειπόμην ἐλίμπανον VERBAL -λειπτός COMP. ἀπο-, *δια-, ἐγ-κατα-, ἐκ-, ἐπι-, κατα-, περι-, *ὕπο- (*λείπω and λιμπάνω).	-ἐλειπον ἐλειψα † ἐλείφην	λείψω		λέλειμμαι
There is a good deal of variation in MSS between ἐλειπον and ἐλειπον. Since itacism does not produce λίσω or ἐλίφθην, we may probably assume that the scribes of our uncials meant aorist-stem forms when they wrote λιπ-: they may often be repeating variants taken from unprofessional copies where itacism was really responsible. See WH <i>App.</i> ² 162.				

λούω (I. a) <i>wash</i> λούομαι COMF. ἀπο-	ἐλουσα ἐλουσάμην	λέλουμαι Heb 10 ²² λελουσμέ- νοι ND*P: so Jn 13 ¹⁰ E, and LXX.
μακαρίζω (VII.) <i>congratulate</i>		μακαριῶ
μανθάνω (II. a. a) <i>learn</i> COMF. κατα-	ἐμαθον	μεμάθηκα
μαρτύρομαι (VII.) <i>protest</i> ἐμαρτυρόμην COMF. δια-, προ-	ἐμαρτυρόμην	
-μάσσω (VII.) <i>wipe</i> -ἔμασσον -μάσσομαι COMF. ἀπο-, ἐκ-	-ἔμαξα	
μεγαλύνω (VII.) <i>magnify</i> ἐμεγάλυνον ἐμεγαλυνόμην	ἐμεγάλυνα ἐμεγαλύνθην	μεγαλυνθήσομαι
μεθύω (VII.) <i>be drunken</i>	ἐμεθύσθην	
μεθύσκομαι (IV.) <i>get drunk</i>		
μέλλω († II. a. a) <i>intend</i> ἤμελλον ἔμελλον. On augment see § 83 (1).		μελήσω
μελεῖ (I. a) <i>impers. it matters</i> ἐμελε	-ἐμελήθην	-μελήσομαι -μεληθήσομαι
-μέλομαι (I. a) <i>care</i> -ἐμελόμην		

VERBAL -μελητός

COMP. ἐπι-, μετα-

μέμφομαι (I. α)

blame

ἐμεμφάμην

(later uncials at Mk 7²).

VERBAL -μεμπτός

μένω (I. α)

remain

ἔμεινα

μενώ

μεμένηκα

μεμενήκειν

ἔμενον

COMP. ἀνα-, δια-, ἐμ-, ἐπι-, κατα-, παρα-, περι-, προσ-, συμ-παρα-, ὄπο-

μιάινω (VII.)

defile

ἐμίανθην

μεμίαμαι †

cl. μεμίασμαι

VERBAL -μιατός

-μίγνυμι (II. β. β)

mix

ἔμιξα

μέμιγμα

-μίγνυμαι

COMP. συν-ανα-

Present stem only middle. The correct spelling in pres., weak aor. and perf. pass. is *μει-*, but in Hellenistic this is a mere matter of orthography.

μιμήσκω (IV.)

remind

-ἔμνησα

-μνήσω

μέμνημαι

μιμήσκομαι

ἐμνήσθην

μνησθήσομαι

COMP. ἀνα-, ἐπ-ανα-, ὄπο-

μνηστεύω (VII.)

betroth

ἐμνηστεύθην

ἐμνήστευμαι

Lk 12⁷ μεμν.

CD.

μολύνω (VII.)

defile

ἐμόλυνα

ἐμολύνθην

μολύνομαι

μωραίνω (VII.)

make foolish

ἐμώρανα

ἐμωράνθην

-νέμω (I. α)

distribute

-ἐνεμήθην

COMP. ἀπο-, δια-

νήφω (I. α)

be sober

ἔνηφα †

COMP. ἀνα-, ἐκ-

νικάω (VII.)

conquer

ἐνίκησα

νικήσω

ενίκηκα

νικάμαι

COMP. ὑπερ-

In Rev 2¹⁷ νικούντι appears in AC, but in 2⁷ only A, in 15² C:
for these confusions of -άω and -έω stems see § 84.

νίπτω † (VII.)	ἔνιψα
νίπτομαι †	ἐνιψάμην
<i>wash</i>	

COMP. ἀπο-

The pres. stem is a back-formation, replacing cl. νίζω, where ζ is the regular resultant of *y* following velar *g*^o.

νύσσω (VII.)	-ενύγην	ἔνυξα
<i>pierce</i>		

COMP. κατα-

νυστάζω (VII.)	ἐνύσταξα
<i>nod</i>	

ξηραίνω (VII.)	ἐξήρᾱνα	ἐξήραμμαι
<i>dry up</i>	ἐξηράνθην	Also -σμαι
ξηραίνομαι		in earlier Greek.

ξυρέω (VII.)	ἐξυράμην	ξυρήσομαι	ἐξυρήμαι
ξύρω (VII.)			
<i>shave</i>			

Ξυρασθαι, 1 Co 11⁶, following κείρασθαι, is not easily construed as present (ξυρᾶσθαι, by confusion of -έω and -άω classes), and is better taken (ξύρασθαι) as aor. from ξύρω, quotable from Hippocrates and Plutarch: see WH *App.*³ 173 (also above, p. 200).

-οίγω, see ἀνοίγω

οἶδα, see √φειδ

οικοδομέω (VII.)	ἠκοδόμησα	οικοδομήσω	οικοδόμημαι
<i>build</i>	οικοδομήθην	οικοδομη-	(Lk 6 ⁴⁸ NBL
ἠκοδόμουν	For the aug-	θήσομαι	33 <i>ol. ib.</i>
οικοδομοῦμαι	ment see		4 ²⁹ D.)
COMP. ἀν-, ἐπ-, συν-	§ 83 (6).		ἠκοδομήμην

οικτιρώ (VII.)	οικτιρήσω †
<i>pity</i>	

In later authorities generally spelt οικτεῖρω.

οἶομαι (VII.)

think

The 1st sing. pres. οἶμαι survives—perhaps originally an “*allegroform*” of οἶομαι, used in parenthesis (Thumb in Brugmann *Gr.*⁴ 80).

-οἴχομαι (I. a) -ῥήχημαι
have gone
 COMP. παρ-

-δέλλω, see -κέλλω

-ἄλλυμι -ῶλόμην -ῶλεσα -δέλω -ἄλωλα
 (II. β. δ) -ἄλω
destroy -ἄλοῦμαι

-ἄλλυμαι

-ἄλλύμην

COMP. ἀπ-, συν-απ-

For flexion see §§ 86-87, also for thematic forms included.

ἠμείρομαι (VII.)

desire

*Απ. λεγ. in 1 Th 2⁸ (cf. Job 3²¹, Ps 62² Symm., ὑπερομ. in Irenaeus 60). Its similarity to the synonymous ἰμείρομαι (denominative from ἴμερος) is accidental. It may be a compound of μείρομαι *obtáin*, which in the conative present could take the required meaning; or we may compare directly the root *smēr* "remember." Debrunner, *Idg. Forsch.* xxi. 204, does not convince me. On the prepositional relic ὄ- see § 111.

ἠμνυμι (II. β. δ) ῶμοσα
swear

Only one non-thematic form (ἠμνύμαι) survives: the present tense forms are from ἠμνύω.

ἠμοίω (VII.) ῶμοίωσα ἠμοίωσω -ῶμοίωμαι
like ῶμοιώθην ἠμοιοθήσο- -ἠμοίωμαι †
 COMP. ἀφ- μαι So Heb 7³
CDal.: see
§ 83 (5).

ἠνίημι (II. α. δ) ἠνάμην

profit Only opt. 1 sg. ἠναίμην: see § 88.

ἴω ῶψάμην ῶφομαι
see Only subj. ῶφθήσομαι
 ὀπτάνομαι † ῶψηθε Lk 13²⁸, developed from fut.
ῶφθην

A suppletive of ἰράω and βλέπω, *q.v.*

ἰράω (VII.) [*εἶδον* see [ῶψάμην [ῶφομαι ἰόρακα
see √*ἔιδ*] ῶφθην: see ῶφθήσο- ἰώρακα
 ἰώρων √*ῶπ*] μαι: see ἰώρακειν
 ἰρώμαι √*ῶπ*]
 -ἰρώμην (§ 83 (4))

VERBAL ὀρατός

COMP. ἀφ-, ἐφ-, καθ-, προ-

A further suppletive in pres. stem active of simplex is βλέπω, which is already outstripping ὀραῖν. The closeness of association between εἶδον and ὀράω is seen in forms like ἀφίδω, ἔφιδε, where the aspirate is carried on.

-ὀργίζω (VII.)

anger

ὀργίζομαι

COMP. παρ-

ὀρθόω (VII.)

set upright

ὀργίσθην

-ὀργῶ

-ὀρθωσα

-ὀρθώσω

-ὀρθώθην Lk 13¹⁸ ἀνορθώθη ABDL *al.* :
see § 83.

COMP. ἀν-, ἐπι-δι-

ὀρίζω (VII.)

define

-ὀρίζον

COMP. ἀφ-, ἀπο-δι-, προ-

ὀρισα

-ὀριῶ

ὀρισμαι

ὀρίσθην

-ὀρίσω

-ὀρύσσω

dig

-ὀρύγγην

(Mt 24⁴⁸ B
al., Lk 12⁵⁹ APQ *al.*).

ὀρυξα

-ὀρύχθην

COMP. δι-, ἐξ-

-ὀτρύνω (VII.)

incite

COMP. παρ-

-ὀτρῦνα

ὀφείλω (VII.)

owe

ὀφείλων

ὀφείλομαι

COMP. προσ-

ὀφελον (for ὠφελον—has become a particle : see *Prol.*
200 f.)

παίζω (VII.)

play

ἐπαίζον

COMP. ἐμ-

-ἐπαίξα †

-παίξω

-ἐπαίχθην †

-παιχθήσομαι †

παίω (I. a)

strike

ἐπαισα

πάσχω (IV.)

suffer

VERBAL παθητός

COMP. προ-, συμ-

ἐπαθον

πέποιθα

πατάσσω (VII.) <i>strike</i> A suppletive of τύπτω, <i>q.v.</i>	ἐπάταξα	πατάξω	
παύω (I. a) <i>stop</i> παύομαι ἐπαυόμην VERBAL -πα(υ)στός COMP. ἀνα-, ἐπ-ανα-, συν-ανα-, κατα- 'Ακατάπατος is probably an instance of the change of αυ to ā: see <i>Prol.</i> 47.	ἔκασα ἐκασάμην	-παύσω παύσομαι -παήσομαι †	πέπαυμαι
παχύνω (VII.) <i>fatten</i>	ἐπαχύνθη		
πείθω (I. a) <i>counsel</i> ἔπειθον πείθομαι ἐπειθόμην VERBAL πιστός COMP. ἀνα-	ἔπεισα ἐπεισθήν	πείσω πεισθήσομαι	πέποιθα ἐπεποίθειν πέπεισμαι
πεινώ (VII.) <i>hunger</i> This verb (inflected like τιμάω) has curiously parted from its twin διψάω, which keeps its future and aorist stems in -ησ, although they have both lost the η of pres. stem (διψῆν, πεινῆν). Debrunner (<i>Blass</i> 43) suggests that association with κοπιάω fut. -άσω has affected it. In MGr it has pulled over διψῶ again (aor. ἐδίψασα).	ἐπίνασα	πεινώσω	
-πείρω (VII.) <i>perce</i> COMP. περι-	-έπειρα		
πέμπω (I. a) <i>send</i> -ἔπεμπον πέμπομαι COMP. ἀνα-, ἐκ-, μετα-, προ-, συμ-	ἔπεμψα -ἐπεμψάμην -ἐπέμφθη	πέμψω	
περάννυμι (II. β. δ) <i>spread</i> COMP. ἐκ-	-ἐπέτασα		
			The punctiliar character of the root is in keeping with the rarity of its occurrence in the present stem.

πήγνυμι (II. β. b)	ἔπηξα		
<i>fasten</i>			
COMP. προσ-			
-πιπλάω (VII.)	ἔπλησα	πλησθήσο-	πέπλησμαι
<i>fill</i>	ἐπλήσθην	μαι	
COMP. ἐμ-			
The simplex present <i>πίμπλημι</i> does not occur in NT.			
πίμπρημι (I. δ)	-ἔπρησα		
<i>burn</i>			
πίμπραμαι			
COMP. ἐμ- (πιπράσθαι): so Ac 28 ^s κ* (Βω πίμπρασθαι)			
† πιάζω (VII.)	ἔπιασα		
<i>seize</i>	ἐπιάσθην		
πιέζω (VII.)			πεπίεσμαι
<i>press</i>			
Like <i>ἀμφιάσαι</i> against <i>ἀμφιέσαι</i> , <i>πιάσαι</i> is said to be Doric: see Thumb in Brugmann <i>Gr.</i> ⁴ 78. Differentiated meaning seems to have set in, for <i>πιάσαι</i> (cf. MGr <i>πιάνω</i>) has the new force <i>seize</i> .			
πικραίνω (VII.)	ἐπικράνα	πικρανῶ	
<i>embitter</i>	ἐπικράνθην		
πικραίνομαι			
COMP. παρα-			
πίνω (II. α)	ἔπιον	ἐπόθην	πίομαι (§ 85, πέπωκα
<i>drink</i>	Inf. πείν		see also <i>Prol.</i> 184 n. ²).
ἔπινον	(§ 38).		
VERBAL (ποτός) whence noun πότης			
COMP. κατα-, συμ-			
πιπράσκω (IV.)	ἐπράθην		πέπρωκα
<i>sell</i>			
ἐπίπρασκον			πέπραμαι
πιπράσκομαι			
πίπτω (I. α)	ἔπεσον	πεσοῦμαι	πέπτωκα
<i>fall</i>	(-α, § 88)		
ἐπιπτον			
COMP. ἀνα-, ἀντι-, ἀπο-, ἐκ-, ἐμ-, ἐπι-, κατα-, παρα-, περι-, προσ-, συμ-			
πλάσσω (VII.)	ἔπλασα		
<i>shape</i>	ἐπλάσθην		
VERBAL πλαστός			
πλατύνω (VII.)	ἐπλατύνθην		πεπλάτυμμαι
<i>broaden</i>			

- πλέκω (I. a) -έπλάκην ἔπλεξα
entwine
 -πλέκομαι
 COMP. ἐμ-
- πλέω (I. a) ἔπλευσε
sail
 ἔπλεον
 COMP. ἀπο-, δια-, ἐκ-, κατα-, παρα-, ὑπο-
 For conjugation of present stem see § 84.
- πλήσσω ἐπλήγην -ἔπληξα
 (VII.) -ἐπλάγην
strike
 -πλήσσομαι
 -ἐπλησσομένη
 COMP. ἐκ-, ἐπι-
 Ac 13¹² ἐκκληττόμενος B 33: on this see § 43. The simplex passive aor. was used in Attic as suppletive for τύπτω: it was distinguished by its η from the form used in compound.
- πλύω (VII.) ἔπλυα
wash (clothes)
 ἔπλυνον
 COMP. ἀπο-
- πνέω (I. a) ἔπνευσα
breathe
 VERBAL -πνευστός
 COMP. ἐκ-, ἐμ-, ὑπο-
 For flexion of present stem see § 84.
- πνίγω (I. a) -ἐπνίγην ἔπνιξα
choke
 -πνίγομαι
 ἔπνιγον
 ἐπνιγόμενη
 VERBAL πνικτός †
 COMP. ἀπο-, συμ-
- ποιέω (VII.) ἐποίησα ποιήσω πεποίηκα
make ἐποιησάμην ποιήσομαι πεποιήκειν
 ἐποίουν
 ποιούμαι πεποιήμαι
 ἐποιούμην
 VERBAL -ποιητός
 COMP. περι-, προσ-

The spellings without η are rare: thus κ in Lk 11⁴² ποισαι, but the same MS has ποιῆσαι normally. In earlier Greek and in papyri ποῶ is found, and papyri have forms without η . See p. 73.

ποιμαίνω (VII.) <i>shepherd</i>	ἐποίμῶνα †	ποιμανῶ	
πράσσω (VII.) <i>practise</i>	ἔπραξα	πράξω	πέπρωχα πέπραγμα
πρίω (I. a) <i>saw</i> -ἐπρίομην COMP. δια-	ἐπρίσθην		
προφητεύω (VII.) <i>prophesy</i> ἐπροφήτευσον	ἐπροφήτευσα	προφητεύσω	Later MSS augment προεφ.: see § 83 (2), (7).
πταίω (I. a) <i>stumble</i> VERBAL -πταιστός	ἔπταισα		
πτύσσω (VII.) <i>roll up</i> COMP. ἀνα-	ἔπτυξα		
-πτύω (VII.) <i>spit</i> -ἔπτυσον COMP. ἐκ-, ἐμ-	ἔπτυσα	-πτύσω -πτυσθήσομαι	
πυθάνομαι ἐπυθόμην (II. a. a) <i>ascertain</i> ἐπυθανόμην			
-ραίνω (VII.) <i>sprinkle</i> COMP. περι-		-ρέραμμα	
βαπτίζω (VII.) <i>sprinkle</i>	ἐράντισα ἐραντισάμην	βεράντισμαι (On breathing see p. 100).	
βαπίζω (VII.) <i>beat</i>	ἐράπισα		
βάσσω (VII.) <i>strike</i>			

The simplex may be original at Rev 19¹⁸ (pf. ptc. pass.): see WH *App.*² 140. On the breathing see § 40.

An independent verb (only in Mk 9¹⁸ D 565), on which see Thumb in Brugmann *Gr.*⁴ 346.

ρέω (I. a) (ρ)ύην ρεύσω
flow subj. -ρυῶ
COMP. παρα-

ρήγνυμι (II. β. δ) ἔ(ρ)ρηξα ρήξω
(§ 83 (9))

ρήσσω (VII.)
break
ρήγνυμαι
-έρησσόμενη
COMP. δια-, περι-, προσ-

ρίζω (VII.) -ερίζωσα -ριζώθησα ἐρρίζωμαι
root Only subj. μαι
-ριζώσητε
-ερίζωθην

COMP. ἐκ-

ρίπτω (VII.) ἔριψα † ἔρ(ρ)ιμμαι
cast see § 83 (8).

COMP. ἀπο-, ἐπι- (both with single ρ following)

The pres. *ρίπτω* is said to differ from *ρίπτω* as *iacto* from *iacio* (μετὰ σφοδρότητος *ρίπτω*): the latter does not occur in NT, the former once.

ρύομαι (VII.) ἔ(ρ)ρυσάμην ρύσομαι
deliver (§ 83 (9))
ἐρύσθην

ρῶννυμι ἔρρωμαι
(II. β. δ)
strengthen

σαλπίζω (VII.) ἐσάλπισα † σαλπίσω †
trumpet

This is an instance of a new aorist and future coming from present (σαλπίζω-γω → -ίζω phonetically): cf. σαλπίζω, etc.

σβέννυμι (II. β. δ) ἔσβεσα σβέσω
quench

σβέννυμαι
VERBAL -σβεστός

Note phonetic spelling ζβέννυτε in 1 Th 5¹⁹ B*D₂*FG. All the present stem forms are still non-thematic.

σέβομαι (I. a) ἐσεβάσθη
worship

VERBAL σεβαστός

In earlier Greek separate, but in Hellenistic the derivative verb is used as a suppletive, σέβομαι having no aorist in continued use.

-σείω (I. a) ἔσεισα σείσω
shake ἐσειόσθη

σειόμαι

COMP. ἀνα-, δια-, κατα-

σημαίνω (VII.) ἐσήμανα †
signify
 ἐσήμαινον

σῆπω (I. a) σέσηπα
rot

σκάπτω (VII.) ἔσκαψα -ἔσκαμμαι
 COMP. κατα-

-σκέπτομαι (VII.) -έσκεψάμην -σκέφομαι
watch
 COMP. ἐπι-

In Attic σκοπέω (only pres. stem in NT) was used as suppletive for the present stem. We find ἐπισκοποῦντες in Heb 12¹⁵ in this sense, and in some papyri and inscriptions. It is perhaps significant that when interpolated (by A and the late MSS) in 1 Pet 5², it is a denominative from ἐπίσκοπος, and an entirely separate word.

σκληρύνω (VII.) ἐσκληρῆνα
harden ἐσκληρύνθη
 ἐσκληρυνόμην

σκύλλω (VII.) ἔσκυλμαι
distress
 σκύλλομαι

σπαράσσω (VII.) ἐσπάραξα
convulse
 COMP. συν-

σπάω (III.) -ἔσπασα -σπάσω -ἔσπασμαι
draw ἐσπασάμην
 -ἔσπώμην -ἔσπάσθη

VERBAL -σπαστός

COMP. ἀνα-, ἀπο-, δια-, ἐπι-, περι-

σπείρω (VII.) <i>σπειρω</i> σπειρον σπείρομαι COMP. δια-, ἐπι-	ἔσπειρα	ἔσπειρα	ἔσπειρα
σπεύδω (I. a) <i>hasten</i> ἔσπευδον	ἔσπευσα		
σπουδάξω (VII.) <i>be zealous</i>	ἔσπούδασα	σπουδάσω † (cl. -ομαι)	
-στέλλω (VII.) -ἐστάλην <i>send</i> -ἔστελλον στέλλομαι -ἔστελλόμεν COMP. ἀπο-, δια-, ἐξ-απο-, ἐπι-, κατα-, συν-, συν-απο, ὑπο-	-ἔστειλα -ἔστειλάμην	-στέλω	-ἔσταλκα -ἔσταλμαι
στενάξω (VII.) <i>groan</i> COMP. ἀνα-, συ-	ἔστέναξα		
† στήκω (I. a) <i>stand</i> ἔστηκον A new present (MGr στέκω) formed from ἔστηκα—see ἴστημι.			
στηρίζω (VII.) <i>establish</i> VERBAL -στηρικτός COMP. ἐπι-	ἔστήριξα ἔστήρισα (Lk 9 ⁵¹ BCL <i>al.</i> , Ac 15 ³² CE, Lk 22 ³² NABL <i>al.</i>).	στηρίζω	ἔστηριγμαι
στρέφω (I. a) <i>twist</i> -ἔστρεφον στρέφομαι COMP. ἀνα-, ἀπο-, δια-, ἐκ-, ἐπι-, κατα-, μετα-, συ-, ὑπο-	ἔστρεψα	-στρέψω -στραφήσομαι	ἔστραμμαι ἔστρεμμαι † : see WH <i>App.</i> ^{2177f.}
στρώννυμι (II. β. b) <i>strew</i> ἔστρώννυον VERBAL -στρωτός COMP. κατα-, ὑπο-	ἔστρωσα -ἔστρωθήν		ἔστρωμαι
σφάζω (VII.) <i>slay</i> COMP. κατα-	ἔσφαξα	σφάζω	ἔσφαγμαι

-σχηματίζω (VII.) <i>fashion</i> -σχηματίζομαι COMP. μετα-, συ-	-ἐσχημάτισα -σχηματίσω		
σχίζω (VII.) <i>split</i> COMP. δια-	ἔσχισα ἐσχίσθη	σχίσω	
σφίζω (VII.) <i>sauce</i> σφίζομαι ἐσφίζομαι COMP. δια-, ἐκ-	ἔσωσα ἐσώθη	σώσω σωθήσομαι	σέσωκα σέσω(σ)μαι Ac 4 ⁹ —σται B D E P,— -ται κA, Eph 2 ⁸ ,— -μένος P,— -σμένος rest.
The <i>ε</i> subscr. is best confined to pres.: see K.Bl. i. 544, and above, § 36, <i>d</i> (α).			
ταράσσω (VII.) <i>disturb</i> ἐτάρασσον ταράσσομαι COMP. δια-, ἐκ-	ἐτάραξα ἐταράχθη		τετάραγμα
τάσσω (VII.) -ἐτάγη <i>arrange</i> τάσσομαι VERBAL τακτός COMP. ἀνα-, ἀντι-, ἀπο-, δια-, ἐν-, ἐπι-, ἐπι-δια-, προ-, προσ-, συν-, ὑπο-	ἔταξα ἐταξάμην ἐτάχθη	-τάξομαι -ταγήσομαι	τέταχα τέταγμα
-τείνω (VII.) <i>stretch</i> -ἔτεινον -τείνομαι COMP. ἐκ-, ἐπ-εκ-, παρα-, προ-, ὑπερ-εκ-. Simplex obsolete.	-ἔτεινα	-τενώ	
τελέω (VII.) <i>finish</i> τελοῦμαι COMP. ἀπο-, δια-, ἐκ-, ἐπι-, συν-	ἐτέλεσα ἐτελέσθη	-τελέσω τελεσθήσομαι	τετέλεκα τετέλεσμαι
-τέλλω (VII.) <i>accomplish?</i> COMP. ἀνα-, ἐξ-ανα-, ἐν-	-ἔτειλα -ἐτειλάμην	-τελοῦμαι	-τέταλκα -τέταλμαι

The simplex occurs very rarely in early poetry. Its central meaning is quite doubtful: it is very probably a conflation of originally distinct roots.

-τέμνω (II. a) -ἔτεμον -ἐτμήθην -τέτμημαι
cut

VERBAL -τμητός

COMP. περι-, συν-

τήκω (I. a)

melt

τήκομαι

τακήσομαι

So 2 Pet 3¹² C, rest

mostly τήκεται.

See WH *App.*³ 103, where Hort suggests τήξεται (quotable from one MS of Hippocrates) to account for the variants: Mayor seems to approve the emendation.

τίθημι (I. b)

set

ἐτίθουν

τίθεμαι

-ἐτιθέμην

VERBAL -θετός

COMP. ἀνα-, ἀντι-δια-, ἀπο-, δια-, ἐκ-, ἐπι-, κατα-,
μετα-, παρα-, περι-, προ-, προσ-, προσ-ανα-,
συν-, συν-επι-, συγ-κατα-, ὑπο-

For the flexion see § 86 f.

θεῖναι etc. (in- ἔθηκα

dic. wanting ἐτέθην
in NT).

ἐθέμην

θήσω

-θήσομαι

-τεθήσομαι

τέθεικα †

τέθειμαι

-έτεθειμην

The cl. -τέ-
θηκα oc-
curs in BGU
Π 388¹⁻⁴⁰
(ii/iii A.D.),
but the
other form,
f o r m e d
after ἀφ-
εῖκα, had
long been
current.

τίκτω (I. a. a) ἔτεκον

bear (child)

-τινάσσω (VII.)

shake

COMP. ἀπο-, ἐκ-

τίνω (II. a)

pay

COMP. ἀπο-

-τρέπω (I. a)

turn

-τρέπομαι

-έτρεπόμην

COMP. ἀνα-, ἀπο-, ἐκ-, ἐν-, ἐπι-, μετα-, περι-, προ-

έτέχθην

-έτινάξα

-έτιναξάμην

-έτρεψα

-έτρεψάμην

τέξομαι

τείσω

The cl. orthography—
usually written τίσω.

-τραπήσομαι

τρέφω (I. a) -έτράφην ἔθρεψα τέθραμμαι
nurture -έθρεψάμην
 τρέφομαι

COMP. ἀνα-, ἐν-, ἐκ-

The root is *θρεφ*, which loses its first aspiration when the second is present.

τρέχω (I. a) [ἔδραμον]
run

ἔτρεχον

COMP. εἰς-, ἐπι-συν-, κατα-, περι-, προ-, προσ-, συν-, ὑπο-

The suppletive is from $\sqrt{\delta\rho\epsilon\mu}$: cf. *δρόμος*. The root is *θρεχ*, whence future *θρέξομαι*.

-τρίβω (I. a) -ἔτριψα -τρίψω -τέτριμμαι
rub -τρίβησομαι
 -ἔτριβον

COMP. δια-, συν-

τυγχάνω (II. a) ἔτυχον
happen

COMP. ἐν-, ἐπι-, παρα-, συν-, ὑπερ-εν

τέτευχα † Heb
 8^o κ*AD*

τέτευχα ἰδ. B

τετύχηκα ἰδ.

P 33

-τυλίσσω (VII.) -ἐτύλιξα -τετύλιγμαι
wind

COMP. ἐν-

τύπτω (VII.) [ἐπλήγην] [ἔπαισα] [πατάξω]
strike [ἐπάταξα]

ἔτυπτον

τύπτομαι

For the suppletives see *παίω*, *πλήσσω* and *πατάσσω*: cf. for the cl. usage the excursus on "The Defective Verb *τύπτω*" in Sandys and Paley's *Demosthenes*, vol. ii. pp. 207-211.

ὀφαίνω (VII.)
weave

VERBAL ὀφαντός

$\sqrt{\phi\alpha\gamma}$ ἔφαγον φάγομαι †
eat

Suppletive to *ἐσθίω*, *q.v.*

φαίνω (VII.) ἐφάνην ἔφᾶνα † φανούμαι
shine φανήσομαι

φαίνομαι

VERBAL -φαντός

COMP. ἀνα-, ἐπι-

In Rev 8¹² 18²⁸ φάνη is best thus accented, to mean "shine" rather than "appear" (*φανῆ*).

† -φαύσκω (IV.)

-φαύσω

† φώσκω (IV.)

COMP. ἐπι-

dawn

-ἔφωσκον

The relations of these words are not quite clear. Ἐπιφαύσει might be the future of (ἐπι)φάω (φάε "shone" in Homer—still surviving in Aratus). The Homeric πιφαύσκω = "declare." Ἐπιφώσκω can be quoted from P Lond. 130²⁰ (= i. p. 134), a horoscope of ii/iii A.D.

φέρω (I. a)

ἤνεγκον (not ἤνεγκα
indic.) ἠνέχθη

οἶσω

-ἐνήνοχα

ἔφερον

φέρομαι

ἐφερόμην

COMP. ἀνα-, ἀπο-, δια-, εἰς-, ἐκ-, ἐπι-, κατα-, παρα-, παρ-εἰς-, περι-, προ-, προσ-, συμ-, ὑπο-

On the question of aorist *Aktionenart* in ἔφερον see *Proz.* 129, 247.

φείδομαι (I. a)

ἐφεισάμην

φείσομαι

spare

φεύγω (I. a)

ἔφυγον

φεύξομαι

πέφευγα

flee

COMP. ἀπο-, δια-, ἐκ-, κατα-

φημί (I. δ)

say

ἔφη

φάσκω (IV.)

ἔφασκον

COMP. σύμ-

Of φημί only φημί, φησί, φασί, and ἔφη are found.

φθάνω (II. a)

ἔφθασα

ἔφθακα

anticipate

COMP. προ-

φθέγγομαι (I. a)

ἐφθεγγάμην

utter

COMP. ἀπο-

φθείρω (VII.)

ἐφθάρην

ἔφθειρα

φθερῶ

-ἔφθαρμαι

corrupt

ἔφθειρον

φθείρομαι

φθιρῆσομαι

VERBAL φθαρτός
COMP. δια-, κατα-

φορέω (VII.) ἐφόρεσα φορέσω
wear

VERBAL -φορητός

φράσσω (VII.) ἐφράγγην ἔφραξα φραγήσομαι
shut

φρνάσσομαι (VII.) ἐφρνάξα †
neigh

Middle in cl. Gr.

φυλάσσω (VII.) ἐφύλαξα φυλάξω
guard

ἐφύλασσον

φυλάσσομαι

Comp. δια-

φύω (VII.) ἐφύην †
grow

VERBAL -φυτός

COMP. ἐκ-, συμ-

In Mt 24³² = Mk 13²⁸ we may accent ἐκφύη pres. (transitive) or ἐκφυῆ aor. (intrans.). Since this late strong aor. accounts for every other occurrence of φύω or compounds in NT, except φύουσα in Heb 12¹⁶, there is a presumption in favour of it here, as it enables us to take both verbs as aorist. To parse ἐκφύη as aor. subj. act. is certainly wrong, for ἔφυν was obsolete and ἐφύην took its place.

φωτίσω (VII.) ἐφώτισα φωτίσω † πεφώτισμαι
illuminate ἐφωτίσθην φωτιῶ (Rev 22⁶ κ)

χαίρω (VII.) ἐχάρην
rejoice

ἔχαιρον

COMP. συγ-

χαρήσομαι

Χαρούσιν in Rev 11¹⁰ TR is perhaps invented out of vg *gaudebunt*. Ἐπιχαρεῖ can be quoted from an Alexandrian inscription of ii/iii A.D., Preisigke *Sammelbuch* no. 1323.

χαλάω (VII.) ἐχάλασα χαλάσω
let down ἐχαλάσθην

χαρίζομαι (VII.) ἐχαρισάμην χαρίζομαι † κεχαρίσμαι
grant ἐχαρίσθην † χαρισθήσομαι †

ψάλλω (VII.) <i>sing</i>		ψαλῶ
ψεύδομαι (I. a) <i>lie</i>	ἐψευσάμην	
-ψύχω (I. a) <i>cool</i>	-ΐψυξα	ψύγήσομαι †
COMP. ἀνα-, ἀπο-, ἐκ-, κατα-		
-ώθειν (VII.) <i>thrust</i>	-ῶσα †	
-ώθοῦμαι	-έωσα (Ac. 7 ⁴⁵ κ ^ε Ε)	
	-ῶσάμην †	
COMP. ἀπ-, ἐξ-		

PART III.

WORD-FORMATION.

§ 96. Our subject hitherto has been exclusively the form of words as isolated units, prepared to take their place in the combinations which make up speech. But we are not yet ready to pass on to Syntax, the study of principles governing these combinations: we have still to investigate important features in the history of the words themselves. We must go a step further back, and examine words before they are prepared for their place in a sentence by receiving inflexions of case or number, of person or mood. The larger part of this field must be excluded from our present survey. The Science of Language, or Grammar in the older and wider sense, is bound to concern itself with Semantics or Semasiology, the scientific investigation of the development of the meaning of words. In the same way it is bound to pass beyond Syntax, and study the phenomena classed under Rhetoric or Stylistic.

§ 97. But convenience demands an artificial limiting of what is involved in "Grammar"; and as we limit Syntax by the period or sentence, so we shall limit the study of single words within the provinces of Accidence and Word-formation. This latter division, upon which we now enter, will include the elements from which Semantics must start.

§ 98. There are two main divisions in the province before us, which we will take in retrograde order. First comes, then, the formation of Compounds, the combination of separate words within the history of the Greek language. Then follows the study of formative elements within words—comparative research into the function of prefixes and suffixes which ceased to be separate words (assuming that they ever were such) in a pre-historic stage of Indo-European speech. Under both these headings we shall have to deal separately with Nouns and Verbs.

WORD-COMPOSITION.

NOUNS.

§ 99. There is a marked difference between the languages of our family, and even between those which are closely related, in the extent to which noun-composition is employed. It is one of the most obvious differences between Greek and Latin, between German and English—the last pair fellow-members of one branch in the Indo-European family. English has less objection to compounds than Latin had ; but we are familiar enough with the instinct that bids us coin our compounds in Greek rather than with native elements. We mentioned *Semasiology* just now. German philologists use *die Bedeutungslehre*, “meaning-science,” where we invent a Greek combination and transfer it to our own tongue.

§ 100. The extreme example of proclivity towards compound-making is found in Sanskrit, where all sorts of relations are expressed by fitting words together, leaving their syntactical functions to be inferred. The Indian grammarians classified compounds with their usual acuteness, and our scientific accounts of them to-day are largely based upon the work of these early philologists. Macdonell (*Sanskrit Grammar*, p. 155) gives a good illustration: “Kālidāsa describes a river as ‘wave-agitation-loquacious-bird-row-girdle-stringed,’ while we should say ‘her girdle-string is a row of birds loquacious because of the agitation of the waves.’” It will be noticed that Sanskrit has the advantage in brevity, but not in clearness. Greek, with its characteristic instinct of proportion, avoids the overdoing of this practice, especially in prose ; and Hellenistic, as we might expect, restricts it somewhat more. Colloquial speech is not prone to multiply cumbrous words, and the more complex compounds are naturally avoided in the artless prose of everyday life.

§ 101. But it is possible to go too far in suspecting special culture when compounds are freely found. Within limits, a compound may be an actually simpler locution than its equivalent with the elements separated ; and MGr vernacular shows that the genius of the language in respect of this resource has not changed. If we find Paul using a compound which we cannot trace elsewhere, we may provisionally allow him

to have coined it without inferring any literary qualities in a man who can avail himself of such means of expressing a new thought. A modern peasant could do the same.

Classification. § 102. For the general principles of classification and the large literature thereon, reference may be made to Brugmann *Grundriss*² II. i. 35-40 and 49-120. A scientifically complete classification can only be made on comparative lines, and will not be attempted here, as we are not going beyond the compounds that occur in the NT. For our purpose we cannot do better than to apply with a few variations the classification devised by the Indian grammarians. We may quote Macdonell's summary (*Sanskrit Grammar*, p. 155): "The most convenient division is into the three classes of Co-ordinatives, Determinatives, and Possessives. The Determinatives, so-called because the former member determines (or qualifies) the latter, are of two kinds, Dependent and Descriptive. Possessives are secondary compounds, consisting chiefly of Determinatives turned into adjectives." The Sanskrit names for the classes, which will be given below, are with one exception typical examples of the class thus described.

Co-ordinatives. § 103. I. Co-ordinative Compounds (Skt. *Dvandva*, i.e. "couple") unite two or more words of the same class: thus Skt. *aho-rātram* "day and night." Numerals afford plentiful examples: *δώδεκα*, *duodecim*, *δεκαοκτώ*, *eighteen*, *twenty-one*, etc., may be compared with the forms in which *and* occurs, as the classical *τρεισκαίδεκα* or our *three and twentieth*. Apart from these there are very few examples of *Dvandva* in Greek¹: the adverb² *νυχθήμερον* "by night and day" is the solitary NT instance.³ *Ἀπόκρας*,

¹ [Mr. E. E. Genner cites *πλουθυγία health and wealth*. (Aristoph.^{acc.})—ED.]

² [So J. H. M. here: but see below, p. 283. "Substantivised neut. from **νυχθήμερος*," Brugmann *Grd.*³ II. i. 99. Generally taken as direct obj. of *πεποίηκα* in 2 Co 11²⁶.—ED.]

³ The *vox nihili* *δευτεροπρώτος* might be said to belong to this class as probably as to any other: we may record it here simply because this is the first class named. Plummer's note on Lk 6¹ gives the various attempts made to explain it. It is an early Western interpolation. WH *App.*³ 58 (q.v.) accept Meyer's explanation of its origin; Burkitt (*Gospel Hist.* 81 n.) supposes a dittography *σαββατωεἰς τὸ*, from which "εἰς τὸ" was erroneously expanded into *δευτεροπρώτος*. Cod. e reads *sabbato mane=έν σαββάτω πρωί*: cf. Mrs. Lewis's conjecture of *πρωί* for *πρώτος* in Jn 1⁴, from a new reading of syr⁴¹² (*Exp T* xx. 229 ff.).

found in Persius 6⁵⁰ as a borrowed word, is taken by Brugmann to mean "bread and meat": it may be Hellenistic, or a survival from classical vocabulary. Brugmann notes that *Dvandva* is commoner in MGr: thus *γυναικόπαιδα* "women and children," *μαχαιροπέρονα* "knives and forks." It even appears in verbs, as *ἀνεβοκατεβαίνω* "pace up and down" (Thumb *Hdb.* 112). The papyri give us *χορτάρακον* (P Lond 1171³⁸) (=iii. p. 178) (8 B.C.), which Grenfell and Hunt take as "hay and aracus," comparing *κριθόπυρος* (P Petr i. p. 78) "barley and wheat." (But see Mayser 468 on this. Kenyon takes it as "aracus for fodder.") Mayser 469 adds *ναυκληρομάχιμος*. We may fairly assume that the usage was known in Hellenistic.

§ 104. II. Closely akin to these compounds

Iteratives. are the iteratives, products of the reduplicating tendency which forms so many words in our own vernacular, and takes a large part in the history of the Indo-European verb-system. Unlike Sanskrit and Latin, Greek hardly ever fuses the two forms into one word, but the principle is not really affected. An exception is *πέρπερος* (whence *περπερεύομαι*), which is not attested till a later date than Latin *perperam* is found: it may quite possibly be borrowed from *perperus*. It comes from the pronominal *pero* "other" (see below, p. 279, under *πέρυσσι*), and the iteration produces elative force, "other than what should be"; cf. uses of *ἕτερος*.¹ The reduplication produces *distributive* force in *δύο δύο* "two by two" (see *Proleg.* 97, and add P Oxy vi. p. 310 note), *πρασιαὶ πρασιαί, συμπόσια συμπόσια, δεσμός δεσμός*: cf. Skt. *ékaikas* "each one," *yádyad* "what each time," Lat. *quisquis*, Avestan *nmāne-nmāne* "in each house." A modern Indian dialect like Gujarati may complete the case against Semitism! Emphasis of various kinds may be seen in *πλέον πλέον, μάλλον μάλλον, magis magis*, "more and more"; *μέγας μέγας*¹ (*Proleg. l.c.*) "very great"; *ὅσον ὅσον* (Aristophanes, LXX, Lk 5³ D, Heb 10³⁷) "only just so much as." The last is like our idiomatic phrase "only so-so": English iteratives like "tut tut!", "hear

¹ *Archiv* v. 163 cites an Egyptian inscr. of 29 B.C. with dedication *θεῷ μεγάλῳ μεγάλῳ ὀψίστῳ*: O. Rubensohn regards it as referring to Jehovah, though it may or may not be from a Jew. The collocation *μέγας μέγας* was however specially Egyptian

hear!”, “come, come!”, “a red, red rose,” will supply further illustration. See Delbrück, *Grd.* v. (iii.) 139 ff.

§ 105. III. Dependent Determinatives

Dependent Determinatives. (Skt. *Tatpuruṣa* “his man,” abbreviated T.P.)

form a very large class. In these the first element stands in a case relationship to the second. As in other compounds, the immense majority of instances show the bare stem in the first part. There are a few exceptions, of which we may name the following as NT words: *ρουνεχής* (adv. in Mk 12³⁴) *acc.*, *ἄδοιπόρος* (noun and verb in NT) *loc.*, *ἄριστον* (= *ἀγέρι* + *στόν*, *loc.* of obsolete noun = morning—cf. *ἦρι* Eng. *ere*—with p.p.p. of *√ed* to eat), *Διόσκουροι* (*sons of Heaven*) Ac 28¹¹; *gen.* A few specimens may be given to show these compounds in the various case relations: it should be premised that the selection of a case is often ambiguous.

Accusative.—*θεοσεβής* *God-worshipping*, *γεωργός* (= *γη-οργός*) *earth-working, tiller*, *φωσφόρος* *light-bringing, daystar*, *κακούργος* (= *κακόεργος*) *evil-doer* (hence by analogy *παν-οὔργος* *one who will do anything, knave*).

Genitive.—*πατριάρχης* *ruler of a clan* (*πατριά*), *αἱματεκχυσία* *shedding of blood*; *οικοδεσπότης* *lord of a house*.

Ablative.—*διοπετής* *fallen from heaven*, *πατροπαράδοτος* *handed down from our fathers*, *ποδαπός* (see *Prol.* 95, Hellen. *ποταπός*) *coming from whence?*

Dative.—*ἀνθρωπάρεσκος* *man-pleaser*, *εἰδωλόθυτος* *sacrificed to idols*.

Locative.—*χείμαρρος* *flowing in the winter*, *γονυπετής* *falling on the knees*, *ὀφθαλμόδουλος* *serving under the eyes*.

Instrumental.—*ποταμοφόρητος* *river-borne*, *χειρόγραφον* *written with the hand*, *αἰχμάλωτος* *spear-captured*, *κιθαρωδός* (= *κιθαρα-αιδός*) *singing with the harp*, *θεοδιδάκτος* *God-taught*.

There are a great many compounds of this form which will easily be placed in one of the categories described above. Some words follow on which special notes are desirable. (As throughout this chapter, the original compound is given whenever it exists: in many cases the NT only shows a secondary derivative.)

ἄλεκτοροφωνία is noted by Blass (*Gr.* 68) as “peculiar, there being no conceivable adjective from which it can be derived.” It is no doubt genitively dependent, *cock-crowing*, with its second element modelled on *συμφωνία*, etc. It is vulgar, as Blass observes.

ἄλλοτριεπίσκοπος (1 Pet 4¹⁶, vg *alienorum appetitor*) may very well be a coined word: of course such a statement only means that we have no other occurrences at present, and that the coining of such a compound is entirely according to usage in Greek of every kind. The elision of its

is determined by NB and other authorities: for the ἀλλοτριεπίσκοπος of the a-text MSS we might compare *ἰπποίατρος* P Oxy i. 92 (iv/A.D.), Ramsay *C. and B.* ii. 662 (no. 627), *δειγματοδότης* and *χωματοεπιμ(ε)λήτης* in P Lond 1159⁸⁷. (=iii. p. 113) (Hermopolis, A.D. 145-7), the former also in P Oxy i. 63⁸ (ii/iii A.D.). Probably the retention of the *o* was normal in freshly coined words at a rather later period than that of the NT Books: WM 124 n describes the other as "more correct." See further above, § 32.

Ἀρμολόγος may be tentatively given as the basis of (συν)αρμολογέω, though its authority (see LS) is *nil*, and the verb may be simply formed from analogy. It would mean *joint-gathering* (accus. dep.), with the verb *to fit together*.

Αἰτός forms sundry compounds that call for comment. In two of them the αἰτός is *nomiñative*, so that the words fall into the next class. In three it is instrumental, viz. αἰθαίρετος *self-chosen*, αἰτόματος *self-thought*, *spontaneous* (*-ματός p.p.p. of *ν* *men* to think), αἰτοκατάκριτος *self-condemned*. Probably αἰτόφωρος is the same, *self-detected*: its usage (see Jebb on Soph. *Ant.* 51) depends on φωράω rather than on φώρ. The dative appears in αἰτάρκης *self-sufficient*, *content*: the vernacular use of the word practically lets the αἰτός go—see *Vocabulary s.v.* Also dative is αἰθάδης (αἰτο-*F*άδης, from *ν* *εμᾶδ* of ἦδομαι, ἀνδάνω, *εμάνις* etc.) *self-pleasing*, *reckless*.

Βατταλογέω (Mt 6⁷ NB—WH *App.*³ 158) presumes an (unquotable) *βατταλόγος, best perhaps taken as from *βατταλο-λόγος by haplogy. It is argued in *Vocabulary s.v.* that βάτταλος, the nickname of Democritus, may have meant *gabbler*: in that case Aramaic *battil* (Wellhausen) may be only accidentally similar. Βατταρίζω *stammer* is another possible source, for *βατταρο-λογέω might suffer haplogy after assimilation. The reading of D (gr.) βλαττολ. is akin to Latin *blatero* (i.e. **mlatero*, Eng. *blether*; the root perhaps in Skt. *mleccha* "foreign-speaking"). The uncertainty of the word's history makes it doubtful whether Class IV. or V. should not claim it.

Βλάσφημος probably shows the reduced form of the stem of βλάβος, thus *injury-speaking* (accus. dep.): see further *Vocabulary s.v.*

Γαζοφυλάκιον (Strabo p. 319) is derived by Blass (*Gr.* 68) from γαζοφύλαξ *treasure-warden* (gen. dep.).

Γλωσσόκομον (Jn 12⁶ 13²⁸) is *what holds* (κομίζει) *the mouthpiece of a flute* (γλωττα—cf. Blass *ib.*). Phrynichus (Rutherford 181) tells us how the degenerate epigoni sacrificed the "correct" Attic γλωττοκομείον, and widened its use so as to describe a case for "books, clothes, money, or anything else." See *Vocabulary s.v.* for papyrus citations for the Attic form (still in W), and the shortened Hellenistic form.

Δεξιολάβος, a d.l. in Ac 23²³ (vg *lancearii*), is supposed to mean

taking (a spear) *in the right hand* (instr. or loc. dependence). In military phraseology the spear was always connected with the right, as the shield with the left. It was certainly not a coined word, but as it does not reappear till vii/A.D. we must suppose it a technical term of limited range.

Δημηγόρος *public orator* (whence -πέω) starts best perhaps from δήμος ἀγείρειν *contionem facere* (so accus. dep.), the connotation of a harangue coming from the conditions familiar from Homer down.

Εἰλικρινής (on breathing see WH *App.*² 151) is as yet unsolved. That the second element is from κρίνω seems clear, so that the meaning is —*tested*, —*discerned*, *sincere*. But neither the Homeric εἰλιποδες (βόες) nor Theocritus' εἰλικρινής, an epithet of a grass, seems to help us for the first element, and it must be left for the present.

Since εἶ is the neuter of an old adjective (Homeric ἦς, cf. Skt. *vasu* good, Zd. *vanhu*, O. Pers. *Dāraya-vahu* (Darius)=*possessing goods*), some of its cpds. may as well come here as in the other classes. Thus εὐεργέτης *benefactor* might be *honorum factor*. But it is better to divide them between Classes IV. and V.

Θεοστυγής (see SH on Rom 1⁸⁰) has sometimes been taken as accusatively dependent, *God-hating*; but there seems no reason for deserting the ancient evidence for *God-hated* (dative). Similarly the proper name Θεόφιλος means *God's beloved, dear to God* (gen. or dat.): the other meaning would be expressed by μισόθεος, φιλόθεος respectively. (As a Jewish name Theophilus appears in papyri: it carries on such OT names as *Jedidiah*.)

Θυμομαχέω —*θυμομάχος is not found—seems to be instr. dep., *to fight with zest or heat, so to quarrel hotly*. So λογομάχος *fighting with words* ("speaking daggers").

Θυρωρός = θυρα-φορός *door-guardian* (δράω, Eng. *ware*) has gen. dependence. Cf. κηπο-φορός, κηπουρός, *gardener*; οἰκουρός *house-guardian* (Tit 2^a a-text). The 1st decl. nouns properly produced compounds in -ωρός, as πυλωρός *gate-guardian*, τιμωρός *honour-guardian, avenger*; but analogy sometimes produced in vernacular documents forms like θυρουρός.

Κενεμβατεύω "according to a probably certain conjecture, Col 2¹⁶" (Blass, *Gr.* 67) ἀέρα κενεμβατεύων for ἀ ἐράκεν ἐμβ. The verb ἐμβατεύω is good vernacular, and, in the process of copying, might easily take the place of a δ.λ., which would probably be a coinage of Paul's own: a conjecture developed by such a succession of great scholars¹ is tempting. C. Taylor, to whom the conjecture in its final form is due, suggested that the phrase was based on the Rabbinic "fly in the air with nothing to rest on." Field's rather doctrinaire objection to a verb not found elsewhere, and not formed according to classical rules—which are far from "inviolable" in Hellenistic—would be easily turned by reading (with Peake) κενεμβατῶν, an existing word, and assuming that the common ἐμβατεύειν

¹ See its history in J. R. Harris's *Side-lights on NT Research* (1909), pp. 198 f.

ousted a rather rare expression. The new verb will mean *to invade the void* (accus. dep.), and with the internal accus. *ἀέρα to tread the empty air*.¹

*Καραδόκος may perhaps be assumed as basis of (ἀπο)καραδοκία (see p. 299), but its formation is not at all clear. If δέχομαι (Att. δέχομαι) originally meant *to stretch out* (cf. Brugmann *Grd.*¹ II. 465), this (hypothetical) adjective *head-stretching* would supply a good basis for *καραδοκίω to expect eagerly*. See further on the noun (possibly a coinage of Paul—the verb is in Polybius) *Vocabulary s.v.*

Ναυᾶγός (ναῦς and *Φάγγυμ*²) must be interpreted on the same lines as its Latin synonym *navifragus*: accus. dependence is perhaps simplest, *one who has wrecked his ship*. Ναύκληρος is complex, as it combines *ναύκληρος with a ship as his portion* (a compound of Class V. below) with a dissimilated form of *ναύκρᾶρος ship-master*, from *κᾶρός *head* (κᾶσ-πεδον, κᾶνίον, Lat. *cerebrum* for *ceresrom*): there are semasiological difficulties here—see LS.

Οἰκουργός (ἰ.λ.), the true reading in Tit 2^s, is a compound with locative dependence, *home-worker*, or it may be exactly parallel with *γεωργός*, which has accus.

Ὀρθοτομέω (2 Ti 2¹¹) occurs in Pr 3⁶ 11^s, of levelling or straightening a road—"cutting straight the path of Truth," for the pilgrims' progress thereon, would be an attractive meaning. But it is simpler to compare (with Grimm) *καινοτομεῖν to innovate*, where the second element has faded: ὀρθ. will then be *to direct, apply faithfully*, as men speak of "a straight talk." So practically *vg recte tractantem*, and RV.

Πατρολώας and μητρολώας in 1 Ti 1⁸ are spelt with ο (not α) by the best MSS: see WH *App.*³ 159. The classical *πατραλώας* seems to make *father-thrasher* (ἀλο(ι)άω) the meaning.³ The levelling tendency of analogy has caused all the *r* nouns to substitute *ρo* in compounds for the *ρα* (i.e. *ρ*) which was originally found (cf. Skt. *pr̥g-*, Goth. *broþru-*): here the tendency has even affected words in which the *a* belongs to the second element of the compound. This is simpler than Radermacher's suggestion (*Gr.*¹ 35, *37) that *δλλυμ* was in mind.

Πλεονέκτης should apparently mean *one who has more* (accus. dep.). But from the first it is *one who would have more*. It is difficult to see where the desiderative element came in: is the -έκτης really *ξέ-της? But cf. *αἰσχροκερδής* below, p. 284.

Πλήμμυρα may be placed here tentatively, on the assumption that the *μμ* (see § 41) only represents a popular connexion with *πλήν*, like *πλημμελής*.

¹ [This "probably certain conjecture" has been gravely discounted by Ramsay's discovery of the word *ἐμβαρεῖν* in inscr. from Klaros as a t.t. of the Mysteries. His essay "The Mysteries in their Relation to St. Paul" (*Contemp. Review*, Aug. 1913, pp. 198 ff.) is republished in *The Teaching of Paul*, pp. 287 ff.). So now *Vocab.* 206a.—Ed.]

² The *z* is taken by Brugmann (*Grd.*² II. i. 92) as due to analogy of nouns that lengthened the vowel at the junction through contraction, as *σπατᾶγός = σπῆτο-αγο-α*.

³ For *σ* or *φ* replacing *α* see p. 83. [WH spell both words with *φ*.—Ed.]

Boisacq regards *πλη-* as a gradation-doublet of *πλω* (*πλώω*, E. *flood*): *μίρομαι*, orig. *to flood*, supplies the second part. In that case the first element would be a primitive noun, accusatively or instrumentally dependent.

Πληροφορέω, which has no **πληροφόρος* behind it, may come from the analogy of cpds. like *τελεσφορέω* (from *τελεσφόρος maturity-bringing*). The verb starts from *to bring in full* (accus. dep.). Its meanings in vernacular Greek may be seen in Deissmann *LAE* 82 f. (*86 f.), Milligan on 1 Th 1^s: see also Lightfoot on Col 4¹².

Ποδήρης must mean *reaching to the feet* (dat. dep.), but its second element is not clear. The root of *ἀραρίσκω* is generally given, and may be right, though *feet-fitting* is not quite what we want. The *-ήρης* in *ἀμφήρης*, *ἐπήρης*, *τριήρης* al., is connected with the root of our *row*, *rudder*, and is less suitable still.

Προσωπολήμπτης is one of the few genuine examples of "Jewish Greek." It is a natural Greek coinage from the phrase *πρόσωπον λαμβάνειν* (accus. dep.), which was a literal rendering of *פְּנֵי נִשְׁבַּח*—a notion not provided with a real equivalent in Greek. *Prol.* 13 gives an estimate of the place of such locutions in the language. The compound (with *-ψία* and *-πτέω*) serves as a good illustration of the fact that word-composition was a resource of language still very much alive in Hellenistic.

Σκύβαλον (Ph 3^s) was a vernacular word, found in papyri. Wetstein gives a mass of passages from *Κοινή* literature, and one or two from earlier writers. The derivation from *σκῶρ* is quite impossible phonetically. The alternative (based on Suidas), that it is a contraction of *ἐς κύνας βαλεῖν*, as *σκορακίζω* is formed from *ἐε κόρακας*, is not to be vetoed so decisively: it might be a popular abbreviation, in form anticipating partly the MGr *στόν* for *ἐς τόν*, etc. In that case we have a compound with quasi-dative dependence. Popular association with *σκῶρ* might account for the predominance of the meaning *stercus*.

Σπερμολόγος *picking up seeds* (applied to a bird in Aristophanes and other writers) has accus. dependence: for the development of its meaning, see comms. on Ac 17¹⁸.

Συκοφάντης (whence *τέω*) *fig-showing* (accus. dep.) seems clear in its composition, but the meaning of the metaphor which thus describes an *informer* is still uncertain.

Φρεναπάτης *mind-deceiving* (accus. dep.), *conceited*. Blass (*Gr.* 68) notes its occurrence in P Grenf i. 1¹.¹⁰ (ii/B.C.), a literary text.

Χειροτόνος (hence *έω*) *stretching the hand* (*Æschylus*) has accus. dependence.

Χορηγός (*χορός* + *άγός*) *chorus-bringing* or *-leading*, originally used mostly of the equipment of a chorus (a *λειτουργία* at Athens), was early generalised to mean *one who supplies* the cost for anything. The irregular *η* (following *ρ*) is probably due to the analogy of other compounds in *-ηγός*, rather than to Ionic influence (see p. 68). (Cf. Brugmann *KVG* 304, 307, *Grd.*² II. i. 92.) In one of its meanings *ἀρχηγός* may belong here: see below, p. 277.

Descriptive Determinatives. § 106. IV. We come next to **Descriptive Determinatives** (Skt. *Karma-dhāraya*, a term of which the exact application is not certain—abbreviation K.D.). In these the first element is a noun, adjective, or adverb which describes the second element, standing to it in a predicate relation. We classify them naturally according to the character of the first element :

(a) Noun or adjective¹ or pronoun :—*αὐτόπτης self-seer*, *κωμόπολις village-town* (a *πόλις* that is little more than a *κώμη*—Strabo, Mk 1³⁸), *μεσότοιχος middle wall, barrier*, *ἀγριέλαιος wild olive*, *δόκαυτος burnt whole*. So in English *midsummer*, *ill-will*.

(b) A subdivision of (a) is required for compounds with numerals, like our *fortnight* : the Indian grammarians made a special class for these, called *Dvigu* (*two-cow*). In the nature of things these, if they belong to Class IV., can only be plural (except possible compounds of *one*, like the English t.t. *single-tax* : *μονογενής only born* might be classed here). Thus we have Latin *decemviri*, *centumviri*. Out of these arose a natural singular, not capable of analysis except by reference to its plural : thus *decemvir=one of a board of ten*. This is found in the NT *τετραάρχης, one of four rulers*. Compare the title *δεκάπρωτος*, found in papyri=*one of ten πρώτοι* (cf. Ac 28⁷), *δεκανός* (whence our *dean*).

(c) A large class has an adverb as first element. It may be the negative *ἀ-*, *ἀν-* (*ψ-*, Lat. *in-*, Eng. *un-*, Skt. *a-*, *an-* : the reduced form of *πῆ*) : so *ἀγνωστος unknown*, *ἄσοφος unwise*, etc. The second element might be a noun (like our *unfaith*) : thus in Sophocles *ἀμήτωρ=one who is no mother*. But these compounds have in Hellenistic all become possessive (Class V.) : *ἀπάτωρ=father unknown*,² *with no recorded father* (Heb 7³). *Εὖ* forms a good many compounds, as *εὐεργέτης well-doer, benefactor* ; so *δυσ-*, as *δυσβάστακτος hardly borne* (cf. our *mis-trust*), etc. Many prepositional cpds. belong to this class (IV.c),

¹ An interesting observation is made by Brugmann *KVG* 362 as to fem. cpds. with *-σ-* at the juncture, like *ἀκρόπολις*. He regards these as dating from a time when the adj. did not take a fem. termination to suit grammatical gender.

² So in the papyri, for illegitimates : see *Vocabulary s.v.*

though Classes V. and VII. are responsible for the major part of them: thus πρόσωπον *what is towards the eyes, face*, προπάτωρ *forefather*, ἐπ-ενδύτης *overcoat*. We will reserve prepositional compounds until we can classify them together. (See §§ 110–129.)

We proceed to comment on special cases:

Class (a). Ἀκροβυστία is not completely explained. Ἀκροποσθία, a normal Descriptive cpd. from ἄκρος and πόςθη with a fresh suffix, is found in Hippocrates, and is obviously the original of the LXX word. When a word containing a *vox obscena* was taken from medical vocabulary into popular religious speech, it was natural to disguise it: a rare word βύστρα=βύσμα may supply the model.

Ἀκρογωνιαίος presumes a (non-existent) ἀκρογωνία *extreme corner*.

Ἀκροθίνα, based on ἀκρόθινα (Pindar), *top heaps=top of a heap* (cf. Latin *summus mons*), *chief spoils*.¹

Ἀρεοπαγίτης depends formally on a cpd. Ἀρε(ι)όπαγος, which never had any real existence: it was at a late period formed afresh from Ἀρεοπαγίτης (for which cf. Meisterh.³ 61, also 43). Lobeck *Phryn.* 599 ff. successfully shows that in this and similar words the separate words were more in accord with Attic taste than the cpd.; but he totally fails in his attempt to eject the Descriptive altogether. His quotations illustrate that a locution containing two or three words was fused when a derived cpd. was wanted: cf. καλοκάγαθία and other cpds., while κυλοκάγαθος never occurs till very late (ii/A.D.). On this see Brugmann *KVG* 306, who compares *terramotium* from *terræ motus*, Ger. *langweilig* from *lange Weile* etc. So we make the compound *Free-Churchmanship* out of the separate *Free Church*.

Ἀρχηγός (cf. ἀρχάγγελος, ἀρχιερέυς) may have as its first element ἀρχι: the ι is elided before -ᾱγός (ἄγω)—for the η see above under χορηγός (p. 275). The alternative ἀρχε- (see Cl. VI.) has probably affected this prefix, and when it precedes vowels we cannot tell which of the two to presume, in the case of early words: ἀρχι- monopolised the late formations. Since there are two distinct functions for the prefix, according as it means *chief* (Cl. IV.) or *ruling* (Cl. VI.), it is reasonable to conjecture ἀρχι- as original in the adjectival and ἀρχε- in the verbal function, with some natural mixture resulting. How far ἀρχι- is primitive we can hardly say. It was shown by Caland and Wackernagel (see the latter's *Altind. Gramm.* ii. 59 ff.) that from I.E. times -i- replaced the adjective suffix -ro- in the first part of cpds., and perhaps replaced other suffixes. Cf. καλλι- cpds. (as καλλιθέλαιος) from καλός. In that case ἀρχι- will be either a primitive base-form, or made by analogy from ἀρχο-, the base of the noun ἀρχός. See Mayser 81. The great majority of the late ἀρχι-

¹ [Mr. E. E. Genner points out that the new LS gives ἀκροθίς as a subst. (like ἀκρόπολις) from a iv/B.C. inser. See Rüsck, *Gr. d. delph. Inschriften*, i. 216: ἀκροθίς *Erstlingsgabe*: τὰν ἀκρόθινα D⁴⁷.—ED.]

cpds. belong to Cl. IV. The old word ἀρχηγός shows fluctuation in meaning between *originator* and *leader*, according as the force of ἀρχεσθαι and ἄρχειν respectively predominates. The former may really go back to ἀρχή + ἄγος, *beginning-leader*, a cpd. of Cl. III.: the latter is Cl. IV., *supreme leader*. See *Vocabulary s.v.*

Αὐθέντης (whence αὐθεντέω *be master of, govern*) is a contracted form of the Sophoclean αὐτοέντης (= αὐτο-έντης from root of ἀνείν, Skt. *sanoti*, Lat. *sons*, our *sin*). The verb is branded as vulgar by Atticists, and is accordingly good vernacular, in the same sense as in 1 Tim 2¹². Latin and English join in giving the verb the nuance of our word *perpetrate*. The curious meaning "murderer" in classical writers comes from an entirely different word, derived from αὐτο-θίντης: see *Vocabulary s.v.* It is classed with αὐτόπτης as a cpd.

Δημιουργός, from δᾶμοφεργός, is as old as Homer. It seems to start from *public worker*, which developed in two different directions into (1) *craftsman*, (2) *magistrate* (in some Doric cities). Under (1) the idea of *skill* grew stronger—perhaps from the contrast of a publicly recognised workman, contrasted with one who only works for himself—and it becomes in philosophy a name for the Creator: cf. Philo *De Somn.* 13 fin. (p. 632 M.), where it is contrasted with the higher title κτίστης. It is natural to think that the author of Heb 11¹⁰ was at least semi-conscious of this.

Ἱεράπολις and Νεάπολις are printed *divisim* by WH: in Col 4¹² the MSS cannot help us, in Ac 16¹¹ CD* are quotable (with the mob) for the cpd. form. Blass's "sic *divisim antiquiores*" is a useless remark, since Luke was not an "antiquior." On the whole, however, the oldest uncials may be allowed to decide, though the tendency to fuse these phrases into cpds. was strong by this time. Μεγαλόπολις, for example, occurs in Strabo (i/v.c.). Ramsay (*C. and B.* ii. p. 681) shows that *Hieropolis* was the local name, and a sign of imperfect Hellenisation.

[Καλοδιδάσκαλος in Tit 2³, being a ἄ.λ., might be taken as *noble teacher*; but this would probably be *καλλιδιδάσκαλος, and the other cpds. of διδάσκαλος belong to Cl. III.]

Κράσπεδον is an old cpd., apparently of this class, from the stem to which κέρας, κέρα and κρά(σ)νιον belong: *utmost edge* seems the meaning.

Λειτουργός, from λήιτο-εργός (Blass *Gr.* 8), is later in its attestation than its formal derivatives (-έω and -ια). Λήιτον occurs in Herodotus (vii. 197) for a set of public offices: this connotation would suggest a clerk in government service as the oldest meaning. It is curious to note how far it has diverged from the very similar δημιουργός.

Μεσημβρία, from μέσος and an ablaut form of ἡμαρ, ἡμέρα, answers to our *mid-day*.

Μεσουράνημα, *mid-heaven*, in Rev 8¹², is from the verb μεσουρανέω *to culminate*, of heavenly bodies crossing the meridian, but the presumable base *μεσουράνος is not quotable, and may never have existed.

Νεομηνία *new-moon*, or rather the *day of the new moon*, is a derivative rather than a direct Descriptive cpd.

Νεόφυτος *new plant*, or *newly planted*, might equally well be put with (c) below.

Πανήγυρις, like some other cpds. of πᾶς, loses the τ of the stem by the influence of the neuter πᾶν, but keeps the original ᾶ. *General assembly* represents the meaning.

Πανοικί is the locative of an unused *πανοικός, which would mean *whole house*: cf. πανστρατιῶ, πανοικία. Πανοικί comes under the ban of the Atticists (Lobeck *Phryg.* 514). No doubt it was formed on the analogy of other locatives in -εί (ἀμισθεί etc.), by substituting οἶκος for οἰκία; nor need we suppose that such formations were ever used in the nom. or other cases, being called into being only for the adverb.

Πέρυσι is another locative without other cases in use, but it is of prehistoric antiquity. Its first element is the primitive pronoun *pero* = *other*, Skt. *para*: cf. πέραν, *perendie*, *perperam*, Eng. *far* etc.: the second is the locative of *yet* (cf. *Feros*, *vetus*) = *year*, with weak grade. The Skt. *parut* has the same meaning, and only differs by the absence of the locative suffix -i.

Πρῶτος forms a good many cpds. of this class, as in NT πρωτοκαθεδρία, πρωτοκλισία, πρωτοστάτης. Πρωτότοκος *first-born* forms the further noun πρωτοτόκια (pl.). Πρωτοτόκος = *bearing a firstborn* is an older word, which is still quotable in ritual language of iii/ii B.C. (*Syll.* 615¹⁶, or *Syll.* 1024¹⁶ ἔν ἐγκύμονα πρωτοτόκον). Isidore of Pelusium (*Lightfoot Col.* p. 150) proposed to use this for the *crux* in Col 1¹⁸, *gs.* "the *first author* of all creation"; but his admission that he was innovating must be noted, and Lightfoot's exegesis may be maintained—see also Peake *EGT* in *loc.*

Σαρδόνυξ, χρυσόλιθος, χρυσόπρασος and the cpds. in ψευδο- (exc. two of Cl. V.) are words of this class that need no comment.

Σήμεραν is an adverb (accus.) like πέρυσι. Its termination is an adj. suffix; and the σ- represents a pronoun κίσ- "this," compared by Brugmann *KVG* 401 with O.E. *hiu-diga* (Ger. *Heute*) "to-day." Hence *σσήμερον, Attic *ττήμερον, whence the initial consonant was reduced.

[Ἐκληροκαρδία might belong to this class, if = "hard heart." It is better taken as Possessive (Cl. V.) in origin, = *hard-heartedness*.]

Συροφονίκισσα in Mk 7²⁶ ΝΑΛΔ stands against Σύρα Φοινίκισσα Βω and Σύρα Φοίνισσα W *al.*—the last probably an Atticist correction. Συροφόνιξ occurs in Lucian (cf. also Juvenal)—see Grimm-Thayer—and is the natural antithesis to Λιβυφόνιξ.

Φθινοπωρινός (Jude 13: see J. B. Mayor's *excursus*, pp. 55 ff.) is a time-adjective (p. 358 below) from φθινόπωρον, which is a *double* cpd. of this class. Ὀπώρα = *late season* (ῶρα orig. = *spring*, but generalised); its first part is the ὄπ- of ὄψέ, ὄπισσω, ὄπισθεν, the association with which has ejected the φ that would be regular. In usage this season opened as early as July; and a new word was needed to describe the autumn proper. The adj. φθινός and cpds. in φθινο- show that the present-

stem φθιν- was accompanied by an adj. base (perhaps merely analogical) containing the ν. The season is therefore ὀπώρα φθίνουσα (like μηνὸς φθίνοντος, of the days following the 20th). So ἰσημερία ἡ φθινοπωρινή (Aristotle)=the autumnal equinox. Pomifer autumnus finds these trees ἄκαρπα.

Καλλοκίβανος, ἀ.λ. in Rev 1¹⁶ and 2¹⁸, is explained by Hort as "brass-like λίβανος," i.e. amber, and so "the glowing metal named from amber by this name as well as by ἤλεκτρον." If this view of the word be taken, it is a noun of the Descriptive class. See Hort's note, also Swete's *in loc.*

Ψευδῆς forms ψευδάδελφος, ψευδαπόστολος, ψευδόμεαρτυρ, ψευδοπροφήτης, ψευδόχριστος.

Class (b). On the whole it seems best to transfer to the next class all the remaining nouns under this head, as being essentially adjectival. Thus δίδραχμον is (an amount) of two drachmæ; διετής is the neuter of an adj.=lasting two years; ἡμίωρον is (a space) of half an hour. The only exception then will be the τετραάρχης type described above.

Class (c). Descriptive compounds in which the first element is an adverb—a term which of course includes prepositions—need not be catalogued in full. The prepositional cpds. will be reserved for the next chapter, so that we may bring together all the combinations in which the several prepositions are concerned. First come the cpds. made with the negative prefix. In the great majority of cases this was from I.E. times η, the weak grade of né, which in Greek became ἀ-, as ἀ-γνω(σ)τος =i(n)-gnotus, unknown; ἀκων (ἀ-φέκων)=un-willing; or ἀν- before vowels, as ἀν-άξιος=un-worthy. That né in the high grade could be compounded with nouns, adjectives and participles is proved by such formations as ne-fas, nēmo (ne-hemo), our naught (=not one wight or whit—see Skeat *E.D.*). Even verbs were once capable of taking this prefix: there is no essential difference between ne-scio, nōlo (ne-volo) and οὐκ οἶδα, οὐ θέλω, except that the former have become one word. A restriction of η to nouns, adjectives and participles had established itself in I.E. times; ἀ-δύνατος, im-potens, un-witting, are normal; but we do not find ἀ-δύναμαι, im-possum, or the like. In Greek this restriction excluded even participles when they still belonged to a verb system—ἀκων is found, but not ἀδυνάμενος.¹ (The verbal in -τος does not originally belong to the verb system proper: see *Prol.* 221 f.) One class of words still maintains (according to Brugmann *KVG* 310) the old né, viz. words where there is δ, ζ, ὀ in Anlaut, which sometimes took né instead of η. Thus νήκεστος from νε+ἀκεσ- (ἀκέομαι) etc.: from these forms, with initial νη- (νᾱ-) as the result of contraction, came such words as νη-πιος (= -πF-ιος, cf. νη-πίτιος)² unintelligent, infant. This account is not wholly satisfactory as an explanation of the prefix νᾱ- or νη-, but no other is forthcoming that will do as well, unless we revert to the theory

¹ There are rare exceptions, like ἀπιστεύσας in P Oxy ii. 237 v.⁶ (A.D. 186).

² The old etym. νη- + Fέπιος word is impossible, as an uncontracted form must have occurred in Homer.

of the long vowel α producing $\nu\alpha$. Among the Cl. IV. cpds. with δ - we need only name one or two.

**Άγνοια* may be from *ἀγνώσ*, if we may assume this to combine an earlier **ἀγνώσ* with the stem in *-r-* (gen. *ἀγνώστος*): *ἀγνοέω* presumes the same.

**Άδημονέω* is a problem imperfectly solved. T. W. Allen (*CR* xx. 5) takes it from *ἀδήμων* (Hippocrates, 1 cod.), the negative of a presumed *δήμων* *prudent*, traceable in proper names, as Dor. *Δάμων*, familiar in pastoral poetry. This he takes from *δέδαε*, that is $\sqrt{\delta\alpha\sigma}$ (perh. from *dems*—Skt. *damsis̥tha*), **δάσμων* becoming *δάμων* regularly. We might take the original meaning of *ἀδήμων* to be *bewildered*: cf. the association of *ἀδημονῶν* and *ἀπορῶν* in Plato (see LS).

**Άόρατος*, not *ἀν-*, because of the *F* in *Forάω* (cf. Eng. *ware*).

**Άσωτος* not *salvable*, *past saving*, *dissolute*: on this connotation of the *-τος* verbal see *Proleg.* 222.

Other cpds. may be taken as they come. **Άγανακτέω* is not completely explained, but it may possibly depend on an (unused) Descriptive **ἀγανάκτης* *greatly angry*: *ἀγαν* is supposed to be a reduced form of *μέγας* (cf. *ingens*, both thus from *ηγρή*), and the second element I should tentatively regard as an agent noun from $\sqrt{\alpha\chi}$ (*ἄχομαι*) *grieve*.

Διχοτόμος (whence *διχοτομέω* *cut in two*) is from *δίχα* *a-two*: its derivatives are from the active paroxytone, but the adj. appears earlier as *διχότομος* passive = "hewyne in to" (*Chevy Chase*).

Δυσ- cpds. are primitive: in Skt. we have not only the prefix *duṣ* but also the noun *doṣa*, *harm*. Cf. also Gothic prefix *tuz-*. Of doubtful history is *δύσκολος* (*morose*, in NT simply *difficult*). Osthoff (*IF* iv. 281), on *βουκόλος*, makes probable the existence of an I.E. \sqrt{qel} (with pure velar) "to keep, tend," found with an extension in our *hold*. The synonymous *q'el* of Latin *colo* would serve equally well, since *εὔκολος* (with *v* preceding the labiovelar—see Giles *Manual*³ 132) would determine the form of its correlate (**δύσπολος* otherwise). The meaning seen in *colo* (e.g. *patronum* or *deum*) would suit the Greek very well: *δύσκολος* would be one who *ἀνθρώπων οὐκ ἐντρέπεται*, so *disagreeable*.

Over against these *δυσ-* compounds stands the more numerous family of *εὖ*. This adverb performs the same function as the Skt. *su-*, but it does not seem possible to equate them. It is assigned by the best authorities (see Boisacq *Lex.* 298 f.) to a primitive *esu-s*, which makes Gaulish *Esogen(us)* (Welsh *Owen*¹) = *Εὐγένιος*. *Su-* appears in *ὕ-γιής*, from $\sqrt{g^h\tilde{e}}$ *live*, whence *ζῆν* and *βίος*. (Cf. also the probably Iranian proper name which in O. Pers. would be *U-frāta*, *Εὐ-φράτης*, *qs.* **εὐπλητος* well-filled.) *Εὐαγγέλιον* depends on the Descriptive *εὐάγγελος* *well-reporting*, *good-news-bringer*. Though its application to the news itself instead of the messenger's reward or the thanksgiving to the gods is not found in classical

¹[Mr. E. E. Genner observes that Welsh *Owen* is commonly derived from *Eugenius* direct, as *Emrys* = *Ambrosius*, where an "Ancient British" etymology seems impossible.—ED.]

Greek, the more general sense of this derivative is current in ordinary Hellenistic and may be independent: it may even be a Descriptive taken directly from *εὐ-αγγελία*, with the decl. changed. [*Εὐδοκία* seems to start from *εὐδοκέω*, which will be treated under Cl. VII.] *Εὐωχέω* (whence *συνευωχεῖσθαι*) may be classed here if it originates in a cpd. *εὐωχος* (not found): this would be from *εὐ*+*-ωχος* (gradation of *ἔχω*), with the vowel lengthened in composition on analogy (cf. on *χορηγός*, p. 275)—the meaning would be *treating well*. Other cpds. of *εὐ* belonging to Cl. IV. are *εὐάρεστος well-pleasing*, *εὐγενής well-born* (or Cl. V. *having good "birth"*—see p. 287), *εὐθετος well-placed*, *εὐλαβής handling well, cautious, reverent*, *εὐμετάδοτος readily distributing*, *εὐπάρεδρος assiduous*, *εὐπειθής obedient*, *εὐπορος well-faring* (hence *ῥέω* and *ῥία*), *εὐσεβής pious*, *εὐχάριστος grateful*, *εὐχρηστος serviceable*. *Εὐποιία* need not imply a non-existent *εὐποιος well-doing*, but may be formed on analogy. *Εὐτράπελος versatile*, hence *witty* and (*in mal. part.*) *ribald* (whence *ᾠία*) comes from *τρέπω*: the adj. **τράπελος* is not found, but is guaranteed by its Latin equivalent *torculus* (*τροχῆλος*)—both=*turning*, but they are applied in different ways (Brugmann *Gr.*⁴ 231).

Εὐπερίστατος, *ἀ.λ.* in Heb 12¹, is a well-known *crux*. To the material given in Westcott's note need be added only the fact that in vernacular Greek (see Deissmann *BS* 150) *περίστασις* often means *distress, evil circumstances*: we sometimes use *circumstances* with the same suggestion. This is what Theophylact was thinking of in explaining *εὐπ.* "because of which one easily falls into distresses (*περιστάσεις*)." I do not quite understand Westcott's objection to Chrysostom's "what can easily suffer *περίστασις* i.e. *removal*." "The cpd. could not lose the *-ι*: it must be formed from *στατός*." No doubt, but we should expect *περίστατος* and *-σις* to have kindred meanings. We are at liberty to give the verbal in *-τος* either active or passive force, the root being intransitive (*Proleg.* 221 f.). From the form it does not seem that there is any fatal objection to (1) *easily avoided*, (2) *admired* (lit. *well-surrounded*), (3) *easily surrounding, besetting*, or (4) *dangerous* (lit. *having easy distress*). This last (Theophylact's) implies that *τὸ περίστατον* got the sense of *περίστασις* in *malam partem*, so that the cpd. becomes a Possessive (based on Cl. IV.a).

Εὐθύδρομος (whence *ἔω*) may be put here as a cpd. of *εὐθύ*, *straight-running*. But as in other cases where an adj. seems used adverbially, we might get the same result by applying the Possessive, based on a Descriptive *straight run*.

Ἡμιθανής=*half dead*: we can hardly class this with the numeral cpds.

Μογίλαλος speaking with difficulty, and *παλιγγενεσία re-generation*, are both simple *exx.* of the present class.

Ταλαίπωρος has in the first place a form from the root of *τάλας* etc. which seems to recur in the Gothic *pulains, patience*: cf. *ταλαίφρων* beside *ταλάφρων*. The *πρός* presumed for the second half—apparently the

gradation of *πηρός disabled*—does not show itself outside the notes of ancient scholiasts and grammarians, who may be etymologising.

Τηλαυγής *far-shining* or *far-discerned*, according as *αἰγή* or *αἰγάζω* is to guide our interpretation of the second part.

Possessive. § 107. V. Possessive Compounds are called in Skt. *Bahu-vrīhi* (B.V.), a term which

illustrates the class: as a K.D. it would mean "much rice," but it has developed instead the possessive sense, "having much rice." These cpds. can be based on any of the foregoing classes, a distinction being made in the earliest times by change of accent. Thus in Skt. *rāja-putrá* (Rajput)=*king's son*, a T.P. (Cl. III.); *rājá-putra*=*having a king for son*, a B.V. So in Greek *θηρο-τρόφος*=*feeding wild beasts* (Cl. III.), while *θηρό-τροφος*=*having wild beasts as food* (Cl. V.). Brugmann (*Grd.*² II. i. 75) shows that the accenting of the first element in a Possessive cpd. goes back to I.E. though comparatively few traces are left in Greek: this is a natural consequence of the Greek restriction of the accent to the last three syllables of a word, a restriction unknown to Skt. and to Germanic in its earliest stages. Brugmann, however, insists that the Possessive class is not to be regarded as secondary: it is as old as the other classes.

Based on Cl. I.—Possessives related to Cl. I. can hardly be illustrated from the NT, unless we treat *νυχθήμερον* as the adverbial acc. of an adj. =*including a day and a night*. Here as in many other Possessives the line separating this class from others is rather unreal.

On Cl. III.—*Ἄγραυλος* (whence *ἰλέω*) is perhaps best taken as =*with dwelling (αὐλή) in the fields*: it might, however, be Cl. IV.

Ἀυτόχειρ is probably based on a Cl. III. noun *hand of himself*, hence *with his own hand*.

Cpds. ending in *-ώδης* (*γραώδης anile*, *δαμονιώδης devilish*, *θειώδης of brimstone*, *πετρώδης rocky*) belong to this class if Wackernagel is right (see Giles *Manual*² 349) in comparing this suffix with that which meets us in *εὐώδης* (whence *ῥῖα*) *fragrant*, from *√ od* of *ὄζω, oleo, odor*. *Θειώδης* thus =*having scent of brimstone*, and the suffix lost its special limitation through its likeness to the *-ώδης* produced by contraction of *-o-* with *-ειδής* (from *εἶδος*).¹

On Cl. IV.—The great majority of Possessives in the NT are closely connected with the Descriptives, from which it is often impossible decisively to separate them.

¹ [See also p. 376 below, and Debrunner's note, *Wortb.* 196 n.¹.—ED.]

To IV. (a) belong the following:—*Αἰσχροκερδής* *having base gain*. As in the case of *πλεονέκτης* above, there is a desiderative tone imported, for the word is normally *turpi-lucri-cupidus* (as Plautus renders it).

[*Αἰσχρολογία* is best taken from *αἰσχρολόγος*, which may be analysed *turpia loquens*, Cl. III., or *having foul speech*, Cl. V. So *ματαιολόγος* *idle talker*.]

Ἄλλογενής of another *γένος*, and *ἀλλόφυλος* of another *φυλή*.

Ἀριστόβουλος (pr. name) = *having excellent counsel*.

Βαρύτιμος = *having heavy price*.

**Βραδύπλοος* may be assumed for *βραδυπλοέω* *having a slow voyage*. (Here as in other such cases we do not assume that the postulated word really existed: when an analogy was started, words would often skip a stage.)

Ἐτερόγλωσσος = *using a strange language*. [The other two cpds. of *ἕτερος* seem to belong to Cl. III., viz. *ἑτεροδιδάσκαλος* (whence *ἕλω*) *teacher of strange things*, and *ἑτερόζυγος* (whence *ἕγω*) *yoked to a stranger*.]

Ζώπυρον (whence *ῥέω*)¹ *spark*, or *bellows*, seems to be from *ζῶρ*, = *what has live fire*: hence the verb means *kindle to flame*.

Ἱεροπρεπής *having sacred seemliness, reverent*, might be Cl. III. (dat. dependence) *beseeming what is sacred*. *Μεγαλοπρεπής* *having great seemliness, majestic*, belongs here.

Κακοήθης (whence *ῥθία*) = *having evil nature, malicious*.

Μακροχρόνιος *having long time*, has an additional adjective suffix *-ιος*—a superfluity not uncommon in these cpds., both in Greek and Skt.

Μετριοπαθής (whence *ῥέω*) is the antithesis of *ἀπαθής*, = *μέτρια τὰ πάθη ἔχων*. So *ὁμοιοπαθής* *with like nature*.

Three cpds. of *ὀλίγος* come here, viz. *ὀλιγόπιστος* *little-faith*, *ὀλιγόψυχος* *little-souled, faint-heart*, and *ὀλιγώρος* (whence *ῥέω*, from *ᾧρα*) *little-caring*.

**Όλος* forms *ὀλόκληρος* *having parts entire*, and *ὀλοτελής* *having entire completeness*. Like the last is *παντελής*.

From the base *ὁμό-* (whence *ὁμοῦ*, *ὁμοιος* etc., = E. *same*—gradation form of *οἰ-* (*εἶς*) and *ση* (*ἀ-παξ* etc.)) come *ὁμόθυμος* (whence *ῥμαδόν*) *one-minded*; *ὁμόλογος* (whence *ῥγέω*, *ῥγία*) *having one speech*, and so *agreed* (or *same-speaking*, Cl. III.); *ὁμορος* (whence *συναμορέω*) *having same boundary*; *ὁμότεχνος* *having same trade*; *ὁμόφρων* of *one mind*. With the last cf. *σώφρων* *having sound mind* and *ὑψηλόφρων* (whence *ῥφρονέω*) (*high-minded*). We find in papyri *ὁμότυπος*, *having one impression*, i.e. *duplicate copy*.

Ὀρθόπους (whence *ῥποδέω*) *having straight feet*.

Πάνοπλος (whence *ῥία*) *having full armour*.

[*Παντοκράτωρ*, if it means *having all strength*, belongs here. But

¹ [*ἀραξωπυρέω* 2 Tim 1⁶. Simplex not in NT.—ED.]

the termination is probably adjectival, a gradation variant of *κρατερός*, so that the cpd. goes into Cl. IV., *All-mighty*.]

Πιθανολόγος (whence *ῥία*) *having persuasive speech*, has the same doubtful classification as the other *-λογος* cpds.

Πολλαπλασίων *having many folds, manifold*, has extra suffix *-ιος*, and the individualising *-ων*: its base *πλατ* is from *πλ*, whence our *fold*. Other cpds. of *πολύς* have the base *πολυ-*. So *πολυλόγος* (whence *ῥία*) *much-speaking*; *πολυμερής* (adv. only) *having many parts*; *πολυποίκιλος* *having much varied*; *πολύσπλαγχνος* *having much compassion* (so *εὐσπλαγχνος*); *πολυτελής* *having great cost*, so *πολύτιμος*; *πολύτροπος* (adv. only) *having many ways*.

Πραῦπαθής (whence *ῥθεια*) *having gentle nature*: cf. the other cpds. of *πάθος*.

Ῥαδιουργός (whence *ῥγημα* and *ῥγία*)=*having easy* (and so *reckless*) *works*: it might equally well be Cl. III. *doing reckless things*, or Cl. IV. *reckless worker*.

Σκληροτράχηλος *stiff-necked* is like *σκληροκαρδία* (see above, p. 279).

Σκυθρωπός=*with gloomy face*.

Σῶς, from *σάφος* (= *τιανος*, cf. Skt. *tuvi* "strong"), answers in meaning to *sanus*, "sturdy." It forms a good many proper names, as *Σωσθένης* from *σθένος*: *Σώπατρος* *having a healthy father* (or, *having his father safe*), will be a name given by the father because of auspicious omen for himself. *Σώφρων*=*healthy minded*: cf. other cpds. of *φρήν* above, p. 284.

Χρυσοδακτύλιος=*having gold δακτύλιον* (*ring* or *rings*).

Ψευδής or its root makes in this class *ψευδολόγος* *with false speech* (but cf. above) and *ψευδώνυμος* *with false name*.

To IV. (b) belong the following (as explained above):

One (1) *ση*, weak grade of *sem* (*eis*=*sems*, *μία*=*smia* etc.).

Ἄδελφός, like *ἄλοχος* etc., has lost its breathing: there was a powerful analogic influence in *ἀ-* privative, and probably also in *ἀ-* from *ϕ*, the reduced form of the prep. *en*. It is *ση-g*elbos* "having one womb."

[*Ἀκέραιος* has been plausibly explained as *ση-kers-ιος* "having one growth," differing only in gradation from Lat. *sin-cērus*. But the etymology has been disputed by such authorities as Brugmann and Osthoff: it may be safer (with Boisacq *Dict. Étym.* 35) to interpret *undamaged* (cf. *κεραίω* etc.), or again *unmixed* (*κεράννυμι*).]

Ἀκόλουθος (whence *ῥέω*) is *ση+κείλευθος* *path*, so *having one way, on the same way*.

Ἄπας, Skt. *raçvant* (= *sa-çvant* by assimilation), is a stronger form of *ῥās*.

Ἄπλοῦς (cf. *διπλοῦς*, Lat. *duplus*, Ger. *Zweifel* ("double mind," doubt)) has a somewhat doubtful second element (see Hirt *Gram.* § 372). Perhaps the element *πλο* (seen in Latin) is increased by different suffixes, *-ο-* in Gk. *-πλόφος*, *-το-* or *-τιο-* in Greek *-πλάτιος* (*διπλάσιος*, *πολλαπλασίων*) and Gothic *aínfalps* (our *-fold*), *-k-* in Lat. *simplex*. A further element

is seen in *ἐπαξ*, presumably a case (which, is not certain) of a cpd. = *having one thrust* (πήγνυμι fix): cf. Ger. *einfach*.¹

(2) *Μόνος* gives us *μονόφθαλμος* with *one eye*. *Μονογενής* (see above) might also be classed as meaning of *single birth*.

Two takes in Greek cpds. the form δι- (=δφι-, formed in prehistoric times on analogy of *tri-*; cf. Lat. *bi-*=*dui-*, etc.). So δι-δυμος *των* (cf. ἀμφί-δυμος *entered on both sides*, νήδυμος *enfolding* (sleep): the root is that of δῖω—see Brugmann in *IF* xi. 283,² and below, p. 305, on ἐνδύω)—δίδραχμος of *two drachmae* (see p. 280), διετής of *two years* (ib.), διθαλάσσιος (with added suffix) *with two seas*, δίλογος *double-tongued*, διπλοῦς *double* (see above), δίστομος *two-edged* (στόμα as in Heb 11³⁴ al.), δίψυχος *with two selves*.

Three is τρι-, in τρίβολος (*three-pointed*, so as a noun) *caltrop*, τρίκλινος (whence ἀρχιτρ.) (a room) *with three couches*, τρίμηνος *three months long*, τρίστεγος *with three storeys*, or *belonging to the third storey* (a noun in Ac 20⁹).

Four occurs in its most reduced form (q^uτηρ, πτρα-) in τράπεζα *four-footed* (table). Less primitive cpds. show τετρα- (q^uτηρ, cf. Gothic *fidur-*): so τετράγωνος *four-cornered*, τετράμηνος *four months long*, τετραπλοῦς *fourfold* (see above), τετράπους *four-footed*. A curious analogy-product results from this last: the association of domestic animals and slaves in the household gave birth to ἀνδράποδα to stand by τετράποδα—in such a sense the word was first wanted in the collective plural: cf. the 3rd decl. dat. ἀνδραπόδεσσι in its earliest occurrence, *Iliad* vii. 475. (Hence ἀνδραποδίξω “to kidnap,” and noun ἀνδραποδιστής.)

Eight from Hesiod down makes cpds. in ὀκτα- (cf. πεντα-, ἕξα-, following ἐπτά etc.). So the NT ἀλ. ὀκτα-ἡμέρος (Ph 3⁵) *on the eighth day*, *eight days old*.

Ten appears in Δεκάπολις (sc. χώρα) *having ten cities*:³ cf. Ἑπτακωμία, a district named in a i/v.c. papyrus (*Archiv* v. 38).

Twelve makes δωδεκάφυλος *having twelve tribes*.

Forty, like 2 and 100, forms a cpd. with *Féros year*, τεσσαρακονταετής *forty years old*.

Hundred, besides ἑκατονταετής, makes ἑκατονταπλασίων *hundredfold*. The base follows τριάκοντα etc.

To IV. (c) belong many cpds. with ἀ- privative, of which only a few need be named.

**Ἄβυσσος* (*βυσσός bottom*, cf. *βυθός*), sc. χώρα, *the bottomless place*.

¹ Brugmann (*IF* xi. 283) thinks πλός *voyage* was used in a metaphor—like δ δεύτερος πλός “a second string to my bow”—and then extended when its meaning was forgotten.

² Brugmann thinks the meaning was obscured in prehistoric times, like that of ἀρλοῦς. May not the connexion he himself makes with τηδός *womb* have helped the specialising of its meaning?

³ Cf. for this ellipsis τὴν δεκάπληγον (sc. τιμηρίαν) P Par 574¹⁰⁰⁷.

'Αγενής *having no "birth"* (in the conventional sense), so *ignoble*: opposite of εὐγενής.

[Ἄκριβής may be mentioned simply to say that its etymology is not known: for some guesses see Boisacq.]

'Αληθής from √ of λήθω, λανθάνω, *having no mistake, true*.

'Ανοους *mindless* (whence ἄνοια): cf. εὐνοους etc.

'Ανωφελής *profitless*, from ὄφελος: for the lengthening of the ο, cf. Boisacq, 732.

'Απρόσκοπος *without προσκοπή*, is either active *not causing to stumble*, or passive *not stumbling, void of offence*.

'Αργός, originally ἀΐργός, = *without work*.

[Ἄσελγής (whence ἀσέλγεια) is of unknown origin. The popular etymology connecting it with θέλω is probably responsible for the spelling ἀσελγία in BGU iv. 1024^{v.17} (iv/v A.D.).]

'Αστοχος (whence ἔω) *having no aim*.

'Ασχήμων, from σχῆμα with its final -μν replaced by the long grade -μῶν, = *without due form, unseemly*.

'Ατοπος *having no place, strange*: in Hellenistic developed into *wrong*.

'Αφελής (whence ἄλγης *simpliçity*) seems rightly connected with φελίς, φέλλια (pl.)—the form is imperfectly preserved—= *stony ground*: ἀφελής appears in Aristophanes as an epithet of a *smooth plain*.

'Αχρεῖος (the derivative ἀχρεῖω drops ι in NT) is formed from χρεῖα, a primitive noun = *use*, with suffix -ιος: cf. Ion. ἀχρήσιος.

One word needs adding that is formed with νέ, viz. νῆστις *having no eating* (*ἴστις from √ εἶ), *hungry*.

Passing from the negative words, we come to miscellaneous items.

Δυσ- forms δυσέντερος (which may be assumed as base of ῥία, ῥιον), *having the έντερα wrong*: the word is late, and was very likely remade. Also δύσφημος (see below).

Εἶ forms a good many, of which we can name without comment εὐγενής *well-born* (see on ἀγενής), εὐθυμος *good-tempered, cheerful*, εὐκαιρος *well-timed*, εὐκοπος *with easy labour, easy*, εὐνοους (whence εὐνοια, εὐνοέω) *good-minded, friendly*, εὐδοος *with prosperous path* (whence ὄδω *make prosperous*), εὐπρόσωπος (whence ὄπρω) *with fair show, specious*, εὐσημος *having easy signification, intelligible*, εὐσπλαγχνος *kind-tempered, compassionate*, εὐσχήμων *respectable* (see on ἀσχήμων above), εὐστονος (τεῖνω), *well-strung, vigorous*, εὐφρων (whence εὐφραίνω and εὐφροσύνη) *happy-minded, merry*, εὐψυχος (whence ἔψω) *of good courage*, εὐώδης (whence ὄδια) *well-smelling*. Εὐδῖος (fem. used as noun) contains the weak grade of Ζεὺς (*dîeys*, the personification of the bright sky) = *having fair sky*. Εὐφήμος by etymology means *with good φήμη, with auspicious sound*, as opposed to δύσφημος (whence ῥία and ῥέω) *inauspicious*. The words were not without a wider use, and in 2 Co 6⁹ presumably bear this: in Ph 4⁸ a suggestion of the earlier association may well survive. Εὐάνυμος

well-named is a conspicuous example of εὐφημισμός: the *left hand*, which in Greek augury was unlucky, was called ἀριστερά *better* or εὐάνυμος *lucky* in the hope that it might answer to its name.

§ 108. VI. A name for the next class is not
Verbal. easy to find: we may call it **Verbal**, *faute*

de mieux. Its characteristic is that the determining element governs the other as a verb does. This does not prevent its having the characteristics of a noun or adjective. Since in Composition we deal mostly with stems that will serve Noun or Verb equally, the line is not easy to draw; and there is a whole class, the Determinatives with accus. dependence, which has been dealt with above, but must be noted as logically coming here.

(A) Verb The class is divided according as the verbal
Second. element stands first or second. A. Cpds. with

verbal element in the second place include (1) a few in which a group of noun+governing verb has been contracted into a single word. Thus ζῶργέω starts from ζῶν ἀργεῖν "to take alive": the stem—*casus indefinitus* as Hirt describes it, since it will stand in any case relation or none—is substituted for the full word. As Hatzidakis suggests (*Einkl.* 227),¹ we have a trace of this mode of word-formation when a second element with verbal function is reduplicated for the perfect, without regard to its history: ἵπποτετρόφηκεν occurs in Lycurgus (iv/B.C.), though τροφέω does not exist, and if it did would govern an accus. This class of course is only treated here because we must register exceptions to the general rule that cpd. verbs, if not formed by joining a "proper" preposition to an existing verb, can only come into being through a cpd. noun or adjective.

It is likely enough that there are some other exceptions not provided for in our general theory. Thus such a word as ἀποκεφαλίζω, used in secular Hellenistic (Philodemus, Arrian), but not found earlier than in LXX, may be got from a presumed *ἀποκέφαλος *having the head off*. But the analogy of our own *behead* (*by+head*) suggests the probability of a direct coinage without this intermediary: the preposition then plays

¹ [Hatzidakis cites "Lykurg. 139 nach allen Codicibus." Mr. E. E. Genner, who points out that the latest Teubner emends it to the correct form, contests the attribution to Lyc. himself.—ED.]

the part of a verb (cf. *ava up* /), and the cpd. gains resemblance to those in Class B below. (See, further, § 109.)

(2) The bulk of the cpds. in this division are the Cl. III. words in which the second element has a strongly verbal force—such as *φωσ-φόρος*, *Luci-fer*, *light-bringer*. This noun is in fact an agent noun, or sometimes an action noun, as we have *day-spring*. It is largely a matter of indifference whether we do or do not transfer here a considerable number of the Cl. III. words, and not only those with accus. dependence. *Cave-dwelling* and *cave-inhabiting* cannot be classed apart, though *cave* in the first represents a locative and in the second an accusative. Brugmann notes (*Grd.*² II. i. 63) that *agri-cola* may be taken either as a Verbal cpd. = *agrum colens* or as a Determinative = *agri cultor*. It will not be necessary to deal further with this class, as the principle of it may be borne in mind while placing the Determinatives.

(B) Verb First. B. Cpds. with the verbal element standing first. There are two formations of this order which come down from I.E. times, though

they are not productive of new formations in Hellenistic. In (1) the verb stands in the same form as the imperative: thus *ἄρχε-λαός* *ruling the people*—the same sense can be obtained from a Cl. III. form, as *πολιτ-άρχης*. In (2) the form coincides with the stem of an action-noun in *-ti*, as *μεμψι-μοῖρος* *complaining of one's lot*. These action-nouns supply infinitives in Vedic Skt., and in Latin they can govern an accus. (cf. *hanc tactio* in Plautus). Brugmann (*Grd.*² II. i. 64) regards them as infinitives with imperative function, so that both classes start from an exclamatory phrase. Such a noun as our *skinflint* could obviously arise from a sarcastic imperative turned into a nickname: cf. *lie-a-bed*, *cut-throat*, *knock-kneed* (with adj. suffix), *tumble-down*, *forget-me-not*, as varied exx. of the way such cpds. could originate.

The form of words in the first division has been largely affected by the strength of the tendency to make *o* the vowel at the juncture. This goes with the fact that some pure noun-stems acquire in composition a strongly verbal meaning. *Μῖσο-*, *νικο-*, *τιμο-*, *φιλο-* are not verbal bases at all: the verbs connected with them are secondary derivatives. Strictly

speaking, φιλάδελφος=*having a loved brother*, Cl. IV. This classification will not suit the other three bases named: it seems best to suppose that since φιλάδελφος so clearly meant φιλῶν ἀδελφόν (or -ούς), analogy formed μισάδελφος as its opposite, and so the type grew. So Aristophanes coined Βδελυκλέων to match his Φιλοκλέων. We will include words of these types with the rest which agree with them syntactically. In some words the elision of the vowel makes it doubtful whether we have the old type or the new.

(1) NT words of the first form are as follows:

**Ἀγρυπνος* (whence **νέω νία*) is supposed by Wackernagel to mean originally *sleeping in the field* (Cl. III.), like *ἀγρᾶυλος, ἀγρικός*; but the meaning *sleepless* is established from the first, and the connexion is strained. I prefer to take a base *ἀγρο-* from the noun *ἀγρα chase*, and give it a verbal meaning, which may very well differ from that of the independent derivative verbs *ἀγρεύω* and *ἀγρέω*. *Chasing sleep* is sufficiently near to *chasing sleep away*.

**Ἀρχέλαος* has been already mentioned, the only NT word to preserve the primitive *ἀρχε-* form (*ἀρχέκακος* etc.). See above, p. 277, for this family. There are two words in which the first element is necessarily verbal, *ἀρχισυνάγωγος* and *ἀρχιτρίκλινος*: had these been formed in the earliest period, they would perhaps have had *ἀρχε-*.

Βερνίκη is a Macedonian name also found in the form *Βερενίκη*, answering to Greek *Φερενίκη carrying off the victory*.¹

**Ἐθειλοθηρσικία*, the well-known crux in Col 2²³, may be paralleled with the conjectural *ἔθειλοταπεινοφροσύνη* which Hort would restore in v.¹³ for the almost unintelligible *θέλων ἐν ταπεινοφροσύνη*: Peake practically approves. If so, the *ἔθειλο-* prefix tinges *ταπεινοφροσύνη* in v.²³ as well. Our *would-be* gives the sense adequately: Paul's meaning will be rather like that of Jas 1²⁶. For other *ἔθειλο-* epds. see LS: note the survival of the older form with initial *ε*, not found in Hellenistic with the verb *θέλω*.

Μυωπάτω (2 Pet 1⁹, practically *ἀ.λ.*) is formed from *μύωψ* (Aristotle—*μυωπός* in Xenophon)=*short-sighted*, i.e. one who *screws up* (*μύει*) his eyes to see. For the formation see J. B. Mayor *in loc.*

Νικάτωρ and *Νικόδημος* and *Νικόλαος* are names of almost the same signification, based on the verbal *νίκο-*, *conquering*, on which see above. [*Νικόπολις* is better referred to Cl. III., *city of victory*.]

Πείθαρχος (*Æsch.*, whence **χέω*)=*πειθόμενος ἀρχῇ, obedient to command*: of *πειθάνωρ*, where likewise the noun is in dat. dependence.

Τιμόθεος=*τιμῶν Θεόν*: on the *τιμο-* prefix see above. The name is classical, like its correlative *Θεότιμος* (Cl. III.), which might also mean *God-honoured* (instr. dep.).

¹ The second *ε* was lost by "Kretschmer's Law"—see p. 64.

The large *φιλο-* class has been also dealt with: it forms an immense number of cpds. in later Greek, some 15 of which occur in NT (reckoning only words with different second element). [*Φιλόφρων* (also adverb) is the only clear Cl. IV. word, = *having friendly temper.*]

(2) From the second class we have but few:

**Ἀλέξανδρος* (pr. name) may be put here because of the antiquity of words like *ἀλεξικάκος*: either *ἀλέκω* or *ἀλέξω* (Skt. *rakṣ*) will account for the form, which = *defending men*.

**Ἀνεξικάκος* *forbearing evil*, from *ἀνέχομαι*, is formed in the same way.

Δεισιδαίμων shows stem assimilated as usual to sigmatic aorist: the root (*δεισῖ* to fear) has no *-σις* noun in Greek. *Fearing the daimones* is the meaning: whether this comes nearer to *religious* or to *superstitious* is a question of usage.

Λύω gives us the only others (*μεμψίμοιρος* having been dealt with above). *Λυσανίας* (pr. name) from *ἀνία* = *destroying trouble*. *Δυσιτελής* (whence *ἰλέω*) *paying expenses*, and so *profitable*. The *υ* is long, so that we have another ex. of the assimilation to the aorist stem: in *λύσις* of course it is short. That new cpds. could be made in this class may be illustrated from the Alexandrian tribe *Σωσικόσμος* (as in P Strass 52^a-151 A.D.),¹ called after the Emperor (Hadrian?) as **σωσικόςσμος* = *σώζων τὸν κόσμον*. Schubart (*Archiv* v. 99 n.) mentions also two other tribes in Alexandria (both i/A.D.), *Φυλαξιθαλάσσειος* and *Αὐξιμητόρειος*, and (p. 101) *Αὐξισπόμειος*.

Based on
Prepositional
Phrases.

§ 109. VII. Last we may define a class of

prepositional cpds. which have apparently been developed directly from a phrase: the *επχ.* will be treated under the head of their respective prepositions in the next section. It is clear that we cannot force into previous classes such a word as *πρόσκαιρος* *temporary*, which is simply *πρὸς καιρὸν* run into a single word and declined afresh. Often we have more complex suffixes added, as *καθημερινός* *daily*, from *καθ' ἡμέραν*, *ἐνόπνιον* = *τὸ ἐν ὑπνῳ* *dream*. Similarly we find verbs made in this way, as *κατακρημνίζειν* = *to cast κατὰ κρημνοῦ*—*ἀποκεφαλίζειν* = *ἀπο(κόπτειν)τὴν κεφαλὴν*.

Closely akin to these are two formations in which the first part is an adjective, but the second part is dependent on it, instead of agreeing with it. *Μεσοποταμία* (properly an adj.) is *ἡ ἐν μέσῳ τῶν ποταμῶν χώρα*: cf. *mediterraneus*, and our *midland*, if it means "what is in the midst of the land"—of course it might be "land which is in the midst." The *ἴσος* cpds. have a dative dependence: *ἰσαγγελοῖς* = *ἴσος ἀγγελοῖς*—

¹ [Cf. P Oxy iii. 513⁴⁸ (184 A.D.).—ED.]

the only other two in the NT (ισότημος and ισόψυχος) belong to Cl. IV.

Like ισάγγελος are ισοπλάτων (Anthology) equal to Plato, ισόνειρος (Aeschylus) like a dream, ισομάτωρ (Theocritus) like one's mother, ισολύμπιος (Philo) like the Olympians, ισοκιννάμωμος (Pliny) like cinnamon, ισόθεος (Homer down) godlike, ισοβασιλεύς (Plutarch) equal to a king, ισάδελφος (Euripides) like a brother, etc. The formation was still capable of being made afresh in Hellenistic, and if Lk 20³⁴ gives us a new coinage, it is so entirely according to analogy and the practice of other writers that we cannot treat it as the basis of any inference as to Luke's Greek.

Εὐδοκέω (and -ία) stands apart as a new verb made with an adverb. There is no reason why we should postulate an adj. εὐδοκος: the verb has probably come straight from εὐδοκεῖ "it pleases me well," fused into a closer union by usage. Laws of speech were made for men, and not men for the laws.

PREPOSITIONS.

§ 110. The part played by Prepositions in Word-composition is of such peculiar importance that it will be well to make a separate section of it, gathering here all that must be said of their formation and history, and their functions in composition. Their use with nouns must be reserved for the Syntax under the Cases; and we shall also have to return under Verb-syntax to some of the phenomena of perfectivising (*Prol.* 111 f.). It will be convenient to anticipate the Syntax by indicating the cases with which the prepositions are found in the NT: the Gen. will have *, the Dat. †, the Accus. ‡.

It is usually assumed that Prepositions are simply Adverbs, separated from their class by special uses. Many of them are obviously specialised cases of nouns: some of the oldest, however, have no link with existing cases, unless it be the *casus indefinitivus* which is used in noun-composition. Delbrück's most important discussion, in his chapter on Prepositions in *Grd.* III. (i.), makes it clear that in their origin they were not Adverbs at all in the ordinary sense. Their oldest use was as *Praeverbia*, and their function as prepositions "governing" cases was derived from this, as was also their rare use as simple adverbs. If this is so—and the facts of Vedic Sanskrit and Homeric Greek unite with scattered indications from less primi-

tive idioms to make it extremely probable—the old grammarians followed a right instinct when they classed Prepositions as “Proper” and “Improper.” The latter are ethnic developments, not used in verb compounds, but only in the later function in association with nouns. There were even *praeverbia* which never became “prepositions” at all. These, as retaining only what we regard as the most primitive force, we may take as our first class, dealing next with the Prepositions, and finally with the “Improper” Prepositions, as latest in development.

In distinguishing below (a) *Composita* proper and (b) compound nouns—often only seen in verbs derived from them—we note Delbrück's argument that noun compounds began as mere adjuncts to *Composita* formed from the same verbal root. Even as late as Hellenistic this class is far more numerous than that which contains real nouns. Compounds belonging to Class VII. are apparently the earliest to arise. With these I have put the verbs of this class, as described above (p. 291). Miscellaneous derivatives go together in a class (c), where especially are found the compound prepositions (like our *be-neath*, Lat. *s-uper* = (*e*)*x-uper*, ἔνωπι etc.): in many of these we cannot strictly use the term *compound*, as the word is only a stereotyped phrase, starting from separate words in syntactical relation. These are as old as Homer, e.g. μετέπειτα, and are greatly extended in Hellenistic.

I. PRAEVERBIA.

Praeverbia. § 111. Hardly any of this class leave any traces in Greek, except those (forming our next section) which developed the use with cases, whether or no this use was in existence in the proethnic period. Thus we have no trace of Skt. *sam* “together” (Av. *ham*, also in Lith.-Slav.), *ni* “down” (Av., and our *nether*, *beneath*: also cf. *ne-st* and Lat. *nīdus* = *ni-zd-os*), *vi* “apart” (Av., and Ger. *wider*), *ava* “off” (Av., Lat. *au-*, and Slav.), *ud* “out” (ὑβρις—cf. βρι-αρός, ὕστερος, *utter*), *ati* “beyond” (also prep. in Skt., and adverb in ἔτι, Lat. *et*). Only one of these is at all conspicuous in Greek, viz. ὠ-, Skt. *ā* (also preposition).¹ It is well seen in ὠκεανός Skt. *āçayāna* “surrounding,” which seems

¹ Brugmann *Dem.* 142 sees it in Lat. *id-ō-neus*, Goth. *ū-a*, also *pan-a* etc. (πέρι-αῶ).

thus to be a participle of *ᾠκειμαι "lie around." ὠρόμαι (cf. Lat. *rūmor* etc.), ᾠφελέω (? Skt. *phala* "fruit, profit"), ᾠδύρομαι (whence ᾠδυρός) and ᾠκέλλω (ἐποκέλλω late MSS in Ac 27^{α1}), compared with their simplicia δύρομαι and κέλλω, ᾠγῶ (whence ᾠοίγῶ) from ᾠφείγῶ, ᾠδύνη (perh. from δύνη?), ᾠμείρομαι (?√ *smē* "to remember," "bethink"—Lat. *memor* etc.), ᾠνειδος (?√ *neid*, *neit*, cf. Ger. *Neid*, O.E. *nīþ*). The shortened ᾠ- may point to gradation: cf. ᾠ- against ᾠ- (below). The general sense of the prefix seems to be directive. But the whole of this entry is decidedly charged with uncertainty. The compounds with other prepositions will be seen in III. below. A cognate preverb ᾠ (cf. Lat. *ē*) may account for ᾠ-θελον. (See p. 188.)

II. PREPOSITIONS.

§ 112. The Proper Prepositions are here discussed in their function as *praeverbia*, and in the probably derived use as forming noun compounds. The latter may be assumed to be of the IV.c class (p. 280 above) unless otherwise stated. Under each preposition (a) contains preverbial uses, (b) noun-compounds, and both nouns and verbs of Cl. VII. (p. 291), while (c) contains adverbial compounds or phrases that have become stereotyped as single words.

1. ᾠμφί *ᾠμφί* on both sides, obsolete in Hellenistic as a preposition.¹ Latin *ambi-*, OHG *umbi* (Ger. *um*), Skt. *abhītas* "on both sides," make its meaning clear, as does its connexion with ᾠμφῶ *ambo*. Brugmann (*KVG* 468) regards it as a compound, the second part of which is compared with Eng. *by* (Ger. *bei*), and Skt. *abhi*, Av. *aiwi*.

(a) ᾠμφιβάλλω in NT is the verb of ᾠμφίβλητρον, but in its oldest use was especially applied to putting on clothes: the dual idea suggested to us by the symmetrical shape of our garments applied less obviously in ancient times. The only other verb compound in NT is that for clothing, in its literary form ᾠμφιέννυμι (Mt 6³⁰) and vernacular ᾠμφιάζω (Lk 12²⁸).

(b) The original dual meaning survives in the place-name ᾠμφίπολις *on-both-sides-(the-river)-town*. In ᾠμφίβλητρον the meaning *casting-net*

¹ It is a dual word, and disappears before *περί* for reasons explained in *Proz.* 57, 77-80.

is as old as Hesiod, and the separate manipulation of the net's two ends makes the ἀμφί appropriate. But ἀμφοδον (*a road round*) is like most of the compounds not much concerned with duality.

§ 113. 2. †'Ανά upwards, as an independent word accented *ána* (not in NT). It is found in Avestan *ana*, Gothic *ana*, Slav. *na*, where the original *up* is only partially visible: Lat. *an-helare* shows it well. *Over*, of space covered, *on* (as in the English cognate), and *up to*, of a goal attained, are developments reached in other languages than Greek. See Delbrück *Grd.* III. (i.) 734.

(a) 71 composita are found in NT. Of these 13 show the local force *up* only: ἀναβαίνω *go up*, ἀναζώννυμι *gird up*, ἀνακράζω, ἀναφωνέω and ἀναστενάζω *cry (groan) up* (i.e. the sound is fetched *up* by a deep respiration), ἀναπληρώ *fill up*, ἀνέχομαι *hold oneself up, endure* etc. In 26 *ána* answers to Lat. *re(d)* in its rather different senses *again* and *back*. 'Αναζάω *live again, revive*, ἀναγεννάω *regenerate*, ἀνακαινίζω and -ώω and ἀνανεώω *renew*, ἀνανήφω *become sober again*, ἀνοικοδομέω *rebuild* show the former: ἀνασταυρώω *crucify afresh*, which in classical Greek shows *ána*=*up*, illustrates the close connexion of all these meanings. For *back* cf. ἀναχωρέω *retire*, ἀνίημι *relax*, ἀνακυλίω *roll back* etc. A few of these answer to the English prefix *un-* (Goth. *and-*, *antri*), which reverses an action: ἀνακαλύπτω=*re-velo, un-cover*, ἀνακύπτω (*qs. un-stoop*) *lift oneself up*, ἀνασκευάζω (*qs. dis-furnish*¹) *unsettle*. In some verbs these various meanings of *ána* exist side by side: thus ἀναπέμπω *send up or send back*, ἀνίστημι *raise up or (make stand again) restore to life*, ἀναβλέπω *look up or regain sight*. Naturally there are ambiguous cases: thus Delbrück (*Grd.* III. (i.) 738) makes ἀνέχω=*hold back, restrain*.

A difficulty is raised by ἀναγινώσκω, which in the Κοινή has always the peculiar Attic meaning *read* (generally *read aloud*). In Homer ἀναγνῶναι=*recognise*, and once or twice in Herodotus. But in the latter there is a transitive meaning *persuade*, found in pres. and 1st aorist. It looks as though a transitive force, *cause to understand*, came from the compound and developed independently in Attic and in Ionic: it may even be proethnic (not of course in the developed sense), since *anakunnan* in Gothic means *read*.² There are other verbs in which *ána* either gives or preserves a causative force. 'Αναμιμνήσκω *remind* and ἀναφαίνω (nautical term) *sight* are transitive in the simplex; but not ἀναθάλλω

¹ [Mr. E. E. Genner questions the meaning "disfurnish," and observes that ἀνασκ. τὴν τράπεζαν in the Orators is just like our "reconstruct" a company (euphemism for bankruptcy).—ED.]

² But only in 2 Co 1¹³ 3², where there is paronomasia with other cpds. of γινώσκω. Elsewhere ἀναγινώσκω is *usurigga*. This rather weakens the inference.

make to bloom, revive, nor (practically) ἀνατέλλω make to rise. The antithesis of ἀνά has this causative force among its functions (see κατὰ below), and it seems possible that ἀνά may have developed it.

In a considerable number of ἀνά compounds we may recognise a distinctly perfective force. As was shown (*Prol.* 112) by evidence from English, perfective force may coexist with the local force of the preposition, there being always a more or less strong tendency to make compounds perfective. Ἀνά is not one of the more markedly perfective prefixes, but such compounds as *eat up, grow up, fill up, upset, done up* (ptc.) illustrate how naturally it may take this function. The following NT verbs may be classed under this heading:—ἀναδείκνυμι (*show up*), ἀναδέχομαι (cf. *taking up* an acquaintance); ἀναδίδωμι (*hand in* documents), ἀνατίθεμαι (sim.); ἀναζητέω (cf. our *hunt up* references), ἀναθεωρέω, ἀνακρίνω, ἀνετάζω, ἀνευρίσκω; ἀναζωπυρέω (*make burn up*), ἀνάπτω; ἀναιρέω (*take up, remove, destroy*), ἀναλύω (*break up*), ἀναλίσκω (probably=ἀνα-Ἔάλισκω, so *take up, spend*); ἀνακεφαλαίω (sum up); ἀναμένω (cf. *stay up for*); ἀναπέιθω (*seduce*—the perfective suggests success: cf. *Prol. l.c.*), ἀνασειώ (*shake up*); ἀνοίγω (our *open* is akin to *up*); ἀνατρέφω (*bring up*); ἀνήκω (*come up, arrive, hence belong, befit*).

(b) Many of the nouns simply attach themselves to the verbs described above. For the local meaning add ἀνάγαιον *upper room*, perhaps formed by antithesis from κατὰγαιον¹ *cellar*; the doublets ἀνάθεμα and ἀνάθημα, votive offerings hung up on a temple wall; ἀνάπειρος (cl. ἀνάπηρος), i.e. *maimed all the way up*; ἀνάστατος (whence the vernacular verb ἀναστατώ *upset*), with the suggestion of ἄνω κάτω *upside-down* in it.

*Αναλογία is of a different formation, coming from the phrase ἀνά λόγον *proportionately*: it belongs to Cl. VII.

(c) On ἄνω see § 130 s.v. ἔξω: hence ἄνωθεν, ἀνώτερος, ἀνωτερικός and ὑπεράνω (an impr. prep.).

§ 114. 3. *Ἀντί in front, opposite, is found in most of the I.E. dialects: Skt. *ánti* “over against, near (adv.),” Lat. *ante* “before,” Goth. *and* “along, on,” Lith. *añt* “on, to.” Cf. also *ἄντα*, Goth. *anda-* (as *anda-bauhts*=ἀντίλυτρον). The local meaning which (with the consequent temporal) occupied the whole field in Latin appears in some Greek dialects.² Thus Cretan *ἀντί μαϊύρων* “before witnesses.” It survives freely in composition. We may note the verb *ἀντάω* (whence *ἀπαντάω* etc.) as formed from *ἄντα*: cf. our verb *to face*, also there is the adj. *ἀντίος* (Homeric), whence *ἐναντίος, ὑπεναντίος*.

¹ Class. ἀνάγαιον is not quite clear (see pp. 70, 76).

² And even (very rarely) in Hellenistic.

(a) *Opposite* is the obvious starting-point in all the 20 composita of the NT. Ἀντιπαρέρχομαι *pass by on the other side* shows it in the simplest form. Ἀνθίσταμαι (Lat. *antisto* "excel," Goth. *andstandan* "oppose") develops "oppositeness" into "opposition": so ἀνταγωνίζομαι, ἀντιλέγω (ἀντεῖπον), ἀντιδιατίθεμαι, ἀντικαθίστημι, ἀντίκειμαι, ἀντιπίπτω, ἀντιστρατεύομαι, ἀντιτάσσομαι. *Reciprocal* action appears in ἀναναπληρῶ, ἀναποδίδωμι, ἀναποκρίνομαι, ἀντιβάλλω, ἀντικαλέω, ἀντιλοιδορέω, ἀντιμετρέομαι: in classical and Κοινή Greek the same sense attaches to ἀνθομολογέομαι, but in its NT occurrence, as in LXX, this is modified by the context—thanksgiving *in return for* benefits. Ἀντέχομαι and ἀντιλαμβάνομαι go together: perhaps the local force survives, to express grasping while squarely facing the object.

(b) Putting aside, as before, the nouns that answer to verbs given above, there are not many left. The original local force appears in ἀντόφθαλμος (only Hesych.) which may perhaps be presumed for ἀντοφθαλμέω: it might, however, be a Cl. VII. verb from ἀντ' ὀφθαλμῶν.¹ *Opposition* appears in ἀναντήτος, ἀντιδικός, ἀντίθεσις; *reciprocity* in ἀντάλλαγμα, ἀντίλυτρον, ἀντιμισθία, where is implied the *equivalence* of the object to that against which it is set. *Equivalence* in a different way is implied in ἀντίτυπος, ἀνθύπατος (= *pro consule*), ἀντίχριστος, which last is not "an opponent of Christ" but "one who assumes the guise of Christ" in order to seduce His people, just as ἀνθύπατος is "one who holds the power of a consul." The proper name Ἀντίπατρος, Ἀντίπας should probably be classed here: cf. Ἀνταδρος in BGU iv. 1134⁶ (B.C. 10).

(c) The only adverbial derivatives of ἀντί appear in the list of Improper Preps.

Ἄπό § 115. 4. *Ἄπό, *off, away*: as an independent word accented ἄπο (not in NT). Skt. *āpa*, Av. *pa*, Lat. *ab* (cf. *aperio*) and *po* (in *po-situs* al.), Goth. *af* etc.: cf. also the adverbs ἄψ *abs* (for the -s see pp. 164, 329). The meaning is practically the same all over the field, all the uses of the word starting from the notion of *separation*.

(a) 90 composita occur in NT, in about 40 of which the local force described above is clearly visible (with perfective force in some). Some of them are proethnic: thus ἀποτίθημι, ἀπειμι (*abeo*), ἀποβαίνω, ἀφίστημι, ἀπέγω may be recognised in at least two other I.E. languages. The common meaning *off* or *away* produces different *nuances* according to the meaning of the verb root. Sometimes the starting-point is the subject, sometimes the object: ἀπαγγέλλω *bring news (from)* starts at one

¹ For this use is not unknown in Hellenistic, where the verb arose: see ἀντί in the Syntax. But the other is perhaps more likely, as in compounds this local sense is obviously active.

end, ἀποδέχομαι *welcome* and ἀπεκδέχομαι *wait for* (see ἐκ) at the other. Ἀπείπον = *renounce* (cf. Goth. *afaihan* and *afziban*, both translating ἀπαρνεῖσθαι). In ἀποβλέπω and ἀφοράω looking *away* to an object suggests concentration: we might as well class them as perfective. Ἀποθησαυρίζω *store away* has likewise practically perfective force, and so ἀπολούομαι and ἀπονίπτομαι *wash away*, ἀπομάσσομαι *wipe off*, ἀφήμι and ἀπολύω *release, dismiss*, ἀποφεύγω *flee away, escape* (φεύγω = *flee*), ἀφορίζω and ἀποδιορίζω *separate off*, ἀφυπνώω *fall off to sleep*. Ἀπό is, as we saw in *Prol.* 112 ff., one of the most conspicuous of perfectivising prefixes: quite one-third of the NT composita have perfective force more or less clearly recognisable. It will be well to continue the list, premising that the similar use of the cognate *off* enables us generally to translate literally:—ἀπάγχομαι and ἀποπνίγω (cf. *choke off*, and ἐπνιγεν simplex in Mt 18²⁸), ἀπαλλάσσω (starting from the idea of a *complete change* ¹), ἀπαλλοτριώω (cf. *abalienare*), ἀπαρτάνω and ἀφικνέομαι,² ἀπαρνεόμαι (cf. *abnego*), ἀπεκδύομαι, ἀπέχω (as used in receipts ³), ἀπογράφομαι (? *write oneself or one's family off*), ἀποδείκνυμι (cf. *show off*), ἀποθλίβω (unless comparable with ἀποδέχομαι above), ἀποθνήσκω and ἀπόλλυμι and ἀποκτείνω, ἀποκλείω (*shut off*), ἀποκνέω (contr. κνέω = *be pregnant*), ἀπορφανίζω and ἀποστερέω, ἀποστεργέω, ἀποτελέω, ἀποτολμάω (*carry daring to its limit*), ἀφομοιόω (*finish off the likeness*). In ἀφυστερέω the perfectivising preposition apparently produces transitive force. There remain two other developments of the local ἀπό. In several verbs we render *back*. Ἀπαίτέω is to *demand back* one's own, ἀποδίδωμι to *give back* what belongs to another, ἀπολαμβάνω to *receive back*, ἀποτίνω to *pay back*, ἀπονέμω to *dispense back, assign*, so also ἀποκαθιστάνω to *establish back, restore*, ἀποκρίνομαι to *decide for oneself back, reply*, ἀποκαταλλάσσω to *effect a thorough change* (perfective κατά) *back, reconcile*. In another class the ἀπό reverses the verb's action:—ἀπαλγέω *have pain off, be past feeling*, ἀπελπίζω *cease hoping*, ἀποδοκιμάζω *disapprove*, ἀποκαλύπτω *take off covering, unveil*, ἀποστεγάζω *unroof*, ἀποφορτίζομαι *unburden*, ἀποψύχω *cease breathing, faint*.

(b) Some twenty of the noun compounds of ἀπό go with verb compounds accounted for under (a). Among these ἀφίξις *departure* alone need be specially mentioned, as having a peculiar meaning, divergent from that of its verb ἀφικνούμαι *arrive*: see *Prol.* 26 n. The noun ἀπαύγασμα (*Wis* 7², *Heb* 1³) comes from ἀπανγάζω, where we have to choose between ἀπό = *from, away* and ἀπό = *back*, between *radiance* and *reflexion*, *sunlight* and *moonlight*. Philo's usage is divided. The Greek Fathers are unanimous for *radiance*: see Westcott's citations *in loc.* The Biblical use—*effulgence*, φῶς ἐκ φωτός—seems to me fairly certain,

¹ Note the very common Hellenistic use of the pf. ptc. ἀπηλαχώς = *dead*.

² Cf. *Prol.* 247 on the late development by which ἀπέρχομαι was similarly transferred to the goal.

³ *Prol.* 247.

though the RV should have given a marginal alternative, as the question is exegetical rather than grammatical or lexical, and on the latter grounds the choice is quite open. Other words showing local *ἀπό* are *ἀποστασία* (cf. *ἀφίσταμαι*), *ἀποστάσιον* (cf. *ἀφίστημι* and see *Vocabulary s.v.*), *ἀποτομία* (from *ἀπότομος* = *abruptus*), *ἀφορμή* (what one starts *from*). A partitive sense is given by the prefix in *ἀπαρχή* (something to begin with taken *from* the whole). *Ἀπελεύθερος freedman* (*ἐλεύθερος* = *freeman*) connotes reparation from a former master: *ἀπολύτρωσις redemption* is parallel. *Ἀπό* is *back* in *ἀπολογέομαι* (like *ἀποκρίνομαι*), but there is a difficulty about the formation, as *ἀπόλογος*, from which it would seem to come, has not the meaning *defence* (an argument *back*). Our classing the word in (a) is forbidden not by the fact that *λογέω* does not figure in our dictionaries, which might be accidental: it does not seem that the word, even if it existed (which is very unlikely), gave birth to *ἀπολογεῖσθαι* as a genuine compound. Either (1) we must assume that *ἀπόλογος* once existed, probably as an adjective, and went out of use in this sense after producing *ἀπολογία* and *ἀπολογέομαι*—a fairly easy supposition. Or (2) we might suppose the verb formed directly from *ἀπό* and *λόγος*, just as *ἀποδιδόναι λόγον* might have been the correlative to *αἰτεῖν λόγον* (1 Pet 3¹⁵): this would bring the word in line with *ἀποκεφαλίζω* and others below. It should be added that LS would take *ἀπό* as *away*, in the sense of repelling an accusation from oneself. *Ἀπαρτισμός completion* comes from the perfective verb *ἀπαρτίζω*, and *ἀπόχρησις* from *ἀποχράσμαι* *use up*. *Ἀπελεγμός dispute* is like *ἀποδοκιμάζω*; in *ἀπόλαυσις* from *ἀπολαύω* *enjoy* the prep. points to the source from which the enjoyment comes. Similarly *ἀποκαταδοκία* is parallel with *ἀποδέχομαι* (above): for the second element see above, p. 274.

(c) There are a few compounds that derive from a phrase (Cl. VII.). *Ἀποκεφαλίζειν* was explained above (p. 288). *Ἀπόδημος* (whence *ἀποδημέω*) is simply *ἀπὸ δῆμον*. The formation was still capable of use for new words, as *ἀποσυνάγωγος*—much as we could coin verbs like *un-church* as the need arises. *Ἀφεδρος*, a *Κοινή* word found in LXX (whence *ἀφεδρών*) is from *ἀφ' ἔδρας* (LS *s.v.* *ἔδρα* iii.). A verb formed like *ἀποκεφαλίζω* is *ἀποστοματίζω*, which is in earlier Greek exactly like *extemporise*, even to the verbal suffix (*extempore* applied to speech is *ἀπὸ στόματος*).¹ In NT the meaning is factitive—to force to extemporise, to heckle.

Ἀπέναντι appears among the Improper Prepositions. *Ἀπᾶρτι*, or if preferred *ἀπ' ἄρτι* (WH)—the Greeks would hardly have recognised the difference—is no true compound, for *ἀπό* practically governs *ἄρτι* as a case (cf. *ἀπὸ τότε*). It is only named here to distinguish it from the classical *ἀπαρτί* exactly (glossed *ἀπηρτισμένως, τελείως, ἀκριβῶς*), or (as some said) *on the contrary*, which was a real compound, with different

¹ Thayer-Grimm is quite wrong in postulating *στοματίζω*, which neither does nor can exist.

accent. LS recognise the Hellenistic meaning in Aristophanes and Plato (Comicus), which is of course just the one kind of Attic wherein a *Κοινή* formation might be foreshadowed.¹ But see the discussion in Lobeck *Phryn.* 20 f.

Διά § 116. 5. *‡Διά *through*, orig. *between through*,
 is apparently cognate with Lat. *dis-* (Ger. *zer-*).

This equation is simple and satisfactory, the only divergence being that Greek has added *-a* (*δισ-ά): Brugmann *KVG* 478 thinks the analogy of *μετά* has been working. The question is whether we may identify this *δισ(ά) with the *δίσ* or *δλ-* which comes from I.E. *dyi*, our *twice* (cf. *between* for connexion of meaning). Greek would of course leave this quite open. But I.E. *dyis* is *bis* in Latin and **twis-* in Gothic (Ger. *zwischen*). It is proposed to postulate I.E. doublets *dyis* and *dis*, postconsonantal *y* disappearing under presumable *sandhi* conditions. See the evidence in Brugmann *Grd.*² I. 259, where the proof of a sound-change in proethnic I.E. is regarded as indecisive. There seems to me a balance of probability in favour of our regarding this dropping of *u* as proethnic rather than independent: perhaps in either case we may accept it for the several dialects, and so connect *διά* with the numeral *two*. Hirt *Gram.* 219 notes on *διά*, "es steht wohl für δ(φ)ισα." Outside Greek this adverb does not become a preposition.

Διά forms 79 composita in NT: it is noteworthy that 200 out of 343 occurrences of these are in the Lucan Books. The *διά* compounds offer rather special difficulties, from the fineness of the distinctions between the classes in which we may place them.² The survey of the whole field shows us that the etymological connexion with *two* justifies itself by usage. To represent it graphically, we have two points or areas (A) (B) set over against one another, and the preposition is concerned with their relations and the interval between them. *Per*, *trans* and *inter*, as well as *dis*, will describe different relations, while our own *through and through (per)* comes with equal naturalness: *per* covers the intervening space in passing from

¹ [The new LS remarks after the Hellen. citations, "This is not an Att. use, hence Pl. Com. I. 43 must be incorrectly interpr. by" *Anecdota Graeca* (ed. Bekker.) 79.—Ed.]

² Winer's monograph (part v. of his *De Verborum Compositorum in N.T. usu*, 1843) is still most valuable, though of course needing supplement now.

A to B, *trans* only considers the reaching of B from A, while *inter* stops on the road, and *dis* still more emphatically dwells on the interval as a gulf fixed between them. *Dis* accordingly coincides only with part of *διά*'s area, and does not so often include the perfectivising force which is conspicuous in *διά* compounds. This is well brought out by the opposite meaning of *διαζώννυμαι* (perfective) *gird right round* and *discingor ungird*: the sense of reversal can attach to *διά* (not in NT), as the equation *διαζεύγνυμαι*=*disiungor* will show. In the attempted classification below we have alternative possibilities presented to us in many cases. We can in some of these only come to a tentative choice, depending generally upon the relative antiquity of meanings attaching to the word in question, where a meaning appears to be derived from earlier developments of the word itself, rather than from independent application of varying uses of *διά* to the word with which it is compounded.

(a) We may take first composita in which *διά*=*per*. These are almost necessarily perfective, though the original force of the prefix is retained, for they describe the carrying of action *through* to a definite result. *Spatial διά* may be seen in *διαβαίνω et sim.* (five others), describing some sort of a journey to a goal. *Διηγέομαι* is the same used metaphorically; *διασώζω* is to *bring safely through*, and *διαφεύγω*, *διαφυλάσσω*, *διατηρέω* are similar. *Διανύω* and *διατελέω*, *διαπρίω* (metaph.) and *διορύσσω* and *διυλίζω*, *διαγγέλλω* and *διαφημίζω* and *διαγογγύζω*, *διακαθαίρω* and *διακαθαρίζω* all show space traversed; *διακούω*, *διαμένω*, *διατρίβω*, *διανυκτερεύω*, with *temporal διά*, may be reinforced with *διαγρηγορέω* if it means *remain awake throughout* (but see below). *Διαυγάζω* (ultimately from *αύγή*, the Hellenistic for *εως*) has probably local *διά*, of dawn breaking *through*: here Latin has *dis* (*dilucesco*). But it is obviously not far from *διαβλέπω*, which we might class as a pure perfective. *Temporal διά* more in the sense of *inter* is seen in *διαγίνομαι* *intervene* (of time) and *διαλείπω* (-*λιμπάνω* in Ac 8²⁴ D).

Trans will perhaps be the closest equivalent for *διά* in *διαβάλλω*=*traduco*, *durchziehen*, as it were to *toss across*: Winer compares *διασύρω* (*pull to pieces*) which would suggest *dis* also for *διαβάλλω*, *qs.* "throw to the winds." Winer compares *διαχλευάζω* *verspotten*, which I would rather put below. *Διερμηνεύω* is *translate*. *Through* has passed into *thoroughly* in the pure perfectives *διαπραγματεύομαι* (*ProL* 118), *διαφθείρω*, *διασειώ* (? *give a thorough shaking to*, hence *extort by intimidation*—*Lat. concutio*), *διεγείρω*, with which we might class *διαγρηγορέω* if taken as in RV text Lk 9³² (with ingressive aorist). *Διακατελέγχομαι* (*d.l.* in Ac 16²²)

might be taken as a sort of double perfective, a combination of *διελέγχομαι* *confute* and *κατελέγχομαι* *convict*; but Blass is probably right in classing it with *διαλέγομαι* (see below). In *διακωλύω* Winer would make *διά* express "intercipiendi et arcendi notionem": he compares *verhindern* against *hindern*, and *διακλείω* *intercludere*. It is perfective in any case: Mt 3¹⁴ is "John was for stopping him altogether." *Διασαφέω* (common in earlier vernacular *Κοινή*) raises a difficulty in that *σαφέω* does not seem to have existed, though *ἀποσαφέω* is found, another perfective: it is likely that these two composita were formed at once from *σαφής* (cf. *σαφηνίζω*), the simplex being skipped. In that case we can enter it still as a proper compound verb, with perfective *διά*: we may compare our verb *clear up* from the Middle English adj. *clear* (nearly a century older than the verb *clear* in the *N.E.D.*). Next to these *exx.* of perfective *διά* we might put some in which the prefix may be rendered *thoroughly*, but there does not seem to be perfective force. *Διαβεβαιοῦμαι* *affirm strongly*, *διαμαρτύρομαι* *solemnly declare*, *δισχυρίζομαι* *confidently assert*, only differ from the simplicia by the equivalent of *σφόδρα*, no achieved result being implied. So *διαπυρόμαι*, *διαπορέω*, *διαταράσσω* (*perturbo*).

There remain the compounds in which *διά*=*dis*, *between* or *to and fro*. The force of *dis* is easily recognised in *διαγινώσκω* and *διακρίνω* (where the middle *distinguish for oneself* naturally develops into *hesitate* by stressing the *dis-*), in *διαδίδωμι*, *διανέμω*, *διαίρέω*, *διαμερίζω*, *διαρρήσσω*, *διασπᾶω*, *διαχωρίζω*, *διαρπάζω*, *διασπείρω*, *διασκορπίζω*, most of which are perfectives. So also *διαφέρω*=*differo*, *διαστρέφω* *distort*, *διατίθεμαι*=*dīspro*, *διαστέλλω*=*discrimina facere* (whence to give *express* commands), *διατάσσω* (*sim.*), *διαλύω*=*dissolvo*, *δικνέομαι* penetrate *between*, *δίστημι* *put asunder* (*διαστήναι* *intervene* or *depart*), *διανοίγω* (Winer compares with Ac 7⁵⁶ Virgil's *video medium discedere caelum*). In *διενθυμέομαι* we think of "This way and that dividing the swift mind." *Διαχειρίζω* *administer* (possibly coloured by the common business phrase *διὰ χειρός*) seems to have been developed into a euphemism for *kill* (as our *settle* is sometimes, or *despatch*). In the rest the mutual relation of the A and the B is indicated by *mediating* *διά*, as we might call it: *διαλέγομαι*, *διαλαλέω*, *διαλογίζομαι*, *διερωτάω* recall the two parties in a conversation, *διανεύω* the same for a dumb show, *διαχλευάζω* perhaps is similarly conditioned by the flinging of ridicule at another party. So *διαλλάσσω* is to make a (favourable) change in people who are at variance (*διαμαχόμενοι*): *διαλύω* is similarly used in papyri; *διαδέχομαι* applies to one official who succeeds another.

(b) Some 20 noun compounds of *διά* are connected with verbs accounted for in (a), and the prefix is similarly explained. Sometimes, however, the noun happens to fall into a different class, attaching itself to a use of the verb which does not occur in NT. Thus *διαστολή* *difference* has the *dis* still very marked, which has become latent in *διαστέλλω*: the verb

has the corresponding force in Polybius. Διαταγή has the *mediating* διά, not seen in the verb. In διαυγής *transparent* (cf. διαφανής—printed in Rev 21st TR without any authority) διά is much clearer than in διαυγάω. Διάλεκτος=ἡ διάλεκτος γλώττα, with verbal adj. in two terminations: διά expresses very well the language of ordinary *intercourse*.

Passing to nouns without congeners in (a), we must pause on the old crux διάκονος (^ο-νέω, ^ονία). It is curious that the latest scientific opinion has been swinging back to the recognition of this as a διά compound after all, with *ā* (Ion. δῆκονος) affected by διηνεκής (*q.v.*) and its class. (See Brugmann *ap.* Boisacq *s.v.*). In that case we can connect with the older word ἐγκονέω (Homer, in *ptc.*) and recognise a metaphor from the games (cf. ἀκονί etc.): the starting-point would be ἐν κόνι as an imperative, διακονέω (which would thus come before its noun) being like this a compound of Class VII. (above, p. 291). I set this down with some reserve. Διηνεκής may be taken next, as in any case containing διά=*per*. Thumb observes (*Dial.* 117) that the η is Doric as well as Hellenistic: Attic διανεκής will thus (like δῆκονος?) be due to the special Attic sound-law that made η *pure* into *ā*.¹ Like ποδηνεκής *reaching to the feet*, δουρηνεκής *reaching a spear-throw*, this comes from √ *eneē* which makes part of the system of φρέω (cf. the two roots combined in our *bring*). The η is from the rule that lengthened the vowel at the junction, in compounds whose second element had vowel *anlaut*. Διάδημα goes with διαζώννυμαι: the dual character of διά is dropped like that of ἀμφί in ἀμφιέννυμι (p. 294). Διέξοδος if taken according to RV will have διά=*dis*—the streets that come out of the town and fork there. See *Vocabulary s.v.* Διόρθωμα and ^οσις are from διορθώω to correct right *through* (constantly used of what we should call *proof-reading*). Διατροφή goes with the perfective verb διατρέφω (*per* temporal), but the perfective sense is hardly visible. On the other hand, διαπαρατριβή (*δ.λ.* in 1 Tim 6^b) is a perfective from παρατριβή *collision* (Polybius), with temporal *per*. Finally comes διανόημα from διανοέω, like διενθυμέομαι above, and διάνοια: the formation of this last is probably influenced by *ἀνοια*, *δύσνοια*, *ἔννοια*, where there were adjectives with possessive force (*e.g.* *ἀνοος*) to start the abstract.

(c) Διόπερ and διότι are the only words in this class, and of course they are only conjunctions formed out of phrases—δι' ὅπερ and δι' ὅτι, *for which reason*—and not compounds at all. Διότι has come in Hellenistic to be often a mere synonym of ὅτι *that*, used by Polybius, for example, in order to escape hiatus: in NT=*because* or *for*.

¹ [See, however, the new LS *s.v.* Mr. E. E. Genner points out that the "Attic" form only occurs in the *Hippias Major* (twice on one page), where the MSS are not unanimous, whilst διηνεκής occurs in the *Laws*, where they are unanimous.—ED.]

Εἰς § 117. 6. †Εἰς *into* is for ἐνς, which still survived in Cretan before vowels, its *sandhi*-form ἐς coming before consonants: in Hellenistic ἐς was obsolete, only appearing in NT in ἔσω and ἔσοπτρον. It should not be treated separately from ἐν, of which it is a variant found in Greek alone, being formed on the analogy of ἐξ for use with verbs of motion. Some dialects (Boeotian, Thessalian and N.W. Greek—see Thumb *Dial.* 55, 184) used only ἐν. Its compounds are naturally few by comparison, though they go back to Homer: *ineo* is more original than εἰσεῖμι, *infero* than εἰσφέρω.

(a) Ten εἰς composita are left in NT. *Going into* (*leap, run*) accounts for half of them. Εἰσάγω and εἰσφέρω *bring into*, εἰσκαλέομαι *invite into*, are all simple. In εἰσακούω alone has there been any obscuration: as early as Homer the εἰς developed the simplex *hear into attend to*. It is not unlike εἰσδέχομαι *receive into* (one's house), *welcome*. Nine of these verbs only occur 50 times in NT all told, and εἰσέρχομαι (191 times) is the only common one.

(b) Two compounds of εἰσάγω, ἐπεισαγωγή and παρείσακτος, give nothing to discuss under the εἰς heading. Εἴσοδος *incoming* (in various senses) is often in Hellenistic associated with ἔξοδος: the former goes back to Homer, the latter to Herodotus and Attic. Ἔσοπτρον, always so spelt, illustrates the fact that the *sandhi* distinction of εἰς and ἐς was lost early (from Pindar down) in this word: on √ ὀρ see *Prol.* 111, and on the suffix -τρον below, p. 369.

(c) Ἔσω (whence ἐσώτερος and ἔσωθεν) is dealt with below, p. 330.

Ἐν § 118. 7. †Ἐν *within* has been mentioned under εἰς. It is found with the same meaning in Lat. *in*, Goth. *in*, and in Keltic and Slavonic, etc. Greek has besides ἐνς (εἰς) the form ἐνί, but not (like Skt., Lat., Keltic and Germanic) the derivative *enter* (ἔτερ). It is possible that the reduced form η̄ (found in Lithuanian) may account for some compounds with initial ἀ-: thus ἀτενής (whence ἀτενίζω) suggests *intendo* more naturally than the prefix σπν (ἀκολουθέω, etc.). See above, under ἀ-, p. 285. Ἐν is by far the commonest of prepositions in NT (*Prol.* 98), but in forming compounds falls behind ἀνά, which is nearly extinct as a preposition. This illustrates very well the independent development of the two uses of these adverbs which we call prepositions: the facts

presented in this chapter make it easy to understand how prepositions which one language uses largely are only adverbs in another.

(a) Fifty-five composita occur in the NT, which seem about equally divided between the forces of *eis* and *én*. It will not be necessary to mention many of them, as in most the choice between *into* (*on*) and *in* is easy, or may be left indeterminate. Those that need a note may be taken as we come to them. *Ἐγκαλέω* does not intrinsically differ from *εἰσκ.*; but one may "call in" a person for various purposes, and *έγκ.* was early specialised *in malam partem*, calling a man in to accuse him. In all languages doublets tend to be utilised for different meanings. So *ἐνδέχομαι* = *admit to oneself* (with *ἀνένδεκτος*): *εἰσδέχομαι* and *εἰσκαλέω*, as is natural in compounds of the more sharply defined *eis*, have meanings coming directly from their constituents without later development. *Ἐγκαταλείπω* will serve as a type of some others: *καταλείπω* *abandon* (perfective) is supplemented with *έν*, pointing to the plight *in* which the victim is left. *Ἐγκομβόομαι* is not a quite certain compound, as its simplex does not occur in extant literature: we depend on Suidas citing Epicharmus and a later comedian. It is presumably to *gird* something *on oneself*. *Ἐμβρυμάομαι* seems to connote strong feeling *within oneself*. *Ἐμπαίζω* = *imudo*, *ἐμπίπλημι* = *impleo*, *ἐμπλέκω* = *implico*. *Ἐμπορεύομαι* is in form a compound, but according to its meaning has nothing to do with *πορεύομαι*: it would indeed be more correct to exclude it from the list of composita. Its meaning is entirely determined by *ἐμπορος* (see below), but had there been no *πορεύομαι*, the verb would more probably have been *ἐμπορέω*: on this ground we may keep it here. The same may perhaps be said of *ἐνδοξάζομαι*, which I suspect was partly influenced by *ἐνδοξος*—*δοξάζω extol* is common in Hellenistic but very rare in classical Greek. Probably both forces acted, for the compound is late: the *έν* has distinct force in one of its occurrences at least. *Ἐνορκίζω* likewise owes its *έν* not so much to significant composition (*έν* + *ορκίζω*) as to the association with *ἐνορκος iuratus* (*έν δρκῳ έν*, Cl. VII.). *Ἐνάρχομαι* is supposed by Lightfoot to retain a trace of its classical connotation, the initial act of a sacrifice. But in Polybius and LXX it is simply *begin* (*qs. make a start upon an act*), and it does not seem that the technical force survived. In its two Pauline occurrences, as in those of its cpd. *προεν.*, it is directly contrasted with *ἐπιτελεῖν* (perfective), which marks the last step as the other marks the first. *Ἐνδείκνυμαι* (cf. *indico*) suggests completer demonstration than the simplex—laying the "index" finger, as it were, *on* the object. With *ἐνδύω* (*ένδύω* is not found in NT) we may couple *ένδιδύσκω*, an alternative present stem. The *έν* is simple, but the semasiology is hard. The meanings *clothe* and *sink* are not easy to correlate, and both of them are found in Skt., in separate roots which can equally well answer to the

Greek: ¹ we may perhaps make *dū-ḡō* aor. *édum* (Skt. *upā-du*) the I.E. word for *clothe*, and *dusnō* (cf. Skt. *doṣā* "in the evening") *sink down, set, penetrate*, whence *δυσ-μή*. The two must have been confused in Greek from the first. With *ἔνειμι insum* we join *ἔνι* (common in Hellenistic), which is simply the alternative form of *έν* with the substantive verb understood and meaning specialised. ² *Ἐνέχω* has the *έν* rather obscured by development. When = *entangle, hold in*, the prefix is clear (cf. *ἔνοχος*): the three Biblical passages (so far unparalleled) for *ένέχω* c. dat. = *press on, set upon*, may be most simply explained by Hesychius' *ἔγκειται*, with intrans. use of *ἔχω* and *έν* = *against*—others assume an ellipse (*χόλον* or simply *νοῦν*). *Ἐνίστημι* (only intr. tenses) answers to *insto* (*έν* practically = *eis*). *Ἐγκαινίζω innouo* (P Par 16²⁴ (B.C. 127), as well as LXX). *Ἐγκόπτω* must be the opposite of *προκόπτω*, which is perhaps a metaphor from path-making, *cut one's way forward*: this will be *cut into* the path, *hinder*. *Ἐγκρίνω* = *judge or reckon among*. *Ἐνοχλέω* is probably *bring annoyance upon*. *Ἐντέλλομαι* is difficult, the relation between simplex and opd. being far from clear: moreover, the associated nouns *ἔνταγμα* and *ἐντολή*, by their form clearly primitive, have no uncompounded form at all. Unless we make the influence of *έντέλλω* on them rather improbably strong, the root should be I.E. *tel*, not *q^hel*, from which other uses of *τέλλω* certainly come: can we compare *intuli*, and make *έντέλλομαι* = *bring one's influence to bear upon* a man? *Ἐντρέπομαι* is apparently *turn towards* (*in bonam partem*), so *regard*. *Ἐντυγχάνω* (whence in a special sense *έντευξις*) *fall in with, meet*.

(b) The main points requiring settlement under this heading concern the recognition of compounds belonging to Class VII. Nearly a score of nouns and adjectives attach themselves to verbs occurring in NT, and either explained above or omitted as self-evident. Nearly all the rest, however, will need some comment. *Ἐγκάθετος* (from *έγκαθίημι let down into*) = *suborned*. *Ἐγκρατής* (*ἔτεια ἑτέομαι*) = *having strength within, self-controlled*. ³ *Ἐγκυος* (*κύος*) *having fetus within*. *Ἐμβατεύω*,⁴ which in the absence of any *βατεύω* must come in this class, raises some difficulty, in that *έμβάτης*, its presumed noun original, begins to appear in literature nearly a century later than the verb, and then in a sense which cannot help us. But *έπεμβάτης, mounted*, is classical, and so are *έπιβάτης* and *έπιβατεύω*, which between them probably formed *έμβατεύω* directly: the sense in Hellenistic is always *enter upon* (also class.), of

¹ Latin *ind-uo* and *ex-uo* can have no etymological connexion with *ένδύω*, for all the similarity of form and meaning. It is possible, however, that *induo* may be a conflation of *ind-uo* (*endo, our into*) and *in-duo* = *ένδύω*.

² Its development in mediæval Greek may be seen in Dieterich *Unters.* 225 ff. The MGr *έναι* = *έντι* is *ένι* with the vowels assimilated to those of *είμαι* and *είσαι* (*sum, es*).

³ But its opposite *άκρατής* suggests the possibility of its being a Cl. VII opd.—see below.

⁴ Very often *έμβαθεύω* in papyri: cf. Wilcken, *Ostr.* i. 190 f.

taking possession. (See also above, p. 273, on *κενεμβατεύω*.) Ἐμφανής (whence ὀπίστω) resembles *ἐναργής*, which differs from *ἀργής* apparently in the suggestion of *inherent* light that makes the compound more emphatic: the Greek sense of the word we have just used is another case in point—cf. *ἐμφασίς* in LS s.v. III. Ἐνδεής *having want within* presumes (like *ἐπιδεύς*, *ὑποδεής*) a neuter noun *δέφος *want*. Ἐνδώμησις (so *κ**A in Rev 21¹⁸: see p. 73, and WH *App.*³ 159)¹ *building in*, from *δωμάω* (√ *dem* with long grade). Ἐνέδρα (whence ὀρεύω) *sitting within* (in hiding), exactly as the independent Lat. *insidiae*. Ἐννοία is apparently from *ἐννοῦς* (see on *διάνοια* above) *having mind within, intelligent*. But as the opposite of *ἄνοῦς*, we might as well put *ἐννοῦς* below. Ἐνταφιάζω (whence ὀσμος) is from *ἐντάφιος funereal*, which is most naturally explained as an adj. from the root of *ἐνθάπτω bury in*: Class VII., however, (τὰ ἐντάφια *obsequies* = τὰ ἐν ταφῇ), is quite possible, though less probable. Παρεμβολή *army, camp, or barracks*, seems originally to have meant *troops drawn up for battle*, cf. *παρεμβάλλω*. This specialisation of meaning is said to have started in Macedonia. In Attic at any rate an entirely different use appears, *insertion*, depending on ἐν *in*, while the other is linked with ἐμβάλλω *attack* (ἐν = *against*).

(c) There is a considerable proportion of Class VII. compounds made with ἐν. Indeed, it is quite an open question whether a good many of the compounds classified above may not have originated rather like those to be described now. Compounds of ἐν are largely found as anti-thetic to those in ἀ-privative, which have the meaning *without* . . . (lit. *having no* . . .). So *ἄνομος without law* is opposed to *ἐννομος under law* in 1 Co 9²¹, *ἄτιμος without honour* to *ἐνδοξος with glory* in 1 Co 4¹⁰ (*ἔντιμος* elsewhere). These must be interpreted as adjectives directly formed from ἐν νόμῳ, ἐν δόξῃ, ἐν τιμῇ. So *ἔμφοβος* (opp. *ἄφοβος*), *ἐνάλιος, ἐνδημος* (whence ὀμέω, opp. *ἀπόδημος*), *ἐνδικος* (opp. *ἄδικος*), *ἐννυχος* (only adv.—the χ for κτ = χτ represents a simpler form of the root), *ἐντρομος, ἐντόπιος* (with further suffix, like *ἐνάλιος*), and so *ἐνύπνιον* (*ἐνύπνιος* from *ἐνυπνος*). Some others need detailed treatment. Ἐγγυος goes with *ἐγγίη security*, which is probably from an old word for *hand* (cf. *γύαλον*, Lat. *vola*, Av. *gava-*), like *ἀμφίγυος* and *ὑπόγυος*, so = *what is put in the hand*. Ἐγκακέω is best taken as ἐν κακῷ εἶμι “*in a bad way*,” ill, enfeebled: this depends mostly on a physical connotation of *κακός*, while *ἄκακος* depends on the moral, and so does *ἐγκακέω* itself in Polybius (iv. 19. 10). Ἐγκρατής (etc.—see under *δ*) might be reckoned here because of its opposite *ἀκρατής without self-control*. Since *κράτος* suggests the possession of strength, as *βία* the using of it, ἐν κράτει (ἄν) = *self-controlled* involves only the specialising reference to *moral κράτος*. Ἐλλογῶ (or -έω—see §§ 84–5) = ἐν λόγῳ τίθημι, according to the very common use of *λόγος* = *accounts*: so *imputo, put to the account of*. There is no connexion with *ἐλλογος rational*

¹ *Syll.* 583⁸⁰ (= *Syll.*³ 996⁸⁰) (i./A.D. ?), *BCH* xvii. 78 (no. 1^a).

(cf. *έννοος*), the opposite of *ἄλογος*, from *έν λόγῳ* in the other sense. *Έναντίος* (and *ὑπεν.*) is probably a cpd. of *ἀντίος* (p. 296). But while *έναντι* and such compounds (p. 329) are correlative adverbs whose contents are added together ("within opposite," etc.), the similar-seeming adj. must be explained differently, though in this case the closely parallel compounds affected one another. *Έναντίος*=*έν ἀντίῳ* (*ἄν*). For the relations of this group see Wackernagel *Hellenistica* pp. 1 ff. *Ένθυμέομαι* (-*ησις*) comes directly from *έν θυμῷ* (*ἔχω*): the negative *ἄθυμος* (whence *ῥέω*) starts from a different association of *θυμός*, with *εὐθυμος* as antithesis. *Ένεργός* (whence *ῥέω* and its derivative *ῥημα*) appears to be from *έν ἔργῳ* *active*, or *productive*, as opposite of *ἀργός* *inactive* or *barren*. The formation of its later equivalent *ένεργής* is not perfectly clear: the derivative *ένεργεια* speaks for an original *-es-* stem, but its record is not good enough to claim antiquity. Has it been formally assimilated to its like-sounding adj. *έναργής* *clear*? On the whole group see J. A. Robinson's important excursus, *Ephes.* pp. 241-7. *Ένιαυτός* *year*, originally *anniversary*, is taken by Prellwitz as starting from *ένι αὐτῷ* (sc. I suppose *ἡματι*, "on the same day"). But see Brugmann *Gr.*⁴ 196 n.¹, and below, p. 372. *Ένωτίζομαι*=*έν ὠτί* (*ἔχω*) is formed directly, in complete independence of *ένώτιον* *earring* (Attic *ένώδιον*—Meisterhans³ 79).

Apart from the cpds. named in § 130, the following adverbs are connected with *έν*. *Ένθάδε* *here* or *hither* (the two being confused in Hellenistic) is from *ένθα*, with suffix *-θα*, which may be compared with Skt. *kuṭha* (*where* ?), *iṭhā* (*here*): Brugmann *KVG* 455 gives this doubtfully, and (*ib.* 456) denies the equation *ένθα*=*inde* (as far as the *in-* goes). The suffix *-δε*=Eng. *to* in origin and meaning. *Ένθεν* has the ablative suffix *-θεν*. *Έντεθεν* has suffered a shifting of aspiration in Attic: Ionic *έντεθεν* is original. Brugmann *Demonstr.* 104 n. shows how the flexion of *ὄστρος* produced a whole series by analogy—*έντεθεν* came from *ένθεν* as *τηλικαῦτα* from *ταῦτα* etc.

§ 119. 8. **Εξ*, *εκ*, *out*. The primitive form was *eǵhs*, as Brugmann (*KVG* 179) shows from Locrian *έχθός* (Att. *εκτός* by anal. of *έντός*) and *έσχατος* (from *eǵhs-ǵo-* becoming *eǵshǵo-*): the by-form *έκ* (also *έγ*) is due to the dropping of *σ* between two mutes (see Brugmann *Gr.*⁴ 148 f.). Latin and Gaulish *ex* are among the cognates, which confirm the meaning given: in the Keltic branch *ex* (Ir. *ess*) is only used in compounds, which illustrates its large proverbial use in Greek.

(a) Ninety-four composita with *έξ* are found in NT. We can recognise *out* in about fifty of them very clearly, and in many more with an easy adaptation: naturally the prefix has, like its English equivalent, a considerable range of meaning. In cpds. where the local force is marked, there is nearly always perfective action: indeed, it is only

when *out* is weakened, and *from*, *forth* or *off* gives the sense, that we have exceptions. Thus ἐκκρέμομαι *hang from*, i.e. *upon*: ἐκτείνω *stretch out* and ἐκπετάννυμι *spread out* are the nearest NT exx. to go with it, but even here ἐκ shows the action of the verb carried as far as it will go, so that we may class both verbs as perfective. The simplest local sense is seen (as with ἀπό etc.) in verbs of *going*—ἔξειμι and ἐξέρχομαι, ἐκβαίνω, ἐκπορεύομαι etc., or allied conceptions, as ἐκπέμπω, ἐκβάλλω, ἐκκολυμβάω, ἐκκομίζομαι, ἐκπηδάω and ἐξάλλομαι, ἐκπλέω, ἐκσώζω (Ac 27²⁹), ἐκτινάσσω, ἐκφεύγω, ἐξανίστημι and ἐξεγείρω, ἐξαιρέω, ἐκκλάω, ἐκκόπτω, ἐξορύσσω, ἐκχέω (-χύννω), ἐξωθέω etc., involving removal *out of* one place into another. Local force of slightly varying kinds (literal or metaphorical) is seen in ἐξαγγέλλω and ἐξομολογέω; ἐκλαλέω *let out*, *divulge*; ἐκνήφω of sobriety attained *out of* drunkenness; ἐκπνέω and ἐκψύχω (strongly perfective); ἐξαιτέομαι *beg surrender of* (removal *from* present position), ἐξαγοράζομαι *ransom (from bondage* ¹); ἐκμάσσω *wipe out* and ἐξαλείφω *smear out*, ἐκκαθαίρω *clear out*; ἐκνεύω (perhaps a metaphor from driving a horse); ἐξίστημι (orig. *displace*—ellipsis of φρενῶν or the like accounts for specialised meaning); ἐκδίδομαι *let out* (but act. in sense *surrender*, in the verbal ἔκδοτος); ἐκκαίω (of fire blazing *out*—the perfective force (metaph.) is very clear in Rom 1²⁷ as compared with the simplex of the same metaphor in 1 Co 7⁹), ἐκλάμπω *to shine out*; ἐκπορνεύω; ἐκλείπω is primarily “*leave off*”; ἐξορκίζω (verb purely perfective in NT occurrence=*adjure, bind by an oath*, but elsewhere like its noun ἐξορκιστής *exorcise, get an evil spirit out by potent words*); ἐκτίθημι (ἔκθετος) as in Ac 7¹⁹⁻²¹; ἐκλεγομαι *eligo, choose out of a larger number*; ἔξεστι (ἐξουσία, ὄζω) it is *out*, i.e. *open, allowed*, which comes curiously near its apparent opposite ἔνεστι in its classical meaning *it is possible*.

In a very few cases ἐξ may be rather intensive (*out and out*) than perfective. Ἐκθαμβέομαι and ἐκθαυμάζω might be described as perfective in that they denote a *complete* astonishment, but a perfective does not differ from a non-perfective merely by the addition of *very*. Ἐκμυκτηρίζω primarily may be only “*scoff bitterly*,” but might be called perfective as much as καταγελάω *laugh to scorn*. Ἐκταράσσω is *gravier turbare*—but *conturbare* (Vulg.) is perfective. Ἐκπειράζω (τὸν θεόν or equiv.²) might suggest the daring of the act, or we might find in it the effort to put to a *decisive* test. It would not be difficult, indeed, to trace in all of these a nuance that would bring them among the perfectives. Ἐκδύω may be noted here as a verb which, though perfective

¹ So J. A. Robinson even in Eph 5¹⁶ (see note there), Col 4⁶=redeeming what has fallen into bad hands. For other views see Peake and Lightfoot on Col. l.c.

² In Dt 8²⁻¹⁶ God putting Israel to a *thorough* test. This may be the meaning in Lk 10²⁸, or the Evangelist may be using instinctively of Jesus a word normally used of God.

already, forms a further perfective: it might imply only the putting off of certain garments, while ἀπεκδύομαι, like its noun ἀπέκδυσις, connotes complete stripping, of oneself or another in one's own interest (Col. 21. 15 3^o).

The following are the perfectives in which the local force of ἐξ has wholly or nearly disappeared. We take first those on which some comment is wanted. 2 Co 4^s ἀπορούμενοι ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐξαπορούμενοι, *perplexed, yet not unto despair*,¹ is a specially good example of perfective action. Ἐκζητέω always seems to denote that the seeker *finds*, or at least exhausts his powers of seeking (Heb 12¹⁷): so ἐξεραυνῶ, ἐξετάζω (rare simplex ἐτάζω—*h* in Arcadian, suiting its probable connexion with \sqrt{es} to be—akin to ἐρεός and ἔρυμος, so *verify*). The Hellenistic verbs ἐξουθενέω and ἐξουθενέω (NT and BGU iv. 1117⁸¹ (13 B.C.—reading not certain)) are good exx. of the continued vitality of this word-forming process. Thackeray shows (*Gr.* 105) that the former was coined first, during the vogue of οὐθεῖς (see p. 111), and ἐξουθενῶ later, when οὐδεῖς had begun to reassert itself: ἐξουθενέω is due to mixture. Independent of both is Plutarch's ἐξουθενίζω (see above, § 46): the forming of compounds on the basis of the neuter οὐδέν goes back to Plato's οὐδένεια. We have then three separate verbs for "making nothing of, despising," formed from ἐξ and the word for *nil* without intervention of a simplex verb. Probably ἐξ was appropriate not only for the needed perfective force, but also to make the transitive clear—a function these prefixes often tend to achieve. Ἐκδέχομαι in its NT sense (so Sophocles and Herodotus) is a little obscure. Jebb (on *Philoct.* 123 σὺ μὲν μόνων νυν κείνον ἐνθάδ' ἐκδέχου) notes: "ἐ., *excipe*. The idea of the compound is, 'be ready for him,'—prepared to deal with him the moment that he appears." This fits the perfective idea when we remember the present-stem action (*Procl.* 114): *qs.* "go on with the act of 'receiving' *till he comes*." (We may compare the way in which μέλλειν to be about to gets from the durative present the sense of *delaying*.) Ἐξηγέομαι is in NT always "explain," *set forth*, as already in (post-Homeric) classical Greek. The comparison of cognate words (Lat. *sāgio*, *sāgax*, Goth. *sokyan*, Eng. *seek*, Ir. *saigim*, with same meaning) shows that the metaphorical application in ἡγέομαι was there from the first: ἡγείσθαι τινα would be *explore for, blaze a path for*. Ἐξηγείσθαι then is the perfective: cf. ἐκζητέω (above) and ἐκθέσθαι *exponere*. Ἐξισχῶ in Eph 3¹⁸ c.inf. is a striking perfective—"be strong enough" to apprehend, a strength exerted till its object is attained. Ἐκρίζω is in form a compound, and of course perfective. But the meaning *uproot* cannot be deduced from a combination of ἐκ and ρίζω, and we must explain it as we explained ἐμπορεύομαι above (p. 305): its meaning is determined by ἐκ ριζῶν (*ἀναρῖν*), just as *eradicate* is really short for *ex radicibus evellere*. It is therefore virtually a cpd. of Class VII. Most of the other perfectives

¹ So (virtually) first AV. The earlier vsa. take ἀπ. = *be poor*, but represent the antithesis correctly.

need only be named. Ἐκδαπανᾶω spend out, spend wholly; ἐκδιηγέομαι tell right through to the end; ἐκκεντέω to give a deadly stab; ἐκλανθάνομαι quite forget; ἐκλύομαι faint off (lit. be dissolved outright); ἐκπληρώω fill up, as we say; ἐκπλήσσομαι, much like ἐκφοβέω, and ἐκταράσσω above—our use of *strike* for a mental impression will illustrate; ἐκτελέω (cf. ἐξαρτίζω) finish off; ἐκτρέφω rear up, in our idiom, decidedly perfective—*nourisheth* is too weak in Eph 5²⁹, and *nurture* (RV) in 6⁴; ἐξακολουθέω follow out; ἐξαπατάω of successful deceit¹; ἐξολοθρεύομαι destroy utterly.

(b) There are some twenty-five noun cpds. which attach themselves to verbs accounted for in (a), and only a few remain. Local ἐξ is recognisable in διέξοδος (see διά), ἔκγονος, ἐκκλησία (orig. a summoned assembly), ἔκτρομα (ἐκτιρώσκω), ἐξέραμα, ἐξοδος, ἐξοχή (ἐξέχω) of outstanding prominence. Perfective ἐξ appears in ἀνεξιχνίαστος (cf. the ἐκζητέω class above), ἔκδηλος, ἔκτρομος (only RD in Heb 12²¹—probably assimilated to ἔκφοβος in context, on which cf. ἐκφοβέω).

(c) To Class VII. belong the following. Ἐκδικος in earlier Greek is ἐκ (i.e. ἀνευ) δίκης, *exlex*, but as early as the *Batrachomyomachia* shows the distinct meaning *avenger*: see Milligan *Thess.* 50. This may possibly be derived from another use of ἐκ, seen in the recurrent formula in legal papyri, καθάπερ ἐγ δίκης “just as after a legal decision”: ἔκδικος would thus be one who carries out a sentence. There is, however, the alternative possibility that the classical compositum ἐκδικάζω *avenge* has influenced the meaning of ἔκδικος (with its deriv. ἔκω ἔκημα). Ἐξυπνος (hence ἰνίξω)=ἐξ ὑπνου (γενόμενος). Συνέκδημος (see σύν) is a compound of ἔκδημος=ἐκ δήμου (δν), like ἀπόδημος.

Perfective ἐξ appears strengthening an adverb in ἐκπερισσῶς (ὑπερεκπ. 1 Th 5¹³ BDG—see ὑπίρ). Ἐκπαλαι is like ἀπὸ τότε, no real compound: cf. ἐξαιτής (really two words). Ἐξάπινα (earlier ἐξαπίνης, with ending assimilated to adverbs) and ἐξαιφνης are no doubt similar phrases, but the second element is not clear: αἴψα is likely enough for the second word, but will not suit the first. For ἔξω and its derivatives and ἐκτός, see § 130.

§ 120. 9. *††'Επί (independent accent form ἔπι), *near, on, up to*, appears in three gradation forms, answering to I.E. *opi* (ὄπι-θεν, Lat. *op-, ob*), *epi* (ἐπι)—Skt. *āpi*, Av. *a'pi* may be either; and *pi* (πίειω Skt. *pīdayati*=*pi-zd-* √ *sed* (*sedēre*); also πτ-υχή whence ἀνα-πίσσω, from *pi+uḡh*, Skt. *pyukṣha*).

(a) As many as ninety-nine composita with ἐπί occur in NT, a total only exceeded by κατά and σύν, the main perfectivising prefixes. Accord-

¹ Conative force may be added in present stem—see *Prol.* 114.

ing to some scholars,¹ a contributory cause for its great frequency in all periods of the language was its inheriting much that belonged to another preposition, akin to Skt. *abhi*, Zd. *aiwi*, Eng. *by*. The hypothesis explains one or two forms like ἐφίορκος, and Delbrück brings up a good many parallels between ἐπί compounds and Skt. *abhi*- compounds: there is also the advantage of a slightly easier explanation of the range of meaning found in the ἐπί family. But it cannot be said that the phonetic argument for the conflation has much weight; and the hypothesis, which is opposed by Brugmann, must remain only a possible one at best. We may still observe (with Brugmann *KVG* 467) that in Latin *ob* has taken over some of the functions of *obhi*: *bhi*, though actually derived from *opi*; and similar mixtures may have occurred in isolated cases elsewhere without demanding the fusion postulated by Delbrück.

In many of the verbal ἐπί cpds. we can trace a clear local sense, and these are clearly the oldest. Delbrück (*Grd.* III. (i.) 675) gives some which may have been compounded before the ethnic period. Closely akin to these are the composita in which the preposition may be described as *directive*, indicating the concentration of the verb's action upon some object: in these cases the simplex will be general and the compositum special in its force, the one may be abstract and the other concrete. The exx. which Dean Robinson chooses for his "directive" sense are "ἐπαινέω, ἐπιδείκνυμι, ἐπιζητέω, ἐπικαλέω, ἐπικηρύσσω, ἐπικρατέω, ἐπικρύπτω, ἐπιμέλομαι, ἐπιμνήσκομαι, ἐπινοέω (*excogitare*), ἐπιχορηγέω," as well as ἐπιγινώσκω, the special subject of his well-known excursus (*Ephes.* 248 ff.). We may add to the class ἐπαγγέλλομαι, ἐπαγωνίζομαι, ἐπαθροίζομαι, ἐπαίρω, ἐπαισχύνομαι, ἐπαιτέω, ἐπακολουθέω, ἐπακούω and ἐπακροάομαι, ἐπανάγω and the other cpds. in ἐπ-*ana*- (with *hostility* implied in ἐπανίσταμαι), ἐπαρκέω, ἐπαφρίζω, ἐπεγείρω (*hostile*), ἐπείδον, ἐπεισέρχομαι, ἐπεκτείνωμαι, ἐπερωτάω, ἐπέχω (in some forces), ἐπιβάλλω (or local), ἐπιβαρέω, ἐπιβλέπω and ἐπισκέπτομαι and ἐπισκοπέω, ἐπιγίνομαι, ἐπιδέχομαι, ἐπιδίδωμι, ἐπιδύω, ἐπικαλύπτω, ἐπικείμαι (or local), ἐπικέλλω, ἐπικρίνω, ἐπιλαμβάνομαι, ἐπιλανθάνομαι, ἐπιλέγω and ἐπονομάζω, ἐπιλέγομαι (*choose*), ἐπιλείπω, ἐπιλείχω, ἐπιλύω, ἐπιμαρτυρέω, ἐπιμένω, ἐπινεύω, ἐπιπλήσσω, ἐπιποθέω, ἐπισκευάζομαι, ἐπιστέλλω, ἐπιστηρίζω, ἐπιστρ'φω, ἐπισυνάγω, ἐπισυντρέχω, ἐπισχύω, ἐπισωρεύω, ἐπιτάσσω, ἐπιτελέω, ἐπιτρέπω, ἐπιτυγχάνω, ἐπιφαίνω and ἐπιφάυσκω and ἐπιφώσκω, ἐπιφέρω, ἐπιφωνέω, ἐπιχρίω.

Two more members of this class require a special note. Ἐπίσταμαι is an old compound not very easily analysed: it seems to be ἐπι-*στάμαι* (not duplicated—cf. φημί, ἐφάμην) with meaning "put oneself in position for." Our *understand*, Ger. *verstanden*, will show that the root *stā* is capable of application to the mind. It was no longer felt to be a compound verb. Ἐπιτιμάω comes from a meaning of the simplex not found in NT=*lay penalty on*, and so *censure*. In many of these, which

¹ Especially Delbrück *Grd.* III. (i.) 675 f., 679.

account for some three-quarters of the total, the line is hard to draw as against the purely local force, which I have restricted almost entirely to verbs of motion with *ἐπί*=to or upon. It will be seen at once that the directive force as understood here is much wider than is implied in the *exx.* given by Robinson. We might subdivide, but the general nexus is clear enough. The only compounds left now are a few in which *ἐπί* means in addition, a natural development of upon: thus *ἐπενδύω*, *ἐπιγαμβρεύω* (make a new marriage connexion), *ἐπιδιατάσσομαι*, *ἐπιδιορθόω*.

(b) About one-third of the noun compounds of *ἐπί* in the NT attach themselves to composita accounted for in (a). Only one of these needs separate mention, *ἐπιούσιος*, the well-known crux in Mt 6¹¹=Lk 11⁸. That this *δ.λ.* was a coinage by the author of the Greek Q may be safely assumed, after Origen. If so, the scholarship of its origin does not justify our laying too much stress on considerations which would weigh with us if Luke himself or even Matthew were responsible, still less some Atticist scholar. Jerome's *supersubstantialis*¹ is therefore not finally discredited by the objection against the non-elision of *ι*: *ἐπιούσιος* would thus become a Class VII. *epd.* rather like *ἐπουράνιος* (see below), from *ἐπί* upon and so above, and *οὔσια*. The only meaning quotable for this noun from NT and papyri is *property* or *estate*, which is not hopeful; and even if it is found in an abstract sense in magical documents, this is most improbable in a context so simple and direct as the Lord's Prayer. Lightfoot's argument² has not been superseded by later literature (see WS i. 136); and we may perhaps agree with Schmiedel in the "sicherlich" with which he put down *ἡ ἐπιούσα* as the true etymon. "*Ἐπειμι* (*obire* etymologically) is to come close after, tread on the heels of, as it were; and its participle was current, as the NT itself shows, to express the immediately following day. In the evening it would mean the same as *ἡ αὔριος*, but in the morning (see esp. the opening of Plato's *Crito*) it is a day earlier than this. The immediacy is quite sufficient reason for the translator's being dissatisfied with *τὸν τῆς αὔριος* or the like as a rendering of the Aramaic before him: he followed a right instinct in coining a new adjective from the common word for "the coming day." That such scholars as Delitzsch and Keim (*ap. Lightfoot op. cit.* p. 226) should have imagined inconsistency with Mt 6³⁴ only proves that the succession of Martial's *Graeci quibus est nihil negatum* is not yet closed. The only serious alternative to the above account of *ἐπιούσιος* is that proposed by Debrunner, and epitomised by himself in his *Blass Gr.*⁴ 75. He makes it a substantivising of *ἐπὶ τὴν οὔσαν (ἡμέραν)* "for the current day": for this use of *ὢν* cf. *Prol.* 228. He compares *ἐπιμήνιος* (Polybius) "for the current month," *ἐφημέριος* etc.; but modestly claims only a preference for this over the derivation from *ἡ ἐπιούσα*. The lamented

¹ Origen seems to have started the idea. Jerome meant by his word, he tells us, *super omnes substantias, extra omnia*, and so *praecipuus, egregius, peculiaris*.

² *On a Fresh Revision*³, p. 217 ff. But see below.

Albert Thumb accepted Debrunner's view whole-heartedly: a pencilled note from his hand on this page, which he saw on a visit to me a few months before his death, refers to Brugmann-Thumb 675 for his endorsement of it. On the other hand, Deissmann¹ holds to the Lightfoot theory, rightly laying stress on the fact that ἡ οὐσα without ἡμέρα expressed has not been found. He even suggests that the later ἡμερούσιος, and ἐφ- and καθ-ημερούσιος, found in papyri and the anti-Christian writer Proclus, are modifications of ἡμερίσιος based on ἐπιούσιος as an "already existing vernacular word" used by the evangelists.² Origen's ignorance of it is met by Deissmann with the remark that he need not have known all the popular vocabulary of the Mediterranean littoral. Whether this be tenable or not, I should give my own vote for ἡ ἐπιούσα with much the same degree of preference as Debrunner himself shows in voting for ἐπὶ τὴν οὐσαν. On the legitimacy of the hiatus involved in Debrunner's theory, see above, § 38.

Directive ἐπὶ may be recognised in the following, with the same latitude of application that we found in the verbs:—Ἐπανόρθωσις (like the composita of ἐπὶ+ἀνά in (a)), ἐπάρατος and ἐπικατάρατος (ἀράσθαι might be cursing at random—the cpd. has an object in view), ἔπαυλις (perhaps formed from αὐλις by influence of ἐπαυλιζομαι), ἐπεισαγωγὴ (ἐπεισάγω=introduce as a substitute), ἐπήρεια (papp.) whence ἐπηρέδῃω (ἀρεΐη in Homer=violence), ἐπιβουλή, ἐπιεικῆς and ἴκεια (Feikw—pf. FéFoika—in Homer=suit or agree—cpd. suggests the environment which is "suited"), ἐπιθυμέω ἴμια ἴμητις (the stage *ἐπιθυμος="having one's θυμός towards," is apparently passed over—cf. ἐνθυμέομαι above), ἐπικούρος whence ἴρια, and ἴρειος from the proper name (√ qers=run—cf. curro, horse, and the Keltic original of car), ἐπίνοια (see on διάνοια and ἔννοια above), ἐπισιτισμός (from ἴζομαι, get σιτία for definite people), ἐπισφαλῆς (directing danger to certain objects), ἐπιφανῆς and ἴνεια (ἐπιφαίνω has been dealt with, but this comes from a technical sense—a divine being manifested to human eyes in human form), ἐπόπτης and ἴτεύω (√ oq* op=see—cf. ἐφορᾶν, ἐπιβλέπειν etc.), ἐφευρετής (from ἴρισκω, to find or invent for a purpose).

Local ἐπὶ may be seen in ἐπίσημος=with σῆμα upon it, the opposite of ἀσημος, and in ἐπιγραφή and ἐπίθεσις, the verbs of which belong to (a). Ἐπιλοιπος, left over, has the sense added to. The name Ἐπαφρόδιτος (with short form Ἐπαφρᾶς³)=having Aphrodite upon him: in earlier Greek this was venustus (Horace's Veneris muneribus potens), but later represented felix, from the Venus-throw of the dice—so as epithet of Sulla. Ἐπίτοκος (ἴκέω) raises various difficulties. Its frequent appear-

¹ Ἐπιούσιος, in *Nitliche Studien Heinrichi dargebracht* (1914), pp. 115-9.

² [Deissmann's guess finds support by the discovery of the word ἐπιουσι[ων] in an old housekeeping book given in Preisigke, *Sammelbuch*, Nr. 5224. See also Deissmann, *LAE*² 78, n. 1.—Ed.]

³ Not implying any necessary identification of the persons.

ance in the Κοινή as ἐφόρκος¹ (*Prol.* 234) was explained by Thumb (*Spir. Asp.* 72) as due to contamination of ἔφορκος and ἐπίορκος: he compares ἐφὶ ἱερέως on an inscription. Against Osthoff's conjecture—accepted by Delbrück—that the I.E. *ebhi* (Skt. *abhi*, Eng. *by*) underlies it, there is the fact that ἐφόρκος is late: Phrynichus is right, from his point of view, when he bans it as un-Attic, and thereby evidences its prevalence in his own day. Delbrück (*Grd.* III. (i.) 676) defines it hesitatingly as concerning “the oath by which one presses on a person and compels him”; but this does not explain the *false* oath. Is *against* the force of ἐπί here, whether drawn from *epi* or *ebhi*?

(c) The remaining compounds are of Class VII. Ἐπιτήδειος as a difficult word may be mentioned first. Brugmann *Dem.* 140 ff. suggests that ἐπιτηδής, from which it is the adj., starts from ἐπὶ τὸ ἦδος = *good for that* (purpose), τὸ being demonstrative and ἦδος a rare Homeric noun = ὄφελος: he compares *idoneus* (see p. 293 n.¹). Ἐπιτάγκες is presumably neuter of *ἐπιανάγκης, which might even be ἐπ' ἀνάγκης used as an adj. unaltered: in any case it starts from it. (Ἐπιτάγκος occurs also in papyri and inscriptions, even as early as the Gortyn Law—see v. Herwerden s.v.) Ἐπαρχος (whence ὄχ(ε)ία) is from ἐπ' ἀρχῆς, ἐπίγειος from ἐπὶ γῆς, ἐπιδημος (whence ὀμέω, παρεπιδημος) from ἐπὶ δήμῳ, ἐπιθανάτιος = ἐπὶ θάνατον κείμενος, ἐπικεφάλαιον (Mk 12¹⁴ D k and two important cursives) = τὸ ἐπὶ κεφαλῆν πρᾶσσόμενον, ἐπουράνιος = ἐπ' οὐρανοῦ ὄν, and ἐφήμερος (ῥία) is from ἐφ' ἡμέραν. Verbs in this class are ἐπιστομίξω from ἐπὶ στόμα (θεῖναι) like the proverb βούς ἐπὶ γλώσση, and ἐπιχειρέω = χεῖρα θεῖναι ἐπὶ τι: in neither case does a noun compound intervene. Both are ancient words.

Ἐπάνω = ἐπὶ + ἀνά + ὤ (see § 130, s.v. ἔξω). Ἐπαύριον is a true compound, ἐπὶ giving the force of succession: its form echoes its primary, the adverb αὐριον. Ἐπέκεινα, *to your side*, is from ἐπ' ἐκείνα. Ἐφάπαξ might just as well be written as two words, like ἐπὶ τρίς, at any rate for the meaning *at once* (1 Co 15⁶): when = *once for all* it is more like a compound, a directive strengthening of ἀπαξ in the same sense.

Κατά § 121. 10. *†Κατά is taken by Brugmann (*KVG* 479) as an extended form of *ko* or *kom*, found in Latin *cum* and *co-*, in Keltic, and in κοινός = κομιός: Gothic *handugs* “wise” (√ *dhē* θη), *qs.* “capable of mental synthesis.” Κάτα (so accented as an independent word) is for κή-τα, with second element as in μέ-τα. Its nearest connexions are Irish *cēt-*, Old Welsh *cant* = *along, by, with*. Brugmann defines its earliest use as “along something so as to remain in connexion

¹ So Mt 5³³ *, 1 Ti 1¹⁰ D*P: in LXX three times, in B, A and C respectively (Thackeray 126). If it is Western (WH *App.* 151), it is only another instance of Western agreement with the most genuine Κοινή.

and contact with the object." The kindred Latin *contra* illustrates one development, *against*, but the meaning *down* can hardly be said to be explained. It is noteworthy that neither *down* nor *against* survives in MGr.¹ As the word had of course a long history in pre-Homeric Greek beyond our reach, the obscurity of its semasiology is not strange. Most probably the key should be found in the antithetic development of *ἀνά* and *κατά*, which with acc. come very near: such antithesis as *ἀνά ῥόον* and *κατὰ ῥόον* might be very productive.

(a) *Κατά* forms 107 composita in the NT, falling thus only a little short of *σύν*, the other great perfectivising preverb. It will be noticed that Latin *co-*, *com-*, which conspicuously performs this function in Italic, is related to *κατά* in form and to *σύν* in meaning. To this class belong fully two-thirds of the *κατά* compounds: we cannot always, however, classify with confidence, and the ambiguous elements in the word's history cause difficulty. There are some clear instances of local force: thus *καταβαίνω*, *καθίημι*, *κατανεύω* and *κατασεύω* (when compared with *ἀνανεύω*), *κατάγω*, *καταπλέω*, *κατατρέχω*, *κατέρχομαι*. In others this meaning could be recognised if the centrality of the meaning *down* could be accepted. *Καθέζομαι* and *κατάκειμαι*, for example, are rendered *sit down*, *lie down*, *καταπίπτω* *fall down*, *καταπατέω* *tread down*; but we may ask pertinently how it is possible to sit, lie, fall or tread in any other direction—even if it be allowed that we may "sit up" and even "lie up"! It is better to regard them as simply perfective, the preverb (whether *down* or *over* or *together*) bringing the action of the verbal root to a definite result. In another class of verbs *κατά* seems to be represented by *against*, as often when placed with a genitive as a preposition. Thus *καταβραβεύω*, *κατηγιγνώσκω*, *καταγωνίζομαι*, *καταδυναστεύω*, *κατακρίνω*, *κατακυριεύω*, *καταλαλέω*, *καταμαρτυρέω*, *καταναρκάω*, *κατασκοπέω*, *καταστρηδιάω*, *καταφρονέω*, *κατεξουσιάζω*, *κατισχύω*, alike differ from their simplicia in that they indicate action unfavourable to an object. (The bringing in of an object, where the simplex had been intransitive, is found not infrequently, but it is not easy to connect it causally with the preverb: further instances are *καταργέω* *put out of action*, from *ἀργέω* *be out of action*, *καταπονέω*, *κατασοφίζομαι*, *κατακληρονομέω*, *κατακαυχάομαι*, *καταγελάω*.) In a good many of the verbs classed as perfective we could easily reach that sense through *κατά*=*down*, and in others by the "hostility" connotation: it is less easy to find compounds where we might recognise the meaning which Brugmann regards as most original. *Κατακολουθέω* and *καταδιώκω* describe following right over an intervening space till the quarry is reached: *καταντάω* and perhaps *κατευθίνω* are not very different, nor is the *ἀλ.* *κατεπέστην* ("make a dead set upon").

¹ Thumb *Hdb.* p. 106.

(b) About 40 compound nouns or adjectives found in NT attach themselves to the verbs under (a), as derivatives or as parallel formations. On ἀκατάπαστος as a negated verbal from καταπαύω see § 37. Καθηγητής from καθηγέομαι *deduco* goes into the perfective list, as does καταπέτασμα from καταπετάσσειν, unless that is to be compared with καταχέω pour over. Κατόρθωμα is from κατορθώω, where κατά has produced a transitive verb. Κατατομή mutilation is linked with perfective κατατέμνω (we say "cut up"). Κατάρα against the more general ἀρά has the κατά of hostility, and so κατάθεμα, κατήγορος (-ωρ, ῥέω, ῥία) and καταδίκη. Κατήφεια, of quite uncertain etymology, seems to contain κατά=δουπ. Κατάδηλος and κατάλοιπος have the intensive κατά. Κατείδωλος is (naturally enough) ἀ.λ.: the special Jewish use of εἶδωλον is sufficient to explain this. But it is coined (by Luke or some Jewish predecessor) in accordance with analogy: cf. κάβαλος full of salt, κάτοφος drenched with vinegar (both New Comedy), κατάγλωττος talkative (Epictetus), κατάδενδρος densely wooded (Nymphodorus—of an uncertain date B.C.).

(c) Κατακρημνίζω=cast κατά κρημνοῦ, καθημερινός from καθ' ἡμέραν daily, καταχθόνιος=κατὰ χθονός ἄν, belong to Cl. VII.¹ Compound prepositions or adverbs include κάτω (with κατώτερος), ὑποκάτω, κατενώπιον, καθεξῆς. Adverbial phrases which are always or often written as single words are καθ' ὅ, καθ' ἃ, καθ' ἅπερ, καθ' ὅτι, κατά μόνας, καθ' ὅλου: it makes no real difference whether we make them one word or two. Καθώς=καθ' ὡς belongs to the same category as ἐκ τότε etc. (Brugmann *Gr.*⁴ 524).

Μετά

§ 122. 11. *‡ Μετά has been already noted as an extension of μέ with the same element that we find in κα-τά. The I.E. *me* seems to have produced *medhi*, whence *medhios*=μέσος, *medius*, *mid*, Skt. *madhyas*, etc.: the Germanic preposition seen in Goth. *miþ*, Ger. *mit*, might equally go back to **meti*. The Greek form with -τα, accented μέτα as an independent word, has apparently no parallel, since the Iranian *mat* "with" must be compared with *ἄμα* because of its obvious link with Skt. *smat*: see Brugmann *Grd.*² II. ii. 856. Μέ-χρ(ι)s and the dialectic μέστα, μέσποδι, μέττ' ἐς, μέσφα, with the early compound μεταξύ, belong to the family. It is possible to conjecture that *meti* was the oldest form, accounting for Germanic and Greek alike: in that case *μές (cf. the dialect forms above) may be its surviving repre-

¹ Καθολικός, from καθ' ὅλου, does not occur in NT, though appearing in late MSS.

sentative, like *πρός* from *προτί*, and *μέτα* may be due to the analogy of *κάτα*. As to its meaning, it seems to start from *amid*, as we may see in *μετέχω* "possess *among others*, share." The common sense of *change* is assigned by Brugmann-Thumb *Gr.* 509 to the local idea of an intervening space (*medium*) which is crossed: they compare Lat. *interesse* "differ." As a preposition the primary force is *with*, in various senses, which alone survives in MGr.,¹ except for phrases of *manner*: *after*, coming from the idea of crossing over the "mid" space to the other side, is of course common in Hellenistic, but leaves no trace to-day.

(a) *Μερά* forms 21 verb compounds in NT. Of these 16 have the idea of *change*, answering often to Latin compounds with *trans-*, which supports the explanation of this force of *μετά* given above from Brugmann. I include *μεταμέλομαι* here, though Grimm finds the sense of "afterthought": there seems no reason for placing it and *μετανοέω* in different classes, and the latter indicates "change of mind" beyond question. "Sharing" action (like German cpds. in *mit-*) accounts for *μεταδίδωμι*, *μεταλαμβάνω*, *μετέχω*. *Μετακαλοῦμαι* and *μεταπέμπομαι*, "call for" and "send for," have the sense which appears with *μετά* c. acc., action crossing over a space to a goal.

(b) Some 16 noun compounds of *μετά* are found, if we include *μετέωρος* on account of its derivative *μετεωρίζομαι*. Of these 11 are derivatives of verbs included under (a), while *μετοικεσία* may be added as very near to *μετοικίζω*. *Μεθόριον* (Mk 7²⁴ AN ω) is a literary word (*μετά* *between*) foisted on Mark by copyists. *Μεθοδεία* comes from *μεθοδεύω*, and this from *μέθοδος*, where *μετά* is like that in *μεθέπω* "follow *after*, up." *Μέτωπον* is apparently the part "between the eyes" (cf. *μεσόφρυνον*). *Μετέωρος* (cf. Lesbian *πεδ-ἄωρος*—from *ἀφείρω*) is like *μετάρσιος* (from *αἴρω*): in *μεταίρω* the idea of *removal* is clear, so that "lifted *across*" a gulf of air will be the starting-point.

(c) *Μετέπειτα* *afterwards* is a very early example of *μετά*=*after*, occurring as it does in Homer. Cf. the note above, p. 293, on this early (non-Attic) justification of Hellenistic combinations like *ἀπὸ τότε*, etc.

Παρά § 123. 12. *†‡ *παρά* makes itself conspicuous by retaining prepositional use with all three cases: it has, however, a very limited range in MGr. It belongs to a family with the common element *per*, including *περί* (loc.), *πάρος* (gen. abl.), *παράι*=Lat. *prae* (dat.), *πέραν*, *πρό*, *πρω-*, *πρός* (= *προτί*): our own *for*, *before*, *from* and *fro*,

¹ Thumb *Hdb.* 104.

Latin *pro*, *prae*, *per*, *por-*, may be mentioned among words quotable from all I.E. dialects. The root of what may well have been a primitive noun can probably be recognised in *πόρος*, our *fare*, *πέλω* "pierce": "going across" (cf. *πέραν*) is the central idea. From the adj. **peros* we have in Greek the acc. fem. *πέραν* to the other side (c. gen.), *πέρα* instr. *beyond*: see Brugmann *Grd.*² II. ii. 872 f. *Πάρα* itself—whose independent accent is unoriginal, like that of *κάτα*—is presumably an instr. case-form, but such identifications of prehistoric words are of course only conjectural. It answers to Skt. *purā*, Av. *para* "before," Alban. *para*, OIr. *ar*, Goth. *faira*, all="before," in time or place. Gothic *fair* may answer in form to the alternative *πάρ*, Lat. *por-*: (*παράγων*) *παρά τὴν θάλασσαν* is in Wulfila *fair marein*, (ἔπεσε) *παρά τὴν ὁδὸν fair wig*. "Close to, beside" is apparently the oldest Greek meaning; but new developments branch out: *beside* gives *mis-*, *stealthily* (*qs.* entering by a *side* way), and sometimes diverges into *onward*, with metaphorical application.

(a) *Παρά* forms 53 or 54 verbal opds. in NT, a fair proportion of which are not very easy to define in relation to the preverb's earliest meanings. The simplest are those where we may represent the *παρά* by "beside, close to." Thus *παρακαθεσθεῖσα* in Lk 10³⁹ is like 9⁴⁷ *ἔστησεν αὐτὸ παρ' ἑαυτῆς*. *Παραβάλλειν compare* (Mk 4²⁰ AD ω —a plausible reading), *πaráκειμαι*, *παρακολουθεῖω follow closely*, *παραμένω*, *παρατηρέω watch closely*, *παρατίθημι*, *παραχειμάζω*, *παρίστημι*, *παροικέω*, are fairly clear. Others have the idea of motion affecting the sense, so that we compare the uses of *παρά* c. acc. *Παραβιάζομαι* (in Luke)=*βιάζομαι παρ' ἑμάντων*, *παραγίνομαι*=*come near*, *πáρειμι*=*am near*, *παρατυγχάνω*=*chance* (to be) *near*; *παρακαλέω* (in Ac 28²⁰) *call to one*; *παραδίδωμι hand on to*; *παρακύπτω stoop close to*; *παρασκευάζω prepare ready*—almost identical with *σκενάζω* but suggesting a "presentation" of the prepared object. The idea of going *past* does not come naturally out of the general sense of *closeness*, and may go back to earlier elements (cf. *praeter*). So *παραβαίνω*, *παρέρχομαι*, *πάρáγω*, *παραπλέω*, *παραπορεύομαι*, *παραρρέω*, *παραφέρω*, *παροίχομαι*. *Aside*, developing into *mis-*, is recognised in *παραθεωρέω overlook*, *παραιτέομαι deprecor* (*qs.* "ask *aside*"), *παρακούω mis-hear*, *ignore* (also with *παρά close*=*overhear*), *παραπίπτω fall aside*, *παραλογίζομαι mis-calculate*. Others have the ablatival connotation: *παραδέχομαι*, *παραιτέομαι* (in Mk 15⁶), and *παραλαμβάνω* suggest the source (*παρά τινος*) as *παραδίδωμι* does the recipient (*παρά τινι*). A kind of dative idea attaches to *παραινέω* and *παρακαλέω*, where *παρά* suggests an intimacy with the object. *Παραγγέλλω* is *pass a message on*, with

the same idea of "onward motion" that we saw in *παραδίδομι*, etc. "On one side" may possibly be the meaning in *παρακαλύπτω* and *παραλύομαι*. The "onward" nuance seems to produce *παραζηλώω*, *παραπικραίνω*, *παροξύνω*, *παροργίζω* and *παροτρύνω*. *Παρακαλέω* and *παραμυθέομαι* with the sense "comfort" may be attached better to the idea of *intimacy*, speaking "to the heart." "Sideways" and so "stealthily" is seen in the *παρ-εις-* opds. of *ἄγω*, *δύω* and *ἔρχομαι*: the last, with *παρεισφέρω*, has also the meaning *besides*. *Παρεμβάλλω* as a military word, said to be Macedonian—i.e. coined especially in Philip's or Alexander's army—must be left uncertain, as a t.t. which might have originated in conditions we cannot trace. On *παραφρονέω*, *παραδειγματίζω* and *παρομοιάζω*, see (b).

(b) Twenty-six noun compounds of *παρά* in NT are formed from verbs already occurring there. Among these we should notice *παρουσία*, in which the RV marginal note ("Gr. *presence*") would suggest that the idea of "motion towards" is to be excluded: outside evidence for the technical meaning "royal visit" shows that *advent* is as literal a rendering as *presence*, which occurs in some places. The simple locative force may be seen in *εὐπάρεδρος* (cf. *παρακαθέζομαι*), *παραδείγμα* (from *παραδείκνυμι* show two things *side by side*) whence *παραδειγματίζω*,¹ *παραλλαγή* (*deviation*), *παράσημος* (marked *on the side*), *παρεπίδημος* (*staying with*), *παρηγορία* (cf. note on *παραμυθέομαι*, ¹ιον above), *πάροδος* (*journey past*), *παροιμία* (cf. *obiter dictum*, τὸ παρ' οἶμον), *πάροις* (=παρ' οἶνον ὄν), *παρόμοιος* (strengthened *ὄμοιος*, *παρά* as elsewhere = *beside* in comparison) whence *παρομοιάζω*,² *παροψίς* (*side-dainty*—with transference to the dish, the converse change to that in our *dish* when used of the food). *Παραβολεύομαι*, from *παράβολος* *venturesome* (cf. class. *παραβάλλομαι* in same sense), has the verbal part expressing the energy of *βάλλειν*, instead of being static as in *παραβολή*. Hence *παρά* describes motion along, like that of an object flung into a rushing stream. *Παραφρονία* from *παράφρων* = *having the mind awry*: *παραφρονέω* might be a cpd. of *φρονέω*, "to think awry," but is more probably from *παράφρων*.

(c) *Παράδοξος* = *παρά δόξαν ὄν*, and *παράνομος* (whence *-ία*) = *παρά νόμον ὄν*, are obvious Class VII. forms, with *παρά* (c. acc.) = *contrary to*. *Παραθαλάσσιος* = *παρά θαλάσση ὄν*, and *παράλιος* = *παρά ἄλι ὄν*, show the ordinary locative sense of *παρά*. *Παραχρήμα* is a phrase adapted unchanged for adverbial use. In *παραπλήσιον*, *παραπλησίως* and *παραυτίκα* the addition *close by* intensifies the force of an adverb which invites an element of this kind.

¹ The simplex *δειγματίζω* is apparently later than the cpd. in emerging, and is best taken as a popular derivative from *παραδειγματίζω* on the basis of the existing *δειγμα*. But that the verb does not emerge till the papyri is not positive proof that it did not exist. [See also *Vocab.* 138.—Ed.]

² The simplex, if it really exists, is secondary to the cpd.

Περί § 124. 13. *† Περί (πέρι) answers exactly in form and meaning to Skt. *pāri*, Av. *pairi*, "around"; Lat. *per*, Goth. *fair-*, Lith. *peř*, less obviously connected in meaning, remind us that the semasiology will not be wholly easy to follow. Brugmann (*Grd.*² II. ii. 865) notes that the divergence dates from I.E. times. He gives the meanings of the preverb as *hinüber, über etwas hinaus—Übergang in ein anderes Verhältniss, in eine andre Form, zu Entgegengesetztem, Umänderung, besonders zum Schlechten—hindurch—umher, herum, um—durch und durch, allseitig, sehr*. But in Greek, as he and Thumb observe (*Gr.*⁴ 511 f.), *around* covers most of the ground: its development was connected with that of ἀμφί, and in dialects and Κοινή the preposition came near ὑπέρ.

(a) There are 32 περί verbs in NT (33 if we accept περιπαίνω from \aleph^* in Rev 19¹³), of which about four-fifths show the meaning "round, about." Περιάπτω *kindle* is not quite clear: perhaps it is enough to compare περιαστρέπτω and περιλάμπω and point to the way the flame runs "round." Περιβάλλω *clothe* illustrates the link with ἀμφί (cf. ἀμφιέννυμι): so περιζώννυμι (=Lith. *pérjosti*). Περιρήγνυμι *tear off* (clothes) is correlative. Περιπατέω *walk about* links itself with Lat. *perambulare*. So does περιφέρω *bear about* with *perfero*. To other headings we assign the following. Περιαιρέω *remove* is taken by Grimm to include (2 Cor 3¹⁶, Ac 27⁴⁰) the idea of something *enveloping* or *lying on both sides*; but it is better to make it intensive (see above). Περιεργάζομαι (cf. περιέργος) implies *overdoing* a thing, with the pejorative nuance included under Brugmann's second heading (above): cf. *perverto, perdo, perimo*. Περιέχω (in 1 Pet 2⁶, and vernacular sources) has a curious intransitive force, *is contained*: the active *include* is easy, and the intransitive use appears to follow the analogy of οὕτως ἔχει etc. Cf. περιοχή *period*. Περίσταμαι *avoid*, a Κοινή use, is somewhat difficult: it may belong to the second category again, of "passage into another relation," whence *shift round*, mid. intransitively with acc. of object shunned. Περιλείπομαι *remain over, survive*, περιποιέομαι *make survive for oneself, gain*, have the force seen in περισσός. Περιμένω is like *pervenio*, Goth. *fairrinnan* (=ἐφικνεῖσθαι): περί is *hindurch*. Περιπίρω *pierce through*, like *perforo* etc. Περιπίπτω is apparently *fall amid*, a kind of passive to περιβάλλω. Περισπάομαι *distract* is like our "pull about." Περιφρονέω *despise* is compared by Brugmann with Skt. *paricakṣ* (*cakṣ*=see—cf. περιωράν) *overlook, disregard*.

(b) Ten noun compounds in NT are linked with verbs included under (a). This includes ἐπιπερίστατος, the difficult ἀλ. discussed above, § 106.

Περικάθαρμα and περίψημα (*ψήω, ψάω, *wipe*), start from "cleaning, wiping round." Περικρατής=having κράτος over, lit. *around*. Περίλυπος is intensive, *having excessive sorrow*. Περίοικος *having house around*—like περίχωρος—is really independent of περιοικέω, but is counted among the ten above. Περιούσιος¹ is said to be a Biblical coinage (LXX), like εἰσιούσιος in NT, to render a Hebrew word meaning "special possession." Can we get the meaning *special, superior*, out of περιουσία *superiority*? It seems desirable to connect it with the quite common noun if at all possible.

(c) Περικεφαλαία is a Cl. VII. noun=τὸ περὶ κεφαλῆν (cf. προσκεφάλαιον). Πέριξ appears to be the nom. sing. of an old adj. formed directly from περὶ with suffixal κ: so περισσός (=perikyos) and its derivatives.

§ 125. 14. *Πρό, for the cognates of which
 Πρό see on παρά *ad. init.*, answers to Skt. *prá*, Av. *frā*, Lat. *prō-*, OIr. *ro-*, Goth. *fra-*, Ger. *ver-*, E. *for-*, Lith. *pra*: its original and still normal sense is *forwards, before*, of either time or place. Lat. *prō, prōd-*, is closely related, and in many cpds. takes the place of *prō-*. The I.E. preverb seems to have been used with special frequency: its close attachment to the verb is marked by the rule that in double or treble cpds. containing *prō* this always comes last—e.g. ὑπεκπροφυγῶν (Hom.), Skt. *ānu prá eti*, etc. (This rule is primitive, but extinct fairly early: five NT cpds. violate it.) Significant also is the frequency of cpds. which seem to have I.E. antiquity, such as *prō g'em* (Gk., Lat., Goth.), *prō bher* (Ar., Gk., Lat., Goth., Slav.).

(a) Πρό forms in NT 49 verbal cpds., in 28 of which it more or less clearly implies *before*, of time, and in about 11 *before*, of place: in προγράφω, προέρχομαι, and προοράω both occur. Besides these we have verbs in which *forward* or *forth* would suit better, whether in local sense, as προπέμπω, προτείνω, προφέρω, or metaphorically, as προκαλέομαι, προλέγω (in some disputed places), προτίθεμαι=*propose*, προτρέπομαι. In προαιρέομαι we have the idea of *preference* (cf. πρὸ πάντων), in προσταίωμαι² that of *protection* or *care*. (Προτάσσω is counted in the list on the strength of one occurrence in D*.) The problem of προεχόμεθα in Rom 3^o does not turn on the προ-: see the Verb-syntax.

(b) Five noun compounds are linked with NT verbs accounted for

¹ See J. B. Lightfoot, *Fresh Revision* (1891), pp. 260 ff.

² Brugmann-Thumb (p. 514) prefers *forward*, i.e. *openly*; but does this suit the following genitive so well?

under (a). *Before* in time or space appears in πρόγονος, πρόδρομος, προθεσμία, πρόκριμα, προπάτωρ; *openly* in πρόδηλος, *forward* in πρόβατον (whatever the second element), πρόθυμος (=having mind forward, ready), προπετής, πρηγής (if =headlong¹). Προδότης *traitor*, from προδίδωμι = *prodo*, seems to start from *forth, away*: we use *give away* in the sense of *betray*. Πρόφασις is *saying or showing in front of*, i.e. an excuse to cloak the reason. Προφήτης has *representative* force, an interpreter speaking for the divinity. According to Brugmann (*Gr.*⁴ 158) we should place here the problem-word πρό-σφατος, the second element of which is an isolated by-form from the root of φθάνω: this is obviously commended by the meaning.

(c) Πρό has a comparative πρότερος: πρώτος if for πρώτ-ατος is from a cognate and not directly formed. To Cl. VII. belong προούλιον = τὸ πρὸ αὐλῆς ὄν, and πρόχειρος (whence ῥίξιμαί) = πρὸ χειρῶν ὄν or ἔχων, with πρὸ local in both cases. Προσάββατον from πρὸ σαββάτου has πρὸ temporal. Πόρρω may be remotely connected.

§ 126. 15. *†† πρὸς is less conspicuous as
 πρὸς a preverb than as a preposition. Its oldest Greek form is προτί = Skt. *prāti*, but the dialects show also a synonymous ποτί (Doric) and πός (Arkad.-Cyprian). The Ar. *pas-cā* ("after"), Lat. *pos-t*, Lith. *pàs* ("near, to"), Alb. *pas* ("after"), may prove *pos* as well as *poti* to be pre-Greek, in which case we have an additional force to explain the survival of πρὸς (= *proty*, the *sandhi*-form before vowels) over προτί. Like Greek, Aryan had both *prati* and *pāti*, the former surviving in Indian, the latter in Iranian: whether there was any distinction of meaning we cannot tell. Both seem to have been local adverbs = "over against." Πός survived in the Κοινή of Phrygia, but otherwise only πρὸς is found in our period. For all these statements see Brugmann-Thumb *Gr.* 514 f. Outside Aryan there is hardly any sign of προτί: Brugmann (*Grd.*² II. ii. 877) would find its gradation doublet *preti* in Lat. *pretium*, and Lettish *pret* ("against"), also Pamphylian περτί. He suggests that *po-s* and *po-ti* may be extensions of (a)πό, as *pro-ti* of *pro*: for the element *-ti* cf. ἀντί, με-τί (?—see under μετά), ἔτι. *Direction* and *addition* are the general headings under which the Greek meanings fall.

¹ Which is improbable for the one NT occurrence, since Bp. Chase's argument for *πρησθεις ουollen* as the meaning in Ac 1¹⁶: see *JTS* xii. 278 and Harnack's endorsement in *ThLZ* xxxvii. 235.

(a) There are 44 composita with *πρός* in NT, if we include *προσαχέω* (Ac 27²⁷ B*) and *προσεγγίζω* (Mk 2⁴ ACD ω). In all but about 8 of these the *πρός* is directive, answering to the meaning of *πρός* as preposition c. acc. In *προσαιτέω* and *προσδέομαι* we should express the force better by *πρός* c. abl., where the case implies *from* and *πρός* adds "to oneself." Sometimes the prepositional equivalent would be rather *πρός* c. loc., as *προσμένειν τινί* = *μένειν πρὸς τινί*. Other cpds. have *πρός* = *in addition*, a meaning which it held in its use as an adverb without a case: so *προσαναπληρώω*, *προσαπειλέομαι*, *προσδαπανάω*, *προσεάω*, *προσεργάζομαι*, *προσοφείλω*, *προστιθήμι*. One of the directive cpds. deserves a note, *προσεύχομαι*, an old word which is markedly appropriated in NT for Christian prayer: contrast *εὐχόμεαι* in Ac 27³⁹. The vivid sense of *πρὸς τὸν θεόν* accompanying it made it the natural word.

(b) Sixteen noun cpds. in NT are linked with verbs accounted for under (a). *Ἀπρόσιτος* from *πρόσειμι* *go to*, *πρόσχυσις* from *προσχέω* *pour on*, may be added. A pure noun cpd. is *προσφιλής* *dear to, pleasing*. *Προσευχή* was probably secondary to the verb *προσεύχομαι*, with *εὐχή* as a starting-point. *Πρόσωπον* (with its derivatives) goes with *μέτωπον*, and on its analogy will mean the part "up to the eyes."

(c) Nouns of Cl. VII. are *πρόσκαιρος* from *πρὸς καιρόν*, *προσκεφάλαιον* from *πρὸς κεφαλὴν*, *πρόσπεινος* from *πρὸς πείναν*. *Ἐμπροσθεν* from *ἐν* and *πρόσθεν*: see under Improper Prepositions, § 130.

Σύν

§ 127. 16. † Σύν, which as a preverb has a

most extended use in Greek, has no clear cognates outside: *μεταξύ* is witness to two older by-forms, *ξύν* and *ξύ*. It may be assumed that *ξύν* (cf. Ion. *ξύνός* = *κοινός* in formation and meaning, being *ξύν* and *κομ-* with adj. suff. *-γος*) is the older form, but the phonetic conditions which caused the *κ* to vanish are not cleared up: *ξύλον* and *ξύλινος* have initial *σ-* in a few Attic inscr. of iv/B.C.¹ For the possibility of a Slavic cognate see Boisacq *s.v.* *ξύν*. It is conceivably a primitive Greek compound of *έξ* (reduced by gradation as in Lat. *s-uper* and *s-ub*) and *su* which may be recognisable in Lith. *sù* "with," unless this is capable of representing *ksu* by itself: see Brugmann *Grd.*² II. ii. 897. The restrictions of *σύν* when used as a preposition are obvious—note that they are not shared when the word becomes a preverb.

(a) The proper meaning of *σύν* being *together*, it is capable (like the synonymous Latin *com-*) of making pure perfectives, under which heading we may class about 24 of the 123 *σύν* compounds in NT.² The rest con-

¹ Meisterhans² 92.

² The total includes *συνελαίνω* (Ac¹ AEP ω) and *συγκαταρεύω* (Ac¹ D).

tain *σύν*=*with*, or various shades of meaning included under *together*. The perfectives reckoned in the above total are *συλλαμβάνω* (*concipio*), *συλλογίζομαι* (*colligo*), *συναρπάζω* (*comprimo*), *συνευδοκέω* (in 1 Cor 7^{12a}.—elsewhere *joint* approval), *συνέχω*, *συνθλάω*, *συνθλίβω*, *συνθρόπτω* (cf. *confringo* etc.), *συγκαλύπτω* (*conceal*), *συγκάμπτω*, *συγκινέω* (*commoveo*), *συγκλείω* (*concludo*), *συγκύπτω*, *συνοράω*, *συμπεριλαμβάνω*, *συμπίπτω* (*concido*), *συμπληρώω* (*compleo*), *συμπνίγω*, *συντελέω*, *συντέμνω* (*concido*), *συντηρέω*, *συντρίβω*, *συγχέω* (-*χύνω*) (*confundo*), *συσπαράσσω* (*convello*). Some of these have the ordinary force of *σύν* in some of their uses; and in other cases the line between perfective *σύν* and non-perfective is not easy to draw. A few of these latter call for note. *Συμβαίνω* (cf. *contingo*) seems to start its special sense from the idea of *coincidence*, and *συμφέρω* from *contributory* action. *Συναλλάσσω* when compared with the nearly synonymous *καταλλάσσω* might be treated as an instance of *σύν* perfective; but it seems to derive its force mainly from the idea of *intercourse*. *Συνελαύνω*, in the one place where NT MSS show it (Ac 7²⁶, where the tense alone suffices to make the reading impossible), must be *compello*=*drive together*, of two parties. *Συνήμι* and *συνιστάνω* (= *exhibeo*) seem to contain the idea of a mental "synthesis." *Συλλυπέομαι* in Mk 3⁶ is difficult, since the word in its earlier record involves *sympathy*, which is somewhat forced here: can it be perfective=*utterly* distressed? *Συγχράομαι* might almost be called an equivalent of *χρᾶσθαι*=*deal with*; but the sociative *σύν* seems to be consciously present, and there is no specially perfective force visible.

(b) In noun cpds. *σύν* acts very much as in verbal. There are 18 words and groups in NT closely connected with verbs found there: *σύγχυσις*, *συνοχή*, *συντέλεια*, *συντόμως*, *σύντριμμα* belong to the perfectives, and the rest to the *com-* class. (*Συντέλεια* of course is from *συντελής*, but its Hellenistic meaning, *consummation*, appears to spring from association with *συντελέω*.) Definitely verbal cpds. are *συναγωγή* (which has become concrete from abstract) and its cpd. *ἐπισυναγωγή*, *συγγνώμη* (from *συγγιγνώσκω pardon*)—the special meaning seems to spring from the idea of *sympathy*, *συγκυρία* (from *συγκυρέω coincide*), *συνδρομή* (cf. *συντρέχω*), *συνειδήσις* (a Hellenistic derivative from *σύννοια*=*conscio*), *σύνεσις*, *συνετός* and *ἀσύνετος* (from *συνήμι*), *συνωμοσία* (from *συνόμνυμι*=*coniuro*), *συστατικός* (from *συνιστάνω*=*commendo*), and *ἀσύνθετος* (from *συντίθημι*). Of purely noun character are a good many of Cl. V. (based on IV.c), as *συγγενής* *having common race*, *σύμμορφος* *having same form*, *σύμφωνος* (whence *ἔω* etc.), *σύμψυχος*, *συμπαθής* (whence *ἔω*), *σύζυγος*, *σύμβουλος*, (*συνέδριον* from) *σύνεδρος*, *συνεργός*, (*συνήθεια* from) *συνηθής*, *σύντροφος* (*τροφή*), *σύνδεσμος*, etc. Others again are Descriptives (IV.c), as *συγκληρονόμος*, *συγκοινωνός*, *συμμαθητής*, *συμμιμητής*, (*συμπόσιον* from) *συμποτής*, *συναιχμάλωτος*, *σύνδουλος*, *συνέκδημος*, *συστασιώτης*. Note the pleonasm in *συμμέτοχος*.

(c) Apart from *μεταξύ* (see above), there seem to be no compound adverbs containing *σύν*; nor are there any CL. VII. formations in NT.

Υπέρ § 128. 17. *† Υπέρ was in proethnic speech the antithesis of *ἡδheri* (*under*, Lat. *infer-us*, *infrā*, Skt. *ādharas*, Av. *adairi*, perh. ἀθερίζω "to slight"). The alternative form with the locative suffix *-i* appears in Skt. *upāri* (also Iranian). Lat. *s-uper* (a compound), Gaulish *Ver* (*cingetorix* etc.), Goth. *ufar*=*over*, and Armen. *i ver*, illustrate it further. The meaning is uniform throughout the wide field, viz. *over*, passing into *across*, *beyond*. Υπέρ is still capable of adverbial use in the NT period (2 Cor 11²³). For the curious fact that the I.E. *uper(i)* and *upo*, which are obviously kin, should in Greek and other languages have antithetic meanings, see under *ὑπό*.

(a) Only 14 verb cpds. of *ὑπέρ* occur in NT; but it is conspicuously capable of forming new ones in this period. Thus it is very likely that Paul coined *ὑπερνικῶ*. In this word and in *ὑπεραυξάνω*, *ὑπερπερισεύω*, *ὑπερπλεονάζω*, *ὑπερυψώ* (all Pauline) the preverb simply magnifies, as in *overjoyed* (*ὑπερχαίρω*). Elsewhere, as usually in our own *over-* cpds., there is the sense of *excess*: so *ὑπεραίρομαι*, *ὑπερβάλλω* (cf. *overshoot*), *ὑπερεκτείνω*, *ὑπερεκχύννομαι*, *ὑπερφρονέω* (cf. *overweening*). Υπερβαίνω = *go beyond*, *transgress*; ὑπεροράω = *overlook*, *neglect*; ὑπερεντυγχάνω = *intercede for* (*ὑπέρ τινος*); ὑπερέχω = *surpass*. It is characteristic of Paul's temperament that only $\frac{1}{5}$ occurrences of *ὑπερ-* cpds. in NT lie outside the *corpus Paulinum*.

(b) Υπερβολή and ὑπεροχή are parallel in meaning with their verbs in (a) above. Υπερήφανος = "overbearing" is generally assumed to contain *ὑπέρ* (or *ὑπερος*) and the root of *φαίνω*, but the *-η-* (for *ā*, as Pindar shows) is not thus satisfactorily explained.¹ Nor is *ὑπερῶν*, from the adj. *ὑπερώιος* = *upper*, the suffix of which is obscure. Υπερόγκος with *excessive swelling* is a Descriptive based on a CL. IV.c cpd.

(c) Υπεράκμος, from *ὑπέρ ἀκμήν* *beyond prime*, belongs to CL VII. Υπερέκεινα, which is guaranteed to be good Κοινή by the strictures of Thomas Magister, is simply *ὑπέρ ἐκείνα* turned into one word: so the earlier *ἐπέκεινα*. In *ὑπερεκπερισσοῦ* a compound adverbial phrase has been heightened as in *ὑπερεκπερισσῶς*, *ὑπερλίαν* and *ὑπερπερισσῶς* a simple or compound adverb. Υπεράνω is rather different, as the former element prevails and makes the whole an improper preposition differing little from *ὑπέρ* c. gen.: cf. *ἐπάνω*.

¹ Wackernagel *Dehnungsgesetz* 42 makes it = *ὑπερ-δφ-α-ρος*, with the vowel of *αφ* lengthened at the juncture: cf. *κατηφής* and derivatives.

ὑπό § 129. 18. *† ὑπό=Lat. *sub*, *super* (like *super*, somewhat doubtfully explained as for *x-upo*, *x-uper*, from *ex*), Skt. and Av. *upa*, Gaulish *Vo*(retus etc.), OIr. *fo*, Goth. *uf*, Ger. *auf*. The adv. ὑψι (*superl. ὕψιστος*) and noun ὕψος seem to have affected the originally distinct ὑψηλός, for *ὑξηλός (cf. Gaul. *Uxellodunum* 'Hightown'). These cognates, together with ὑπέρ, need to be brought in here to account for the meaning: add *up*=O.E. *uppe*, OIcel. *upp*, probably from proto-Germanic *upn*, Skt. *upan-ayati* (Brugmann *Grd.*² II. ii. 911). The original idea accordingly seems to be "upwards from below": cf. also Goth. *iup* (I.E. *eurpn-*) "upwards," Lat. *susque deque* "up and down," *sustineo* "hold up." Brugmann also compares *aufsteigen*, *succingere*, for the idea of motion from below. In that case it was possible, in languages which like Greek and Latin had lost the I.E. antithesis of *over* and *under* (*uperi*, *ἠdheri*—see above by the disappearance of the latter, that the starting-point of *upo* should be isolated, and ὑπό *sub* become the antithesis of ὑπέρ *super*. This is essentially Brugmann's explanation (*op. cit.* 912). Note that Goth. *uf* renders ὑπό c. acc., as in Mt 8⁸.

(a) The 27 ὑπό cpds. occurring in NT can mostly be paralleled with Latin words containing *sub*. The idea of "submission" accounts for ὑπακούω,¹ ὑπέικω, ὑπέχω, ὑποτάσσω; that of "underhand" for ὑποβάλλω, ὑποκρίνομαι.¹ *Under* in the literal sense gives ὑποδέομαι and ὑποστρωνύω (cf. Aryan, Lat., Goth., OIr., for an identic cpd.). Motion ὑπό τι may explain ὑποδέχομαι, ὑποστρέφω, and perhaps originally ὑπάγω, ὑποχωρέω, but ὑπό leaves no sensible force but *away*, or even *back*, in the last three named. Ὑπαντάω=come *up* to; ὑπάρχω spring *up*, arise; ὑποδείκνυμι, ὑπομιμνήσκω and ὑπονοέω (cf. *suggest*) convey the idea of thoughts making their way *up* into the mind; ὑποζώννυμι gird *up*, cf. *succingo*, ὑπολαμβάνω =take *up*, in various senses; ὑπολείπω (-λιμπάνω)=leave *behind* (*qs.* at the bottom); ὑπομένω=*undergo*, sometimes=*tarry behind*, as in ὑπολείπω; ὑποπλέω=sail *under*, close up to, and so ὑποτρέχω; ὑποπνέω=*sufflo*, breathe *softly*; ὑποστέλλω=draw *back* (cf. on ὑποχωρέω above)—note that Wulfila renders *ufslaur* in Gal 2¹².

(b) Ὑπακοή and ὑπήκοος, ὑπάντησις, ὑπαρξίς, ὑπόδειγμα, ὑπόδημα, ὑπόκρισις and -κριτής, ὑπόλειμμα, ὑπόμνησις, ὑπομονή, ὑπόνοια, ὑπο-

¹ In both of these verbs the sense of ὑπό has continued to work in the later development. Ὑπακούω was originally only to "answer" the door, ὑποκρίνομαι (in Attic—developed from "answer") to "play a part": in both we recognise originally the local sense found in ὑποχωρέω.

στολή, ὑποταγή and ἀνυπότακτος are accounted for above, under their allied verbs in (a). Ὑπηρέτης (whence -έω) was originally a t.t. of the galley (cf. ἐρέσσω), as ὑπηρεσία still shows in classical writers, but it early lost its special connotation and became an "underling" in general. Ὑπολαμπάς (Ac 20⁶ D) = *window* is a very rare word (see LS, and add *Syll.* 568²¹⁹ (*Syll.*³ om.) [ii/B.C.]): apparently a screen *under* which the light shines. Ὑπόστασις in its various meanings runs parallel with its Latin equivalent *substantia*, an underlying foundation being implied. Ὑποτύπωσις is like ὑπογραμμός, both suggesting a copy traced over a pattern below. Ὑπεραντίος is a stronger form of ἐναντίος, with ὑπό as in ὑπαντάω: the opponent "comes up against" one.

(c) Nouns of Cl. VII. are ὑπανδρος = ὑπ' ἀνδρὶ ὄσα, ὑπόδικος = ὑπὸ δίκῃ ἄν, ὑποζύγιον = ὑπὸ ζυγῶ ὄν, ὑπολήνιον = ὑπὸ ληνῶ ὄν, ὑποπόδιον = ὑπὸ ποσὶν ὄν, and ὑπόπιον (whence ὑπωπιάζω) = τὸ ὑπ' ὀπί, the cheek just under the eye. All come from the meaning *under*, as used (in class. Gk.) with locative. Ὑποκάτω down *under* is the only compound adverb—see the improper prepositions.

III. IMPROPER PREPOSITIONS.

§ 130. † Ἄμα is an old instr. case of *sem*
Improper (εἰς), = *sigma*: Lat. *unā* has a similar history.

Ὅμοῦ is a case of *ὁμός (= *same*), which only differs in gradation, but it is not used prepositionally. The meaning is that of *simul* (a derivative of the same root), *with one thing, together*.

* Ἄνευ *without* is of doubtful history. It has been connected by Wackernagel with Lat. *sine*, by others with Goth. *inu* (Ger. *ohne*). So Brugmann-Thumb, *Gr.* 523.

* Ἀντικρῶς (Attic—other dialects are without the -s, for which see under ἀχρῖ(ς)) *opposite*. Clearly a cpd. of ἀντί: its second element has been assigned to the root of κάρα, *qs.* "having the head (face) opposite": this is not perhaps a great improvement on the older derivation from κρούω. WH accentuate proparoxytone: Blass (p. 20) gives Attic ἀντικρῶς = *downright*, but accentuates this late preposition on analogy of Attic (κατ)αντικρῶς.

* Ἀντιπέρθε *opposite* has the later form without final ν: it is a cpd. prep.—see below for its elements.

* Ἀπέναντι *opposite*: see ἐναντι below.

* Ἄτερ *without* probably came into the Κοινή mainly from

Ionic, which would account for its limited use there [LXX, NT and papp. once each]. It is generally taken as = Eng. *sunder*, I.E. *sntér*. The aspirate destroyed by Ionic psilosis is plausibly recognised in *ἄρεπος*, the older form of *ἔρεπος* (cf. Attic *θάρεπον*) = *separate* ("sundry"). *Sine* and perhaps *ἄνευ* will be cognate.

* *ἄχρι(ς)* *until* is a phonetic doublet of *μέχρι(ς)*: *a* (= *η*) is the weak grade of *μe*. The final *-s*, which had become functionless in the prehistoric period and came into Hellenistic perhaps through the influence of Epic language, appears to a very limited extent in the NT as in LXX and papyri, and never before a consonant. See Thackeray 136, WH *App.*² 155: for its history Brugmann *KVG* 456. There is no visible difference between *ἄχρι* and *μέχρι*. Brugmann gives the Armenian *merj* "near" as a cognate.

*† *ἔγγυς* *near* (cpve. *ἐγγύτερον*) is the neuter of an obsolete adjective in *-ύς* with an *-ς* added which has the same history as that in *ἄχρῖς*, *οὐτως*, *εὐθύς* etc. No very safe guess has been made as to its etymology.

* *ἔκτος* *outside* is a derivative of *ἐξ*: the *-τος* is a suffix with ablative force as in Lat. *coelitus*, Skt. *nāmatas*, etc. See Brugmann *KVG* 455, also 180, where Locrian *ἐχθός* is noted as older, *ἐξ* being for **ἐχς* (cf. *ἔσχατος*).

* *ἔμπροσθεν* *in front of* is a combination of *ἐν* with *πρόσθεν*, that is *πρός* + ablative suffix *-θεν*.

* *ἔναντι* *in the presence of* has two further compounds *ἀπέναντι* and *κατέναντι*, which secured a place in *Κοινή* literature, while *ἔναντι* itself appears in a very old Cretan inscription, and in LXX and one or two inscriptions and papyri of the Hellenistic period. Wackernagel (*Hellenistica*, pp. 3–6) shows that it came into Hellenistic from Doric Greek. The Attic was **ἐναντίον*, which held a stronger position in the *Κοινή* than an element drawn from the less influential dialect. It is acc. of the adj. *ἐναντίος* (see p. 308). *Ἀπέναντι* has the same three adverbs as the French *en avant*, but in a different order. (Note that *ἔναντι* was for Grimm presumably a Jewish coinage!)

* *ἔνεκεν*, less frequently *ἐνεκα*, also *εἵνεκεν* (*quater*) *because of*. On the variant forms cf. Thackeray 82 f., 135, Mayser 241 f., Crönert 114, Schwyzer 35 f., Nachmanson 18 f., WS 50. The NT order of frequency matches that found in the *Κοινή* sources: it does not seem possible to trace much system in the use of

variants due originally to dialect mixture. The Attic was *ἐνεκα*, which was invaded by *ἐνεκεν* as early as iv/B.C. (end): see Meisterhans³ 215 f., who shows that in ii/B.C. it has almost driven out *ἐνεκα* even in Attica. Thumb *Dial.* 359 gives *εἶνεκα* and *ἐνεκε* (Erythrae al.) *ἐνεκε* (Ephesus al.) as the Ionic forms. It is derived from **ἐνφεκα*, and the second element is a case-form of $\sqrt{\text{φεκ-}}$ (whence the ptc. *ἐκόν*). Brugmann (*Gr.*⁴ 524) compares Armen. *vasn* with same meaning as *ἐνεκα*, but notes that its morphology is not clear.

* *Ἐντός* *within*, Latin *intus*: see *ἐκτός* above.

* *Ἐνώπιον* *before, in presence of* (cpd. *κατενώπιον*), an adverb from the old adjective *ἐνώπιος*, a derivative of the phrase *ἐν ὤπα* (acc.) *to the face*, which became stereotyped as an adverb. It was only moderately common in the *Κουή*, but attained currency among Biblical translators as a conveniently literal equivalent of פְּנֵי : see *Prol.* 99. In legal papyri it gains a separate currency by its equivalence to Lat. *coram*.

* *Ἐξω* *outside*, whence (cpve. *ἐξώτερος* and) the similarly used *ἐξωθεν*, is best, I think, treated as a compound of *ἐξ* and the obsolete adverb **ῶ*, Skt. *ā*, possibly a gradation variant of either (Lat.) *ā* or *ē*: traces of it are probably visible in *ὠ-κεανός*, *ὠ-ρύομαι*, *ὠ-κέλλω*, *ὠ-δύρομαι* al. Cf. *ἔσ-ω*, *ἄν-ω*, *κάτ-ω*, *ὀπίσω*. So now Brugmann *KVG* 465.

* *Ἐπάνω* *above, upon*, a compound of *ἐπί* and *ἄνω* (see above).

* *Ἐπέκεινα* *beyond*, lit. *to that* (side), *ἐπ' ἐκείνα*. Cf. *ὑπερέκεινα*.

* *Ἐσω* (whence *ἐσώτερος* and *ἔσωθεν* adv.) *inside*. The classical alternative *εἶσω* (more correct, since *εἰς* is phonetically the form before vowels) has rather strangely yielded in Hellenistic to *ἔσω*, though *ἐς* is there obsolete (above, p. 304). For *-ω* see above *s.v.* *ἔξω*.

* *Ἔως* *until*, also of space *as far as* (as *ὡς* in MGr, Thumb *Hellen.* 125). It answers (except in the final *-ς*) to Skt. *yāvat* "so long as," with correlative *tāvat*: in Homer these were presumably *ἄφος* and *τᾶφος* (Doric *rās*, *ās*), but they are affected by Ionic spellings. "*Ἔως* is accordingly from the stem of the relative *ὄς*, with a possessive suffix (Brugmann *KVG* 667): its passage from conjunction to preposition (in and after Aristotle) is traced by Brugmann (*Gr.*⁴ 496) to the analogy of *μέχρι*, which already combined these functions.

* *Μεταξύ* *between* is most simply taken as a mere compound of

μετά and ξύν : cf. νύ by the side of νύν. (So Brugmann *Gr.*⁴ 521).

* Μέχρι(ς) *until* : see ἄχρι(ς) above.

* Ὅπισθεν and ὀπίσω *behind, after*. The older form ὀπιθεν seems to be an ablative from the noun base whose accus. is seen in κατόπιν. But at the same time *ὄπι belongs with gradation to ἔπι (ἐπί)—cf. ὀπ-ώρα, ὀψέ, Latin *op* (*ob*) and our *after* : its weak grade is seen in πι-έξω. The form of both these “improper” preps. has been affected by the antithetic πρόσσω and πρόσθεν : πρόσσω (= *protiy-ō*, with *ō* as in ἔξω above) produced its opposite ὀπίσσω as early as Homer, and ὀπιθεν was modified in the same period, surviving only in poetry (see ἔμπροσθεν above). An alternative account in Brugmann *Grd.*² II. ii. 729 seems less probable.

† Παραπλήσιον *near to*, neuter of an adj. compounded of παρά and πλησίος : see πλησίον below.

* Παρεκτός *except* : see ἐκτός above.

* Πέραν *beyond* is closely connected with πέρα (cf. ἀντιέρα above) : they are case-forms of a pronominal adjective common in Skt. (*para*=*other*)—cf. πέρσι (p. 279), *perendie*, Eng. *far*. See under περί among the Prepositions proper.

* Πλήν *except* is connected by Brugmann (*Gr.*⁴ 523—see *KVG* 479) with πλησίον : πλήν τινος *qs.* “prope ab aliqua re.” The final -ν, as in other cases (πέραν al.) may be accus. or instrumental ultimately. The root appears to be *seq*^r, as in ἔπομαι *sequor* : *socius* and *secus* show the same divergence as πλήν and πλησίον.

* Πλησίον *near* (Dor. πλατίον), from √ *pelā* “draw near” hence πέλας with accent on first syllable of root, and πλατίος accented later. The word is of course the adverbial accus. of an adj.

* Ὑπεράνω *above*, a compound of ὑπέρ and ἄνω (see above).

* Ὑπερέκεινα *beyond*, lit. *beyond that* (side), ὑπὲρ ἐκεῖνα. Cf. ἐπέκεινα.

* Χάριν *for the sake of, on account of*, accus. of χάρις, exactly like our *thanks to*, except for the case governed.

Χωρίς *apart from* has a suffix parallel with that in ἄλις, Megarian ἄνις (= ἄνευ), which may possibly be akin to the plural instrumental ending (λόγοις etc.). The root seems to be found in χώρα χῶρος “empty space” and (with different

grades) *χῆρος* "empty of" and Skt. *hitvā* "without." The meaning *apart* comes easily from an instr. of such a noun. See Solmsen *Gr. Wortf.* 175 f.

**Μακράν* is a preposition in P Oxy i. 113¹⁸ (ii/A.D.), but in NT has *ἀπό* after it. It is only the acc. sg. fem. of *μακρός*, with presumably *ὄδόν* understood. Conceivably the consciousness of words like this may have prompted the new improper preposition **ὄδόν* by way of in the "translation Greek" of Mt 4¹⁵ (not LXX).¹

SUFFIXES.²

WORD-FORMATION BY SUFFIXES.

§ 131. We must now turn our attention to the second main division in the province of word-formation, namely, the study of formative elements within words. In the structure of the individual word we can generally distinguish between (a) the root, (b) the formative suffix (or suffixes), (c) the case suffix in the noun, or the personal suffixes in the verb. In addition to these there is sometimes (d) a prefix (or prefixes) at the beginning of the word. (For illustration, reference may be made to Giles, 26 ff.) In this section we are concerned primarily with the formative suffix, for notes have already been supplied under the heading Composition on the origin and meaning of such prefixes as we meet with in the vocabulary of the NT. Here, again, it is necessary to deal separately with nouns and verbs.

THE FORMATION OF NOUNS AND ADJECTIVES.

Root Nouns. § 132. A preliminary distinction must be made between root nouns and those nouns and adjectives which contain a formative suffix. Root nouns are those in which the case suffixes are attached to the bare root, that is, to something which is incapable of further analysis. They are generally monosyllabic, and are often found as the

¹ [See further, Appendix, p. 459.—Ed.]

² Dr. Moulton's MS ends with § 130. The chapter on Suffixes has been written by the Editor. See Preface.

second member of a compound noun. It is usual to classify them as they preserve two or more ablaut grades in the case forms, or as they show the same grade throughout.

(a) To the former class belong :

Πούς, gen. ποδός. Dor. πός. Skt. *pât, padâs*. Lat. *pēs, pedis*.

Εἶς, gen. ἐνός. In Cret. εἶς and neut. εἶν the *m* of **sem-* has become a according to phonetic law (see Brugmann *Gr.*⁴ 86, 88). The weak form of the stem appears (**ση-*) in ἀμ-α (*simul*), ἀ-παξ (Skt. *sa-kṣt*) and (**sm-*) in μ-ία and μ-ῶνυξ.

Φρήν, φρεν-ός. Derivation uncertain. For conjectures see Boisacq.

Ζεύς (see above, p. 142).

Χιών originally an *m*-stem (Brugmann *Gr.*⁴ 88), cf. Lat. *hiem-s*.

Βοῦς, Skt. *gāúṣ*. The weakest grade of the stem **gʷu-* is seen in ἐκατόμ-βη (cf. Skt. *śata-gu-* = having 100 kine) and possibly in βόσ-πορος.

(b) To the second class belong :

Υς (Lat. *sus*), ἰχθύς, ὄφρυς, ὄσφρυς (for accentuation see above, p. 141), ναῦς (from **naus*, Skt. *nāú-ṣ*. See above, p. 142), χεῖρ (p. 138), ἄλς (p. 132) (Lat. *sal*), θρίξ (p. 130).

(For full treatment see Brugmann *Grd.*² II. i. 130-146.)

FORMATIVE SUFFIXES.

Suffixes.

§ 133. Whether the suffixes which play so important a part in the stem formation of Greek nouns ever had a separate existence in the prehistoric stage of the original Indo-European language we cannot say. In O.E., *dōm* meaning judgment was a separate noun, though it also appeared as a suffix in such words as *cynedōm* (kingdom), *freo-dōm* (freedom). In the same way O.E. *lic*, which meant body or corpse (as preserved in the words lych-gate and lyke-wake) became the very common suffix -ly, so that manly or man-like means "having the body or form of a man."¹ Analogy is a tempting form of argument, but in the absence of convincing evidence, we must leave the question of the sometime separate existence of the Greek suffixes unanswered, and confine our attention to their function in the historical period of the language. The Indian grammarians distinguished between primary and secondary suffixes used in noun formation, primary being those attached to a root or to a verbal stem, secondary those added to a noun stem. Thus -τορ- in δῶ-τορ-ες was primary,

¹ See Giles², 246 ff.

-*ω*- in *πάτρ-ω-ς* secondary. Modern philologists (e.g. Giles², 245) apply these terms differently, using primary of a suffix which is added directly to a root, and secondary of a suffix which is added to an existing stem which already contains a suffix. Thus -*ω*- in *ἐαρι-νό-ς* is secondary because it follows the locative case ending of the noun. For our treatment of the subject, however, the distinction may be ignored for reasons given by Brugmann (*Grd.*² II. i. 124 f.).

A. Vowel Suffixes.¹

(1) -*ο*- and -*ᾶ*-.

1. Nouns in -*ο*-.

§ 134. This -*ο*- was originally the second syllable in dissyllabic light bases, and in the primitive I.E. period served a noun function, e.g. *λύκο-ς* (Skt. *ῥῥκα-ς*) < I.E. **ῥῥkʷó-ς*; *ζυγό-ν* (Skt. *yugá-m*); also adjectivally, e.g. *νέ(φ)ο*ς (Skt. *nána-ς*). The ablaut relation *o/e* appears in the vocative *λύκε* (Skt. *ῥῥka*, Lat. *lupe*). The suffix -*ο*- was then attached to bases which had the accent originally on the first syllable. In the same way the -*ᾶ*-, originally the second syllable of dissyllabic heavy bases, appears to have been extracted and given an extended use as a feminine suffix in the I.E. period.

The most important use of the -*ο*- suffix is in connexion with verbal roots. Two classes of nouns are thus formed, according to the accent; the barytones are *nomina actionis*, and the oxytones *nomina agentis*.

(a) *Nomina actionis* are γόμος, δρόμος, πλό(φ)ος, πόνος (*πένομαι*), σπόρος, τόκος, τρόμος, τρόπος, φόβος (*φέβομαι*), φόνος, φόρος: and with hanged meaning λόγος, νόμος, ὄγκος (*ένεγκ-είν*), τάφος (*θάπτω*), τοῖχος.

(b) *Nomina agentis* are τροφός, τροχός.

Both classes became important in providing the latter member for compound nouns and adjectives. The NT provides examples in *χιλί-αρχος*, *ἀρχ-ηγός*, *πρό-δρομος*, *οἰκο-δόμος*, *δεξιο-λάβος* (*δεξιο-βόλος*, L in Ac 23²²), *ἔμ-πορος*, *δοδο-πόρος* (>*δοδοπορέω*), *ιερό-συλος*.

For the accentuation of such compounds see below, p. 392 N.2.

Compounds, not only from verbal stems, but from nouns with various stem-endings, often took this suffix. See below, Adjectives in -*ο*-.

2. Nouns in -*α*-, -*η*-.

Verbal abstract nouns in -*ᾶ* (-*ῆ*), formed directly from the

¹ An obelus (†) before a word in the chapter on Suffixes marks it as not appearing before Aristotle.

root, were inherited at an early stage, and were still in active formation during the historical period :

-α (-η) *E.g.* ἀρχή, βολή (βαλ-εῖν), δίκη (cf. δεικ-νυ-μι, Skt. *dīc-*, *dīk*, Lat. *dīco* and *judez* (**ious-dīc-s*)), δοχή (δέχ-ομαι), κλοπή (*κλεπ-ιω), νομή (νέμ-ω), πνοή (πνέω), ριπή (ρίπτω < **Fríp-ιω*), βοπή (ρέπω; for ριπή, 1 Co 15⁵² DG), σπορά (σπερ-οι σπαρ-), σπουδή (σπεύδ-ω), στεγή (στέγω, cf. Skt. *sthaḡati*, Lat. *tego*), στολή (στέλλω), σφαγή (σφάζω < *σφαγ-ιω), ταφή (θάπτω, ταφ-εῖν), τροπή (τρέπω), τροφή (τρέφω), φθορά (φθείρω < φθερ-ιω), φυγή (φυγ-εῖν), χαρά (χαρ-ῆναι).

NOTE.—The transition from the abstract to the concrete is specially noticeable in ἀκοή, which is often used for the organ of hearing as well as for the object heard, and γραφή (see *Vocab. s.v.* for its common use in papyri as “document of contract,” and its use in Aristees and NT for “Scripture”).

From the classical age all kinds of verbs gave rise to such formations, especially those ending in mutes, and more particularly those whose stems ended in mediae or aspirates, *e.g.* ἀρπαγή, διδαχή, καταλλαγή, παραλλαγή, ταραχή.

A few back-formations in -η are of special interest.

†*Ἀγάπη*, a shortened form of *ἀγάπησις*, just as *συνανή* (3 K 18¹⁸, 4 K 2¹⁸ 5²⁶) and *ἀπανή* (3 K 20¹⁸) are back-formations from *συνάντησις* and *ἀπάντησις*. (See *Vocab. s.v.* and supplementary note in *Exp T xxvi.* 139.)

†*Οἰκοδομή*, shortened in the same way from *οἰκοδόμησις*, appears first in Aristotle, and is frequently found in the *Κοινή*, both literary (see Lobeck *Phryg.* 487 ff.) and vernacular (see *Vocab. s.v.*), for *οἰκοδόμημα*; -ᾶ- is also used to represent the feminine equivalents to masculines in -ος: *e.g.* θεός: θεά, ἀδελφός: ἀδελφή. In this the adjectival type -ος, -ᾶ, -ον was followed.

3. Adjectives in -ος.

(a) *Simplicia*: ἀγαθός, βάρβαρος, ἐνεός (“*étym. inconnuie*,” Boissoq), ἔρημος, κωφός, λείος, λοιπός, μάρμαρος, μόνος, μωρός, νόθος, ολίγος, πειθός, σοφός, στενός, φίλος, χαλεπός, χωλός.

(b) *Compounds*: ἀναλος, πρόγονος, ἀργός (see pp. 158, 287), δύσκολος, ἔγκυος, ὄμιλος (see below, n. 1), ἀπειρος, ταλαίπωρος, †*ἄραφος* (for *ἀραπτος*, see p. 371), ἄσπονδος, †*τρίστεγος*, δίστομος, ἄστοργος, ἱερόσυλος, αὐτόφωρος.

NOTE.—1. ὄμιλος (which owes its place in NT text (Rev 18¹⁷) to cursive 1, the sole MS used by Erasmus for the Apoc.—a rdg. also found in Hipp.) is given a note here because it has not been included in the ὄμο- opds. in § 107 (p. 284). Sütterlin 61 suspects that it is a opd. Boissoq

(p. 700) derives from **δμο-μῆλ-* by syllabic haplogy and cft. Skt. *milāti* to come together, join, *mēlā-h* meeting, Lat. *mīles -ītis* (*mīl-ī-tēs* " **ceux qui marchent en troupe* ").

2. Adjectives formed from composita generally took the suffix most appropriate to the second member of the cpd. But when the first member was a particle or a preposition an *-ā-* stem gave way to the suffix *-o-*. This usage spread to most cpds. ending in *-a-* stems, and consonantal stems also showed a strong preference for the convenient suffix *-os*. See Debrunner *Wortb.* 71 ff., and p. 289 above.

(2) *-io-* and *-iā-*.

1. From adverbs and locatives in *-i-* we have—

-ios § 135. **ἄρτιος* (*ἄρτι*), *πρώιος* (*πρωί*) and so by analogy *ὄψιος* (*ὄψέ*), *ἐνάλιος* (*ἐν ἀλί*) and *παράλιος*, *δεξιός* (cf. *δεξι-τερός*). So *ἀίδιος* (for the locative *ἀεί* see *Vocab. s.v.*).

Under this head should also come *μέσος* (cf. Lat. *medius*, Skt. *mādhyas*. Brugm. *Grd.*² II. i. 164 relates this to **me-dhi*, *με-ρά* and Skt. *á-dhi*) and *ἄλλος* (**aljo-s*, Lat. *alius*, from **ali*, cf. Lat. *ali-ter*).

2. Verbal adjectives.

E.g. *ἅγιος* (*ἅζομαι*, Skt. *yágya-s*), *ἄξιος* (**áγ-τι-ος*, Boisacq, *s.v.*), *σφάγιος* (> *σφάγιον*, *σφάζω* = **σφαγγω*). In this way comes *μανία* (*μáινομαι* < I.E. **mehi-d-*).

In I.E. there were a number of adjectives in (*i*) *jo* with verbal force (see Brugm. *Grd.*² II. i. 183 ff.), and this tendency has not been without effect in Greek, though the suffix did not prove a fruitful source for adjectives.

3. *Denominative adjectives.*—This very numerous class consists of adjectives formed from the stems of nouns by means of the suffix *-ios* with the meaning "of, or belonging to."

Thus *ἰδοκίμιος* (< *δοκιμή* < *δόκιμος* < *δέκομαι*), *τίμιος* (< *τιμή*), *κόσμιος* (< *κόσμος*).

The suffix is thinly disguised by contraction in *θεῖος* : *θεός*, *πειθός* (*πειθ-ιος*, cf. Skt. *padyás*) : *πούς*.

This came to be the appropriate adjectival suffix in cpds., e.g. *καταχθόνιος*, *μακροχρόνιος*.

-τήριος From such regular formations as *σωτήριος* the new suffix *-τηριο-* was extracted, which appears in *ικετήριος*, and in the neuter nouns in *-τήριον* given in § 137 below. Apart from a rather numerous list of derived substantives (represented in NT by *ἰξευκτηρία* and *σωτηρία*), this suffix soon worked itself out, and was displaced by *-τικός*. Thus we have *κριτήριον*, but *κριτικός* (see p. 379).

The addition of *-ios* to various *-t* stems produced *-σιος* (*-σιος* (K. Bl. ii. 292), *έκούσιος* : *έκοντ.*). In this way *-σιος* came to be the regular adjectival formation corresponding to the verbal adjectives in *-τος*, e.g. *θαυμάσιος* : *θαυμαστός*, and to the denominative nouns and *deverbativa* in *-της*, e.g. *δημόσιος* : *δημότης* (< *δήμος*), *γνήσιος* : *γνησιότης* (< *γίγνομαι*).

NOTE.—1. Debrunner *Wortb.* 143) observes that this *-σιος* has become specially attached to compounds, since the verbal adjectives in *-τος* favoured the compounds, and the *nomina agentis* in *-της* were originally also peculiar to the compounds; in particular the fem. noun in *-σία* thus came into sharp contrast with *-σις* in the simplex verb. Thus *γνώσις* : *άγνωσία*, *δόσις* : *ήμισθαποδοσία*, *κρίσις* : *ήδικοκροσία*, *στάσις* : *ήάποστασία*.

2. *Φιλιππήσιος* (Ph 4th) does not, of course, belong to this group, but has the Gr. *-ios* added to the *-e(n)s-* stem of the Lat. *-ensis*. For the loss of *-n-*, see above, p. 106. Ramsay (*JTS* i. 116) says this suffix is only used in Gr. to reproduce a Lat. name, as *Μουτουνησιος* for *Mutinensis*. The ordinary Gr. was *Φιλιππέις* or *-ηνός*. Possibly the remembrance of Homeric *ήθακήσιος* (Bl⁵-D 6 n. 6) may be a factor.

With *ā-* stems *-ios* combines to form *-αίος* (rarely *-αιος* as *δίκη* : *δίκαιος*); thus we have *άγοραίος*, *άναγκαίος*, *άρχαίος*, *ήάκρογωνιαίος* (see § 106 (a) and *Vocab.*), *έδραίος*, *κρυφαίος*, *σπουδαίος*, *ώραίος*.

Brugmann (*Grd.*² II. i. 194) finds the explanation in the contraction of **-αιω-* to *-αιω-* in the three words *κνεφαίος*, *γεραίος*, *γηραίος* (the accent in the last two following that in *παλαιός*). The rest would then be formed by false analogy. Brugmann's earlier explanation (*Gr.*³ 181, retained by Thumb in *Gr.*⁴ 212) rests on the loc. sing. *-αι-ή-μω-*. At any rate the locative meaning so evident in *άγοραίος*, *θυραίος* and *πυλαίος* gave the meaning "belonging to a place" to *-αίος*, and it was added in this sense to *o-* stems. Thus in class. Gr. we find *νησαίος* and *χερσαίος*. This predominant meaning may account for its wide use in gentile names. In addition to those given above on p. 150, the NT supplies *ήθθναίος*, *Βεροιαίος*, *Δερβαίος*, *Κυρηναίος*. For *δευτεραίος* and *τεταρταίος* see p. 176 above (also W. Bauer *HNT* ap. Jn 11th).

-αίος In *παλαιός* and *κραταίος* the suffix *-ος* is added to the adverb *πάλαι* and to *κραται* (cf. *κραταί-πους*).

-αιος Like *δίκαιος* (*δίκη*) the following are proparoxytone : *βίαιος* (: *βία*), *μάταιος* (< *μάτην* < *μάτη*), *βέβαιος* (< *βαίνω*, cf. *βέβα-μεν*), *άκέραιος* (accented as almost all compounds with *ά-*). For the noun *προσκεφάλαιον* see above, § 126 (c).

-ιαίος *Ταλαντιαίος* represents a class of adjective in which the suffix *-ιαίος* stands for measure, weight or value. Kühner-Bl. ii. 292 f. suggests an origin in *-i-* stems, *σταδιαίος*, *όργυιαίος*, though these first appear in Hellenistic. *Μηνιαίος* is early;

for its frequent use in papyri of monthly accounts see Mayser *Gr.* i. 448, and add Wilcken *Archiv* ii. 126 and P Oxy xii. p. 48.

The suffix *-eios* represents the convergence of two formations.

(a) *-eios* < **-eios*, attached to *s*-stems.

E.g. τέλειος : τέλος (τελεσ-ιος), ἐπιτήδειος (< adv. ἐπιτηδής, see above, § 120), ἄρειος : ἄρης.

(b) *-ήιος* (Hom.) < **ηf-ios* attached to stems in *eu-* : *v*.

In this way arose βασιλείος (: βασιλεύς), ἀστέιος (: ἄστυ).

Οἰκεῖος (: οἰκέυς, Hom.) would be popularly attached to οἶκος after οἰκέυς had become obsolete. With the help of this analogy the rapid extension of the suffix to other stems can be explained.

Ἀνθρώπειος has its natural counterpart in γυναικεῖος. So also we find αἰγείος (: αἰξ), ἑπάρχειος (ἐπαρχος), ἐπίγειος (see above, § 120), μεγαλείος, ἀχρεῖος (for deriv. see above, § 107, also Boisacq 1070).

This suffix, according to Brugmann (*Gr.*⁴ 212), originates in loc. sing. in *-oi + io* and is found in ποῖος, τοῖος, ἀλλοῖος etc. with παντοῖος conforming to type.

It is represented in NT by ὁποῖος and ὅμοιος.

The locative derivation is disputed by Hirt *Hdb.* 255. Debrunner *Wortb.* 144 derives the suffix from **-oiFos*, and regards it as originally a *Kompositionshinterglied* with the meaning "kind," "sort."

-ῶος

Two examples in NT.

Πατρῶος (in Hom., Hes. and Herod. always πατρῷος; see LS. From stem πατρωF-. Brugmann *Grd.*² π. i. 206).

ὑπερῶος (an adjectival ending added to ὑπέρ, following πατρῶος, μητρῶος), represented by the neut. noun ὑπερῶον. See p. 326.

(3) Nouns in *-ία*.

-ία

§ 136. Several important groups call for consideration.

1. *Names of Countries.*—Many of these are back-formations from national names. Συρία < Σύριος < Σύρος; Ἀχαῖα < Ἀχαιοί; Φρυγία < Φρύγιος < Φρύξ will serve as examples of many more in NT.

2. *Abstract Nouns.*—The normal type is found in ἐλευθερία (< ἐλευθέριος < ἐλεύθερος), ξενία (< ξένιος < ξένος), σωτηρία (< σωτήριος < σωτήρ). So with ἡσυχία, παρθενία, ἴσκοτία, φιλία.

But a far larger number are formed straight from nouns, or from adjectives in *-os* without the intervention of an adj. in *-ios*, *e.g.* :

from adjectives in *-os*, δειλία, ελαφρία, κοινωνία, μαλακία, μωρία, πικρία, πονηρία, ρυπαρία, σοφία;

from nouns, ἀγγελία (ἄγγελος), ἡγεμονία (ἡγεμών), ἡλικία (ἡλιξ), κυβία (κύβος), μαγία (μάγος);

from verbs, ἁμαρτία (*ἄνω, ἁμαρτ-εῖν), μαρτυρία (*έω);

from compounds, e.g. ἡπέπιχορηγία (*γέω), ἡκκενοδοξία (ἡκκενοδοξός).

So ἀγρυπνία, ἡάντημισθία, ἡεπαρχ(ε)ία, ἡέφημερία, φιλαδελφία, (§ 108), φιλανθρωπία, φιλαργυρία, φιλονεικία.

Compounds in -ια are formed direct, e.g. ἀναλογία (from prepositional phrase, see § 113), ἡέθελοθρησκία (§ 108).

(4) Nouns in -εία.

Abstracts in -εία are formed either from nouns in -εύς (originally through the mediation of an adjective in -ειός, for -ἡίος), or from verbs in -εύω.

Thus βασιλεία < βασιλείος < βασιλεύς.

All the other abstracts in -εία found in the NT are derived from verbs in -εύω (-εύομαι): viz. ἀλαζονεία*, ἀρεσκεία*, δουλεία, ἐριθεία*, ἐρμηγεία*, θεραπεία, ἡθρησκεία, ἡερατεία*, κολακεία*, λατρεία, ἡλογεία, ἡμεθοδεία*, μοιχεία, νηστεία, ἡοικετεία, παιδεία, ἡπερισσειά, πολιτεία, πορεία, πορνεία, πραγματεία*, πρεσβεία, ἡπροφητεία, στρατεία, φαρμακεία*, φυτεία.

NOTE.—1. Those nouns marked above with an asterisk (*) are spelt by WH in the shortened form -ία (*App.*³ 161). This is due to the itacistic tendencies of the scribes in the age of the great uncials. See above, pp. 57, 76 f. and *Proleg.* 47.

2. The transition from abstract to result is seen in some words, e.g. φυτεία *planting* in Xen., LXX, but *plant* in Mt 15¹³ (as in inscrr.); to collective concrete in θεραπεία (Lk 12⁴²), οἰκετεία (Mt 24⁴⁵), πρεσβεία (Lk 14³² 19¹⁴). Θρησκεία hovers between *worship* and the *ritual of worship* (see *Vocab.*). Μεθοδεία used in *malam partem* in Eph 4¹⁴ 6¹¹, as in Polyb. and LXX. See J. A. Robinson *in loc.* *Vocab. s.v.* shows that in papp. the word reverted in meaning to *method*.

3. For ἀρεσκεία and ἐριθεία see p. 57. That the former is derived from ἀρεσκείω is clear from the bad sense in which it is used by class. writers and in literary Hellenistic. For vernacular support of Philo's use in good sense, as in NT, see *Vocab.* ἡεπιθεία < ἐπιθειόμαι *to work for hire*, < ἐπιθός *day labourer, worker for hire*. *Selfishness* rather than *factiousness* was the original meaning, labouring for one's own interests rather than devotion to public service. So in the 3 NT passages. See Kennedy *EGT ap. Phil* 1¹⁶, and *Vocab.*

4. The word λογεία was rescued by Deissmann (*BS* 142 ff., 219 f., *LAE*¹ 103 ff., ²104) from Grimm's class of "biblical words," and the discovery of its verb λογείω *to collect* (see Wilcken *Ostr.* i. 255 n.¹, 493 f.) removes its derivation from doubt. For further instances of this word, so common in the papp. and yet entirely absent from literary sources, see *Vocab. s.v.* Προφητεία is Hellenistic, with very slight support until we come to papp. and inscrr., for which see *Vocab. s.v.*

-ίας Masculine nouns in *-ίας* originate from abstracts in *-ᾶ*.

Thus *νεανίας*, the only NT member of this class, is derived, acc. to Debrunner (*Wortb.* 145), from **νεανία* *youth* (abstract), which then gave *youth* (concrete collective) from which the individualised masc. form in *-ίας* came.

(5) Nouns in *-σ-ία*.

-σία Abstracts in *-σία* are derived in the same way as the adjectives in *-σιος* (*-τιος); see above, § 135.

(a) From composita came *ἀγνωσία*, *ἀθανασία*, *ἀκαθαρσία*, *ἀκρασία*, *ἀπιστία*,¹ *ἄκαταστασία*, *ἄσωτία*,¹ *ἄφθαρσία*, *ταίχμαλωσία*, *ἡμισθαποδοσία*, *ἡπροσωποληψία*, *ἡαίματεκχυσία*, *ὄρκωμοσία*, *νομο-, νου-, ἴδρο-, ἡυίο-θεσία*, *ἡκενοδοξία*, *ἡδικαιοκρισία*, *ἡὀλιγοπιστία*,¹ *εὐεργασία*, *εὐχαριστία*, *ἡπαλιγγενεσία*, *πλεονεξία*, *ἡπρωτοκλισία*, *παρρησία*, *διχοστασία*, *ἐκκλησία*, *μετοικεσία*, *ἡἀποστασία*, *συνωμοσία*.

(b) The only simplicia to come under this heading are *θυσία* and *κλισία*.

(c) Seven abstracts from verbs in *-άζω* (*-άζομαι*) complete the list: *γυμνασία*, *δοκιμασία*, *ἐργασία*, *ἐτοιμασία*, *ἴδπησσία*, *παραχειμασία*, *φαντασία*.

NOTE.—1. *Παραχειμασία*, from **αἴω* (see § 123), a verb used by Polyb. ii. 54. 5. The simplex *χειμασία* is also used in the same context of winter quarters, upon which Capes remarks: "The word is used by Herod. of the haunts of birds (ii. 22. 6), but only reappears in the later language."

2. For fuller treatment see Fraenkel *ZVS* xlv. 160 ff.

(6) Neuter Nouns in *-ιον*.

-ιον § 137. This extremely large class of nouns requires systematic treatment, both because of the common belief that its fundamental characteristic is the diminutive meaning, and on account of its prolific extension from the Hellenistic age onwards. It is necessary to separate nouns which do not originate with the diminutive connotation from those that do.

¹ For phonetic reasons the *τ*- remains unchanged in these words.

1. Nouns in *-ιον* (other than diminutives).

Here we may follow the same classification as in § 135 above when dealing with adjectives, for the substantivised neuter of such adjectives probably marks the starting-point of this development.

1. *Adverbs and locatives* in *-ι* do not seem to have contributed nouns to our NT vocabulary.

2. *Adjectives*.—(a) Verbal adjectives (as in I.E.) are responsible for a number of *nomina actionis*. In some of these the verbal force is strongly felt throughout the history of the word; in most the concrete meaning superseded the abstract at an early stage. Closely associated with these are many denominatives in *-ιον* themselves formed from *nomina actionis* and *nomina agentis*. Other nouns are formed directly from verbs without the intervention of any adj.: e.g. †προσφάγιον and †σιτομέτριον. For extra-biblical use, see *Vocab. s.v.* The noun may have come to represent the *result* of the action, as in λόγιον, εὐαγγέλιον, †θεμέλιον; or its *object*, as σφάγιον; or its *instrument*, as ἰμάτιον, †ὄψώνιον (see *Vocab. s.v.* for history and meaning), παραμύθιον. Sometimes the subjects of the action are expressed collectively, as in συμπόσιον, συνέδριον, †συμβούλιον (see Deissmann *BS* 238 and *Vocab. s.v.* for this late word), and by analogy, †πρεσβυτέριον.

This varying relation of the noun to the verbal action is sometimes reflected in the different uses of the same word. †Γεώργιον in 1 Co 3⁹ (a rare word, see J. Weiss *in loc.*) seems to = *husbandry, tith*, as in LXX¹⁰⁷; whereas in Pr 24⁵⁻³⁰, as in Strabo, it = *field*. So μαρτύριον.

(b) Very near to these in meaning are adjectival abstracts in *-ιον* expressing a state or attribute.

The change in relation to verbal action may account partly for the two meanings of αἴτιον in Ac 19⁴⁰ (= *cause*) and in Lk 23^{4. 14. 22} (= *crime*). So Petersen *Gr. Dim.* 27, “τὸ αἴτιον ‘the cause,’ with the distinct idea of activity, must have been originally conceived as ‘the blame-worthiness,’ for it comes from the adj. αἴτιος, ‘blame-worthy.’”

The transition from abstract to concrete is seen in δαιμόνιον, *divinity* (< δαιμόνιος, *divine*). From a vague meaning of “divine power,” a personal denotation was evolved. The limitation in Attic (as in magic, see *BS* 281 and *Vocab. s.v.*) to inferior deities is probably due to influence of diminutives in *-ιον*. See below, § 138.

(c) Compound adjectives. We may note specially two kinds:

a. prepositional compounds, in some of which the adjective survives, e.g. μεθόριον, ὑποζύγιον; but not in all, e.g. ἐνύπνιον (see above, § 109), προαύλιον (§ 125 (c)).

β. numerical compounds, and those signifying a part of the simplex. Cpds. of ἡμι- and ἀκρο- are common. In the NT we find †ἡμιώριον (Rev 8¹ RP 046), ἀκροθίνιον (§ 106), †μεσονύκτιον.

3. *Denominatives*. (As some of these are formed from *nomina actionis* they have been referred to under 2 (a) above.)

The infinite variety of meanings connoted by this suffix forbids an exhaustive classification. The main groups come under the following headings:

(1) *Appurtenance*.

(a) *Place*.

a. The primitive is *nomen agentis*. The derivative denotes the place connected with the person. Ἐμπόριον (<ἔμπορος), ἱερώσιον (<ἱερός). (Cf. δεκατώνης : δεκατόνιον iv/B.C.)

A special group is formed from *nom. agentis* in -τήρ, of the type δικαστήρ : δικαστήριον. The termination -τήριον was then detached and applied to *nomina agentis* in -της. Thus ἱεραστήριον, δεσμωτήριον, κρητήριον, οἰκητήριον (κατ-).

β. The sanctuary of a god or hero. Ἀπολλων : Ἀπολλώνιον, Νύμφη : Νυμφαίον. So Ἀστυγείριον I K 31¹⁰.¹ On this analogy ἱερώσιον (an idol's temple, I Co 8¹⁰).

(b) *Instrument or Means*.

a. Sometimes the primitive is not extant, e.g. ἱμάτιον (<*ἱμα <*Fισμα < √*μῖς), "that which is used for winding about or surrounding." πηδάλιον (<πηδόν = blade of oar), ἱγασοφυλάκιον (see above, § 105).

β. Primitive is a *nomen agentis* in -τήρ (-της).

Ἀισθητήριον (see *Vocab. s.v.*), θυμιατήριον, ἱθυσιαστήριον, ἱλαστήριον (Deissmann BS 124 ff.), μυστήριον, σωτήριον, τεκμήριον (see *Vocab. s.v.*), φυλακτήριον (see below, § 150), καυστήριον (<ἱκαυστηριάξω).

(c) *Vessels and utensils, household effects*.

These really form one congeneric group with words like ποτήριον, ἰδωλόθηριον, ἰδωλόδιον. The primitive of τρύβλιον is not extant.

(d) *Herd of domestic animals*. E.g. ποιμνιον (=herd of sheep : ποιμήν). See below, p. 346.

(e) *Part of the whole designated by the primitive*. E.g. κράνιον : κάρανον = that which belongs to the head, the skull. ἱβραίων (palm branch : βαίς).²

(f) *Indefinite plurals in -ια*. Ὅρια = what belongs to the boundary, limits, frontier. Φορτία = the things belonging to the load (<φόρτος = load), then φορτίον = load. Χωρία = what belongs to a particular country (χώρα), regions. Then χωρίον, a particular place, or, as in Mk 14²⁸, an enclosed piece of ground (RVmg).

(g) A word that comes under none of these headings is ἱδυσεντέριον (Ac 28² KAB, see p. 125). Can this late form of the word be influenced by μεσεντέριον, one of "a large number of words beginning with μεσο- which are of a heterogeneous semantic character" (Petersen, *op. cit.* 37)? For its derivation see p. 287 above.

¹ Cf. P Garob 22¹⁰ Μίθραλον, ²² Ἀφροσιδίου, ²⁷ Ἐρμαίου, ⁴² Σαχμειου, ⁴³ Νεφθιμειου (iii/B.C.).

² The new LS accents βραίων (βραίς).

-τήριον NOTE.—1. Under (a), (b) and (c) we see examples of **-τήριον** as a suffix. 'Ορμηγήριον (found in Xen., Isocr. and Dem. and more freely in Hellenistic authors), πολεμητήριον (Polyb.), show that in Attic and literary Hellenistic the suffix was already productive in the formation of new words. For new words appearing in Ptolemaic papyri see Mayser *Gr.* i. 439 f. For later words, cf. ἀπαντητήριον (*inn*) in PSI iii. 175^b (A.D. 462). Ἀγρευτήριον occurs in the Gospel fragment P Oxy v. 840^a.¹³

2. Some nouns in **-τήριον** pass from the local meaning in the later language, e.g. βουλευτήριον, *council chamber* in class. Gr., becomes *senate* in Polyb. ii. 50. 10; cf. Dion. H. 2. 12.

Κριτήριον, which is used with both the instrumental and the local meanings in Plato (so papp. and inscr.) = *tribunal* Jas 2^a, but *law-suit, cause* 1 Co 6^a. 4 (see J. Weiss *in loc.*).

(2) *Material, substance.*

This can be illustrated from the NT by ἀργύριον (*ἄργυρος*) *silver, silver coin, money*; χρυσίον (*χρυσός*) *gold, piece of gold, money, golden ornament*; χαλκίον (*χαλκός*) *brazen vessel* (Mk 7^a); κεράμιον (*κέραμος*) *earthenware vessel*; βιβλίον (*βιβλος, βύβλος*) that which is made of papyrus pith, a *papyrus roll, book*; σχοινίον *rope*, that which is made of reeds (*σχοίνοι*); δθόνιον (*δθόνη*) that which is made of linen, *linen cloth, bandage, swathing band*; σιτίον (*σίτος wheat*) *grain* (generally used in plur. = *food, provisions*); κηρίον (*κηρός = bees-wax*) *honeycomb* (Lk 24^{ab}, EKMΘ).

(3) *Category.*

This class of words with the connotation "belonging to the category of," "having the nature of," Petersen divides into those in which **-ιον** has a "generalising" nature, under which θηρίον would come, and those in which the suffix has a "specialising" force. Under the latter heading must come σανδάλιον (from a root of Semitic origin) *a shoe of the sandal kind*; ἑτεράδιον (see above, p. 176); ζῶον (which is adjectival in origin and has no noun primitive).

(4) *Similarity.*

NT examples are ἑκράτιον (*κέρας horn*) *carob-pod* (Lk 15^{ab}), κολλούριον (p. 78) (*κολλύρα = κολλίξ, a bread-roll*) *eye-salve*, because put up in small cakes (see *Vocab. s.v.*), ἑπερέγιον (*πτερυξ*) anything like a wing—in architecture, a *turret, a pinnacle, battlement* or *pointed roof*.

ἑτοπάξιον, a word of uncertain derivation, in which the root is almost certainly Semitic (see Cheyne in *EBi. s.v.*), possibly owes its suffix to the influence of *δνύχιον* (*δνυξ*) "that which is like a nail," "a gem streaked with veins," an *onyx, ἀνθράκιον* (*ἀνθραξ*) a kind of jewel that is like charcoal. Under this heading of Similarity come the names of quilt, a number of articles of dress and ornament.

Under the influence of such words as *δελφίνιον* (: *δελφίς*) the **-ιον** suffix came to be used as the normal ending for plant names. In this way probably we can account for the two forms ἑάψινθιον (Rev 8^u n^a

and *ἄψινθος* (Rev 8^u A *et al.*); see above, p. 123. Here also should come in *†*ἰζάνιον (for its Semitic root see Lewy, *Fremdwörter*, 52).

As with adjectives in *-ιος*, the nouns in *-ιον* provide a subdivision in *-ειον*. Here, again, we notice the convergence of two formations, those deriving from *s-* stems and those from nouns in *-εως*, or verbs in *-εῖω* (see above, p. 339).

(a) Ἄγγειον (: ἄγγελος). See *Vocab.* for variety of meaning in papyri. Δανείον (: δάνος < *δανός = Skt. *dinā-s*. See *Brgm. Gdr.*² π. i. 256, 526).

(b) Βραβείον (: βραβεύς), πανδοχείον (: πανδοχεύς), ταμείον (: ταμείω); for spelling see above, p. 89.

This suffix before long was appended to other stems, as we are reminded by σημεῖον (: σῆμα) and μνημεῖον (: μνήμα).

Θεῖον (Hom. *θείιον* sulphur fumes) *brimstone* (< **θφεσ-ειον* : < I.E. **d̥h₂gos* breath); an adj. "emitting vapours, fumes," from a noun **θεός* or **θεόν* (*θφεσός*, -όν) "breath, fume." So Boisacq 337; *q.v.* for connexion with *θεός* and *θύω*.

NOTE.—This termination was added to various stems in the classical age to betoken a *place* (especially for the carrying on of business), *e.g.* χαλκεύς : χαλκείον, κάπηλος : καπηλείον, Μούσα : Μουσείον. In Hellenistic it proves a fertile source for such nouns as the papyri show, *e.g.* ἱερογραφείον (= "writings" in Clem. *ad Cor.* 28³), ἱερογραφονομείον and μνημονομείον different names of the same notarial office (see *Archiv* vi. 104), ἀρχαίου ἱεροκαταλογίου. For all these terms see Mitteis, *Papyruskunde*, π. i. 59 ff.

A notable instance comes in a schedule of water rates, P Lond 1177^{6a} (A.D. 113) (=iii. p. 183), where a Jewish place of prayer *†*εὐχέιον is mentioned in the same connexion as a *προσευχή* or synagogue.

2. Diminutives in *-ιον*.

§ 138. This term is here used to include Diminutives in *-ιον*. words with a "deteriorative" and "hypocoristic"¹ significance, as well as those which connote relative smallness of size. The entire class has probably arisen from the use of the suffix (see above, p. 343) to connote similarity to the type represented by the primitive noun. The original meaning is then "a kind of," "something like."

NOTE.—1. The question whether the diminutive suffix is inherited from I.E. or was developed in Greek within the class. period is still open.

¹The ancient Greek grammarians coined the word *ὑποκοριστικά* (from *ὑποκορίζεσθαι* = "to speak as a child (*κόρη*)") for words formed to express tenderness, and so smallness and even disparagement. It seems better to restrict its use to the original meaning.

Brugmann (*Grd.*³ II. i. 676) states that -(i)jo- was a diminutive suffix in I.E. times. But his earlier view (*Gr.*³ 180, retained by Thumb in ed.⁴ 212) was that this development in the use of the suffix was post-Homeric. The absence of diminutives proper in Homer might of course be deliberate, but the total absence of "faded diminutives" is significant. Two strong arguments in favour of the post-Homeric origin of diminutives are: (a) The dim. meaning is only found in the historic Gk. -ιον, never in words such as πέζον (<πεδ-ιον) or those in which the dissyllabic -ιον is merged in a diphthong, as -αιον, -ειον, -οιον; thus this function may be presumed to have developed after -dy-, -ασι-, -εσι-, -οσι-, had become -ζ-, -αι-, -ει-, -οι-. (b) The accentuation of παιδίον, which was the principal pattern of diminutives and one of the oldest. Παιρ <πάρις was still often dissyl. in Homer (παίρις), and the diminutive, if formed in early Homeric times, would be accented on the antepenult (παιδίον > παιδιον). This suggests that παιδίον and all words modelled thereupon must be later at least than the earlier parts of Homer. See Petersen *Greek Diminutives in -ιον*, from which this account is abridged.

2. The accentuation of "diminutives" seems to defy precise definition. Petersen (*ib.* 12 ff.) suggests "trisyllabic substantives in -ιον, if all connexion with the adjectival types from which they are derived has faded from the mind, have a tendency to accent the penult if they are dactylic, but the antepenult if they are tribrachs." But in view of the conflicting analogical influences at work both in early and later times he cannot make use of accent in his treatment of the semantic development of the -ιον diminutives.

Diminutives, which are found sparsely in tragedy, abound, as might be expected, in comedy. During the Hellenistic period the intimate language of the home and the speech of the lower social strata forced its way up into the vocabulary of literature. Words which originated in the nursery and the streets lost their hypocoristic meaning or became "faded diminutives," in many cases superseding the primitive noun. (See p. 346, Note.)

In the NT the following classes of diminutives in -ιον are represented:

Persons.—Παιδίον (παίρις), θυγάτριον (θυγάτηρ), τέκνιον (1 Jn *passim*) (: τέκνον), κοράσιον (: κόρη). In all of these the hypocoristic use is specially evident in the vocative.

Animals.—Στρουθίον (: στρουθός), προβάτιον (: πρόβατον), άρνιον (: άρνήν), νοσσίον (: νοσός).

Parts of the body.—Ψυχίον (: ούς).

Geographical terms.—Ψησίον (: νήσος).

Food.—Ψυχίον (=ψίξ) δ.λ. in Mk 7²⁸ (|| Mt 15²⁷), ψωμίον Jn 13^{30c}. (elsewhere Marcus vii. 3, Diog. L. vi. 37 and papp.). By this time παιδίον

and *προβάτιον* are faded diminutives, for no consideration of size distinguishes them from their primitives.

Ποίμνιον might seem to show a survival of hypocoristic use in Lk 12²⁸, but the addition of *τὸ μικρόν* proves that there is no consciousness of diminutive force (see p. 342).

ᾠτίον is a faded hypocorism and has "passed from the language of nurses and lovers into universal use. Both *ᾠτίον* and *ᾠτάριον* are never used when the ear is thought of as an organ of hearing, nor in a figurative sense, but only when the outer ear is distinctly in mind" (Petersen *ib.* 183).

NOTE.—Petersen cites Plut. *Ages.* 13 in proof that *ἐπιστόλιον* was a true diminutive. But its fairly common use in papyri without any such suggestion, e.g. P Fay 122⁵ (c. 100 A.D.), P Lips 69³ (118 A.D.), shows how easily the diminutive became a substitute for the primitive. Vogeser illustrates this tendency in the later vernacular and cites many passages where *μικρόν* is added (*Gr. Heiligenleg.* 42 f.). The full development of this tendency is seen in MGr. (See Thumb, *Hellen.* 178, 220, *Handb.* 62.)

3. Conglutinates with *-ιον*.

§ 139. *-ίδιον* is a suffix which probably takes its rise from stems in *-ιδ-*, e.g. *ἀσπίδ-ιον* (: *ἀσπίς*). The suffix was then applied to other stems, as in *κλινίδιον* (: *κλίνη*). The uncertainty whether some words in *-ίδιον* had primitives in *-ι-* or *-ιο-* (e.g. in NT *πινακίδιον* < *πινάκιον* or < *πίναξ* may have given rise to the suffix *-διον* which appears in *ἰχθύδιον* (: *ἰχθύς*).

At the side of *-ίδιον* there appears a suffix *-ιδιον*, as in *βιβλίδιον* (< **βιβλι-ιδιον* < *βιβλίον*), *οικίδιον* (< **οικειδ-ιον* < *οικία*, but also assignable to *οἶκος*). In this way some have explained *ἰχθύδιον* : *ἰχθύς*.

Further examples are *ἀγρίδιον* (*Mart. Polyc.* 5¹), *βιβλίδιον* (*Herm. Vis.* iii. 1⁴; *Ignat. Eph.* 20¹), *ξιφίδιον* (*Mart. Polyc.* 16¹), *ἐπιστολίδιον* (P Hamb 89⁴; PSI i. 93¹⁶). Thumb *Dial.* 376 quotes Pollux x. 116 to show that Aristoph. used *λυχνίδια* for *λύχνα*. Cf. P Ryl ii. 239²¹, *δναρίδιον μικρόν*. See also Mayser *Gr.* i. 428 for productivity of this suffix.

Stems in *-αρ-* provided a number of diminutives in *-άριον* which was then regarded as an independent suffix, and used to form a large number of diminutives, e.g. *γυναικάριον* (: *γυνή*), *κλινάριον* (: *κλίνη*), *κυνάριον* (: *κύων*), *ὄναριον* (: *ὄνος*), *ὄψάριον* (: *ὄψον*), *παιδάριον* (: *παῖς*), *πλοιάριον* (: *πλοῖον*), *ῥάτάριον* (: *ᾠτίον*).

NOTE.—1. The freedom with which this suffix was used in coining fresh words is seen from such a formation as *κερβικάριον* (*Herm. Vis.* iii. 1⁴) (< Lat. *cervical* < *cervix*), *ξυλάριον* (3 K 17¹² and papp.; see *Vocab.* 434 f.), *μοσχάριον* (LXX and PSI vi. 600⁴).

2. The decline and disappearance of the diminutive force in these *-άριον* formations becomes evident from their use in the papyri. Thus *κοσμάριον* (P Hamb 10²² χρυσά ἐν κοσμαρίοις μναϊαῖα), *φερνάριον* (BGU iv. 1102¹⁹ where the amount of the dowry is quite substantial), *ώάρια* (BGU iii. 781 v.⁸). *Οίνάριον* preserves a diminutive meaning in Epict. *Ench.* 12 (ἐκχεῖται τὸ ἐλάδιον, κλέπτεται τὸ οἰνάριον), but the deteriorative force found in Demosth. c. *Lacr.* 32 is retained in P Flor ii. 160³, according to Comparetti's note "a light wine, or of inferior quality," though there is nothing to indicate this in the context. See note in P Par p. 414 and additional ref. given in Witk.² p. 27 n. In MGr the process is complete, as *λιοντάρι* shows (see Thumb *Handb.* 338).

Not to be confused with these are the Latin loan words, in which *assarius* and *denarius* are given this common neuter ending, *άσάριον*, *δηνάριον*, *σουδάριον* (*sudarium*, see BS 223), which, with *σικάριος*, is simply transliterated. For papp. see *Vocab. s.v.* For further creations under Latin influence see Vogeser, *Gr. Heiligenleg.* 41.

These secondary suffixes can be yet further combined, as in †βιβλαριίδιον (Rev 10². 8^a), †βιβλιδάριον (Rev 10² C, 10² 8, 10⁹ 046). Βιβλιίδιον and βιβλάριον (Rev 10⁹ A*) have also some MS attestation. In Herm. *Vie.* ii. 1², βιβλαριίδιον and βιβλιίδιον are used together synonymously.

(7) -εος.

-εος The simple suffix *-εος* (<**-εμος*), which in Attic contracts to *-ούς* (see above, pp. 120, 121, 156 for irregularities in NT), forms a group of adjectives of material, represented by *ἀργυρούς*, *χρυσούς*, *χαλκοούς*, *σιδηρούς*. The transition from material to colour, e.g. *πορφυρούς*, may have been helped by the secondary meaning of *χρυσούς* = golden.

The old connexion between *-εχο-* and *ι-* stems, which is absent from these adjectives, appears in a few nouns which bear trace of adjectival origin, e.g. *δοτέον* (cf. Skt. *ásthi*), and *ᾄρνεον* (<*ᾄρνις*). In the same way the stem of *στερεός* appears in *στέρεθος* (Brugm. *Grd.*² II. i. 199).

Two masc. nouns in *-εος* seem to come in here.

Θυρεός in its Hom. meaning "door-stone" shows its derivation from *θύρα* more clearly than in its Hellenistic meaning of "shield" (Polyb. *Plut.* Eph 6¹⁶).

†Φωλεός (Mt 8²⁰ || Lk 9⁵⁸) occurs first in Arist. For derivation see Boisacq, *s.v.*

(8) -ιά.

§ 140. Widely productive at an early stage of the language for the formation of feminines to adjectives and nouns, this suffix now survives in longer suffixes in *-α* impure used for

forming the feminine of third declension adjectives and participles with three terminations, e.g. *-ουσα* (= *-οντια*) etc. See § 65 above.

Φέροντ-, φέρουσα (= *φέροντια*), cf. Skt. *bhārant-, bhārant-ī*.

In *γλωσσα* (= **γλωχια*) the suffix is added directly to a root.

1. Nouns in *-ειᾶ*.

Feminine nouns in *-εια* are almost all regularly formed feminines of the *εσ*-stem adjectives (< **-εσ-ια*). As a separate feminine was not used for these adjectives, the feminine was used substantivally.

From adjectives in *-ης* we have *ἀκρίβεια*, *ἀλήθεια*, *ἀναίδεια**, *αὐτάρκεια*, *συγγένεια*, *ἐπιείκεια** (§ 120), *εἰλικρίνεια** (§ 105), *ἐνέργεια*, *κακοήθεια**, *συνήθεια*, *ἐγκράτεια*, *εὐλάβεια*, *ἀ-*, *θεο-*, *εὐ-σέβεια*, *ἐπιμέλεια*, *κακοπάθεια**, *†πραῦπάθεια**, *ἀπειθεια*, *εὐπρέπεια*, *ἀσέλγεια* (§ 107), *ἀσθένεια*, *ἀσφάλεια* (§ 107), *συντέλεια* (§ 127 (b)), *†ἐκτένεια*, *ἐπιφάνεια*, *κατήφεια*; to these must be added *ἀπώλεια*, *βοήθεια*, *ὠφέλεια**, which are verbal derivatives.

Three more which come from *-εσ*-stems have yielded to the influence of the *-ια* class, viz. *ἀηδία* (Lk 23¹² D, see *Vocab. s.v.*), *ἀφειδία*, *εὐωδία*. The same influence affected the orthography of other words. See p. 78 above, also WH *App.*² 161, where the words marked * are spelt *-ια*, *ἀκριβία*, *ἀπειθία* (in Heb.) and *ἐκτενία* being treated as doubtful.

Originally a similar suffix (< **-εF-ια* or **-ηF-ια*) was used to form a few feminine titles to nouns in *-εύς*, whilst *-ειᾶ* (the fem. of adj. *-ειος*) served for abstract nouns, e.g. *βασιλεύς*, king; *βασιλεια*, queen; *βασιλεία*, kingdom. But in the Tragedians *-εις* has already displaced *-εια*, and in Hellenistic the Macedonian suffix *-ισσα* established itself and spread widely from *βασιλισσα* to other feminine titles (see Mayser *Gr.* i. 255, and below, p. 349).

2. Nouns in *-αινα*.

This suffix, so largely used in Greek for feminines from *-n*-stems (**-η-ια* > **-αν-ια*, > *-αινα*), is only represented in NT by *†γάγγραινα*, the name *Τρύφαινα*, and the adj. *μέλαινα*.

The origin of the suffix is seen in such a word as *τέκτων*: *τέκταινα* (= **τεκταν-ια*) (cf. Skt. *tákṣan- : takṣṇ-ī*). Then through similarity of nom. in *-ων*, this became fem. suffix for nouns with *οντ*-stem. The suffix was detached and appended even to *-ο* stems, specially for names of persons and animals, e.g. *λέων*: *λέαινα*, *λύκος*: *λύκαινα*.

Γάγγραινα may be derived from γόγγρος (so Boisacq), or may come directly, with reduplication, from γράνω = γράω, to gnaw.

(9) -τρια.

†Μαθήτρια is the only NT example of this form of the feminine of *nomina agentis* in -της (< -τηρ, see § 150).

-τρια

To Mayser's instances (*Gr.* i. 444), βεβαιώτρια and προπωλητρια, we may add ἀγοράστρια, P Thead 1¹¹ (A.D. 306), BGU iii. 907¹¹ (c. 185 A.D.).

(10) -ισσα.

This suffix (from *-ικ-ια) arose with such examples as Κίλιξ : Κίλισσα, but was widely used in the Hellenistic period under the influence of the Macedonian court. See (8) above.

-ισσα

Βασίλισσα (see *Vocab. s.v.*), Φοίνισσα (Mk 7³⁶ D), Φοινίκισσα (*ib.* B *et al.*), Συροφοινίκισσα (*ib.* RAL *et al.*).

The papyri furnish further exx. of this fem. formation, e.g. πατρώνισσα IGSI, 1671, P Oxy iii. 478²⁷ (A.D. 132), ἀρτοκόπισσα (new fem. of ἀρτοκόπος) P Oxy viii. 1146⁸⁻⁹ (early iv/A.D.). Mayser (i. 255, 451) cites ἴρισσα from numerous Ptolemaic papp., and the two adjectives μελανοσπαλάκισσα (*iron-grey*) and ψακάδισσα (*dappled*) from a register of cavalry horses, P Petr ii. 35, col. 1⁷⁻⁹ (c. 240 B.C.).

(11) -ισσος.

The proper name Νάρκισσος preserves a plant name showing the same suffix as κυπάρισσος. See *Vocab. s.v.*, and for the suffix -ισσος, Kretschmer *Einl.* 405 ff.

-ισσος

(12) -εύ-.

(a) From the earliest period this was freely used as a denominative suffix to indicate a person specially concerned with the thing denoted by the primitive. It thus came in time to mark a trade or profession.

-εύς

Our examples are δλιεύς, †βυρσεύς, †γναφεύς (see p. 108), γραμματεύς, ιερεύς, ἱππεύς, κεραμεύς, φαρμακεύς (only in inferior MSS of Rev 21⁸), χαλκεύς.

(b) In a few words we have trace of an early formation from a verb, γονεύς (< γέν-εσθαι) and φονεύς (< √φεν. cf. Hom. ἔ-πε-φν-ε).

(c) In compound formations this suffix is almost confined to prepositional compounds (for reasons shown by Debrunner *Wortb.* 152 f.). †Καταγγελεύς is a NT example. Πανδοχεύς is an exception. Συγγενεύσιν as read in some MSS in Mk 6⁴, Lk 2⁴⁴, is really from the adjective συγγενής— an instance of popular heteroclisia, see above, p. 138.

(d) *Ethnica* were generally formed by substituting -εύς for suffix in name of city or country, e.g. Θεσσαλονικ-εύς (-η), Κολόσσ-εύς (-αι), Λαοδικ-εύς (-ία), Ταρσ-εύς (-ός).

From names in -ειᾶ, both -ειεύς and -εύς (-ειεύς > -εεύς > -εύς) were formed in Attic, e.g. Δεκέλεια, Δεκελειεύς and Δεκελεύς; in Hellenistic almost always -εύς, e.g. Ἀλεξανδρεύς, Ἀντιοχεύς.

(e) Νηρεύς (Rom 16¹⁸), a personal name, possibly marking one of Nero's freedmen; see Rouffiac 91 for inscriptional evidence of widespread occurrence in Galatia and Athens. The name, of course, is as old as Homer.

(13) -εμ- : -υ-.

(a) -εμ is represented by the solitary noun πῆχυς^{-υς} (p. 141) and the adjectives on p. 180 above.

(b) -υ-. For nouns see p. 141.

B. Nasal Suffixes.

(1) -μο-, -μᾶ-.

1. Nouns in -μός, -θμός, -σμός.

§ 141. This suffix originates in an I.E. abstract suffix which appears in different stages of development in Gr. While it is used primarily to form verbal abstracts, that meaning is often lost in the concrete.

(a) In λιμός *hunger*, λοιμός *plague*, the underlying root has vanished though both may perhaps be related to Lat. *letum* (=death).

(b) It is attached to primary verbal stems in a number of words, such as ἀρμός (probably from √ seen in ἀραρίσκω), βρυγμός (βρίχω), βωμός (< βᾶ-, of ἔ-βη-ν), ἴππογραμμός (γράφω), διωγμός (διώκω), ἔλεγχμός (ἐλέγχω, also ἀπελεγμός fr. ἀπ°), ὄδυρμός (ὀδύρομαι), οἰκτιρμός (οἰκτείρω), ἔμπαιγμός (ἐμπαιζω), σεισμός (σειώ, cf. σέ-σεισ-μαι, ἐ-σεισ-θην), φραγμός (φράσσω), ψαλμός (ψάλλω).

(c) Its more typical use is with denominative verbal stems, e.g. ἄρπαγμός, στεναγμός, στήριγμός.

(d) Far more usual is the extended form of the suffix, -σμός, which is specially attached to the denominatives in -ίζω, -άζω and ὕζω, with dental stems.

From *-ίζω* come *τάγνισμός*, *-αρτισμός* (*τάπ-*, *τακτ-*), *ἱερατισμός*, *βασιανισμός* (Alexis in Athen., 4 Macc), *θερισμός*, *ἱματισμός* (see *Vocab.*), *ἱουδαϊσμός*, *ἱκαθαρισμός*, *λογισμός*, *μακαρισμός*, *μερισμός* (*δια-*), *ἰδνειδισμός*, *ἱπαροργισμός*, *ἱπορισμός*, *ἱραντισμός*, *ἱσαββατισμός* (see Moffatt *ICC*, ap. Heb 4⁹), *ἐπισιτισμός* (from Xen. down), *ἱάφανισμός*, *ἱσαφρονισμός*, *ἱφωτισμός*, *χρηματισμός*, *ἱψιθουρισμός*.

From *άζω*, *ἱάγιασμός*, *ἱσπασμός*, *ἱένταφιασμός*, *ἱπειρασμός*, *ἱπαραπικρασμός*.

From *-ύζω*, *ἱγογγυσμός* (see Rutherford *NP* 463), *κατακλυσμός* (see *Vocab.*).

Then the suffix passed over to nasal and other verbs whose perf. pass. ended in *-σμαι* as with the *-ζω* verbs, e.g. *ἱλασμός* (*ἱλάσκω*, cf. *ἱλάσ-θητι*), *ἱμιασμός* (*ἱμαίνω*), *ἱμολυσμός* (*ἱμολύνω*), *ἱπαροξυσμός* (*ἱπαροξύνω*), *ἱκυλισμός* (2 Pet 2¹³ BC) (*κυλίνδω*, later form *κυλίω*, p. 246).

ἱσμός exhibits this suffix as early as Homer (*δέω*, *δέ-δε-μαι*).

NOTE.—For papyrus nouns in *-μός*, see Mayser *Gr.* i. 435 ff., and for the very large class of new formations in *-ισμός* cf. *δειγματισμός* PSI iv. 358^{s. 11}; *ἱμπυρισμός* PSI iv. 338^{7. 15} (*v. Intr.*), 339⁷ (all iii/B.C.).

(e) In the termination *-θμός* we have the root *-θμός*.
determinative¹ *-dh-* combined with the suffix *-μός*.

ἱριθμός where the root is *ἱρι-*, as found in *νήριτος* (=numberless), *ἱβαθμός* (see p. 112, *Vocab.* s.v.) from the root *βα-* (seen in *βαίνω* < **βαμω* < **g^hῥ-ιθ*) *βη* (*ἱ-βη*), *κλαυθμός* from *κλαίω* (fut. *κλαύ-σ-ομαι*).

(f) Several nouns in *-μος* go back to a very early stage in the language.

ἱνεμος (I.E. *anēi*, *to breathe*, cf. Skt. *āni-ti*).

ἱήμος (√ *dā(i)*, cf. Skt. *dāti*, *to cut, divide*) originally meant the *portion of territory* belonging to a community, then a *canton*, finally the *people* (see Boisacq 182).

ἱλάμος (I.E. **k^hmo-s*, see Boisacq 397).

ἱέραμος (I.E. **qer^hmo-s*, cf. Lat. *crēmo* from √ **qer* or **qar*, cf. Lat. *carbo* (**car-dho*), see Boisacq 436).

ἱδόςμος (< **κονσμο-s* I.E. **kens-* = *to make authoritative announcement*, cf. Lat. *censeo* = *to judge*; see Boisacq 500).

ἱδόςμος (opinion is divided between I.E. **qō(i)mo-s* from a supposed √ *qōi* = *to meet*, suggested as root of *κώμη*, and I.E. **kō(i)mo-s*, cf. Skt. *ciçāti* = *to share with one*, Boisacq 544).

ἱδόςμος probably connected with *ἱδόςμων*, for which Hirt suggests I.E.

¹ For root-determinatives see Brugmann *KVG* 296 f., Hirt *Handb.*, 202 ff., Debrunner *Wortb.* 3 f. The term is applied to a consonant coming between the root (or base) and the suffix, differing from the former in that it contributes nothing to the meaning of the word and from the latter in that it is not used in the formation of groups of words. (cf. *τρέμω*, *τρέσσε*, *trepidus*, where *μ*, *σ*, *p*, belong neither to the root nor to the suffix).

mōum (see Boisacq 57). For vowel gradation see Hirt *Hdb.* 89. On the interesting Biblical history of the word see Hort *Comm. on 1 Pet.* p. 77.

Πόλεμος. Uncertain derivation. See Boisacq *s.v.* *πελεμίζω, πάλλω*.

With these should also come :

Ποταμός (Lesb. *πόταμος*) < I.E. **petā-*, to move rapidly, fly, tumble (cf. *ἐπτάμην*), cf. also I.E. **pet-* **pete-*, Skt. *prā-man*, *πέτομαι* (*ἐπτόμην*).

2. Nouns in -μή.

This formation is closely parallel to that in -μός, and was used for verbal abstract nouns, many of which became concrete.

(a) The verbal root is evident in γνώμη, δέσμη (for accent and meaning see *Vocab. s.v.*), δραχμή (< *δράσσομαι*, but for other theory see *Vocab. s.v.*), δυσμή (< *δύναω*. First = *δύσις setting*, then = *west*), μνήμη, ῥύμη (< *ῥύομαι*. For its Hellenistic meaning = *street*, see Rutherford *NP* 487-8), στιγμή (< *στίζω* < **στιγ-ζω*), τμή (< *τίω, τίνω*), φήμη (< *φημί*).

(b) The suffix -σμή is half concealed in αἰχμή (whence αἰχμάλωτος), which comes from **αἰέσμη*, and ὄσμή (cf. *ὀδή*, p. 112) from ὄζω.

(c) Other nouns are †δοκιμή (see *Vocab. s.v.*), ζύμη (< **ζύμα* or *ζύμα*, I.E. **jū(s)-mā*, "juice," "pottage," see Boisacq, *s.v.*), κλάμη (see under 1 (f)), ὀρμή (< I.E. **ser-*), πυγμή (see Boisacq, *s.v.* *πύξ*), which seems to be concrete (= *fight*) in the difficult passage Mk 7². The verbal force is prominent in Barn 12² (*fighting, fight*).

Θέρμη (= *θέρμη*) is not in place in this group.

3. Adjectives in -μος.

§ 142. These are mainly denominatives and compounds.

(a) †Υπέρακμος (for derivation see p. 326 above). For meaning, however, of this *ἀπ. λεγ.* see J. Weiss *ap. 1 Co* 7²⁶, where the comparative force of the adjective is taken to be modal rather than temporal. So D. Smith (*L. and L. of St. Paul*, 268 n. 6) favours "exceedingly lusty" rather than "past the flower of youth," and cites *ὑπερακμάζω* = *excel in youthful vigour* (*Athen.* 657 D). Ἀπόδημος, †διδραχμος, ἄζιμος, πρόθυμος, ἄμωμος (see *Vocab. s.v.*), ἡδύσμος, ἄσημος (also *εὐ-σ*, *ἐπί-σ*, *παρά-σ*), δίστομος, †σύνσωμος, ἄτιμος (also *βαρύ-τ*, *ἔν-τ*, *τίσ-τ*, *πολύ-τ*), βλάσφημος, and εὐφήμος, εὐάνυμος, and ψευδάνυμος.

(b) Δίδυμος (Boisacq derives from **di-*, cf. *dis* "deux fois" + *δυ-μος* "apparenté de façon peu claire à duo"; cf. *ἀμφίδυμος* "double." Brugmann *IF* xi. 283 n. suggests influence of *νήδυμος*), ἔρημος (< I.E. *erē* = *separate*, cf. *ἀραιός, scarce*, Lat. *rarus*), †ἥρημος (1 Ti 2², see LS, and for vernac. use see *Vocab.*). The derivation of ἔτοιμος is obscure. (See under (4) below.)

(c) †^αἄθεσμος (2 Pet 2⁷ 3¹⁷, see Mayor *in loc.* and *Vocab.*) <θεσμός for Laconian θεθμός. For analogical invasion of σ (from -σμός group) into conglutinates in -θ-μός see Brugmann *Grd.*³ π. i. 252.

(d) ἑβδομος represents a distinct suffix -μο-, cf. Lat. *septimus*, and see Brugmann *Grd.*³ π. i. 225 f.

4. Adjectives in -(σ)ιμος.

Those in -ιμος begin with adjectives in which -μος was added to an *i*-stem; thus πρώιμος (: πρωί), ὄψιμος (: *ὄψι) were formed from adverbs (for πρώιμος, the correct rdg. in Jas 5⁷, see p. 73; Ruth. NP 124); noun stems are recognisable in the Homeric κάλλι-μος and φαίδιμος (where -ι- represents an *r*-suffix φαιδρ-ός), and thus the ending -ιμος came to be detached and given as a new suffix.

Examples in the NT are δόκιμος and ἀδόκιμος, σπόριμος, φρόνιμος, ὠφέλιμος. We may compare the proper name Τρόφιμος.

The same suffix -μος joined to *ti*-stems, i.e. to verbal abstracts in -σις, produced the suffix -σιμος, which has become very productive in late and MGr. (Brugmann-Thumb *Gr.* 219). For papyri, see Mayser *Gr.* i. 449.

Thus βρώσιμος, θανάσιμος, χρήσιμος. Cf. proper name Ὀνήσιμος (with the play upon words in Philem¹¹).

NOTE.—1. Debrunner *Wortb.* 155 suggests that from -ι stems the suffix passed naturally to the verbal abstracts in -σις in which the Attic effacement of the *i*-character (declension -εως, -ει etc.) favoured a further transference to other verbal nouns (e.g. μάχιμος : μάχη), and then to nouns other than verbal (e.g. νόμιμος (-ως) : νόμος). (See also Solmsen *Gr. Wortf.* 49.)

2. ἑτοιμος (earlier ἐτοιμος) might possibly come here, but Boisacq's verdict seems against this ("mot obscur; formation isolée").

(2) -men-, -mon- (-μα, -μην, -μων).

1. Neuters in -μα.

§ 143. This very productive class of neuter nouns originates in I.E. -m̥n̥, which is widely represented in many branches of the parent language.

In Greek it appears as a dental stem, but the close connexion of -μα with -men- is seen both in comparison with Latin (e.g. *no-ma*, -ματος, *no-men*, -minis) and in the continuance of the *n*-stem in verba derivatives in -μαίνειν (see § 167) and in the cpds. in μων (see p. 355).

It is found with :

(a) Primary verbal stems : ἄρμα, βῆμα, βλέμμα, ἐπί-βλημα, βρῶμα, γράμμα, δείγμα, δέρμα, διάδημα, ὑπέδ^ο, δόγμα, †δῶμα, †ἔν-δύμα, δῶμα,

θαῦμα, ἰδνά-θεμα, ἀνά-θημα, θρέμμα, ἴαμα, κάλυμμα, καῦμα, κέρμα, κλέμμα, ἔγκλημα, κλήμα, κλίμα, ἱπρόσ-κομμα, κρίμα, κτήμα, κύμα, λείμμα, ἱκατά-λυμα, μίγμα, μνήμα, ὄμμα, πλάσμα, πλέγμα, πνεῦμα, ἱπόμα, πρᾶγμα, πτύσμα, πῶμα, ῥήγμα, ῥήμα, σπέρμα, στέμμα, διά-στημα, στίγμα, σχήμα, τάγμα, ἱέν-ταλμα, τραῦμα, τρήμα, σύν-τριμμα, ἱέκ-τρωμα (Rutherford *NP* 288 f.), χάσμα, χρέμα, ἱπερί-ψημα (§ 124 (b)).

NOTE.—In Hellenistic a great preference is shown for the short penultimate in such words as κλίμα, κρίμα, πόμα, which had already come in as doublets to κλίμα, κρίμα, πῶμα, under the influence of the feminine abstracts in *-sis* (δόμα: δύσις etc.) and the verbal adjectives in *-τος*. See (θέτος) above, p. 57, also Brugmann *Gr.*⁴ 222. The two forms ἀνάθημα (*votive offering*) and ἀνάθεμα (*curse*) were both preserved for the convenient distn. of meanings: see *Proleg.* 46, *Vocab. s.v.*

(b) Denominative verbal stems: ἑπ-άγγελμα, αἰνιγμα, αἴτημα, ἱαἰτίωμα (for class. αἰτίαμα, see *Vocab. s.v.*), ἱἀλίσηγμα, ἀντάλλαγμα, ἀμάρτημα, ἱἀντημα, ἱβδέλυγμα, βούλημα, ἱγένημα, γέννημα, ἱά-γνόημα, ἀ-δίκημα, δικαίωμα, δώρημα, ἱέδραίωμα, ἑλιγμα, ἱέξ-έραμα, ἱένέργημα (see Capes *Ach. L.* p. 248), ῥαδιούρημα, ἐπ-ερώτημα, ζήτημα, ἱήτημα (see Lightfoot, Lietzmann, J. Weiss *ap.* 1 Co 6⁷, and *Vocab. s.v.*), ἱθέλημα, θυμίαμα, ἱιεράτευμα, ἱπερι-κάθαυμα, ἱόλο-καύτωμα, καύχημα, κήρυγμα, μίσθωμα, νόημα, νόσημα, οἴκημα, ὁμοίωμα, ὄραμα, δι-όρθωμα (Ac 24² & AB 33), κατ-όρθωμα (*ib.* ω), ὄρημα, ἱμεσουράνημα, ὀφειλημα, ὀχύρωμα (Xen.), πάθημα, ἱπερίσσευμα, πλήρωμα, ποίημα, πολίτευμα, ἀ-σθένημα, σκήνωμα, στερέωμα, στρατεύμα, τρύπημα, ἱύστέρημα, ὑψωμα, φίλημα, φρόνημα, φύραμα, χάραγμα.

(c) The suffix takes the form *-σμα* with *-ίζω*, *-άζω* and other dental stems: from *-ίζω* come ἱβάπτισμα, κτίσμα, νόμισμα, ῥάπισμα, ἱσχίσμα, ἱχάρισμα;

from *-άζω*, ἱἀπαύγασμα, σέβασμα, σέπασμα, ἱἀπο-σκίασμα, φάντασμα, ἱχόρτασμα;

from other dental stems, πλάσμα (πλάσσω < πλᾶθω), ψεύσμα (ψεύδομαι).

Thence the suffix spreads (as with *-σμός*, p. 351) to nasal stems and stems of other verbs with perf. pass. in *-σμαι*: πτύσμα (πτύω), χάσμα (χάσκω or χαινῶ), χρίσμα (χρίω), κέλευσμα (κελεύω), κλάσμα (κλάω), κύλισμα (κυλίνδω: ῶμα, 2 Pet 2²² & AKLP), μίασμα (μαίνω), ἱκαταπέτασμα (καταπετάσσειν); also μέθυσμα (Herm. *Mand.* viii. 3: μεθύσκω).

(d) A few words of uncertain derivation remain:

Αἶμα < *aīhma, *aīsuma, cf. Skt. *is- iśās*, "juice," "drink," "power."

*Όνομα cf. Skt. *nāma*, Lat. *nomen*; Brugm. *Grd.*³ II. i. 234; Boisacq,

s.v.

Στόμα. See *Grd.*³ I. 383; Boisacq, *s.v.*

Σῶμα probably < **tyōmēt*, "swelling." I.E. **teuā-* which is seen in σῶος (**τFω-Fos*) σῶος (*τFα-Fo-s*) etc. Boisacq, *s.v.*

Χεῖμα (χείμαρρος), see χεῖμών.

NOTE.—1. Although the close verbal connexion of these nouns in *-μα* is evident throughout the history of the language, in its earlier stages there was at the same time a tendency to use these formations for all kinds of *nomina actionis*, and another to lose the verbal conception in the most concrete of nouns. In the classical, and still more in the Hellenistic period, a differentiation of meanings was observed in the use of the several formations: *-σις* then expressed the verbal abstract (cf. Latin *-tio*), *-μός* generally indicated the state, and *-μα* the result of the action (see, however, pp. 350, 374). Debrunner (*Wortb.* 157) points out other factors which played their part. Thus phonetic sympathies gave a preference for *-ημα* over *-ημός*, whilst *-ισμός* was preferred to *-ισμα*. The NT list shows 35 nouns in *-ημα* as against one only in *-μος*, δῆμος, which goes back to very early times (see above, § 141 (*f*)), and 23 nouns in *-ισμός* against 8 in *-ισμα*. He also finds distinctions due to the period, dialect and style of Greek writers.

2. Thumb (*Hellen.* 216) calls attention to the productivity of this suffix in the Κοινή, and attributes it to Ionic influence. Where Attic uses ἀπόκρισις, ἔγκλισις, νίκη, νόσος, the Κοινή prefers ἀπόκριμα, ἔγκλιμα, νίκημα, νόσημα. He also remarks that outside the Κοινή this formation is most common in poetry, and specially in the Tragedians.

3. See Capes *Ach. L.* p. 247, for relation between σύστασις in Polyb. ii. 42. 1 and σύστημα *ib.* 41. 15.

4. See Helbing *Gr.* 113 ff. for LXX nouns in *-μα*. To his list Wackernagel *ThLZ* xxxiii. 641 adds ἀνάστημα, ἀνταπόδομα, ἀφαίρεμα, ἀπόδομα, διάταγμα, δόμα, εὔρεμα, ἔψημα, ζέμα, κάθεμα, παράθεμα, σύστημα. See also Thackeray *Gr.* 80.

5. For words in *-μα* in papyri, see Mayser *Gr.* i. 433 ff., to which add, e.g., ἀγώνισμα C P Herm 121¹⁰, κατόρθωμα 125 ii.⁴, τέλεισμα 127¹⁰, δαπάνημα BGU iv. 1126¹⁸, ὄδρουμα BGU iv. 1130¹².

2. Masculines in *-μην* and *-μων*.

These suffixes were specially used in the formation of *nomina agentis* and adjectives.

Λιμήν, ποιμήν, ἄρχι-ποιμήν.

† Ἀρτέμων (: ἀρτάω), χεῖμών (= χεῖμα), δαίμων (< **d̄i*, cf. δαίωμα), ἡγεμών (: ἡγέομαι), Φιλήμων.

Adjectives: Ἐλεήμων, οἰκτίρμων, ἐπιστήμων, ἀσχήμων, εὐσχήμων (: σχήμα).

(3) *-μι-*.

A small group of nouns may be mentioned here.

-μις Θέμις (> δῶθέμιτος) cf. Av. *dāmi-* (*Brugmann Gr.*⁴ 219, *Grd.*² ii. i. 254), and probably δύραμις.

(4) *Other Suffixes in -n-*.§ 144. *-en, -on.*

For these nouns with their various ablaut grades, see above, pp. 134-6, also Brugmann *Gr.*⁴ 219 f.

-ην and *-ων* It has been observed (J. Wright *Comp. Gr. Gr.* 130) that this suffix was specially used in the formation of nouns denoting (1) animate objects and (2) parts of the body.

Under these headings come :

(1) Ἀρῆν (see p. 135), ἄρσην; γείτων, κύων, τέκτων, τρυγών. To this group δράκων, λέων, θεράπων originally belonged, as the feminine forms *-αινα* (= *-αια*) show.

(2) The only NT words which represent this class are φρήν, σιῶγών. Perhaps βραχίων may come in here.

(3) A very old use of the suffix *-ων* (gen. *-ωνος*) was to represent the possession of a quality or characteristic signified by the primitive noun. Examples of this usage are not here in evidence, but an extension of it is seen in the formation of surnames, nicknames, and, indirectly, in the patronymics in *-ίων*.

We may quote Τίμων, Σίμων, Ἡρωδίων. For other names in *-ων*, see above, p. 146.

(4) There is uncertainty about the origin of place-names in *-ών* (gen. *-ώνος*) and words indicating locality.

To this class belong ἀμπελών, ἰάφεδρών, κοιτών, μυλών (Mt 24⁴¹ D *et al.*), ἰνυμφών, πυλών. For Ἐλαιών see above, pp. 151 f., for Κεδρών (so in Josephus) see above, p. 149.

(5) For the comparative suffix see above, pp. 165 ff.

(6) For derivation of αἰών see *Vocab.* 165.

(5) *-no-, -nā-*.1. *-νος, -νη.*

§ 145. As primary suffix in nouns and adjectives.

-νος, -νη

(a) Nouns, e.g. αἶνος, ἀμνός, θρόνος, καπνός, οἶνος, πόρνος, ὕπνος, χρόνος; ἰώγη, κλίγη, πλάγη, σκηγή, φάγη, φωνή; δειπνον, κρίνον, τέκνον.

(b) Adjectives, esp. verbal adjectives, e.g. ἀγνός, δεινός, πτηνός, σεμνός, γυμνός, πυκνός.

-s-no- is disguised in λύχνος (<*λυκνο-ς), τέχνη (<*τεκνο).

*ἰχνος (<ἰκσπνο-, see Brugm. *Grd.*³ II. i. 265, 245) belongs to the stems in *-σ*, see below, § 158.

-να

-na is found in a few back-formations from verbs.

Thus μέριμνα from μεριμνάω; cf. ἔρευνα from ἔω, γέννα from γεννάω. So Solmsen, *Wortf.* 39 f., 238, following Wackernagel *KZ* xxx. 300, 314.

2. *-ανος, -ανη, -ανον* is used in the formation of a number of nouns and adjectives.

αν-ος, -η, -ον

(a) κλίβανος, οὐρανός, στέφανος; βοτάνη, δαπάνη, σαργάνη; δρέπανον, λάχανον, πήγανον, φρύγανον.

(b) ἱκανός, ὄρφανός.

NOTE.—According to Solmsen *Wortf.* 257 f., ἔχιδνα is a substantivised adj. in *-δνος* (cf. Μακεδνός=Μακεδανός), *ἔχιδνη becoming ἔχιδνα under the influence of δρᾶκαινα.

3. *-εινός* arises from *-νος* added as a secondary suffix

to neuter stems in *-es* (*-εινός*=*-εσ-νο-ς*).
Thus ἔλειενός : ἔλεος, ὄρεινός : ὄρος.

In φωτεινός the same suffix has been transferred to the stem of the Attic φῶς (*φωτ-*) from φαεινός (<*φαφεσνος): φάος.

Analogy played a larger part in the formation of σκοτεινός either in the direct influence of φωτεινός or through the influence of the neut. φῶς in changing ὁ σκότος to τὸ σκότος in the early classical period. See, however, Brugmann's theory (p. 126 above).

Πετεινός (<πέτομαι) and ταπεινός (for deriv. see Boisacq) are probably analogical formations.

NOTE.—1. As *εσ-νο-ς has produced this group, so *ασ-νο-ς is not altogether unfruitful, as evidenced by σελήνη (Attic for Lesb. σελάννᾱ), which is the substantivised fem. of *σελ-ασ-νο-ς : σέλας.

2. WH *App.*² 161, "Adjectives that in the best MSS have *-ινός* for *-εινός* are ὀρινός, σκοτινός, φωτινός."

4. *-όνη* is a suffix used in words to denote tools, instruments etc., as βελόνη (perhaps also ὀθόνη), and also (with a different accent) to form abstracts, e.g. ἡδονή.

The derivation of ὀθόνη is uncertain. Some trace it to *Fεθόνη (accounting for its form by vocalic assimilation). Cf. Zd. *fra-vaðəmnā*, Fr. *vétue*, A.S. *woéd*. Others find evidence of Semitic origin, and cf. Hebr. רִצְוֹן *yarn*. See Boisacq 687, 1119. Its use by Luke, as also that of βελόνη, is remarked by Hobart, pp. 218, 61.

5. *-υνος, -ύνη*.

Originally an extension of the *-νο-* suffix to *υ-* stems, this never became productive in the formation of nouns.

Of the four which occur in the NT, *αἰσχύνη* is a back-formation from *αἰσχύνω* which was formed from the much older *αἰσχος*.

Βόθῦνος (< $\sqrt{b}hed(h)$, $bhod(h)$) is a rare and late equivalent for *βάθρος* and is probably influenced by the cognate *βαθύς*.

In *κίνδυνος* and *δδύνη* the *-u-* has not been explained, but for the latter see the suggestion in § 111.

6. *-συνος, -σύνη*.

The adjectival suffix *-συνος*, of obscure origin, was never fruitful except in the formation of abstract nouns in *-σύνη*.

Starting from such adjectival formations as *δουλόσυνος*, an extended form of *δούλος*, the suffix *-σύνη* was added to nouns ending in *-ος*, to nouns and adjs. in *-ης*, to adjectives in *-ων* and even to nouns in *-ις*, which were all treated as *o-* stems.

In the NT we have :

Δικαιοσύνη (: *δίκαιος*), *ἐλεημοσύνη* (: *ἐλεήμων*).

Ἄφροσύνη, *εὐφροσύνη* *σωφροσύνη*, *ἤταπεινο-φροσύνη* (: **φρων*).

Ἀσχημοσύνη, *εὐσχημοσύνη* (: **σχήμων*).

-ωσύνη *ἱεροσύνη* (< *ἱερωσύνη* Attic < *ἱερηF-οσύνη*) : *ιερείς*,

became in Hellenistic a model from which *-ωσύνη* was conveniently applied to avoid a series of short vowels, e.g. *ἡγάθωσύνη*, *ἡγαλιωσύνη*, *ἡμεγαλωσύνη*.

For frequency in Hellenistic see *Vocab. s.v. ἀγαθωσύνη*, and for NT see *SH Romans*, p. 404.

7. *Temporal Adjectives in -ινός*.

§ 146. These can be traced to locatives or adverbs in *-ί* (see Brugmann *Grd.*² II. i. 270). Thus *ἑαρινός* :

ἔαρι, *πρωῖνός* : *πρωί*. In the class. age *-ινός* was applied to other stems, *ἑσπερινός* (which appears in Xen.) superseding the earlier *ἑσπέριος* formed regularly from *ἑσπερος*. The detached suffix was then used analogically for all kinds of time descriptions; e.g. *ἡδερρινός* (: *ἡδερρος*) Lk 24²² for earlier form *ἡδερριος* (*ib. E et al.*), also Herm. *Sim.* v. 1¹ (see Lobeck *Phryg.* 51), and *ταχινός* (: *τάχαι*).

ἡκαθημερινός (< *καθ' ἡμέραν*, § 109; see p. 158) survives in MGr *καθημερινός*.

ἡφθινοπωρινός, see above, § 106, and Mayor on Jude 1⁸.

Cf. *νυκτερινός*, quoted from papp. in *Vocab.* 432a; also Clem. *ad Cor.* 20⁸, *καιροὶ ἑαρινοὶ καὶ θερινοὶ καὶ μεταπωρινοὶ καὶ χειμερινοὶ ἐν εἰρήνῃ μεταπαραδίδόασιν ἀλλήλοις*.

8. *Adjectives of material in -ivos.*

-ivos A large group of adjectives signifying material, origin or kind was formed with the suffix *-ivos*, in prehistoric times originating with *i-* stems, but from Homer onward found used with all kinds of stems.

The NT supplies *ἀκάνθινος*, *ἰαμαράντινος*, *ἀνθρώπινος*, *βύσσινος*, *δερμάτινος*, *ελεφάντινος*, *ῥθύϊνος*, *ῥκόκκινος*, *κρίθινος*, *λίθινος*, *ῥμύλινος*, *ξύλινος*, *ὄστράκινος*, *πύρινος*, *σάρκινος*, *τρίχινος*, *ὑακίνθινος*, *ὕαλινος*.

To these may be added *σάρδινος* (Rev 4^s P *et al.* for *σάρδιον*) and *ἰαμαράγδινος*, the adjective in each case being used with *λίθος* (understood).

Two oxytones obviously belong to this rather than the preceding class:

ἄληθινός the only adjectival derivative in this group, from *ἀληθής*.

Πεδινός (< *πεδίον*) which probably follows the accent of its antonym *ὄρεινός* (see 3. above).

The activity of this suffix in late Greek (cf. *οὐθαμινός* P Flor ii. 170^r (iii/A.D.); *ὑαμινός*, (see Herwerden *Lex. s.v.*) suggests a possible explanation of the form *συκάμινος* (see above, p. 153).

9. *-ίνος, -ανός, -ηνός.*

-ίνος Ethnica and adjectives signifying "belonging to," which have the suffix *-ίνος*, may have originated, as Debrunner (*Wortb.* 162) following K.Bi. ii. 296 suggests, in words formed from the names of Greek towns in S. Italy and Sicily, and were therefore of Latin origin (e.g. *Ἀκραγαντινος*, *Ταραντινος*).

In NT we have *Ἀλεξανδρινός* (which, however, in the best MSS is *Ἀλεξανδρινός*), *Ἐφεσίνος* (296 and another cursive *ap.* Rev 2¹), and the unquestionably Latin *Λιβερτινος*.

-ανός, -ηνός *-ανός* and *-ηνός*, which were not native to Greece, came to be used from the time of Alexander as ethnica, for Asiatic towns and districts. Thus *Ἀδραμύττειον*: *Ἀδραμυττηνός* (WH *Ἀδραμυττηνός*), *Ἀσία*: *Ἀσιανός*, *Γερασά*: *Γερασηνός*, *Δαμασκός*: *Δαμασκηνός*, *Ναζαρά*: *Ναζαρηνός*. Also *Μαγδαλά*: *Μαγδαληνή*. Used as nouns for place-names, *Ἀβειληνή*, *Μελιτινή* (Ac 28¹ B), *Μιτυλήνη*.

10. *-ιανός.*

-ιανός Latin is also responsible for the extended suffix *-ιανός*. Stems in *-i* took the normal Latin termination *-anus* to denote a follower of a party leader. The partisans of C. Marius were thus termed *Mari-ani*, those of Cn. Pompeius *Pompei-*

ani. It was an easy transition to *Cæsar-iani*. Thus *Χριστιανός*, *Ἡρωδιανός*.

NOTE.—R. S. Radford, "The Suffixes -ānus and -Inus" in *Gildersleeve Studies*, 1903, pp. 95 ff., shows (after Schnorr v. Carolsfeld, *Archiv f. lat. Lex.* i. 177-194) that the formation was so regularly from the nomen in -ius (or -ia stems, cf. *Fimbrianus*) that "from the second half of the Augustan period on new formations are made only in -iānus." On p. 98 he catalogues "extension of the purely Roman suffix -ānus (-iānus) to other than Roman words." Thus *Herculanus*, cf. *Plautaneus*, *Trophonianus* (Cic.), *Thyonianus* (Cat.), *Hannibalianus*, *Hasdrubalianus* and many others. The suffix when added to names of persons makes a possessive, closely allied to gen. for cases of adoption, but more restricted than corresponding gen. and tending to recur in set phrases. He cft. "the Clayton-Bulwer treaty," etc. [Germ. -sche]. Varro says (LL 9. 42, 71 Sp.) from *Faustus* should be *Faustinus*, *Faustianus* could only rightly be from *Faustius*. But Cato says *Quirinianus*. Cicero avoids these new forms in the orations and philosophical works, and uses them twice only in his letters. From -ōn- base he has *Pisonianus* and *Neronianus* in or. and phil. The suffix -inus was practically obsolete in the silver age. The conclusion is "that the possessive adjectives in -anus are later formations of the language, and that the gentile adjective (*Titius*, *Aelius*) originally possessed a much broader, perhaps a wholly unrestricted, use. This older usage was always retained in the ritualistic language, in the poets and in the authors of archaic tendencies."¹

C. Liquid Suffixes.

(1) *l*-Suffixes.

1. -lo-, -la-

§ 147. The simple suffix -λος, -λη was not fruitful, though a number of words survive.

Nouns: *Αὔλος*, *ἄθλος* (*ἀ-Feθ-λος*) (>*ἀθλέω*), *ζῆλος*, *ξύλον*, *ἔπλον* (<I.E. **sop-lo-m*), *σπήλαιον* (cf. Hom. *σπέος*), *σπίλος*, *στύλος* (Skt. *sithurá-s*).

Ὀμίχλη, φυλή.

Adjectives: *Βέβηλος*, *δειλός*, *δῆλος* (<**δειηλος*), *δοῦλος*, *στρεβλός* (>*στρεβλόω*), *τυφλός*, *φαῦλος*.

NOTE.—*Βέβηλος*, an old t.t. of religion, from √ *βη*- in *βαίνω*, means accessible and so *profane*, as opposed to *ἄβατος*, inaccessible and so *sacred*. *Σπίλος* Boisacq (p. 693) connects with *κηλίς*, Lat. *cāligo*, *equālis*, <I.E. **sq*ā*, or else from I.E. **spōi*-**spī*-. Rutherford NP 87, identifies with *σπιλάς* [<I.E. **spēi*-, **spī**=to be pointed, cf. Lat. *spīna*, *spīca*, *pīnna* (**pīnā*), Boisacq, p. 896 f.], and "tracks *σπιλος* rock through

¹ Mr. E. E. Genner calls attention to such formations as *Ἀττικιανός* from "Atticus."

an easy gradation of meanings historically consecutive from the beginning to the close of Greek literature. Originally meaning rock, it came to signify successively *porous rock*, *rotten-stone*, *clay*, and *clay-stain*, till Paul could employ it metaphorically as in Eph 5²⁷, and Dion. H. apply it to men with the meaning *dregs of humanity*."

2. -αλο-, -ελο-, -ιλο-.

These are more numerous.

-αλος Nouns: Αἰγιαλός, διδάσκαλος, ὕαλος (see Thumb in *DAC* i. 553b): κύμβαλον, πηδάλιον, Ἰσκάνδαλον, Ἰσκούβαλον (<I.E. *squb-, see Boisacq s.v., but see § 105 for derivation, which removes it into class of cpds.): ἀγκάλη (<ἀγκος), κεφαλῆ (cf. Gothic *gibla*, OHG *gebal*), κρεπάλη, σπατάλη (> Ἰσπαταλάω), φιάλη.

Adjectives: Ἄπαλος (cf. Lat. *sapere*, and ὀπίος *juice*), μεγάλ-η.

-ελος Ἄγγελος, ἄμπελος, μυελός; ἀγέλη, νεφέλη (Lat. *nebula*); εὐτράπελος (> ὀλία, § 106).

-ιλος. Ὀργίλος, ποικίλος: κοιλία (<κοῖλος <*κόφιλος, cf. Lat. *cavus*).

NOTE.—Αἰγιαλός. Hirt *IdgF* (1917) xxxvii. 229 f., starting from Hesych. αἶγες· τὰ κύματα· Δωριεῖς (also Artem. *Oneirocrit.* ii, 12), leaps to αἶξ=*shore*. Then in such a line as Hom. *Il.* iv. 422 ἐν αἰγιαλῷ may originally have been ἐν αἰγί ἄλος, i.e. "on the shore of the salt-flood." If this association was frequent, they flowed together into one word, at least in pronunciation. We should then have a connexion which was transformed into αἰγιαλῷ, to form again a nom. from this, αἰγιαλός.

Ἰσκάδαλον, Moulton *Exp T* xxvi. 331, connects with Skt. *skand* "leap," "spirt," Lat. *scandō*, O.Ir. *scendim* "I spring," and holds that Ἰσκάδαλον existed before σκανδάληθρον (Arist. *Acharn.* 687), though not occurring in literature.

Κρεπάλη (for spelling see p. 81) possibly connected with *κραμπνός* *swift, impetuous*. So Boisacq 506, who, however, rejects the theory of a primitive *κραμπνός, related to καρπάλιμος, and is unconvinced by the etymology *κραῦ- *head* + πάλη.

3. -ᾶλό-, -ηλό-, -ωλό-.

These productive adjectival suffixes, in which -ᾶλός came to be specially appended to stems with corresponding verbs in -ᾶν, and -ηλός to stems with similar verbs in -εῖν, are not represented in N.T.

-ηλος The later use of -ηλος to form *nomina agentis* has provided κάπηλος (whence ἡλεύω), τράχηλος (properly "carrier," so Brugmann *Gr.*⁴ 231. For another derivation see Boisacq, s.v.). The detached suffix is appended without any semantic reason in ὄψηλός.

-ωλος -ωλός is represented in ἁμαρτωλός and εἰδωλόν.

4. -υ(λ)λο-.

-υλος
The diminutive conception which was always closely related to the -λο- suffixes and is specially evident in the mass of Latin diminutives in -ulus, -ellus, -illus, comes out in Greek, specially with words in -υλος and -υλλος. In proper names this suffix generally marks either a pet name or an abbreviation of a compound appellative.

Δάκτυλος (<*δατ-κ-υλο- <*dakt-go-, cf. MHG *zint*, Germ. *Zinke*, *Zacke*), acc. to Brugmann (*JF* xi. 284 ff., *Gr.*⁴ 159, *Grd.*² π. i. 484), originally meant "little tooth."

Σταφυλή (<I.E. *steh₂h-, see Boisacq 90, 91, 903.

†Βήρυλλος (Rev 21²⁰, so also in Tob 13¹⁷ B). For the form βηρύλλιον (Ex 28²⁰) see above, p. 343.

Τέρτυλλος=Lat. *Tertullus*, dim. cf. *Tertius*.

Τρωγύλιον. For this "Western and Syrian" reading in Ac 20¹⁵ see WH *App.*² 98. For spelling see WS 47, and Ramsay *CRE* 155.

5. -αλέος.

-αλέος
It is curious that this extended suffix which was widely used in the Κοινή (Br.-Thumb *Gr.* 231) does not appear in NT except in inferior MSS for νηφάλιος (see p. 76).

6. -αλις.

-αλις
This seems to be a feminine suffix in names of animals, in δάμαλις (perh. through masc. δαμάλης, where λ is δαμ- (cf. Ir. *dam*<Celt. *damo-s), πάρδαλις (masc. πάρδος <I.E. *prda, cf. Skt. *pr̥dāku-h*). So also μοιχαλῖς (LXX, *Test. XII Patr.*, Plut.; for Attic μοιχάς, see Lobeck *Phryn.* 452).

Quite distinct is σεμίδαλις, cf. Lat. *simila* (*sem-). Possibly from I.E. *sem-* <*bhs-em- (:ψωμός), cf. *bhas- to pound, which fits the meaning *fine wheat*. This rare word (Rev 18¹⁸) in addition to citations in Gr.-Th. is found Justin *M. Ap.* i. 37 and papp. (see *Vocab. s.v.*).

(2) r- Suffixes.

§ 148. The most important words with r- suffixes are the *nomina agentis* in -τηρ and -τωρ (see §§ 150, 152) and the related formations in -τρος, -τρον (see § 152), which are dealt with below.

1. -ρο-, -ρα.

-ρος, -ρα
This suffix was partly connected with the -ρ in the nom. and acc. sing. of neuters, e.g. ἄνυδρος : ὕδωρ, ἄλευρον : ἄλεφαρ, and with the suffix -er, e.g. αὔρα : ἀήρ.

Nouns: ἄγρος, ἄγρα, ἄκρον, αὔρα, ἀφρός, δῶρον, ἔδρα, (ἔνεδρα, see above, p. 125), ἔχθρα, κλήρος, κόπριον, κοπρία, λεπρός, λέπρα, μήρος, νεφρός, ὄμβρος, πέτρα, πήρα, πλευρά, πρῶρα, σταυρός (Brugm. *Grd.*² II. i. 351), τέφρον (τεφρώ), χώρα.

Adjectives: Αἰσχρός, ἀνυδρος, ἀφεδρος (> τᾶφεδρών, see § 115), ἐλαφρός, ἐρυθρός, ἐχθρός, λαμπρός, μακρός, μικρός, νεκρός, νωθρός (see *Vocab. s.v.*), ξηρός, πενιχρός (see *Vocab. s.v.*), πηρός (ἀνάπηρος), πικρός, σαπρός, σκληρός, σύνεδρος (> συνέδριον), ὑγρός, χλωρός, ψυχρός.

2. -ἄρο-, -ερο-, -ορο-, -υρο- (principally with adjectives). See Brugmann *Grd.*² II. i. 347 f.

-αρος, -αρα Κιθάρα; ἰλαρός, καθαρός, λιπαρός, ρυπαρός, χλιαρός.

-ερος, -ερα Ἑσπέρα, ἡμέρα; πενθερός, πενθερά; βλαβερός, ἱερός, καρτερός (whence ῥησις), φανερός, φοβερός.

With different accentuation, ἐλεύθερος (ἐ- prothetic vowel, Brugmann *Gr.*⁴ 173, cf. *Lat. liber*. Boisacq 242, derives from *ἐλευθος, *generation, people*, cf. O. Slav. *ljudŭje*).

-ορος Βόρβορος (2 Pet 2²², a classical word found elsewhere in bibl. Gr. only in Jer (LXX) 45⁶): λοιδόρος.

For the -*Foros* opds. (e.g. θυρωρός) see § 105. Θεωρός (> ῥέω) belongs probably to that group; see below, p. 391.

-ῦρος *Ἀχυρον; ἄργυρος (Skt. *arjuna-s*, *bright, white*), ὀχυρός (ὀχύρωμα), ψίθυρος (ψιθυρισμός).

3. -ἄρο-, -ηρο-, -υρο-.

As with -*lo-* suffixes, combination with stems ending in long vowels (e.g. ὀδυνηρός: ὀδυνᾶω, ὀδύνη) formed a class to which adjectives derived from other stems were added by false analogy.

-ᾶρος Φλύᾶρος (φλύω).

-ηρος Αὔστηρός (αὔω, *dry up*, < *αὔσιω, *Lat. haucio, haucium*), αὔχημός (αὔχος, *drought*), ὀκνηρός (: ὀκνέω, *δκνος*), ποτηρός (: πονέομαι, *πόνος*). Τολμηρός (> *τολμηροτέρως*) formed regularly from *τολμάω*. The origin of the noun σίδηρος is unknown.

-ῦρος, -ῦρα Αγκῦρα (ἀγκών), κολλῦρα (> *κολλῦριον*, see p. 78): ἰσχυρός (ἰσχῦς).

4. -ήρ, -ωρ.

For ἄήρ see Brugm. *Grd.*² II. i. 339, ἀνήρ, *ib.* 332 f.

-ήρ, -ωρ †Κατήγωρ is a Hellenistic back-formation from *κατήγορος* (see Thumb *Hellen.* 126, and Brugmann-Thumb *Gr.* 210 n.², also p. 127 above).

5. For *-τερος*, see below, § 153, p. 369.

6. *-dhro-*, *-dhrā-*, and *-dhlo-*, *-dhlā-*.

This suffix seems to be related on one side to the *-ro-*, *-lo-* suffixes, and on the other to those in *-tro-*, *-ilo-* (see § 152 below). Brugmann (*Grd.*² π. i. 377) regards this *-dh-* (as in *-θμός*, § 141 above) as probably a root determinative.

-θρος, *-θρον*,
-θρα *Ολεθρος (δλλῦμι, <δλ-νῦ-μι), ὄρθρος, σκυθρός
(>σκυθρωπός) <*σκυσθρός (by dissimilation): σκύ-
ζομαι, φόβηθρον (Lk 21¹¹ BDW, see pp. 110, 369),

κολυμβήθρα (: κολυμβάω).

There is no NT example of *-θλο-*, but *γενέθλιον* (*Mart. Polyc.* 18^o) is a derivative of *γένεθλον* and appears in disguise at Mk 6²¹ D (see p. 112).

D. Suffixes with Labial Stops.

1. *-π-*.

ψ § 149. Apart from *ποταπός* (see *Prol.* 95 and pp. 112, 271 above), stems in *-π-* are *κῶνυψ*, *μάλωψ*, *ἰδρωψ* (*ἰδρωπικός*) (genitives in *-ωπος*), *σκόλοψ* (gen. *-οπος*), *λαῖλαψ* (gen. *-απος*). (See further Sturtevant, *Cl. Phil.* vii. 425 ff.)

As *ἄνθρωπος* has not been dealt with among the cpds., it may be mentioned here. Boisacq rejects the old derivation *ἀνῆρ* + *ῶψ* (which leaves the *-θ-* unexplained), preferring <*ἀνδρ-ἡωπος “having the appearance of a man,” where the second element is related to the Gothic *aihan*, to see, Lat. *signum* <*seq*no-m.

2. *-bho-*, *-bha-*.

φος *Εριφος is the sole representative in the NT of the old class of animal names in *-φος* (cf. *εἰλαφος*).

We may note three other words. *Εδαφος <*εδ-, √sed), by the law which forbids successive aspirates under the influence of *εδος* has passed from the masc. type to the neut. with stem in *εδαφε(σ)-* (Brugm. *Grd.*² π. i. 390). *Κόλαφος* is preserved in *†κολαφίζω*. *Ψήφος* *pebble*, polished by the churning of the waves, suggests connexion with L.E. *dhas-*bh* >Skt. *dhas-*, “to pound,” “crush.” The same root appears in *ψάμμος* (=sand). See Boisacq, s.vv.

E. Suffixes with Dental Stops.

(1) The *-t* Suffixes.

1. *Nomina agentis* in *-τήρ*, *-τωρ*, *-της*.

§ 150. The original distinction between these suffixes was that simple verbs formed *nomina agentis* in *-τήρ* or *-τωρ*, and

noun compounds in *-της*. Compound verbs followed the usage of the simplex when the preverb was felt to be an integral part of the verb; otherwise they took *-της*. Ionic-Attic very early substituted *-της* for *-τηρ*, with the result that in Hellenistic *-της* is left in possession.

-τήρ A few of those in *-τήρ*, *-τωρ*, mostly religious and legal terms, survive: *σωτήρ*, *φωστήρ*, *φυλακτήρ* (preserved in *φυλακτήριον*).

-τωρ †*Κοσμοκράτωρ*, †*παντοκράτωρ* (see § 107), †*κτήτωρ*, †*πράκτωρ*, *ρήτωρ*. *Σπεκουλάτωρ* is a Latin loan word. *Οικήτωρ* occurs in *Clem. ad Cor.* 14⁴. *Οικήτήριον* is witness for the earlier *-τήρ*. *Ἀλέκτωρ* (superseded in Att. by *ἀλεκτρούων*, but reappearing in *Κοινή*: see Rutherford *NP* 307 f. and *Vocab. s.v.*) should come here, if Kretschmer (*KZ* xxxiii. 560) is right in deriving it from *ἀλέξω*. See Boisacq 43.

NOTE.—For difference of accent in *-τήρ* and *-τωρ* see Brugmann *Grd.*² II. i. 331.

-της, τής The vast majority of these *nomina agentis* are formed in *-της*.

From verbs in *-άω*: *Ἀκροατής*, *κυβερνήτης*, *πλανήτης*, *τολμητής*.

From verbs in *-έω*: *Αὐλητής*, *ἐπιθυμητής*, †*καθηγητής*, †*καταφρονητής*, *μετρητής*, *μιμητής*, *ποιητής*, †*προσαίτης* (a late word—*Plut.*, *Lucian*—by haplology for *προσαίτητης*, see *Hirt Handb.* 172), †*προσκυνητής* (*NT* *δ.λ.* *Jn* 4²². See *Vocab. s.v.* and *LAE*¹ 99 f. (² 101), for probable pre-Christian use), †*συνζητητής* (*NT* *δ.λ.* *I Co* 1²², elsewhere only in the citation in *Ignat. Eph.* 18¹).

From verbs in *-όω*: *Ζηλωτής*, †*λυτρώτης* (*LXX*, *Philo*, *Just. M.*, *Act. Thom.*), †*τελειωτής* (*δ.λ.* in *Heb* 12²—apparently coined by the author).

From verbs in *-εύω*: *Βουλευτής*, *ἐρμηνευτής*, †*δολοβρευτής* (*δ.λ.* in *I Co* 10¹²; for form see p. 71), *παιδευτής*.

From verbs in *-άζω*: †*βιαστής* (*NT* *δ.λ.* in *Mt* 11¹². A late form for *βιαράς*, common in *Pindar*. *Wetst.* cites from *Eustath.* and *Arctaeus* alone. *Gr.-Th.* quotes *Philo Agric.* 19, where *Cohn* and *Wendland* print *divisim*, *βιας τῶν*), *δικαστής*, †*στασιαστής* (for class. *στασιωτής*).

From verbs in *-ίζω*: *Ἀνδραποδιστής* (see p. 286 for derivation of this class. word; in *NT* only *I Ti* 1¹⁰), †*βαπτιστής* (*NT* and *Joseph.*; see *Vocab.* 102 b), *βασανιστής*, †*δανιστής* (for form, see p. 77), †*Ἑλληνιστής*, †*ἔξορκιστής* (apart from *NT* *δ.λ.* *Ac* 19¹², only found in *Joseph.*, *Lucian.* and *eccles. writers*), †*εὐαγγελιστής* (*NT* and *eccles.*, but see *Vocab. s.v.* for inscr. possibly non-Christian), *θεριστής*, †*κερματιστής* (see *N.* *I* below), †*κτίστης* (*NT* *δ.λ.* *I Pet* 4¹⁰; see *Vocab. s.v.* for use in *Κοινή*), *ληστής*, *μεριστής* (*NT* *δ.λ.* *Lk* 12¹⁴. To *Pollux* and *eccles.* add *Κοινή*

εξ. in *Vocab. s.v.*), †σαλπιστής (for class. σαλπικτής, Lob. *Phryn.* 191), ὄβριστής, ψιθυριστής.

From verb in -ίζω: †Γογγυστής (NT δ.λ. Jude 1⁸; elsewhere only LXX, Sym., Theod.).

From other verbal stems: †Γγώστης (in which σ is inserted before τ as in δυνάστης and ψεύστης), †διώκτης (NT δ.λ. 1 Ti 1², elsewhere *Did.* 5², Barn. 20², Sym. But the LXX cpd. ἐργοδιώκτης is "profane," as shown by a iii/B.C. papyrus: see *Vocab.* 166a), †δότης (δ.λ. 2 Co 9⁷ (LXX), for class. δοτήρ; see *Vocab. s.v.* for pre-Christian inser. ἐκδότης), †ἐμπαίκτης (only LXX semel, 2 Pet 3², Jude 1⁸: see *Mayor Commentary, in loc.*), ἐπενδύτης (see n. 2 below), ἐφευρετής, κλέπτης, κριτής, μαθητής (cf. με-μάθ-η-κα), νομοθέτης (a T.P. cpd., see § 105), ὀφειλέτης, παραβάτης, †πλήκτης, †προσωπολήμπτης (§ 105), προφήτης, ὑπηρετής (§ 129 (b)).

NOTE.—1. Κερματιστής (peculiar to NT and related writings) is formed from *ίζω, a classical verb for *to cut small*, which gained the meaning in Hellenistic *to coin into small money* (Anth.), *to exchange* (for papp. see *Vocab.*); †κολλυβιστής, a late word (Rutherford *NP* 499, common in papp., see *Vocab.*), has no corresponding verb, and must owe its form to analogy, probably with κερματιστής. The noun κολουβος is of Semitic origin.

2. As with nouns in -τήρ, we can trace an easy transition from *nomen agentis* to instrumental meaning in some words, e.g. ἐπενδύτης, μετρητής.

2. Derivatives in -της from nouns.

§ 151. The denominatives include ναύτης, πρεσβύτες. The suffix is found after a variety of stems, some of which have given rise to complex suffixes which were freely used in the production of analogy formations. Thus:

- έτης: from stems in -ο-, οἰκέτης (οἰκότης only found in vulgar course tablet, Meisterhans² 117), †συμφυλέτης (for Attic φυλέτης, from φύλον or φυλή). So εὐεργέτης (see below, under cpds.).
- ώτης: from -ο- stems, δεσμώτης, ιδιώτης: from -α stems, στρατιώτης, †συνηλικιώτης (for class. ἡλικιώτης).
- ίτης: from -ι- stems, πολίτης. By analogy μεσίτης and a group of appellatives which τεχνίτης and τραπέζιτης (WH -είτης) represent in the NT. These two influences may account for Ἄρεσπαγίτης (§ 106). The common ethnica in -ίτης are naturally reinforced by the Semitic ethnica in ʾ (fem. ת), though the spelling -είτης is better supported (WH *App.*² 161). See the list above, p. 150.

Νικόλαίτης, a follower of Νικόλαος—an easy extension of the idea of "membership" that constitutes the preceding classes. Μαργαρίτης may (through its association with precious stones) be quoted as the one NT example of a class of nouns with this suffix used of kinds of stone (e.g. πυρίτης, αἱματίτης; cf. Lat. *anthracites* (Pliny)).

3. *Compounds in -της.*

The large class with *-στάτης* as second member of the compound is represented by *ἐπιστάτης* and *πρωτοστάτης* (a K.D. cpd., § 106). So *αὐτόπτης* (a K.D. cpd. § 106) and *ἐπόπτης* (§ 120) represent another group. Three T.P. cpds. (§ 105) are *ἀρσενοκοίτης* (from *ἄρσην, κοιτή*), *οἰνοπότης*, *†φρεναπάτης*. Probably to the same class belongs *χροοφειλέτης* (for form see p. 73, also Lob. *Phryg.* 691).

NOTE.—The accentual variations within these groups call for some notice. Brugmann (*IF* ix. (1898) 368 n.²) draws attention to the correspondence between the masculines *κλέπτης, γυμνήτης* etc., with their penultimate accent, and the abstracts *βλάβση, ἀήτη* etc., just as *κριτής* etc. correspond to the abstracts *ἀκτή, μελετή* etc. But the connexion is not shown. The fullest treatment is in Fraenkel, *Geschichte der griechischen Nomina agentis*, ii. 199-215. Debrunner *Wortb.* 175 f., while suspecting that the ancient grammarians added to the confusion by unreliable transmission in individual words as well as groups, offers the following general rules. Derivatives in *-της* from nouns are barytone, also the old *nomina agentis* in *-της*, and the compounds, together with a few uncompounded formations as *ικέτης* and *κλέπτης*. Oxytone are those formations in *-της* which have taken the place of an earlier *-τήρ*. Thus *οικέτης, πολίτης, δεσμώτης, ἐπόπτης, οἰνοπότης*; but *βουλευτής*. Other factors, however, may break through this partition. Thus the Hellenistic *δότης* (for Homeric *δοτήρ*) is under the influence of *-δότης*, so often the final member in cpds. (e.g. *μισθαποδότης*). On the contrary, *κριτής* (also *ὑποκριτής*), which replaced Dor. *κριτήρ*, maintained a sturdy independence of *δικαιο-κριτής* etc. because of its legal use. It will be seen that generally those formed directly from a verb are oxytone.

4. *Abstract nouns in -της.*

§ 152. These are nearly all formed from
Abstracts adjectives in *-ο-*, with the result that the
in -της suffix *-ότης* is regularly attached to the consonantal stems as well.

From nouns in *-ο-*: *†Θεότης, †ἀδελφότης* (note extension of meaning to concrete and collective sense. See *Vocab.*).

From adjectives in *-ο-*: *†Ἁγιοότης, †ἀγνότης, ἀδρότης, αἰσχρότης, †γυμνότης, †ἀδελλότης, †θειότης, ἱκανότης, †ἱλαρότης, ἰσότης, καθαρότης, καινότης, †κυριοότης, λαμπρότης, †ματαιότης* (see *Vocab.*), *†μεγαλειότης, νεότης, ὁμοιότης, ὀσιότης, παλαιότης, σεμνότης, σκληρότης, τελειότης, †τιμιότης, χρηστότης: ἀπλότης* (from *-όος*).

†Ἀφελότης (from *-ης*, for which see § 107) appears in the *Κοινή* together with class. *ἀφέλεια*, e.g. Vett. Val. p. 240¹⁸. (See *Vocab. s.v.*)

Πιότης (from *πίων*), *†ἐνότης* (from *εἶς* gen. *ένός*).

From adjectives in *-ús*: Βραδυτής, †εὐθύτης, πρᾶυτης.

NOTE.—For the accent in βραδυτής see Br.-Th. *Gr.* 180 and Debr. *Wortb.* 184 n.¹. The distinction seems to rest upon an I.E. principle of accentuation. In Att. and Hellen. there was a tendency to assimilation, e.g. Att. κουφοτής: τραχυτής. Hellen. γλυκίτης etc.: νεότης.

5. Other nouns in *-τηρ*.

-τηρ These fall into three groups :

(a) Closely connected with *nomina agentis*, already discussed under 1, are a number of terms for instruments, tools, etc. (cf. words in *-τρον* (under 6. below).

†Νιπτήρ.—This word for basin, found first in Jn 13⁵, and elsewhere only in writings influenced by the Johannine narrative of the foot-washing, is formed from the late verb νίπτω (class. νίζω): cf. κρατήρ, κρητήρ fr. κεράννυμι. Στατήρ (Skt. *sthātār*, Lat. *stator*, I.E. **sthā-*, cf. *stā-* of ἵστημι), used first of a weight, then of a coin. The connexion with *nomina agentis* is here traceable.

Χαρακτήρ (χαράσσω), originally a tool for engraving, then of the die or mould, then of the stamp or impress, as on a coin or seal; so Heb 1².

(b) Terms of relationship: Θυγάτηρ, μήτηρ, πατήρ. On the "relative" force of *-τηρ* cf. under 7. below.

(c) A few other nouns of various meaning :

*Ἄστῆρ (Skt. *stār-*, Lat. *stella* < **stēr-lā*. The *a-* in Gr. and Arm. *astē* is not prothetic. I.E. **astēr*, gen. *strós*. Boisacq, *s.v.*).

Γαστήρ.—Brugmann (*IF* xi. 272 n.) suggests connexion with γέν-το "he held," γέμω "I am full of anything," γέμος, γόμος etc. For the *σ* he compares Skt. *vasti-*, *vaniśthū-*, Lat. *vē(n)sica*; Germ. *wanst*, Lat. *venter*.

NOTE.—Brugmann (*Gr.*⁴ 180) suspects that the recessive accent in μήτηρ, θυγάτηρ, for *μητήρ, *θυγατήρ (Skt. *mātā*, *duhitā*), is due to the influence of the vocative μηῆτερ, θύγατερ, in the same way that personal names prefer the recessive accent on that account. (See p. 59 above.)

6. Nouns in *-τρος*, *-τρα*, *-τρον*.

-τρος, *-τρᾶ*, These are closely related to the *-ter-*, *-tor-*
-τρον suffix of the *nomina agentis*.

(a) *-τρος*, a most unproductive suffix, is represented in NT only by ἰατρός (: ἰατήρ, Ion. ἰητήρ).

(b) *-τρᾶ* is seen in μήτρα, *womb*, where the instrumental force is evident.

(c) *-τρον* is common in names for implements. Debrunner (*Wortb.* 178 f.) traces three stages in use of this suffix: (a) instrument, (β) locality, (γ) payment.

Under (α) we have ἀγκιστρον (Mt 17²⁷, Ignat. *Magh.* 11¹), ἄροτρον, ἀμφίβληστρον (§ 112, 1 (β)), ἔσοπτρον (§ 117), κέντρον, λουτρόν, μέτρον, φόβητρον (Lk 21¹¹). So most MSS, see above, pp. 110, 364. Both suffixes are old, but this spelling was preferred because of dissimilation of aspirates. Bl-D § 35, 2). Under (β) θέατρον (so Ac 19^{29, 31}; then *spectacle* as in 1 Co 4⁹). Under (γ) λύτρον and ἀντίλυτρον.

NOTE.—1. The accent of λουτρόν, like that of another Homeric word δαιτρόν, distinguishes it from almost every other noun in -τρον. (For the group of cognates, λουτρών and λουτήρ, with which it is so closely allied in meaning, see J. A. Robinson *op. Eph* 5²⁶.)

2. The papyri show that -τρον was still active. Thus for (α) ἐγκοιμητρον "counterpane," P Petr ii. 9²⁰; for (γ) the very common φόρετρον "cost of carriage," e.g. P Ryl ii. 209⁵ (ii/A.D.).

7. -τερος.

§ 153. This was confined in the historical period to the formation of the comparative of adjectives, but the suffix -τερο- was used at a much earlier stage to indicate ideas that were relative rather than absolute. The I.E. comparative in -τερο- did not stand for an intensification of the positive, but represented a comparison. So the form in -τερο- expressed no absolute property of a thing, but a relationship. Pairs of correlatives or opposites were thus formed,

E.g. ἀριστερός—δεξιτερός (cf. Lat. *sinister*—*dexter*).

ἡμέτερος—ὀμέτερος (cf. Lat. *noster*—*vester*).

ὄρεστερος—ἀγρότερος ("on the hills"—"on the plain").

Streitberg (*IF* xxxv. 196 f.) contends that the suffix -τερο- is to be explained in the same way. It is seen at once in the terms for family relationship πατήρ, μήτηρ, θυγάτηρ, φράτηρ, which all point to the character of one person in relation to another. We can understand why such nouns should be provided with the same suffix as the so-called comparative formations. It is but one step further to claim that the same holds good of the *nomina agentis*. These originally were concerned with ideas which had no unqualified but only a relative meaning, and would be unthinkable except in some external connexion. Just as the term "father" involves a relationship to another person, "child," so "giver" (*δότηρ*, *δοτήρ*, *δότης*) implies relationship to a second party. Thus the suffix -τερο- is appropriate here also.

Comparatives. See above, pp. 165-7. The ordinal δεύτερος is of the same formation.

Pronouns: Ἀμφότερος, ἕτερος, see p. 182 above. Πότερος, which of two, survives in NT only in adverbial form, πότερον, *whether*, Jn 7¹⁷.

The adj. ἀλλότριος owes the secondary suffix -ιος- to its original antonym ἴδιος. The primary suffix -τριος- is the weak grade of -τερος-. For similar ablaut changes see Brugmann *Gr.*⁴ 228, *Grd.*² π. i. 165, 329.

8. *Nouns and adjectives in -τος, -τη, -τον.*

§ 164. These suffixes were chiefly used in the parent I.E. to form verbal adjectives and ordinal numerals. In Greek the verbal connexion is less strong than in some cognate languages, and -τος is not the mark of the perf. pass. partic. (cf. Lat. -tus), but is free from tense and voice connexions (*Proleg.* 221). The verbal attachment was weak enough to allow the suffix to be added to noun stems.

(a) *Verbal adjectives.* For formation see pp. 188, 224, and for accent, p. 224.

-τος

These may be grouped conveniently under the conjugation classes (*supra* 184 f., *infra* 381 ff.). Often the neg. adj. alone occurs.

From verbs in I. a. (a): †'Αδιάλειπτος (see *Vocab. s.v.*), †ἀκατάλυτος, †ἀκατάπαστος (p. 253, *Vocab. s.v.*), †ἀκατάσχετος, ἀκώλυτος (-ως, *Vocab. s.v.*), ἀμεμπτος, ἀμεταμέλητος, ἀνεκτός, †ἀνένδεκτος, ἄπιστος, †ἀπόδεκτος, ἄπαιστος (Xen. and later), γραπτός, †δεκτός (*Vocab. s.v.*), ἐκλεκτός, †ἔστος, †θεόπνευστος (p. 255, *Vocab. s.v.*), †παρείσακτος (*Vocab. s.v.*), πιστός (*Vocab. s.v.*), †πνικτός, †προσήλυτος (p. 237, also *Vocab. s.v.*), †συνεκλεκτός.

(b) 'Απρόσιτος.

I. β. (b) 'Ακατάστατος (Hippocr. and Hellen. writers), †ἀμετάθετος, ἀνεύθετος, ἀσύνητος, ἐγκάθετος, ἔκδοτος, ἔκθετος, εὐθετος (§ 106), μετάδοτος (εὐμεγ*, § 106), παράδοτος (†πατρο-, § 106), περίστατος (εὐπ*, § 106), συνετός.

II. a. (a) 'Αναμάρτητος, ἀνεπιλημπτος, †ἀπερίμητος, ποτός (> noun, πότης, p. 254).

(b) Δυνατός, whence δδύνατος (§ 106).

II. β. (a) 'Αμετακίνητος, πρόσφατος (§ 125).

(b) 'Ακρατος, ἄρρωστος (Hippocr. and Hellen.), ἄσβεστος, στρατός (λιθό-).

III. †'Απερίσπαστος (†-ως).

IV. (a) 'Αρεστός, εὐάρεστος (*Vocab. s.v.*), -βρωτός (†σητό-, †σκωληκό-), παθητός. Μεθυστός > ἀμέθυστος (in Plut. = "not drunken," then used for a remedy against drunkenness, and so of the stone (ἡ ἀμέθ.)).

(b) 'Αγνωστος (§ 106), †ἀκατάγνωστος, γνωστός, διδακτός.

(c) Αἰχμάλωτος (< αἰχμή and εἰσκόμαι, a T.P. opd., § 105), θνητός.

There are no verbals from verbs in Classes V. and VI. Those in the next Class follow the subdivision of verbs in *yo* : *ye* given below, § 160.

VII. From verbs in -άω. 'Αγαπητός, †ἀρτιγέννητος, ἀνεξεραύνητος, ἀμώμητος, δόρατος (§ 106), γεννητός, δρατός. From χρήμαι, χρηστός (p. 265).

- in -έω. †Αγενεαλόγητος, †άλλάλητος, †άμετανόητος, †άναπολόγητος, ἀναρίθμητος, ἀνέγκλητος, †άνεκδιήγητος, †άνεκλάλητος, ἀνόητος, άόρατος (§ 106), άρκετός, αὐθαίρετος, †άχειροποίητος, δυσνόητος, Ἐπαίετος, ἐπιπόθητος, †εὐλόγητος, κλητός, παράκλητος, †ποταμοφόρητος, (for *parp.* see *Vocab. s.v.*), στυγητός, χειροποίητος.
- in -όω. Μισθωτός.
- in -ύω. -θυτός (†εἰδωλόθυτος, ἱερόθυτος), -φυτός (ἔμφυτος, νεόφυτος).
- in -εύω. Ἐπαίδευτος, ἀσάλευτος, †δυσερμήνευτος, †λαξευτός, σιτευτός.
- in -αίνω. †Ἀμάραντος, ἀμίαντος, ἀπαράβατος (*Ruth. NP* 367. For meaning, see *Westcott ap. Heb* 7²⁴ and *Vocab. s.v.*), ἀπέραντος, ἄφαντος (see *Vocab. s.v.*), ὕφαντός.
- in -ίνω (-n-γο). Ἐδιάκριτος, †ἀκατάκριτος, ἀνυπόκριτος, Ἄσύνκριτος, †αὐτοκατάκριτος.
- in -ύνω. †Ἀνεπαίσχυντος.
- in -αρω, -είρω. Ἀκάθαρτος, φθαρτός, ἄφθαρτος. (Here also may come ῥήτος (-ῶς), ἄρρητος, ἀναντίρητος. See p. 235.)
- in -λλω. Ἐπόβλητος.
- in -πτω. †Ἄγναφος (= ἄγναπτος, see *Vocab. s.v.*), †ἀκατακάλυπτος, ἄμεμπτος, ἀνιπτος, ἄραφος (= ὀπτος), κρυπτός.
- in -σσω. †Ἀνυπότακτος, ἄτακτος, †βδελυκτός, πλαστός, τακτός.
- in -άζω. †Ἀνεξιχνίαστος, ἀπαρασκευάστος, †ἀπείραστος, †δυσβάστακτος (for guttural form, see p. 230 and *Vocab. pp.* 106, 173), θαυμαστός, σεβαστός.
- in -ίζω. †Ἀστήρικτος, ἀθέμιτος (for older ἀθέμιστος), †ἀστήρικτος, ἀχάριστος, εὐχάριστος, †σιτιστός; also ἄσωτος (-ως, § 106). But ἀθέμιτος (for older ἀθέμιστος) from θέμις. Χριστός is from χρίω.

NOTE.—1. The general rule for accentuation is that verbal adjectives in -τος are oxytone when uncompounded, or when compounded with a preposition if they denote possibility (three terminations). Otherwise the compounds are proparoxytone (and of two terminations). But as the passive meaning can so easily pass over into that of possibility, we often find paroxytones with two terminations for oxytones with three terminations. For exceptions to these rules see K.Bl. i. 538. Schmiedel (WS 69) explains ἐκλεκτός as derived direct from ἐκλέγω (with no corresponding simplex), so also εὐλογητός from εὐλογέω. This probably explains συνετός. Συνεκλεκτός is influenced by its simplex above. For ἀπόδεκτος and ἐκλεκτός, *supra*, p. 58.

2. Ἀμέθυστος and διάλεκτος preserve their adjectival force, as is shown by their feminine gender, due to the supply of λίθος and γλώσσα respectively.

(b) *Nouns, abstract and concrete.*—The masc., fem., and neut. of these verbal adjectives often came to be used as abstract nouns. Many, however, have the concrete meaning.

a. Θάνατος, κούριος, κοπετός, μαστός (see p. 110 above, νότος (see Boisacq, s.v. νόω), πλούτος, πότος, πυρετός, ύετός, φότος, χότος. Στρατός (<στόρνυμι) is represented in NT by compounds (e.g. στρατηγός, στρατολογέω). Σίτος (<*ψίτος : ψίω = *round*. So Prellwitz. Boisacq gives this with alternative etymologies), έναυτός (<Hom. έναύω = *rest in*. Hence original meaning was *solstice*, i.e. place of rest in the sun's progress. See Boisacq s.v., and Brugmann *IF* xv. 89 ff., xvii. 319 f.).

-τή

β. Ἄρετή, βροντή (βρέμω), γενετή, κούτη, κρύπτη, τελευτατή, μελετή (Barn. 10¹¹). Ἑορτή possibly belongs to this group if the derivation <*Fε-Fop-τᾶ is right. (See Boisacq s.v.)

-τόν

γ. Ἐρπετόν (ἔρπω), πρόβατον (προβαίνω), λεπτόν (λέπω); ἄριστον rightly comes in here, <*ἄρι <*ā[ι]ερι (a locative form = *in the morning*) and *ἔστόν <ἔδω (= *eat*). See Brugm. *KVG* 453, and, for loss of ε by ablaut, *ib.* 143. Ποτόν *drink* occurs in *Did.* 10², *Ignat. Tral.* 2³, *Ep. Diogn.* 6².

(c) *Suffix -ωτός.*—A special variety is the suffix -ωτός, originally belonging to the verbal adjective closely associated with verbs in -όω (see IV. (c) above), and then attached to other stems, even to nouns, in the sense of "supplied with."

-ωτός

Λιβανωτός (<λίβανος) may come under this heading, if in Rev 8³ it = *censer*, a view which Charles supports (*ICC in loc.*). See, however, *Vocab. s.v.* Κιβωτός is a word of Semitic origin and uncertain etymology.

In later Greek the fem. form -ωτή is fairly common as an elliptical subst. with the meaning "made of" or "coming from." Thus μηλωτή *sc. δορά* coat of sheepskin (<μήλον *sheep*). See Mayser *Gr.* i. 454, Jannaris *Gr.* 297.

(d) *Superlatives and Ordinals.*—For the -τος suffix in the formation of superlatives see above, §§ 67–69, and for the closely related ordinals see § 72.

The suffix -το- appears chiefly in ordinals, e.g. ἕκτος (Skt. *ṣaṣṭhāh*) Lat. *sextus*). From ἑνατος, δέκατος etc., -ατος became detached as a distinctive suffix and is found in two superlatives, πρῶτος and ἔσχατος (see p. 167). How the once productive superl. suffix -ατος arose is not clear. Brugmann (*Gr.*³ 202) suggested φέριατος = φέριστος as the explanation, but this is dropped in ed.⁴ (p. 238). Others account for it by

comparing the Hom. *ὑστῆρος* with Skt. *uttamās* and assuming that *-ραμο-* became *-ρατο-* under the influence of *-τος* in *-ιστος*. So Hirt *Handb.* 204. The suffix *-ιστος* goes back to I.E. (cf. Skt. *-iṣṭha-*, Goth. *-ista-*), and is composed of *-is-*, weak grade of the suffix *-jes-* (cf. Lat. *magis*), and the *-to-* already mentioned.

9. *-τιῆ, -τεῖ.*

Under this heading we find in NT only the group of adverbs in *-ιστί*, for which see p. 163.

10. *Nomina actionis in -ti-*.

§ 155. A very productive suffix from the I.E. period in the formation of primary verbal abstracts (*nomina actionis*) of the feminine gender.

For the change of *τ* to *σ* before *ι* and *ε* at a primitive stage of the language, see Brugmann *Gr.*⁴ 118.

This suffix was originally added to the weak grade of the roots or bases (as with the verbal adjectives in *-τος*). In time, however, with the gradual passing of the ablaut distinction in many verbs, and partly under the influence of other forms of the verb, and of other verbal nouns, the suffix was attached also to the strong grade of ablaut. Thus *βάσις*, *δόσις*, but in Hellenistic *ρεύσις* came in for the earlier *ρύσις*. It is therefore worthy of notice that *ρύσις* is the form in the NT.

(1) Formed by adding suffix directly to root or base :

Αἴρεσις (ἀν-, δι-, καθ-), *βάσις* (ἔκ-, κατά-, παρά-), *βρώσις*, *γένεσις*, *γνώσις* (ἀνά-, διά-, ἑπί-, ἑπί-), *δόσις* (ἀνταπό-, παρά-), *δύσις* (<δύνω=σελ), *ἐγερσις*, *ἑλεγκσις*, *ἑλευσις*, *ἕξις*, *θλίψις*, *ἰασις*, *καῦσις*, *κλήσις* (παρά-, πρόσ-), *κρίσις* (ἀνά-, ἀπό-, διά-, ἑκάτά-, ὑπό-), *κτίσις*, *λήψις* (ἀνά-, ἀντί-, μετά-, πρόσ-), *λύσις* (ἀνά-, ἐπί-), *ὄρασις*, *ὄρεσις*, *ὄψις*, *πόσις*, *πράξις*, *πτῶσις*, *ρύσις*, *στάσις* (ἀνά-, ἀποκατά-, ἔκ-, ἐξανά-, ἐπί-, ἑπίσι-, ὑπό-), *τάξις*, *φάσις* (πρό-), *φύσις*, *χρήσις* (ἑκάτά-).

In the following words the suffix is added to the compound verbal stem (as was the case with most of the compounds just given in brackets). They are put in a separate list as the simplicia are not found in NT:

Ἐπιπαύσις, *ἀνάβλεψις*, *ἑκάτά-*, *ἀπό-*, *ἐν-* *δειξις*, *ἑκάτά-*, *ἐν-* *δυσσις*, (<δύω), *ἀν-*, *ἑκάτά-*, *πάρ-*, *σύν-* *εσις*, *ἑκάτά-* *θεσις* (*θέσις* in Herm. *Vis.* iii. 13³), *ἑκάτά-*, *ἑκάτά-*, *ἑκάτά-*, *ἑκάτά-* *θεσις* (*θέσις* in Herm. *Vis.* iii. 13³), *ἑκάτά-*, *ἑκάτά-*, *ἑκάτά-*, *ἑκάτά-* *θεσις* (*θέσις* in Herm. *Vis.* iii. 13³), *ἑκάτά-*, *ἑκάτά-*, *ἑκάτά-*, *ἑκάτά-* *θεσις* (*θέσις* in Herm. *Vis.* iii. 13³), *ἑκάτά-*, *ἑκάτά-*, *ἑκάτά-*, *ἑκάτά-* *θεσις* (*θέσις* in Herm. *Vis.* iii. 13³).

(2) This suffix was then attached to denominative verbal stems, especially when the existing noun from which the verb was derived did not convey the abstract verbal meaning.

Thus from verbs in -άω :

†'Αγαλλίασις (see below, p. 385), ἀπ-, συν-, τύπ- ἀντησις, γέννησις, τένδωμησις (pp. 73, 307), †καύχησις, κοίμησις, κυβέρνησις.

From verbs in -έω :

'Αγανάκτησις, †ἀθέτησις, †ἀθλησις, †αἰνεσις, δέησις, διήγησις, †ἐκδίκησις, ἐνθύμησις, †ἐπιπόθησις, †ἔσθησις (but see p. 133), ζήτησις, κατοίκησις, κίνησις, †παρατήρησις, ποίησις, †προσκαρτέρησις, πτόησις, †συμφώνησις, †υστέρησις, φρόνησις.

The short vowel in the penult of αἰνεσις, as the long vowel in θέλησις (<θέλω), is probably due to the influence of the aor. ἤνεσα, ἐθέλησα (see Brugm. Gr.⁴ 239).

From verbs in -όω :

†'Ανακαίνωσις, βεβαίωσις, †βίωσις, δι-, ἐπαν- ὀρθωσις, δικαίωσις, †ἐκπλήρωσις, †ἐρήμωσις, †κατασκήνωσις, †λύτρωσις, †μόρφωσις, †νέκρωσις, ὁμοίωσις, πύρωσις, πώρωσις, ταπεινώσις, τελειώσις, †τύποτύπωσις, †φανέρωσις, †φυσίωσις.

From other verbal stems :

Κόλασις (: -άζω), †κατάρτισις (: -ίζω), †ἀποκάλυψις (: -πτω), αἴσθησις (: αἰσθ-άνο-μαι), αὔξησις (: αὐξ-άν-ω, fut. αὐξήσω), ἄλωσις (: ἀλίσκομαι, fut. ἀλώσο-μαι), συνείδησις (: σύννοια, fut. -εἰδήσω), †πεποιθήσις (: πείθω, πέποιθα).

Notes may be given on three words.

*'Αλυσις *chain* is of uncertain etymology, and may have no connexion with these *nomina actionis*.

Πεποιθήσις. "Substantives in -σις from the perfect stem were not used by Attic writers" (Rutherford NP 355).

Συνείδησις (see above § 127). For history of this word see Norden *Agnostos Theos*, 136 n.¹. It is noteworthy that with one doubtful exception Epictetus prefers the participle τὸ συνειδές (cf. Bonhöffer, *Epiktet u. das NT*, 156).

(3) The old form of the suffix -τις survives in a few old words only. Πίστις (=πίθ-τις), νῆστις *fasting*, where νη is the result of contraction, high grade *nē* coming before *ē* in Anlaut, *√ed-*, see above, p. 287.

The masc. μάντις (Herm. *Mand.* xi. 2) was originally fem. abstract (cf. Lat. *hōstis*. Brugmann *Gr.*⁴ 239).

NOTE.—1. -σις nouns in Hellenistic no longer represent action merely, but also result. Thus κτίσις *creation* or *creature*, γνῶσις the result of insight, as well as insight itself.

2. "-σις is apparently concrete in αἴτησις CP Herm 73 ii², but οἰκοδόμησις in 83⁹ is *nomen actionis*; so πλάκωσις 94¹², δῆλωσις 101¹⁰. But κτήσις 101b, οἴκησις 119 iii¹⁷, σύμπτωσις often, κράτησις 119 iv²⁹, βεβαίωσις²¹, μέτρησης v²², ἀθλησις verso iii¹³ [are concrete]. *'Αξίωσις *ib.*²⁰ less clear. Πράξις, legal execution (BGU iv. 1115²³ etc.). Thumb (*Dial.* 373) says -σις and -μα were signs of Ionic influence in Attic prose."—J. H. M.

(2) *The -d- Suffixes.*

§ 156. Though originating in the I.E. period, this suffix had a specially extended use in Greek.

1. *Nouns in -αδ-, -ιδ-.*

-αδ- (-αδ-) 1. As a root determinative it appears in such formations as *παρα-στά-ς*, *-άδος*, which became a model for formations in *-άς*, *-άδος*. Thus *ἰκμάς* (Lk 8⁸, see *Vocab.*), *λαμπάς*, *σπιλάς* (Jude 13 : see Mayor *in loc.*), *στιβάς* (Mk 11⁸, see Swete *in loc.* For *στοιβάς* and *στυβάς* see p. 76 above). *Δορκάς*, a woman's name, means "gazelle," and is an instance of a form modified by popular etymology, *ζορκάς* (=I.E. **zork-s*) being conformed to supposed connexion with *δέρκομαι*.

2. Patronymics and place-names are represented by *Ἠρωδιάς*, *Τιβεριάς*, *Τρωάς*, and *Ἑλλάς*.

3. For the numerals *μυριάς* and *χιλιάς*, see above, pp. 169, 176.

-δ-απος 4. The old class to which *ποδαπ'ς*, *ἀλλοδαπός* etc. belonged is represented in the NT by *ποταπός*, which has been modified by popular etymology under the influence of *πόρε*. (See *Proleg.* 95.)

-ις (-ιδ-) 5. The ethnica in *-ις* are represented only by *Ἑλληνίς* (: masc. *Ἕλληνα*), and *Ἑβραίς* (a peculiar form for the more usual *Ἑβραϊκός*, *ἡ*, *ὄν*), which is found twice in the LXX (4 Mac 12⁷ 16¹³, *ἡ* 'E. φωνή) and in the NT in Acts *ter* (*ἡ* 'Eβ. διάλεκτος).

Σαμαρείτις in Joseph. = the region of Samaria, but in Jn 4⁹ is the fem. of *Σαμαρείτης*.

6. Feminine appellatives in *-ις* are *τσυγενίς* (from m. *-ής*), *†μοιχαλίς* (Hell. form of Att. *μοιχάς*, see above, § 147, from m. *μοιχός*), *†πορφυρέπωλις* (from m. *-ης*).

7. A diminutive meaning may be traced in *θυρίς* (: *θύρα*), *κεφαλίς* (: *κεφαλή*), *πινακίς* (Lk 1²³ C³D)). Cf. Plummer *in loc.*: "All four forms, *πίναξ*, *πινακίς*, *πινάκιον*, and *πινακίδιον*, are used of writing-tablets, and *πινακίδα* is *v.l.* here. But elsewhere in NT *πίναξ* is a "dish" or "platter."

8. Apart from these groups we have a large number of nouns with the *-ις* termination. *Ἄκρίς*, *ἀσπίς*, *ἀτμίς* (cf. *ἀτμός*, < *ἄω* = to blow), *†βολίς* (Heb 12²⁰ (LXX) *minusc. pauc.*), *ἐλπίς*, *κλεις*, *λεπίς*, *μερίς*, *παῖς* (< *πάφισ*), *παγίς*, *ῥαφίς*, *ῥυτίς*, *σανίς*, *σφραγίς*, *σφυρίς* (see above, p. 109).

Ἰασπίς, a word of Phœnician origin (see Boisacq, and cf. Hebrew *יָסֵפֶת*). *Ἴρις* < **Fī-ri-s*, I.E. **uṛ-ti-s*.

Παροψίς (see above, § 123). The Atticists condemned the use of this word in the derivative sense (see NP 265).

Πατρίς, originally poet. fem. of *πάτριος*, then subst. (=ή πατρία γῆ), Σύρτις, Λωίς.

9. -τις has become the regular feminine for *nomina agentis* in -της, e.g. προφήτις, προστάτις, and for denominatives in -της, e.g. πρεσβύτις.

2. Conglutinates with -αδ-, -ιδ-.

-ίδιον These are represented in the NT only by the neuter nouns in -ίδιον, for which see above, p. 346.

3. Nouns in -δων-.

-δων (-δων-) The sole NT representative of this formation is χαλκηδών. Found in Rev 21¹⁹ alone in Biblical Greek, it is the name given to a copper silicate found in the mines near Chalcedon. The place name itself is a derivative of χαλκός *copper*.

It is doubtful whether σινδών should come under this heading. It seems to be an Oriental loan word; cf. Hebr. פְּרִיז "linen wrapper."

4. Adjectives in -ώδης.

These have been given in § 107 above (p. 283) under compounds. The fondness of Hermas for words of this formation is striking: ἐρημώδης (*Sim.* ix. 26¹), κροκώδης (*Sim.* vi. 1⁵), μαστώδης (*Sim.* ix. 1⁴), πυροειδής και αιματώδης (*Vis.* iv. 3³), κρημνώδης, ακανθώδης, τριβολώδης (*Sim.* vi. 2⁶), ακανθώδης (*Mand.* xii. 1^{3, 4} et al.).

(3) The -θ- Suffixes.

See above, p. 364.

F. Suffixes with Guttural Stops.

(1) The -k- Suffixes.

1. Primary nouns in -κη.

-κη § 157. A few words have this as a primary suffix, e.g. θήκη, νίκη.

νίκη <*nī- according to Osthoff *MU* iv. 223 f., who cft. Skt. nī-ca-ḥ. But this is very doubtful; see Boisacq 671.

2. Adverbs in -ίξ, -αξ.

-ίξ, -αξ πέριξ (§ 124 (c)) and ἀπαξ (p. 286) are nom. sing. of adjectives petrified as adverbs (cf. ἀναμίξ, πατάξ, Brugmann *Gr.*⁴ 207).

3. *Nouns with stems in -ακ-, -εκ-, -ηκ-, -υκ-, -ικ-.*

Nouns in -αξ, ἄνθραξ, θώραξ, κόραξ, πίναξ, φύλαξ, χάραξ;
 -ηξ, -υξ, -ιξ n -εκ- : ἀλώπηξ; in -ηκ- : σκώληξ; in -υκ- : κήρυξ
 (for accent, see above, p. 57); in -(α)ικ- : γυνή; in -ικ- :

Φήλιξ, Φοῖνιξ, φοῖνιξ, χοῖνιξ.

The history of the relation between γυναικ- and γυνή is uncertain, but that it goes back to prim. I.E. is shown by Armen. *kanaï-*. The accent in γυναικός may be derived from the monosyllabic *βναικ- (*βναικός). See Brugmann *IF* xxii. 171 ff., *Gr.*⁴ 242. For etymology of ἀλώπηξ, see Brugmann *Grd.*³ π. i. 474.

4. *Denominative adjectives and nouns in -κο-.*

-κος, -κη, -κον φυσικός (φύ-σι-ς), ἀλυκός (ἄλς), μαλακός;
 φάρμακον; φυλακή.

Ἄλυκός is supplanted in Hellenistic by ἀλικός, really a distinct word. See above, p. 80, and *Vocab. s.v.* (Apart from Jas 3¹² the classical form is found in the Bible only in the name for the Dead Sea, Num 3¹², Deut 3¹⁷.)

Φάρμακον < *φάρμα < *bhrmen-. So Brugm. *Grd.*³ π. i. 485. See, however, Thumb in Brugm. *Gr.*⁴ 241 n.⁴, and Boisacq 1015 n.¹

Μαλακός < I.E. *m¹l-qó-s, < melā²-, to grind, pulverise (see Boisacq, *s.v.* μαλακός, μύλλω, βλάβη). For the meaning of this word in 1 Co 6⁹ see Deissmann *LAE* 150 (²164) n.⁴, *Vocab. s.v.*

5. *Denominative adjectives in -ιακός, formed from nouns in*

-ιακός -ιο-, -ια, on the analogy of -ιάς : -ίς, -ιάδης
 : -ίδης, -ιάζειν : -ίζειν.

†Κυριακός (κύριος), †οικιακός, are both Hellenistic formations.

For the contemporary use of κυριακός = *imperial*, and for the origin of the use of ἡ κυριακή = *Lord's day* in Rev 1¹⁰, see Deissmann *BS* 217 ff. *LAE* 362 ff. (²358 ff.), and *Vocab.* 364.

Οικιακός (Mt 10^{25, 26} only in Gr. Bible), a Κοινή formation found in papp. (see *Vocab.*) in the sense of a *member of a household*. Οικειακός, read v.²⁶ by CDMU (v.²⁶ Ur), is a late formation from οικείος, meaning *his own*. (Found in Plut. *Cic.* 20).

6. *Denominative adjectives in -ικός (after -ιος the most*

-ικός productive of adjectival suffixes in Greek),
 from prim. I.E. -iqo-, as in Skt. *pariyāyiká-s*
 (=strophic) from *pariyāyá-s* (=strophe), cf. Lat. *modicus* :
modus.

(a) In Homeric period these were mostly ethnica, which continue to be formed in this way.

Ἀχαιῖκός, Γαλατικὸς, Ἑβραϊκός, Ἑλληνικός, Ἰουδαϊκός, Ἰταλικός, Λευιτικὸς, Ποιτικὸς, Ῥωμαϊκός.

Φουνίκη (p. 149) and Σαμοθράκη (-θράκη, BE) are of a different formation.

(b) The extension of this suffix in the classical period probably arose with such words as φυσικός, μαντικός, where the suffix -ικός was attached to an -ι- stem.

The idea of "belonging to" is seen in βασιλικός. (For the meaning in Jn 4⁶ see Bauer *in loc.*, in Jas 2⁸ see Hort *in loc.* and Deissmann *LAE* 367 n.² (2362 n.²). For the stem see Fraenkel *ZVS* xlv. 222 f.). The suffix, which was a favourite with the Ionian sophists, came into common use with the Attic writers in the latter part of the fifth century B.C.,¹ where the meaning of "pertaining to," "with the characteristics of," became prominent. In the NT list we have †ἀρχιερατικός, †ἐθνικός, εἰρηνικός, ἵππικός, κεραμικός (see note 2 below), κοσμικός, †λειτουργικός (see *LAE* 70, 276), λογικός (see *Vocab. s.v.* For Rom 12¹ see Lietzmann *HNT in loc.*; for 1 Pet 2³, Hort *in loc.*), μουσικός, †μυλικός, νομικός, †δικός (NT, papp., inscr., see *Vocab. s.v.*), πατρικός, προβατικός, σιρικός (by vowel assimilation for σηρικός, see Mayser *Gr.* i. 150, *WH App.* 158, above p. 72;—really an ethnic adj. from οἱ Σήρες), Στοϊκός, τυπικός, (†-ῶς), †τυφωνικός, ὕδρωπικός, †χοϊκός.

From compar. adjectives come ἀνωτερικός, †νωτερικός, and from adv. καθόλου, καθολικός (in the titles of Cath. Epp. in late MSS. See Mayor *Comm. James* ed.² cclix).

Κοινωνικός, originally "social," later acquired the meaning "ready to go shares" (so 1 Ti 6¹³), and thus approximates to a nuance found in some of the adjectives in -τικός (see below (c)).

Σαρκικός, ψυχικός, πνευματικός, σωματικός form an important group.

NOTE.—1. The distinction in meaning between adjectives in -ικός and those in -ινος is generally maintained, the former connoting . . . -like, and the latter made of It corresponds to that found in the English suffixes -y and -en: e.g. leathery, leathern, earthy, earthen. "The termination -ινος denotes a material relation, while -ικός denotes an ethical or dynamic relation, to the idea involved in the root" (Plummer *op.* 1 Co 3¹, where σαρκίνους is deliberately chosen in distinction from σαρκικοί in v.³). The true reading is preserved in \aleph ABC*D* 33; σαρκικοίς (D³EFGLP) is an obvious correction. The same contrast with πνευματικός has led to the substitution of -ικός for -ινος in Rom 7¹⁴ (N^cLP ω); a similar misunderstanding is answerable for -ικῆς (ε) in Heb 7¹⁴. On the other hand -ικός is right in Rom 15²⁷, 1 Co 3³ (bis) (-ινος D*FG) 9¹¹, 2 Co 1¹² (-ίνη FG) 10¹, 1 Pet 2¹¹. In 1 Co 3⁴ N^cLP have

¹ Fraenkel, *ut supra*, 205 f., gives statistics showing the relative frequency in Euripides compared with Sophocles, in Thucydides: Herodotus, and in Isocrates: *ISSUS*. It is specially common in Plato, Xenophon, and Aristotle, and in scientific terminology.

σαρκικοί, where *ἄνθρωποι* is the true reading. (See Westcott *ap.* Heb 7¹⁸ for true distribution of these words.) For confusion of meaning in these suffixes see *Vocab. s.v. ξύλινος*.

2. Κεραμικός *earthen* (<κέραμος *clay*) is to be distinguished from κεραμικός *of a potter* (<κεραμεύς). It was a late form, deprecated by Phrynichus (see Lob. 147), for class. κεραμεύς, which was already undergoing change in Hellenistic (-μαῖος, Polyb., -μειος Plut.). Fraenkel shows (*ib.* 221) how closely κεραμικός and -ικός approximated in meaning. In view of P Lond 121⁸⁶⁷ (=i. p. 112) ἀπὸ τρόχου [κε]ραμικοῦ and Ps 2⁸ ὡς σκεύος κεραμέως, Rev 2²⁷ (σκεύη κεραμικά) is probably an itacism (see above, 76 f.).

3. The form ἀρχιερατικός follows the classical ἱερατικός, which is influenced by the verb ἱερατεύω, although there is no verbal stress in the adjective.

4. Ἡλικός, πηλικός, τηλικός (τηλικούτος) preserve a suffix -λι- (cf. Lat. *qualis, talis*) to which the secondary suffix -κος is attached.

(c) From *nomina agentis* in -της were formed many adjectives in -τικός, in which the verbal force was strongly present. These verbal derivatives took the same suffix with either an intransitive or a causative force.

Thus αἰρετικός *capable of choosing* (Plato) and so *factious* (Tit 3¹⁰, where the current use of αἵρεσις = *secta, factio*, has coloured the meaning, see Parry, *Comm. in loc.*), †διδασκτικός *apt at teaching* (1 Ti 3², 2 Ti 2²⁴), elsewhere only in Philo. The class. διδασκαλικός appears even in Vett. Val., and survives in MGr (see *Vocab.*). Κριτικός *able to discern*, †παραλυτικός the late and vernacular word (probably formed on the analogy of ἀναλυτικός, διαλυτικός, ἐκλυτικός, from Arist. onwards—for *exx.* see Fraenkel *ib.* 216) always used by Mt and Mk, whereas Lk retains the medical term παραλελυμένος, συστατικός (<συνίστημι) post-classical in sense of “constructive,” and more often, as in 2 Co 3¹ a t.t. for *commendatory* (letter), †προφητικός (<προφήτης), apart from Rom 16²⁶, 2 Pet 1¹⁹ and Patr., only in Philo and Lucian.

NOTE.—1. Βιωτικός (<βίωω) as first used by Aristotle = *fit to live, lively*, and shows analogy with most words in this group. But its regular use in Hellenistic (Polyb., Diod., Philo, Plut., Artem.), condemned by Phryn. (Rutherford *NP* 459), appears in Lk 21³⁴, 1 Co 6³, where it is adj. corresponding to βίος (see Lightfoot *Notes* 211, Field *Notes* 171). This meaning of “worldly,” “secular,” “business,” “everyday” can be illustrated from the unliterary as well as the literary Κοινή (papp. Vett. Val. etc., see *Vocab. s.v.*)

2. †Πιστικός, that *cruz interpretum* in Mk 14³, Jn 12³, if a Greek word, is either (a) from πιστός (<πείθω) *fit to be trusted, genuine*, though elsewhere of persons, as in Artem. *On.* ii. 32, 66, iii. 54, where = *faithful*

(applied to woman); or (b) from πιστός (<πίνω)=πιστός, liquid. If a loan-word, John Lightfoot's conjecture (*Hor. Hebr.* ii. 446), followed by Merx (*ap. Mk* 14³), is possible, that we have a transliteration of the Aramaic כְּרִימָה, *krimāca*. So that the ointment was *unguentum balaninum*. Against this must be set the difficulty of the Syriac translator. Abbott (*J.V.* 252), following Wetstein, who quotes abundant instances of σπικάτον as the name of an ointment (<σπικά, cf. Vulg. *spicati*), suggests that an early Galilean tradition, finding in the original some form of σπικάτον, played upon it by saying "not σπικάτον but πιστικόν." W. C. Allen (*Comm. on Mk.* 168) supposes σπικάτον transliterated into Aramaic and misread by the Greek translator. (See also *Vocab. s.v.*)

7. Nouns in -ίσκος, -ίσκη.

-ίσκος, -ίσκη A frequent diminutive suffix, represented in NT only by ἡ βασιλίσκος, ἡ νεανίσκος, ἡ παιδίσκη.

Βασιλίσκος, which D reads in Jn 4^{46, 49}, a diminutive precisely corresponding to our *princelet*. So Polyb. iii. 44. 5, Dittenb. *OGIS* 201^{1, 10} (quoted by Bauer *in loc.*).

Παιδίσκη. The deteriorative force of this diminutive is constant in the NT. Cf. Meyer, *Ostr.* 57⁶ (A.D. 192) and Deissmann's note, *LAE* 186 (200) n. "παιδίσκη meaning as in the NT a 'female slave.'"

The formation of a diminutive νεανισκάριον (Epict. ii. 16. 29) shows that νεανίσκος was a "faded diminutive."

(2) The -g- Suffixes.

1. Nouns in -αγ-, -υγ-, -ἰγ-.

-αγ-, -υγ-, -ἰγ- This group was no larger in Greek than in the cognate languages; see Brugmann *Grd.*² II. i. 506 ff. Ἄραγξ (for ἀρπαγή, see p. 335), πτέρυξ (for πτερύγιον, see p. 343), μάστιξ.

2. Nouns in -γγ-.

-γγ- A group of words denoting a hollow or a musical instrument is represented in the NT by λάρυγγς, σάλπιγγς, φάραγγς.

(3) The -χ- Suffixes.

-χ- To this small miscellany belong στόμαχος, θρίξ, ὄρνιξ (see p. 130).

G. Stems in -σ-.

Stems in -ος : -εσ-.

-ος (-εσ-). § 158. (a) *Nouns*. For this class see p. 138 above. Of the sixty-two nouns found in the NT notes are required for very few.

†Γλεῦκος first appears in Arist. For vernacular use of this NT ἀπ. λεγ. in Ac 2¹³, see *Vocab. s.v.*

*Ἐλεος and σκότος; see above, pp. 126 f.

Νίκος. An old word, as Lobeck *Phryn.* 647 shows. Wackernagel, *Hellenistica* 27, suggests that νείκος, a poetical word in Attic, and alive in Ionic for Herodotus (=contention), passed into the Κοινή with the meaning *victory*, through confusion with νίκη.

Σπῆνος. This ἀ.λ. in NT at Rev 18² first appears in the New Com. See Lobeck's *Phryn.* 381, Kennedy *Sources* 41.

(b) *Adjectives*.—For this class see p. 162.

THE FORMATION OF VERBS.

§ 159. In considering the formation of verbs by suffixes we have to do with present stems, and shall follow the classification set forth above on pp. 184 f. Under most of the headings a classified list of verbs occurring in the NT will suffice without further comment. Class VII., however, is very rich in types, and was specially productive in the Hellenistic period. These types must be discussed in greater detail. As a general rule the simplex preceded by a hyphen is given for composita. If the *Præverbia* do not follow within brackets, they may be found by reference to the List of Verbs, § 95.

I. a. Person suffixes added to root.

(a) With thematic vowel :

-ἄγω, ἄγω, ἀλείφω, ἀνοίγω, ἄρχω, βλέπω, βούλομαι, βρέχω, βρύω, γράφω, δέομαι (p. 195), δέρω, δέχομαι, διώκω, -δύω, -εἶκω, ἐλέγχω, ἔλκω, ἐμέω (p. 236), -ἔπομαι, ἐρείδω, ἐρεύγομαι, ἔρχομαι, εὐχομαι. ἔχω, ζέω (p. 195), ἦκω, θέλω, θλάω, θλίβω, θραύω, καθεύδω, λάμπω, λέγω, λείπω, λούω, λύω, μέλλω, -μέλομαι, μέμφομαι, μένω, -νέμω, νήφω, -οἴχομαι, παίω, παύω, πείθω, πέμπω, πλέκω, πλέω (p. 195), πνέω (p. 195), -πνίγω, πρίω, πταίω, βέω (p. 195), σέβομαι, -σειώ, σήπω,

σπεύδω, στήκω, στρέφω, τήκω, τρέπω, τρέφω, τρέχω, τρίβω, φείδομαι, φέρω, φεύγω, φθέγγομαι, -χέω (p. 195), ψεύδομαι, -ψύχω.

NOTE.—In συνθλάω the simplex θλα(σ)-ω may be from **dhrāti* > Skt. *dhrāti*, mill-stone (cf. *δειράς*), see Boisacq 347 n.¹.

(b) Without thematic vowel :

Είμι, -εἶμι, ἐπίσταμαι, κείμει, κρέμαμαι, φημί.

NOTE.—Κρύβω (περι^ο) is a late formation, following the analogy of τρίβω : ἐτριψα. (See Thumb in Brugmann *Gr.*⁴ 375 n. 1.)

I. β. Reduplicated forms.

(a) Thematic :

Γίνομαι (class. γί-γνομαι, see p. 232), πίπτω (*πῖ-πτω), τίκτω (*τι-τκω).

(b) Unthematic :

Δίδωμι, -ἴημι, ἴστημι, κίχρημι, τίθημι ; (with nasal inserted) πίμπρημι.

II. With formative suffix in -n-.

a. (a) Suffix *no* : *νε* or *ανο* : *ανε*.

(i) Added to root : Δάκνω, δύνω, ἰστάνω (p. 241), κάμνω, -κτέννω (p. 245), πίνω, τέμνω, -χύννω. Αἰσθάνομαι, ἀμαρτάνω, αὐξάνω, βλαστάνω (but see p. 231), ἴδπτόνομαι (for this late present, a back-formation from ἴδφθην, see pap. instances in *Vocab. s.v.*).

(ii) Added to root with nasal inserted : Θιγγάνω, λαγγάνω, λαμβάνω (p. 247), λανθάνω, λιμπάνω, μανθάνω, πυνθάνομαι, τυγχάνω.

(b) Suffix *νη* : *νᾶ* added to root. Δύναμαι, δνίνημι (p. 251).

β. (a) (i) Suffix *nvo* : *ννε*. Δεικνύω.

(ii) Suffix *νFo* : *νFe*. Τίνω, φθάνω.

(iii) Suffix *νεFo* : *νεFe*. -ικνέομαι, κινέω (<I.E. **q̄i-*, cf. Lat. *ac-citius*), προσκυνέω (κυνέω = **κυ-νεσω* < **κυ-νε-σ-μι*, according to Johanson, followed by Boisacq. Brugmann (*Grd.*² II. iii. 276), however, follows Wackernagel in deriving Skt. *cumba-ti* "kissed" from **cunva-ti*, which supports *F* as against *σ*).

(b) Suffix *νῦ* : *νῦ* added to root. Ἀμφιέννυμι, δείκνυμι, ζώννυμι, κεράννυμι, -κτέννυμι (p. 245), -μίγνυμι, -ἄλλυμι (*ἄλ-νῦ-μι), ὄμνυμι (p. 251), πέταννυμι, πήγνυμι, ῥήγνυμι, ῥώννυμι, σβέννυμι, στρώννυμι.

III. With formative suffix in *so* : *se*.

Αὔξω (cf. Lat. *aug-eo*), κλά-(σ)-ω, σεί-(σ)-ω, σπά-(σ)-ω.

IV. Suffixes in *ske* : *ske*.

(a) Added to simple stems : Ἀρέσκω, βόσκω, γηράσκω, μεθύσκομαι, πιάσχω (=πάθ-σκω), φάσκω, -φαύσκω, -φώσκω (for relation between these last two words, and possible derivation of former, see above, p. 263).

(b) Added to reduplicated stem : Βιβρώσκω, γι(γ)νώσκω, διδά(κ)σκω, -διδύσκω (ἐν-), μιμνήσκω, πιπράσκω.

So also ἰλάσκομαι, according to Boisacq, p. 373, <*σι-σλᾶ-σκομαι.

(c) With *ι* before the suffix : Ἀναλίσκω (but see p. 228 above), γαμίσκομαι, εὐρίσκω, -θνήσκω. To these we may add the ἀπ. λεγ. σταυρίσκω, *Ev. Petr.* ii. 3.

NOTE.—1. According to J. Wright (*Comp. Gram.* 290), in such verbs as δλίσκομαι and εὐρίσκω the *-ι-* was the weak grade form of an original long diphthong *-εῖ-*, *-δι-*. Such presents as Attic θνήσκω and μιμνήσκω were formed by analogy.

2. The inceptive meaning which is so prominent in Latin verbs in *-sco* is rarely traceable in Greek. Μεθύσκω, which in the active is used as a causative of μεθύω, means, in the middle, "to get drunk." But that cannot always be pressed, as 1 Th 5' shows. (See Milligan *Commentary in loc.*). Γαμίσκω is used in a causative sense in Lk 20²⁴, and is equivalent to γαμίζω in v.²⁶.

V. Suffixes in *to* : *te*.

See above, p. 185, where it is shown that these may be ignored.

VI. Suffixes in *θo* : *θε*.

This small class is represented by †ἀλήθω, ἔσθω, †κνήθω, νήθω (see LS), πλήθω, πρήθω. The present stems πλήθω, πρήθω are not found in NT. Ἀλήθω, κνήθω and νήθω are Hellenistic forms for ἀλέω, κνάω and νέω (Rutherford *NP* 90, 134, 240).

VII. Suffixes in *yo* : *ye*.

§ 160. For this very large class of verbs it will be convenient to discuss word-formation under different headings from those of the divisions suggested on p. 185.

i. *Vocalic yo-* presents.

These consist of 1. άω ; 2. έω ; 3. όω ; 4. ίω ; 5. ύω ; 6. εύω.

1. *Verbs in -άω.*

(a) A few root verbs, *έάω* (etym. uncertain, Boisacq, s.v.), *ιάομαι* (<*iṣā-ḡ-), *κτάομαι* (cf. pf. *κέ-κτη-μαι*, *κτῆ-μα*, Skt. *ksāyatī*), and, with suffix *-m-*, *κοιμάω* (c. *κοίτη*, *κείμαι*).

(b) Denominatives from *ā-* stems supply the majority.

βοάω, *δαπανάω*, *διψάω*, *θεάομαι*, *καταράομαι* (<*κατάρα*), *καυχάομαι*, *κολλάω*, *ναρκάω* (*κατα-*), *νικάω*, *όδυνάω* (see *Vocab.*), *όρμάω*, *πεινάω*, *πειράω*, *σιγάω*, *σιωπάω*, *†σπαταλάω* (once in Polyb., in LXX and late writings), *συλάω* (<*σύλη* or *σύλον*, both used mostly in plur.), *τιμάω*, *τολμάω*, *τρυγάω*, *τρυφάω*, *φυσάω* (*έμ-*), *χολάω*. To these may be added *όράω* for which Sütterlin (p. 10) postulates **óra* (cf. *φρουρά* and Germ. **warō*).

(c) **Αγαπάω*, *γεννάω*, *†έβραυνάω* (see p. 86), *ήπτάομαι*, *μεριμνάω*, *πλανάω* are not derived from the corresponding nouns in *-ā*, which are back-formations or "noms postverbaux"; see pp. 335, 356 *supra*. For *έβραυνάω* see Solmsen *Gr. Wortf.* 50, who also (pp. 48 f.) derives *μεριμνάω* from **μερίμων* <**μέριμος* (cf. *μάχιμος* etc.). *Γεννάω*, *έρευνάω*, and *πλανάω* had originally an *-n-* suffix, but were later taken over into the *-δ-* conjugation. **Ηπτάομαι* (<*ήπτων*) has replaced **ήπτόομαι* (cf. Ion. *έισσόομαι*) under analogy of *νικάομαι*. (See further, p. 107.)

(d) Conformity to type influences many verbs, especially when a considerable group already exists with the same general meaning.

Thus the large group of verbs of *sound* in *-άω* is represented in NT by *βριμάομαι* (*έμ-*)¹ and *μυκάομαι* (<I.E. **māk-*, extension of **mū-*, an onomatop. word, Sütterlin 25). Another drawn from *agriculture*, and represented in (b) above by *τρυγάω*, supplies us with *άλοάω* (<*άλος* (Att.), *†άλων*), *άμάω*, *λικμάω* (<*λικμός*). *Sickness*, and unhealthy desire, furnish another group, as *χολάω* in (b). This may possibly account for the LXX *μοιχάω*, NT *μοιχάομαι* (Xenophon and Hellenistic), which replaces the class *μοιχέω* (see *Vocab.*).

Analogy accounts also for the following: **Ατιμάω*, Mk 12^d D (<*άτιμος*), follows *τιμάω* (<*τιμή*); *άντάω* (*άπ-*, *ύπ-*) <adv. *άντα* (see § 114) conforms to the pattern *πειράω*: *πείρα*, so *περάω* (*δια-*) <adv. *πέραν*. *Μωμάομαι* (<*μώμος*) may be influenced by *λωβάομαι* (*λώβη*).

(e) A few verbs in *-άω* apparently come under none of these headings: **Αριστάω* (<*άριστον*), *έμπιπλάω* (pp. 205, 254), *έμπιπρόομαι*, Ac 28^e κ* (p. 254), *κολυμβάω* (<*κόλυμβος*), *μασάομαι* (Aristoph. and Hellen.) <**μαθισομαι* <**μαθια*, I.E. **mēth-ja* (Boisacq, s.v.), *πηδάω* (*έκ-*) <*πηδόν* <I.E. **ped*, which has the long grade of **ped*, the root found in *πίδη*, *πέζα*, *πίδον*, *πούς*; also *χαλάω* (deriv. uncertain, Boisacq, s.v.), *ψηλαφάω* (see Boisacq, s.v. *ψάλλω*).

¹ See § 163 (3) (c) below. The new LS maintains this distinction between *βριμάομαι* and **όομαι*, as between *sound* and *feeling*.

(f) †'Ελεδάω is a later form of ἐλεέω (p. 235, and for confusion of flexions, pp. 195, 197, 198). Προσδοκάω, though simplex is δοκέω. †'Ελλογάω, a Κοινή word, is an instance of a verb in -άω formed from a prep. phrase (see § 118 and *Vocab. s.v.*). Γελάω (<*γελασ-ιω, cf. γέλωσ) is an example of a consonantal γο- present.

(g) There is really no justification for treating verbs in -ράω as a distinct class. The only possible example in NT of a frequentative force is in σκιρτάω (: σκαίρω), though it is doubtful whether there is any connexion between this ending and that of the Lat. frequentatives (e.g. *dicitare* : *dicere*). As the *nomina agentis* in -της regularly form their verbs in -τέω, that noun formation supplies no reason for a separate group here. The presence of τ in the stems of several ā- nouns gives us †βλαστάω (p. 231), μελετάω, τελευτάω. Φρεναπατάω (<φρεναπάτης) follows the analogy of άπατάω. 'Ερωτάω (<*έρφ-ωτ-) is connected with έρέω (έρέφω); see Boisacq 278.

(h) Some verbs in -ιάω are simply denominatives from stems in -ια; e.g. δειλιάω, κονιάω, †προαιτιά-ομαι (ά.λ. Rom 3^o. Its simplex <αίτια is common in class. Gr.). Others are affected by the clearly marked groups in -ιάω (Sütterlin 29 ff., and see (d) above), e.g. †άγαλλιάω (for class. άγάλλω), άροτριάω (<άροτρον), θυμιάω (to burn incense, distinguished from θυμόω, to be angry. The latter accords with the only meaning attaching to the Gr. word θύμός, whereas θυμιάω goes back to the original and literal sense found in Skt. *dhūmāh*, I.E. *dhū-mó-s), κοπιάω (<κόπος), στρηνιάω (a word first found in the Mid. Comedy, see Lobeck *Phryg.* 381, Rutherford *NP* 475) <σρηνος.

(i) For ζήω, χρήομαι, the only two remaining verbs in the class -ήω, see p. 195.

2. Verbs in -έω.

§ 161. The principal classification follows the distinction between verbs derived from simple noun stems, and those derived from compound nouns (and adjectives). In early Greek these verbs were more commonly formed from simple nouns in -ος. The proportion gradually changed, until in the Hellenistic period the overwhelming majority of new formations came from compounds.

Sütterlin (p. 63) examines and corrects v.d. Pfordten's tables, and with 1160 verbs in -έω shows the following ratio of new formations in (a) Homer, (b) Classical, (c) Post-classical authors—

From simplicia, (a) 50, (b) 30, (c) 10.

From compounds, (a) 20, (b) 450, (c) 600.

A. Verbs in -έω from simplicia.

(a) Denominatives in -έω (I.E. *-e- $\dot{\iota}$ δ) corresponding to stems ending in -o-, where the -e- represents the σ gradation.

* α θλέω ($\dot{\alpha}$ θλος), ἀντλέω (fr. *λος=hold of ship, then bilge-water) to bale out, thence simply to draw (water), ἀργέω (*γός< α -, ἔργον), ἀριθμέω (*μος), αὐλέω (*λος), γαμέω (*μος), δειπνέω (*νον), †δεσμέω (*μος) read by CD and late uncials at Lk 8²⁹ for δεσμεύω (BL 33) late and rare, δωρέομαι (*ρον) (LXX -έω, as less often in class.), θορυβέω (*βος), θρηνέω (*νος), θροέω (*οος), καρτερέω (*ρως<κάρτος, Ep. and Ion. for κράτος), κοινωνέω (*νός), κοσμέω (*μος), λοιδορέω (*ρος), μετρέω (*ρον), μιμέομαι (μίμος), (παρα-)μυθόομαι (μῦθος), νοέω (νόος, νοῦς), νοσέω (*σος), οἰκέω (*κος) (so ἐν-, κατ-, ἐγκατ-, συν- : but παρ- and περι- probably from cpds., see below, p. 389), ὀκνέω (*νος), ὀμιλέω (*λος) (for meaning see *Vocab. s.v.*, and for ὀμιλος, see above, p. 335), ὀμορέω (†συνομορέω a. d. l. in Ac 18⁷; συνόμορος is only found in later eccl. writers), from ὀμορος (see above, § 107, p. 284), is found as early as Hdt. and occurs in Plut. See also *Syll.*² 641¹⁶, ed.³ 1044¹⁶), ὀχλέω (*λος), πατέω (<πάτος <*πρτο-σ [cf. πόντος, Skt. *pāṇthāḥ*, Lat. *pons -tis*] <I.E.*pent(h) : see Boisacq 803), πλουτέω (*τος), (ἐπι-)ποθέω (*θος), πολεμέω (*μος), (δια-, κατα-) -πονέω (*νος), στοιχέω (*χος), (ἀπο-)στυγέω (*γος), τηρέω (possibly¹ from τηρός, which is only found in Aesch. *Supp.* 248. It may come from I.E. *q $\dot{\iota}$ e- : cf. Skt. *cāyati*, "perceive, watch"; O. Slav. *caja* <*k $\dot{\iota}$ ja, "wait, hope"; Boisacq, *s.v.*), ὑμένέω (*νος), ὑστερέω (*ρος), φθονέω (*νος), φιλέω (*λος), φλυαρέω (*ρος), φοβέω (*βος), φρουρέω (*ρος), χωρέω (*ρος), ὤνομαι (ὄνος).

NOTE.—1. αἰνέω (αἶνο-ς) belongs to this group, as Hom. *ἦνθησα* shows. The later form *ἦνεσα* (cf. fut. αἰνέσω) is due to its antonym *νεικέω* (<νεικος, neut.).

2. Ποτέω is denominative from *ποι-*Fó-s* (so Boisacq, *s.v.*), which, as Sütterlin (p. 41) observes, only survives in cpds., e.g. ἀροποῖός, *baker*.

(b) A few deverbative in -έω (I.E. - $\acute{\epsilon}$ - $\dot{\iota}$ δ) with traces of frequentative force. †Γρηγορέω, a Hellen. back-formation from pf. ἔγρηγόρα of ἐγείρω, πορθέω (<πέρθω), ριπτέω (<ρίπτω, cf. *iacto* : *iactio* : see p. 257, also Brugmann *KVG* 536), σκοπέω (acc. to Brugmann-Thumb *Gr.* 360, this corresponds to σκέπτομαι as an iterative. See above, p. 258, for the denominative ἐπισκοπέω in 1 Pet 5³ (A ω)), φορέω, frequentative of φέρω (but see Debrunner *Wordb.* 95 for φορέω <φόρος).

(c) Denominatives in -έω (<*-εσ- ι) from σ -stems. A few of these preserve traces of their origin outside the present tense, e.g. τελέω, aor. τέλεισα, f. τελέσω. Most of them have conformed to the *-e- $\dot{\iota}$ δ type.

¹ Mr. E. E. Genner observes that the word τηρός in Aesch. *Supp.* 248 is almost certainly corrupt. [Sidgwick's textual note in the OCT is "ἢ τηρών εσθηρον ut videtur factum M."—ED.]

(Ἄπ-)ἀλγέω, (ἐπι-, κατα-)βαρέω, a later form of βαρίνω, ἐλεέω (see above, pp. 195-7, 235, 385), θαμβέω, θαρρέω later form of θαρσέω, κρατέω, μισέω, πενθέω. All these are formed from neuter nouns in -ος, -εος.

NOTE.—Βαρέω and θαμβέω are Ionic contributions to the Κοινή.¹

(d) Denominatives from other stems.

Ἄπειλέω (ἀπειλή), †ἐλαττονέω (ἐλάττων). See *Vocab. s.v.* for other occurrences of this rare word. Ἰστορέω (ἱστωρ < *Fιδ-τορ-). For the history of the meaning of this word (ἀ.λ. in NT Gal 1¹⁸ = *to visit*) see Burton *ICC in loc.*, 59 *Vocab. s.v.* Λυπέω (: λύπη following ἀλγέω : ἄλγος), μαρτυρέω (μάρτυς, -υρ-), φρονέω (φρήν, φρεν-), φωνέω (: φωνή, following αὔτρω : αὔρη, and other primary verbs of sound).

(e) A number of verbs in -έω remain, which are not formed from compounds, but for which a Greek simple noun is not quotable. Some are root verbs, but not all:

Αἰρέω, "l'étymologie de αἰρέω est incertaine; l'initiale n'a pas été F." Boisacq, *s.v.*

Αἰτέω, formerly connected with αἰκίζω, Skt. *yācati*, Goth. *aīhtōn*, and derived from base *aiēq**. For Buck's phonetic objections to this, see Boisacq, *s.v.*

†Ἀλισγέω, a late verb (LXX^{ter}), is attested by †ἀλίσγημα (Ac 15²⁰). Boisacq notes "le groupe -σγ- est énigmatique; rapport possible avec ἀλίνειν."

Ἄρκέω, cf. Lat. *arceo*, *arx*, *arcānus*, from base *areq* "to avert," "repel." Brugmann (*Grd.*² II. iii. 339) derives from Skt. *rākṣa-ti* "to arm," "deliver" < *(a)ṛeq-s(o)-.

Ἄρνεομαι, possibly connected with Arm. *uranam* "to refuse," from *ἄρ.

Ἄσκέω. Uncertain etym. Boisacq quotes theory deriving word from *ἄ-σκόος < *ἄν-σκος, and oft. *ἀνακῶς carefully* < *κοέω*.

†Ἐνειλέω (Mk 15⁴⁶, εἰλέω *Ev. Petr.* vi. 24) for classical ἐνειλλω (Thuc.). See *Vocab. s.v.*

Ζητέω < *διᾱτέω. Cf. Skt. *yātiati* "to fix," *yātiatē* "to make an effort."

Καλέω, weak and strong grades seen in *καλέ-σαι*, *κέ-κλη-μαι*, Lat. *cālō*, -āre, *clāmor*, *clāmo*. I.E. *qalā- and *qel (?). See Boisacq, *s.v.*

¹ See Thumb *DAC* i. 555 a. "Words like ἀπαρτίζω (in ἀπαρτισμός), ἔκρωμα, κοπάζω (of the wind), δυνθος, σανδάλιον, σκορπίζω, etc., in the LXX or NT are of Ionic origin. The Ionic element includes, further, the so-called poetical words of the Κοινή, i.e. Hellenistic words which formerly were to be found only in the poets, but which from the fact of their occurrence in papyrus texts concerned with matters of everyday life, and partly also from the fact of their survival in MGR, are now seen to have belonged to the colloquial language. They include, e.g., βαρέω, ἐντρέπομαι, θαμβέω, μεσονύκτιον, πειράζω, ῥάκος, ὠρύομαι, in the LXX and the NT, and ἀλέκτωρ, βαστάζω, ἐριφος, φαντάζω, φημίζω, in the NT. Words of this class were imported first from the literary Ionic of the earlier period into the language of poetry, and then again from the vernacular Ionic of the later period into the Κοινή, and there was no direct link of connexion between the two processes."

(Ἐκ-)κεντέω to prick, stab, goad, cf. κοντός pole (Lat. *contus*), Skt. *ḡnāthati*, *ḡnāthāyati*, "to pierce."

Λαίεω (see p. 246 and *Vocab. s.v.*), cf. Lat. *loquor* (<**laquor*, **laq-uo*-). I.E. **l̥g-*, extension of **l̥*, reduced form of **l̥d(i)*- "to cry." See, further, Boisacq, *s.v. λαίειν*.

Λαλέω, onomatop. cf. Skt. *lalalla*. The original sense of *to chatter* had quite left the word in NT times. See *Vocab. s.v.*, where a number of exx. from papp. "all bear out the usual distinction that while λέγω calls attention to the substance of what is said, the onomatopoetic λαλέω points rather to the outward utterance."

Μυέω from √ μύ, μύ, a sound made with closed lips. J. A. Robinson, *Ephesians* 234, casts doubt on the derivation from μύω as that, when used simply, always means to close the eyes, not the lips. For the fading of technical meaning from μυέω and μυστήριον in later Greek, see *Vocab. s.v.*

Ῥοχέομαι. Cf. Skt. *r̥ghāyāti* "to tremble," I.E. **ergh-* (see Boisacq, *s.v.*).

Πτοέω from √ πτω-, πτᾶ-, πετ- <**pet-* seen in πέτομαι, πίπτω, in πτάξ, πτώξ, πτώσσω (see Boisacq 823,—also Sütterlin 84, on late date of πτοία from which verb has sometimes been derived).

Πωλέω <I.E. **pel-*. Cf. Skt. *pánatē* (**prnatē* <*pl̥n-*).

(Ἄπο-)στερέω. Root uncertain. Boisacq cft. MTr. *serbh* "theft."

(Ἄπ-, ἔξ-)ωθέω. Cf. Skt. *vadh-* "to strike," <IE **medh-* **modh-* **uōdh-* (see Boisacq, *s.v.*).

Ῥφελέω (see above, § 111, and Boisacq 732, 1085).

B. Verbs in -έω from compounds.

§ 162. (a) Denominatives corresponding to stems in -ο-.

Many of these are verbs in -φορέω, -ποιέω, -λογέω, -εργέω, which were very productive verbal endings in later Gr. (For tables of relative frequency in class. and post-class. writers, see Sütterlin 49).

The most noticeable groups in the NT vocabulary are those in—

-αγωγέω: †δουλαγωγέω, †συλαγωγέω, †χαλιναγωγέω (only Jas^{61s}, Lucian^{61s}: *γος first appears in Chryst.), †χειραγωγέω (Ps-Anacr., LXX, *Ev. Petr.* x. 40).

-αρχέω: πειθαρχέω (§ 108, p. 290) represents for the NT this very large group, whilst for †τετρααρχέω, which has *χης for its cognate in NT, we may either postulate a form in -ος, or account for the verb by analogy (see Sütterlin 79).

-γονέω: ζωογονέω (see *Vocab. s.v.* for LXX and NT meaning, *to preserve alive*, as against class. use = *to endue with life*, †τεκνογονέω).

-δημέω: ἀποδημέω (§ 115, p. 299), ἐκδημέω, ἐνδημέω, ἐπιδημέω (§ 120, p. 315).

-εργέω: †ἀγαθοεργέω (1 Ti 6¹⁸: the rare contracted form ἀγαθουργέω appears in Ac 14⁷), ἐνεργέω (§ 118, p. 308), συνεργέω, γεωργέω

(§ 105, p. 271), *ῥιευργέω*, *λειτουργέω* (§ 106), *συνυπουργέω* (elsewhere found only in Hipp. Art. 824, and Lucian *Bis Accusat.* 17) is an instance of the tendency in later Gr. to coin double cpds. *ῥπουργέω* (<°γός) is common in class. Gr., though °γός is not found before Xenophon.

- ηγέω : *ἰδηγέω*, *χορηγέω* (see § 105, p. 275).
- ηγορέω : *ἰἀλληγορέω* (<°ρος, acc. to v. d. Pfordten *Gr. Denom.* 35, but, °ρος not given in LS.¹ For verb see Burton *Gal (ICC)* 254 f.), *δημηγορέω* (§ 105, p. 273), *κατηγορέω*.
- θετέω : *ἰἀθετέω* (see *Vocab. s.v.*) is from °τος, with which we may compare *νομοθετέω* (<°της) and *νουθετέω*, for which a primitive °τος is not extant.
- θυμέω : *ἀθυμέω*, *εὐθυμέω* (§ 118, p. 308), *ἰμακροθυμέω*.
- λογέω : *ἀπολογέομαι* may possibly come in here, but see § 115, p. 299, and Sütterlin 52. *ἰβατταλογέω* (§ 105, p. 272), *γενεαλογέω* (found as early as Hdt., whereas °γος is not quotable until Dion. H. Cpds. formed with *λογέω* were very numerous, so that analogy probably plays its part), *εὐλογέω* (given by v. d. Pfordten 54 as from °λος, but as the meaning of the adj. is *reasonable*, and of the verb *to praise, bless*, the cpd. of *εὐ* and *λέγειν* may simply follow the common type of -*λογέω* verbs, esp. its antonym), *κακολογέω* (<°γος), *ἰμολογέω* (§ 107, p. 284), *ἰρμολογέω* (*ἰσυν-* see § 105, p. 272), *ἰστρατολογέω* (2 Ti 2⁴).
- μαχέω : in *ἰθυμομαχέω* and *λογομαχέω* (d.l. 2 Ti 2¹⁴) the first constituent is instrumental (see § 105, p. 273), whereas in *θεομαχέω* (Ac 23⁸ HLP) and *ἰθηριομαχέω* (<°ος not °ης, see Sütterlin 79) it is dative.
- νομέω : *κληρονομέω*, *οἰκονομέω*, *παρανομέω*.
- οικέω : Unlike the cpds. of *οἰκέω* mentioned above, *παροικέω* and *περιοικέω* are derived directly from *πάροικος*, *περίοικος*. This is clearly seen in the former by the changed meaning of the verb in Hellenistic corresponding to the changed meaning of the adj. from *neighbouring to foreign, alien*. (For *πάροικος* in Hellenistic see Deissmann *BS* 227 f.)
- ποιέω : *ἀγαθοποιέω*, *ἰεἰρηνοποιέω*, *ἰζωοποιέω*, *κακοποιέω*, *ἰκαλοποιέω*, *ἰμοσχοποιέω* (d.l. Ac 7⁴¹), *ἰὄχλοποιέω* (d.l. Ac 17⁵). A special note may be given to *ὄδοποιέω* (from Xenophon), which is read in Mk 2²³ by BGH 13 etc. It is tempting to adopt this rdg. with WH mg., and so avoid the incorrect use of the active for the middle. But the avoidance of the term in the Synoptic parallels,

¹ The new LS cites the *Etymologicum Gudianum*, 515. 42. Mr. E. E. Genner tells me that this medieval glossary, based on material of the early Byzantine age, quotes, *s.v.* *συνήγορος*, *παρήγορος* and *ἀλλήγορος* as parallel forms.

and the evidence of confusion between act. and mid. in the papyri (see *Proz.* 159), raises a doubt. For the word see *Vocab. s.v.*

-πορέω: ἀπορέω, εὐπορέω, ἰδοιπορέω.

-τομέω: διχοτομέω (§ 106, p. 281), †ἁτομέω (elsewhere in LXX, Justin M., Diod., <°μος [<λᾱs, τέμνω] only found in LXX and Josephus), †ὀρθοτομέω, a direct formation on analogy of other cpds. in -τομέω. See above, § 105, p. 274.

-φημέω: βλασφημέω (§ 105, p. 272), δυσφημέω (§ 107, p. 287).

-φορέω: εὐφορέω (<°ρος, which started with the passive sense of *bearable*, and then developed the active meaning, *fruitful, productive*, common in the medical writers (Hobart 144), and in Hellenistic. See further Sütterlin 42), καρποφορέω, †πληροφορέω, which follows the analogy of τελεσφορέω (§ 105, p. 275), τροποφορέω (Ac 13¹⁸ NBC²Dω) also found as a v.l. in Deut 1²¹ B*; its existence (=φέρω τὸν τρόπον) is attested by Cicero *Att.* xiii. 29. 2. In the absence of °ρος we must regard the verb as a direct formation. †Τροποφορέω (*v.* AC*E 33) is the reading of B*AF in Deut 1²¹, and the word occurs without v.l. in 2 Mac 7²⁷. The adj. °ρος is not found before Eustathius.

A number of these verbs in -έω were formed from noun compounds having ἀ- privative or εὐ- as a prefix. In addition to those given above, we find in the NT ἀγνοέω (<*α-γνοο-ς, <*γνα-φο-ς, cf. Lat. *cognitus*, <*-gna-to-ς, see Brugmann *Grd.*² i. 203; but see above, § 106, p. 281), ἀδικέω (as in class. Gr. both intrans. and trans., whereas †ἐκδικέω (<°κος) is only used transitively. The latter verb is only found in Κοινή. For papyrus exx. see *Vocab.*). ἄδυνατέω (Xen., Plat., Arist.) from °τος has given us the analogous †δυνατέω from °τός, a verb found in Philodemus the Epicurean philosopher of i/b.c., elsewhere only in Paul (Rom 14⁴, 2 Co 9⁸ 13³). †Ἀκαιρέω (Diod. †-έομαι, N.T. ἀλ. Phil 4¹¹, Herm. *Sim.* ix. 10⁵) is a Hellenistic derivative from the class. ἀκαιρος, opposed to †εὐκαιρέω, which is a good Κοινή word (Polyb., Plut., papp.) condemned by Phrynichus and Photius (Rutherford *NP* 205), who prefer εὖ σχολῆς ἔχειν (°ρος and °ρία are sound Attic, but not in the sense of σχολαίος and σχολή). See *Vocab. s.v.*, as also for remaining words in this group, ἀπιστέω, †ἀστατέω and ἀτακτέω. †Εὐαρεστέω is used by Hellenistic writers alone (so °τος can be quoted from inserr. and papp. in addition to the "bibl. and eccl." citations. *Vocab. s.v.*). Εὐνοέω (§ 107, p. 287).

The remaining verbs in this class are:

ἄγραιλέω (§ 107, p. 283), ἀγρυπνέω (§ 108, p. 290), αἰμορροέω (<°ροος, where the first element in the word is instrumental in case relationship; see T.P. cpds., § 105), ἀκολουθέω (§ 107, p. 285), †ἀντοφθαλμέω (unless this vb. should be placed in class (ε) below. See above, § 114 (δ), p. 297), βραδυπλοέω (<*°πλοος, see § 107, p. 284), διακονέω (<°νος, but see § 116, p. 303, for another possibility), ἐπιορκέω (§ 120, p. 314), †τέροδιδασκαλέω (§ 107, p. 284), †τέροζυγέω (<°γος) occurs first in 2 Co 6¹⁴ (see § 107,

p. 284), $\tau\epsilon\upsilon\theta\upsilon\delta\rho\omicron\mu\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ (Philo and NT; for $\acute{\omicron}\mu\omicron\varsigma$ see § 106, p. 282), $\tau\epsilon\upsilon\pi\rho\omicron\sigma\omega\pi\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ (§ 107, p. 287), $\epsilon\upsilon\chi\alpha\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ (for meaning of this verb in Hellenistic, see Milligan, *Thess.* p. 5, and *Vocab. s.v.*, also Deissmann *LAE*¹ 132 n.⁸, 168 n.² (²135 n.⁸, 179 n.⁵)), $\tau\epsilon\upsilon\psi\upsilon\chi\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ (§ 107, p. 287), $\epsilon\upsilon\omega\chi\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ ($\sigma\upsilon\nu\epsilon\omega\chi\omicron\upsilon\mu\alpha\iota$, first in Arist. See § 106, p. 282), ($\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha$ -) $\zeta\omega\pi\upsilon\rho\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ (< $\zeta\omega\pi\upsilon\rho\omicron\nu$, § 107, p. 284), $\theta\epsilon\omega\rho\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ (< $\acute{\omicron}\rho\omicron\varsigma$ < * $\theta\epsilon\acute{\alpha}$ - $\omicron\rho\omicron\varsigma$, *-*Foros*, cf. $\acute{\omicron}\rho\acute{\alpha}\omega$, O.E. *warðn*, *ware*), $\iota\epsilon\rho\omicron\sigma\upsilon\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omega$, $\tau\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\kappa\lambda\eta\rho\omicron\delta\omicron\tau\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ (Ac 13¹⁹ minusc. pauc. for $\acute{\omicron}\nu\omicron\mu\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ "from missing active sense of $\kappa\lambda\eta\rho\omicron\nu\omicron\mu\iota$," (Knowing *EGT* in loc. See *Vocab. s.v.* for use elsewhere), $\tau\kappa\lambda\eta\rho\omicron\nu\omicron\mu\acute{\epsilon}\omega$, $\tau\lambda\iota\theta\omicron\beta\omicron\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omega$, $\mu\epsilon\gamma\alpha\lambda\alpha\upsilon\chi\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ (Jas 3⁵ NC⁸KL, written *divisim* in other MSS; both verb and $\acute{\omicron}\chi\omicron\varsigma$ as early as Aeschyl.), $\nu\alpha\nu\alpha\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ (for $\nu\alpha\nu\acute{\alpha}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ see § 105, p. 274), $\xi\epsilon\nu\omicron\delta\omicron\chi\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ (spelt in Attic with κ for χ , as all the cognate words, see Rutherford *NP* 362), $\omicron\iota\kappa\omicron\delta\omicron\mu\acute{\epsilon}\omega$, $\delta\lambda\iota\gamma\omega\rho\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ (for $\acute{\omicron}\rho\omicron\varsigma$ see § 107, p. 284), $\sigma\tau\epsilon\nu\omicron\chi\omega\rho\acute{\epsilon}\omega$, $\tau\alpha\lambda\alpha\iota\pi\omega\rho\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ (§ 106, p. 282), $\tau\iota\mu\omega\rho\acute{\epsilon}\omega$, $\phi\iota\lambda\omicron\tau\iota\mu\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ (for these $\phi\iota\lambda\omicron$ - and $\tau\iota\mu\omicron$ - cpds., see § 108), $\chi\epsilon\iota\rho\omicron\tau\omicron\nu\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ (§ 105).

(b) Denominatives corresponding to *nomina agentis* in -ης, -της.

There is one doubtful example only of verbs formed from first declension nouns in -ης, $\tau\epsilon\tau\rho\alpha\rho\chi\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ (see under (a) above).

As already seen in § 150 above, noun compounds show a strong preference for the ending -της when forming *nomina agentis*. Eleven of these supply verbs in -έω in the NT. In most cases the nouns have been discussed above, and the references are accordingly given: $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\nu\alpha\kappa\tau\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ (§ 106), $\tau\acute{\alpha}\theta\eta\nu\tau\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ (§ 106), $\tau\gamma\omicron\nu\nu\pi\epsilon\tau\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ (§ 105), $\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\rho\gamma\epsilon\tau\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ (§ 106), $\nu\omicron\mu\omicron\theta\epsilon\tau\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ (see (a) above), $\tau\omicron\iota\kappa\omicron\delta\omicron\epsilon\sigma\tau\omicron\tau\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ (§ 105), $\pi\lambda\epsilon\omicron\nu\epsilon\kappa\tau\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ (§ 105), $\tau\pi\rho\omicron\sigma\omega\pi\omicron\lambda\eta\mu\pi\tau\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ (§ 105), $\sigma\upsilon\kappa\omicron\phi\alpha\nu\tau\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ (§ 105), $\upsilon\delta\rho\omicron\pi\omicron\tau\acute{\epsilon}\omega$, $\upsilon\pi\eta\rho\epsilon\tau\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ (§ 129 (b)).

(c) Denominatives from compound adjectives in -ης (-ης).

But for the absence of any *surviva*' in the *s*- conjugation, we might relate this group to the *-*es-jo*- class in A (c). As it is, we can infer that before the Homeric period these verbs conformed in all ways to the predominating class of -*o*- stems.

$\acute{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omega$, $\acute{\alpha}\pi\epsilon\iota\theta\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ (for meaning, see *Vocab. s.v.*), $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\epsilon\beta\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ and its opposite $\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\beta\acute{\epsilon}\omega$, $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\theta\eta\nu\acute{\epsilon}\omega$, $\epsilon\upsilon\lambda\alpha\beta\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$, $\kappa\alpha\kappa\omicron\pi\alpha\theta\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ (first in Xenophon), and the other - $\pi\alpha\theta\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ cpds., $\tau\mu\epsilon\tau\rho\iota\omicron\pi\alpha\theta\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ (§ 107) and $\sigma\upsilon\nu\pi\alpha\theta\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ (§ 127), $\lambda\upsilon\sigma\iota\tau\epsilon\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ (§ 108), $\delta\iota\alpha\sigma\alpha\phi\acute{\epsilon}\omega$, which appears to have been formed straight from $\sigma\alpha\phi\acute{\eta}\varsigma$, without the intervention of * $\delta\iota\alpha\sigma\alpha\phi\acute{\eta}\varsigma$ (§ 116).

(d) Denominatives from adjectival compounds in consonantal stems.

Of stems in -*ov*- the - $\phi\rho\nu\acute{\omicron}\nu\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ cpds. are as old as Homer. In NT this formation supplies $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\phi\rho\nu\acute{\omicron}\nu\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ (§ 123 (b)), $\sigma\omega\phi\rho\nu\acute{\omicron}\nu\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ (§ 107, pp. 284-5), $\upsilon\psi\eta\lambda\omicron\phi\rho\nu\acute{\omicron}\nu\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ (§ 107). In addition there are two $\acute{\alpha}$ - cpds., $\acute{\alpha}\delta\eta\mu\omicron\nu\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ (§ 106), $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\chi\eta\mu\omicron\nu\acute{\epsilon}\omega$.

Of stems in - ρ - $\psi\epsilon\upsilon\delta\omicron\mu\alpha\rho\tau\upsilon\rho\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ (§ 106).

Of stems in - δ - $\tau\delta\omicron\rho\theta\omicron\sigma\omicron\delta\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ (§ 107).

(e) Compound verbs in -έω formed directly on the model of those grouped under (b).

This flexibility in verb formation goes back to very early times, for ζωγρέω and ἐπιχειρέω appear in Homer and ἐνθυμέομαι is very common in class. writers. Still greater freedom was shown at a later stage in the language, for the remaining seven verbs in this list are purely Hellenistic.

† Ἀντοφθαλμέω (Polyb., see Capes, *Achaean League*, p. 262), possibly a Class VII. verb¹ from ἀντ' ὀφθαλμῶν (§ 114 (b)).

Ἐνθυμέομαι, from ἐν θυμῷ (ἔχω), see § 118 (c), and, for meaning, *Vocab. s.v.*

† Ἐνκακέω (Polyb.) for ἐν κακῷ εἶμι. See § 118 (c) for derivation and meaning.

† Ἐξουθενέω (LXX and pap.). See above, §§ 46, 119, and *Vocab. s.v.*

Ἐπιχειρέω, a verbal cpd. of Class VII. above (§ 109) = χεῖρα θείναι ἐπί τι, without the intervention of a noun cpd.: see § 120 (c).

† Εὐδόκew (Polyb., Diod., LXX), a new verb made with an adv. (p. 292). Ζωγρέω, Class VI. above, from ζῶν ἀγρεῖν (§ 108).

† Κακουχέω (Plut.¹ LXX^{bis}, common in papp., esp. in marriage contracts, see *Vocab. s.v.*, though the derivative noun ὄια is found as early as Aeschyl.) seems to belong to Class VI. A (§ 108).

† Τεκνοτροφέω (1 Ti 5¹⁰. Elsewhere Arist., Epict.), Class VI. A.

† Χρονοτριβέω (Ac 20¹⁶. Elsewhere Arist., Plut., and late writers), Class VI. A.

NOTE.—The distinction of class in these verbs in -έω corresponds broadly to a difference in meaning, which again lies in the nature of the nominal types from which the verbs are formed. The compounds are adjectival in meaning, and the derivative verbs have the force of "to be what the adjectival word stands for." The simple nouns, on the other hand, stand rather for things or abstractions. Other compounds are virtually *nomina agentis*, and the derived verbs have what at first sight appears to be a factitive force, though it actually comes under the general meaning "to be so and so." The distinction is not absolute, and the following considerations may be observed.

1. Verbs in -έω from simplicia sometimes admit the meaning "to be what the noun represents." *E.g.* in class. authors, διακονέω, καρτερέω, κοινωνέω, λαλέω, λειδορέω, μιμέομαι, σκοπέω, τηρέω, ὑστερέω, φλυαρέω. Sütterlin 49 attributes this in τηρέω and σκοπέω to their being primitive formations, whereas φλυαρέω is from a *nomen actionis* ῥος. In NT we have also †δυνατέω and its predominantly Hellenistic negative ἀδυνατέω.

2. The factitive appearance of some verbs in -έω from cpds. involves a question of accent. A good example is †λιθοβολέω. The rule is that when a T.P. cpd. is a transitive, or active, verbal in -ος, it accents the penult if this is short, otherwise the last syllable. But if the last part is intransitive, or passive (in meaning), the accent is recessive (see Goodwin, *Gr. Gr.*² 194). Thus λιθο-βόλος *thrower of stones*, λιθό-βολος *pelted with stones*. The verb corresponds to the former only. Similarly διχοτομέω follows the active meaning of διχοτόμος. Of course this

¹ The classification here referred to is set forth in § 102 above.

uncertainty as to the accent of the nominal cpd. sometimes leads to ambiguity in the force of the derivative verb.

3. A number of Possessive (B.V.) cpds. give rise to ambiguity in their derivatives. Thus, εὐθυμέω in class. writers is both trans. and intrans.; in NT always intrans. Εὐπορέω class. both trans. and intrans.; in NT intrans. = *to be well off*. Similarly ταλαιπωρέω in its NT occurrence (Jas 4^o) has the intrans. meaning, though exx. can be quoted from class. writers and LXX to support an active sense = *to weary, distress*.

4. Occasionally an unambiguous adjective results in a verb with double meaning. Thus στενόχωρος *narrow* gives *ρέω = (1) intr. *to be straitened* (LXX), *anxious* (Hipp.); (2) trans. *to straiten, compress* (LXX, Diod., papp.). So in NT the pass. = *to be straitened*. (See *Vocab. s.v.*)

Similarly with simplicia. Θόρυβος, *uproar*, gives *βέω; (1) *to make an uproar*; (2) *to throw into confusion*.

5. In Hellenistic there are numerous examples of a tendency, already traceable in the class. age, to give an active sense to the verb, though its corresponding adjective is passive. Thus the good Κοινή verb †ἀθετέω *to annul, cancel*, comes from ἄθετος, which is found in the passive sense *null, void, set aside*.

6. Note the transitive force produced by the perfectivising preposition ἀπο-, in †ἀφυστερέω, *to keep back* (Jas 5⁴), see § 114.

7. The deponent verb φιλοτιμέομαι may owe its form to the inherently middle force of the word in its classical (but not Hellenistic) sense of *to be ambitious*; or, as Sütterlin (p. 44) and Debrunner (*Wortb.* 99) suggest, it may follow the example of other verbs of desire, e.g. βούλομαι, ὀρέγομαι.

3. Verbs in -όω.

§ 163. This class of verbs, if not peculiar
 ὄω
 to Greek, must have arisen at a very late stage in the I.E. parent language. We have already seen that \bar{a} -stems gave rise to -άω verbs, and -o- stems to -έω verbs.

The origin of the -όω verbs may probably be traced to three or four influences.

(a) The analogy of the instrumental -άω verbs would play a part. Thus, πέδη *a fetter*, πεδάω *to fetter*, σκίπη *a cover*, σκεπάω *to cover*, from which the transition was easy to στέφανος, στεφανώω. This tendency would be strengthened by the parallel formations μῆνις: μηνίω, μέθυ: μεθύω.

(b) Apart altogether from the denominative verbs and their tense system, there was a direct formation of denominative adjectives, e.g. Lat. *barba*: *barbātus*, *aeger*: *aegrātus*. So in Greek we have κοντός: κοντωτός *provided with a rowing pole* (though this adj. is not attested before Diod.). Brugmann (*KVG* 532) postulates μισθός: μισθωτός, and derives from this

μισθωθῆναι, μισθώσω, ἐμισθώσα, and finally μισθώ. (See also *Grd.*³ II. iii. 206 and *Gr.*⁴ 357.)

(c) Where there are pairs of nouns derived from the same root and closely related in meaning, one ending in an *-ā-* stem and the other in an *-o-* stem, a verb in *-ώ* may well have arisen from the noun in *-os* corresponding to the already existing verb in *-ά*. Thus χολή : χολάω, χολός : χολώ. (See Sütterlin 99.)

(d) Dr. Giles finds the beginning of this series in *-ώ* "with denominatives like ριγώ from *ριγός (gen. *ριγός, cf. Lat. *rigor*), ιδρώ from ιδρός (= *ειδρός, cf. Lat. *sūdor* = *σμοιδός)" (*Manual*² 442 n.).

Whatever the origin, this type became very common in forming verbs from *-o-* stems with a factitive or an instrumental meaning. There are 96 verbs in *-ώ* in the NT, together with 25 additional compound verbs. Of these about three-fourths are derived from *o-* stems (in about equal proportions from nouns and adjectives), 7 from *a-* stems, 9 from 3rd Decl. nouns, 4 from adjectives with consonantal stems, and a few from prepositional and other phrases.

(1) Denominatives from *-o-* stems.

Many of these were normal in the classical period, some few are only found in the late classical writers, others first appear in prose in the *Κοινή*, whilst the considerable batch of fresh formations shows that this suffix was actively creative. Attention need only be called to the following :—

† *Ἀκυρώ* (< *ἄκυρος* common in legal phraseology. *Vocab. s.v.*)

† *Ἀναλώ*. (Back-formation, see p. 228.)

† *Ἀνακαινώ* (first in Paul, for class. *ἴζω (as in Heb 6⁶ and LXX). See *Vocab. s.v.*)

† *Ἀναστατώ*. (See § 113. A vernac. word found in LXX, NT and papp. *Vocab. s.v.*)

† *Ἀφυπνώ*. (Late verb. In Anth. trans. *to wake from sleep*. Elsewhere, as in Lk 8²³, *to fall asleep*. For this meaning see § 115 and *Vocab. s.v.*)

† *Βεβηλώ*. (First in LXX. See *Vocab. s.v.* *λος.)

† *Δεκατώ*. (Sütterlin 108 would derive this from ἡ δεκάτη (*μερίς*), but the adj. in *-τος* would account for the Hellenistic suffix *-ώ* in place of class. *τεύω. Note, however, "the rare ἀποδεκατώ (without var. Mt¹, Lk¹, Heb¹) is replaced by the rarer ἀποδεκατεύω (N²B), Lk 18¹²" (*WH App.*² 178). A reason for the new coinage is suggested in *Vocab. s.v.*

- †'Εντυπόω. (Hellenistic, though the simplex appears in Plato.)
- †'Επιδιορθόω. (Almost peculiar to Tit 1^s, is the common διορθόω cpded. with ἐπι- = *in addition*. See § 120.)
- Θεμελίόω. (First in Xen. In MGr θεμελιώνω.)
- Θυμόω. (Act. in LXX only. In class. and in the one NT occurrence, pass. = *to be angry*.)
- †'Ικανόω. (Act. in NT. Elsewhere pass., e.g. P Tebt i. 20^s.)
- †Κατιόω. (Apart from Jas 5^s only found in Sir. and Epict.)
- †Καυσόω (for class. καυματίζω. See Mayor, *op.* 2 Pet 3¹⁰.)
- Κεφαλαίόω. If this rdg. is right in Mk 12⁴ (ἐκεφαλαίωσαν), κεφάλαιον has given rise to a verb with a totally different meaning. Lobeck (*Phryg.* 95) points out that κεφαλή > κεφαλίζεῖν, *caput percutere*, λαμός > λαμιζεῖν, *ράχis* > *ραχίζεῖν* and adds "*alia huius significationis terminatio est in verbis γναθούν, i.e. eis γνάθους τύπτειν, γυιούν, κεφαλαίουν in Ev. D. Marci xii. 4.*" But as κεφάλαιον does not mean *head*, but *sum total*, or *chief point* (whence ἀνακεφαλαίω, *to sum up*, see J. A. Robinson *Ephes.* 145), there is much to be said for the rdg. of NBL, ἐκεφαλίωσαν. The verb would then be †κεφαλιόω, formed from κεφάλιον, a Hellenistic diminutive of κεφαλή. For further suggestions see *Vocab. s.v.*
- Κημόω. Only in Xen. before Paul, who in I Co 9^s (κημώσεις B*D*FG, φιμώσεις NACω) substitutes this verb for φιμώω, which our MSS of the LXX read in the pass. cited. (Lietzmann (*HNT in loc.*) thinks Paul here gives the true text of the LXX.)
- †Κολοβόω (first in Arist.), from κολοβός = *maimed, mutilated*. For vernacular use of cognates of this verb see *Vocab. s.v.*
- Λυτρόω. Class. but well established in vernac. See *Vocab. s.v.*
- †Ματαιόω. LXX and Paul (Rom 1²¹). Act. only in Jer 23¹⁶, where intrans. (= *to pretend*).
- †Νεκρόω. See *Vocab. s.v. νεκρός*.
- Παλαιόω. In act. peculiar to LXX and NT, but pass. in Hipp., Plat., Arist.
- Πωρόω. Factitive verb in medical and Hellen. writers. Metaph. meaning peculiar to LXX and NT. (For confusion with πηρόω in some MSS, see J. A. Robinson *Ephes.* 271.)
- *Ρυπόω. A rare class. verb given in NT lexicons on strength of T.R. in Rev 22¹¹. Ρυπωσάτω seems to be without MS warrant. According to v. Soden and R. H. Charles the alternatives are *ρύπανθήτω* (N, 94, 2017), *ρύπαρωθήτω* (205), *ρύπαρευθήτω* (046 et al.) *ρύπασάτω* (2029).
- Σαρόω. For *σαίρω*, which was in common use in Tragedy. But even this was condemned as un-Attic by Phrynichus (Rutherford *NP* 156), who requires παρακορέω, as κόρημα for *σάρων*. Lobeck (*Phryg.* 83) remarks "*σαροῦν ἰστροβαί Phryg., non σαίρειν.*"

The explanation may be that *σαρώ* had completely displaced *σαίρειν* = *sweep* by this time, the latter being only still used in the sense of *to grin*.

†*Σημείω*. For *σημαίνω* (2 Th 3¹⁴. See Milligan *in loc.*).

Σπαργανώ. From *σπάργανον* a *swathing-band*. Lk is preceded by the medical writer Hipp. as well as by Arist. It is also used by Plut.

†*Σπιλώ*. A Hellenistic derivative from the word *σπίλος*, which in late Gk. came to mean a *stain* (Rutherford *NP* 87 and Lobeck *Phryn.* 28).

Σταυρώ. In class. *to fence with a palisade*; in Polyb. and NT = *to crucify*.

Στερέω. A factitive verb, not found before Xen.

†*Ταρταρώ*. *ἀλ.* in 2 Pet 2⁴, though the cpd. *κατα*° is found in Sext. Emp. and other late writers.

†*Φραγελλώ*. From *φραγέλιον* = Lat. *flagellum* by consonantal dissimilation (§ 42). Only NT and eccles. Sütterlin 120 curiously derives from **λη*.

(2) Denominatives from *-a-* stems.

These are *ζημιώ* (though Sütterlin 123 derives from **ζήμος* on the ground that the fem. abstracts in *-ia* are probably all secondary formations, see above, § 136), *ζυμώ*, *†μορφώ* (Hellenistic, as also is *μετα*°. *†Συμ*° is *ἀλ.* in Ph 3¹⁰ (N°D°EKL), where *συμμορφίζω* is correct rdg. See below, § 173), *ρίζω* (class., but *†έκριζώ* LXX and NT only. *Ἐκ*° is only in form a cpd. See § 119 and *Vocab. s.v.* Note the different senses in which the two verbs are factitive), *σκηνώ* (class., but *ἐπι*° Hellenistic, *κατα*° Xen. and Hell.), *†τεφρώ* (*ἡ τέφρα* ashes), *†φυσώ* (< *φῦσα* bellows. NT and eccles. for class. *ἰώ*).

(3) Denominatives from other stems.

Stems ending in *-es-*.

From nouns, *σκοτώ* (possibly from *ὁ σκότος*, then attributed to *τὸ σκότος*, hence by analogous formation), *ἐλκώ*, *κυρώ*, *†σθενώ* (a word only known from 1 Pet 5¹⁰, and its mention in Hesych.), *ὀψώ* (though this may be influenced by its antonym *ταπεινώ* < *ταπεινός*). From adjectives, *ἀκριβώ*, *πληρώ* (but Sütterlin 117 connects this with *-o-* stem, and *cft.* Lat. *plenus*).

Consonantal stems, *κυρώ*, *†χαριτώ*.

From comparatives, *ἑσσώ* (2 Co 12¹³ N°BD°, see above, p. 107, and *Vocab. s.v.* *ἠτιάσμαι*), *ἐλαττώ*. Debrunner (*Wortb.* 103) traces these verbs in *-ώ* back to the neut. *ἐλαττων*, which resembles the neut. of *-o-* adjectives.

For *†έξουθενώ* (Mk 9¹² AC), *°θενώ* (*ιδ.* 869) see §§ 46, 119, and *Vocab. s.v.*

The dominant force of these verbs in *-όω* was instrumental or factitive, and as words tend to fall into groups under the stress of similarity of meaning, this kind of relationship was a determining factor in the history of the growth of this class.

Instrumental conception shown in various ways, e.g.—

(a) *To present, or reward with; to injure, or punish with:*

Σημαιοῦ, θανατοῦ, μαστιγοῦ, νεκροῦ, σταυροῦ, ἱταρταροῦ, τυφλοῦ, ἱφραγελλοῦ. Perhaps we may extend to κημοῦ, φιμοῦ, μισθοῦ, στεφανοῦ, ἱχαριτοῦ (*to endue with χάρις*, see J. A. Robinson *Ephes.* 227).

(b) *To treat with kindness, or with eagerness, with evil, with guile etc.:*

ἱδολιοῦ (LXX and NT. See *Vocab. s.v.*), ζηλοῦ, ζυμοῦ, κακοῦ.

(c) *To give expression to personal feelings:*

θυμοδομαι, which may have influenced ἐμβριμοδομαι (for the form see above, pp. 198-201; for the derivation, Debrunner in *IF* xxi. 53; for this group of words, Sütterlin 125).

The *Factitive* conception is evident in a number of groups, e.g.—

(a) *Words meaning to make strong etc.:*

ἱικανοῦ, ἱκραταιοῦ (late form for ἱτινω, see *Vocab. s.v. κραταιός*), and ἱισχυροῦ (LXX, *Herm. Mand.* v. 2^a), from *-o-* stems, are accompanied by ἱδυναμοῦ (*Vocab. s.v.*), ἱσθενοῦ.

The group, which is quite Hellenistic, may have originated in such pairs of contrasts as ἀσθενέω (*to be weak*): ἀσθενόω (*to weaken*—as early as *Xen. Cyr.* I v. 3), καρτερέω : καρτεροῦ. On the other hand, the group may have started with the class. βεβαιοῦ.

(b) A contrast of meaning may have produced ἱψόω (from an *-es* stem) to match ταπεινοῦ, and πληροῦ against κενόω. (See, however, above, under (3)).

(c) A very important variety of the factitive meaning is found in a group of verbs in *-όω*, derived from adjectives of *moral* as distinguished from *physical* meaning. Here the meaning is *to regard as, to treat as, not to make*. Thus ἀξιοῦ (see *Lightfoot Notes on Epp.* 105), δικαιοῦ (see *Evans ap. 1 Co* 6¹¹ cited by S and H *Romans* 30).

4. Verbs in *-ίω*.

ἱίω § 164. This small class of denominatives from *i-* stems was almost confined to Homer. There are no representatives in the NT, and the noun *μηρίς* which is found in *Hermas* (*Mand.* v. 2^a), has produced a verb *μηριόω* (*Sim.* ix. 23^b) according to the later formation. (See § 160 (*h*) above.)

Two verbs *ἱσθίω* and *κυλίω* are later forms of *ἱσθω* and *κυλίνδω*, as shown on pp. 238, 246.

5. Verbs in -ύω.

-ύω § 165. A small class of denominatives in *v*-stems is represented in the NT by ἀρτύω from ἀρτύς, which Hesych. gives as Ion. for ἀρθμός, cf. Lat. *artus*. (The same root as in ἀρτι, ἀραρίσκω.) For the transition from original meaning to *prepare* to later meaning to *season*, see *Vocab. s.v.* and Wakernagel's important note in his review of Mayser *Gram. i.* (*ThLZ* xxxiii. 36, n.¹). Δακρύω, ἰσχύω, μεθύω (<μέθυ, wine).

Two other verbs κωλύω and μηνύω are of doubtful etymology (see Boisacq *s.v.*); κωλύω probably belongs to Class I. *a.* (*a*) above.

In the following the suffix *-yo* is added to a root :

Θύω (<*dhy-ijo), -πτύω (έκ-, έμ-) (*[s]prijū-ijō, Lat. *spuo*), φύω (Lesb. φύω <*φυιω), βύομαι (<*Frū-, *yrū-, see Boisacq 846).

Two other stems are represented by compounds. Καμμύω, a synopated form of καταμύω, is a Κοινή word (see Ruth. *NP* 426 f.). For ώρύομαι see above, pp. 330, 387 n.¹. Its root (I.E. *(e)rēu- = "cry") is quite distinct from that of βύομαι above.

6. Verbs in -εύω.

§ 166. The denominatives were first formed from the stem of nouns in -εύς. Strict phonetic law would require a verb in -είω from *ηF-ι- or *εF-ι-, but the influence of the nom. sing. -εύς, and perhaps the analogy of other tenses (cf. καίω, *καFιω : έκαυσα) determined the form -εύω. Thus -αίω : -αυσα : -αύω :: -είω : -ευσα : -εύω.

As the suffix -εύς in a noun stands for one holding a professional rank or vocation, so the corresponding verb in -εύω marks the exercise of that profession. Thus βασιλεύω, βραβεύω, έρμηνεύω, άγρεύω, †άλιεύω. This type became very productive at an early stage of the language and spread to other stems than nouns in -εύς, largely under the influence of semantic analogy. No doubt the relation ἵππος : ἵππεύς : ἵππεύειν partly accounts for the freedom with which this suffix was added to stems in -ος.

The following groups are specially noteworthy :—

(a) Domination, oversight, rank :

Βασιλεύω (which βραβεύω regularly follows) gives by example ήγεμονεύω (*μων), †θριαμβεύω, καταδυναστεύω, κελεύω, κυριεύω (κατα°), παιδεύω, πρσβεύω, έπιτροπεύω, †άνθυπατεύω (Ac 18¹² HLPSS, *Mart. Polyc.* 21), άγγαρεύω (for this "interesting old Persian word," and the noun άγγαρος in Aesch., see *Vocab. s.v.*). So perhaps έποπτεύω (<°της, originally *overseer*).

(b) Correlative to these are verbs for subjection, obedience and service, especially religious service, thus leading on to verbs which mark the exercise of religious functions :

Δουλεύω, λατρεύω, νηστεύω, ἱερατεύω (see Hort *Comm. 1 Pet.* 109), μαρτυροῦμαι, ἡμμιτεύω, παρεδρεύω (1 Co 9¹², "kultischer Terminus," Lietzmann *HNT in loc.* See also *Vocab. s.v.* Πρὸς^ο is read by KL and later MSS), προφητεύω. For μαθητεύω see note below.

(c) Verbs connected with hunting, snaring, etc. :

ἄγρεύω, θηρεύω, ἐνεδρεύω (§ 118), †άλιεύω, †παγιδεύω and possibly also φονεύω and †όλοθρεύω (late form of ὀλεθρεύω). Κατατοξεύω (Heb 12⁹⁰ αὐτῶν) finds its way into T.R. on the strength of "nonnulli minusc."

(d) A number of these verbs mean "to play the part of," "to act as" the man denoted by the corresponding noun :

Καπηλεύω (ἄλος), to play the huckster, to deal in for purposes of gain. For pap. illustrations in support of RVmg., see *Vocab. s.v.* So μαγεύω to play the magus, deal in magic; πολιτεύω, in LXX and NT always ἡμμιτεύω, to act the citizen, live one's public life; πυκτεύω (της) act like a boxer, fight; ἡγυμνιτεύω (spelling, p. 72), to be scantily clad (as in Dio Chrys.; but in Plut. and Dio Cass. to be light-armed, where we may possibly trace a noun γυμνίτης formed after ὀπλίτης; see Brugmann *Gr.* 237). The meaning "to behave as" is clear in μοιχεύω (ἄχος), πορνεύω (ἄνος).

Many of the verbs in -εύω fall naturally into none of these groups. They are either factitive, or connote the possession of a quality, or represent an action. In some instances we find the relationship of quality passing to that of action.

The factitive meaning is evident in—

Δεσμεύω to bind (ἄμος), σαλεύω to shake (ἄλος a trembling), ἡσπερεύω (ἄρος a heap) to heap on, overwhelm, φυτεύω to plant, ἡἀποδεκατεύω (see ἄνω above, § 163).

The possession of a quality is conspicuous in—

ἡἀληθεύω to be truthful, hence to deal truly (Field, *Notes* 192, *Vocab. s.v.*), εἰρηνεύω, ἡἀλητεύω (late and rare for -ἄω), μνημονεύω, περισσεύω (passes from the intr. to the trans., see Lightfoot *Notes* 48, Milligan *Thess.* 44), πιστεύω (passes from the intr. to the trans., but in the NT the activity of faith is strongly present in the word), πτωχεύω, συμβουλεύω (< ἄλος). The cpd. ἡἀφιλοπρωτεύω, ἀλ. in 3 Jn⁹, is from φιλόπρωτος (Polyb., Plut., Artem.), the simplex πρωτεύω (LXX, Col 1¹⁰) is later class. (Plat., the Orators etc.).

The idea of action appears in the following :

ἡἀγορεύω to speak in the ἀγορά (contr. ἡἀράζω, § 172 (d)) lost its specific meaning, and its cpd. προσἀγορεύω = to address, hail (so Heb 5¹⁰, see Moffatt *ICC in loc.*). See *Vocab. s.v.*, and for use of ἀγορεύω and cpds., Rutherford *NP* 326 ff. Διανυκτερεύω, a Hellenistic coinage (Xen.), following διημερεύω which occurs once in Plato, afterwards in Hellen.

authors. Ἐμβατεύω (see § 118 (b), *Vocab. s.v.*), †ἐπιγαμβρεύω (see § 120, *Vocab. s.v. γαμβρός*), κινδυνεύω, κυκλεύω (rather rare word for common ὄρω, ὄω, Jn 10²⁴ (B), Rev 20⁶, see WH *App.*² 178, also *Vocab. s.v.*), μνηστεύω (as old as Homer, <μνηστήρ <μνάομαι. See Boisacq 641), Πορεύω in class. Gk. was used with a transitive force, but only the far more common εὐόμαι survives (with its 8 cpds.) in the NT. Its synonym ὀδεύω was an early poet. word which reappeared in Hellen. prose. Πεξεύω (poet. until Xen.). The cpd. †αἰχμαλωτεύω (<ῶτος, ² 105) probably followed the analogy of φυγαδεύω (Debrunner in Blass *Gr.*⁵ 65). Lobeck (*Phryn.* 442) observes "Extrema Graeciae senectus novum palmitem promisit αἰχμαλωτεύειν."

Although the active ending -εύω could, and did originally, convey the idea of "being or behaving, or acting as —," the influence of other classes of verbs where this condition is expressed by the middle (e.g. ἄχθομαι, αἰδοῦμαι) led to the formation of *deponents* in -εύομαι:

Ἐγκρατεύομαι (<ῆς, § 118 (c)), ἔμπορεύομαι (<ῶρος, assumed this form through mistaken connexion with πορεύομαι, see § 118 (a)). †Περπερεύομαι (<ῶρος, § 104) is first met with in 1 Co 13⁴; elsewhere only in Marcus. Πραγματεύομαι (<πράγματα, *business*) to trade, a common commercial term in papp. See *Vocab. s.v. †Παραβολεύομαι* (<παράβολος, § 123 (b), according to the true rdg. Phil 2³⁰, rather than †παραβουλεύομαι (CKLP), see Kennedy, *EGT in loc.*). †Ῥυπαρεύομαι (read by 046 *ap.* Rev 22¹¹, see under ῥυπώω above, § 163). Στρατεύομαι (στρατός, army in camp) to serve as a soldier, make war. Depon. only is found in NT, though -εύω is occasionally used in class. authors. In later Hellen. active used transitively=*enlist*. †Χρηστεύομαι (from ῥός) not found earlier than 1 Co 13⁴.

NOTE.—In several of these verbs we observe the transition from intr. to trans. use:

Ἐμπορεύομαι to travel as a merchant (Jas 4¹⁸), 'then, with a transitive force "to import," "purchase," "traffic in," "make gain or business of,"' Mayor, *ap.* 2 Pet 2⁸. This meaning of to exploit occurs in Polyb. xxxviii. 10, where the active form is used. †Θριαμβεύω to celebrate a triumph (so in Plut. e.g. *Tib. Grac.* 21, *C. Grac.* 17). Then, as in NT, to lead in triumph. So Col 2¹⁴, 2 Co 2¹⁴ (on which see Lietzmann *HNT in loc.*, with parallels from Plut., also *Vocab. s.v.*). †Μαθητεύω, intr. to be a disciple (Mt 27⁵⁷ ABL. So Plut.), and trans.=to make a disciple (Mt 28¹⁹, Ac 14²¹); -εύομαι, depon.=to be a disciple, (Mt 13⁵² 27⁵⁷ NCD, l. 33, 17).

ii. Consonantal yo- presents.

These consist of A. -*n-χo-*, (1) *αίνω*, (2) *-ύνω*.

B. -*r-χo-*, -*l-χo-*, (1) *-αίρω*, *-είρω*, *-θρω*, (2) *-άλλω*, *-έλλω*, *-ίλλω*, *-ύλλω*. C. -*πτω*, *-σσω*. D. -*ζω*, (1) *-άζω*, (2) *-ίζω*, (3) *-ύζω*. (4) *-έζω*, (5) *-όζω*.

A. Verbs in *-n-ίω-*.1. *-αίνω*.*-αίνω*

§ 167. These denominatives were formed from a variety of stems. Starting with stems containing, or ending in, *-n-*, the suffix was extended under the influence of analogy to other groups of words.

Thus :

(a) To stems with *-n-*: Ποιμαίνω (from ποιμεν- <**-μη-ι*), εὐφραίνω (from εὐφρον-), βασκαίνω (fr. βάσκανος <**βακ-σκ-ανο-ς*); κερδαίνω (present stem not found in NT) may come from **κέρδων* (> *Ἀκέρδων* prop. name, also Lat. *cerdo*, *-dn-is*), see *IF* xxi. 20.

This applies also to neuters in *-μα* (<**-μη-*; cf. *ὄνομα*, Lat. *nomen*): Σημαίνω (from σῆμα <I.E.* *dhǵā-mh*), θερμαίνω (probably from a neut. **θέρμα*), and λυμαινόμεαι (from λύμα, not λύμη, see *IF* xxi. 22).

(b) The suffix is often added to stems in *-ρος*. Debrunner (following Brugmann *Grd.*² II. i. 347, 578) recalls the interchange of the *n-* and *r-* suffixes in I.E., and thus accounts for the partiality of the *ro-* and *lo-* stems for *-αίνω* (*IF* xxi. 31).

Μωραίνω from *ῥός*, ξηραίνω from *ῥός*, πικραίνω from *ῥός*, illustrate this partiality, whilst *μαίνω* from *μαρός* is an example of the interchange of *n-* and *r-*.

(c) Certain verbs are treated by Brugmann (*Gr.*⁴ 349) as instances of the *ίω* extension of a nasal present. To this class belong :

Μαραίνω (cf. Skt. *μη-ῥā-ti*) <I.E.* *merā-* (*grind*), **mere-* (*die*) identical in Lat. *morior*, *βροτός*; *mer-η-ίω* > *μαραίνω* (Boisacq).

Υφαίνω* <γῆβῆ-η-ίω* > *ύφ-ανω* > *ύφαίνω*.

(d) The analogic spread of this suffix in verbal formation was aided by certain groups of words. We need only consider the bearing of this upon NT vocabulary. In the factitive group *μελαίνω* (from *μελαν-*) quite naturally led to *λευκαίνω* from *λευκός*, whilst *θερμαίνω* set the fashion for a whole group of words of which *ξηραίνω* is our only example. Under the influence of *μαίνω* the Homeric *ῥυπώω* gave place to *ῥυπαίνω* (Xen., Arist.), with the result that an adj. *ῥυπαρός* was formed on the reverse analogy of *μαρός*: *μαίνω*. One may hazard the suggestion that *πικραίνω* was influenced by *γλυκαίνω*, which Brugmann (*IF* xxxviii. 125 f.) has explained as a substitute for *γλυκύνω* by the principle of "prohibitive dissimilation." *Γλυκαίνω* is the one verb from a *-υ* stem which joins the *-αίνω* class; contrast its synonym *ἡδύνω*. In the intransitive group there are a number of words representing a state of mind or character, to which, in the class. age, *μωραίνω* belonged (see Note below), and others representing a bodily condition, e.g. *ύγιαίνω* from *ύγιής*.

NOTE.—As was the case with *-εύω* verbs, we see a change from active to middle, and from trans. to intr., in the following:

Μωραίνω (1) class. *to be foolish*. (2) In LXX and NT, factitive, *to make foolish* (1 Co 1²⁰), *-ομαι, to become foolish* (Rom 1²³), *to become tasteless* (Mt 5¹³ || Lk 14³⁴).

Πικραίνω *to make bitter* (Rev 10⁹), *-ομαι to show bitterness* (Col 3¹⁹).

2. *-ύνω*.

-ύνω § 168. Verbs in *-ύνω* stand in close relation to adjectives and nouns with *υ-* stems. But since some adjectives in *-ύς* were related to neut. nouns in *-ος*, the verbal suffix *-ύνω* came to be attached to other stems in *-ος* where no such adjectives in *-ύς* were to be found.

(a) In *ἀμύνω* and *πλύνω* we have primary verbs, where *-υν-* is part of the stem (see Debrunner *IF* xxi. 73).

(b) Adjectives in *-ύς* furnish us with *βαθύνω*, *βαρύνω*, *βραδύνω*, *εὐθύνω*, (*παρ-*)*όξύνω*, *παχύνω*, *πλατύνω*; and *πληθύνω* may have been formed from the Homeric noun *πληθύς*.

(c) *Αἰσχύνω* comes from *αἰσχος*, which had no corresponding adj. in *-ύς*, (*αἰσχύνη* being a back-formation from the verb).

(d) *Βαθύνω* and *πλατύνω* became patterns for a group of words represented by *μεγαλύνω*, *μηκύνω*, and possibly *πληθύνω*. *Παχύνω* probably led the way for *σκληρύνω* (from *σκληρός*).

(e) *Μολύνω* is closely connected with *μέλας* (<**μέλανο-s*), cf. Skt. *maidhā-s*, I.E. *meḥno-s*. *Ότρύνω* (*παρ-*) is really a compd., <**δ-τρυν-ν-ιω* <**δ* (see § 111 above, and Brugmann *Grd.*³ II. ii. 817), and *τρυν* (cf. Skt. *ttar-*, Brugmann *ib.* i. 260, 311).

(f) Other *-n-yo-* verbs: *Κρίνω* (*κρι-ν-ιω*), *ἐλαύνω* (see p. 235. Solmsen, *Gr. Wortf.* 51 <*ελα-υν-ιω* <*ελα-Fων*, *nomen agentis* from *ελα-* in *ελά-σαι*, *ελα-τήρ* etc.).

B. Verbs in *-r-ίω*, *-l-ίω*.

-αίρω § 169. (1) In *-αίρω* we have two primary verbs *αἴρω* and *χαίρω*, and the denominative *καθαίρω* (from *καθαρός*).

-εἶρω In *-εἶρω* almost all the verbs are primary, thus, *ἐγείρω*, *κείρω*, *σπείρω*, *φθείρω*

For *ἡμείρομαι* see p. 251 above.

Οἰκτεῖρω is another spelling for *οἰκτιρω*, which Brugmann *Grd.*³ II. i. 358 derives from **οικτι-ρο-* (cf. *οικτίζω*) after the type *ὑλοφύ-ρο-μαι*.

In *-ύρω* we have two primary verbs, *πύρομαι* and *σύρω*, and the denominative *μαρτύρομαι*.

(2) The only verbs in *-άλλω* in the NT are primary, viz. *ἄλλομαι*, *βάλλω*, *θάλλω*, *ψάλλω*. The same applies to verbs in *-έλλω*, viz. *μέλλω*, *στέλλω*, *τέλλω*, except *ἀγγέλλω*, which is a denominative from *ἄγγελος*. For *ὀκέλλω* see pp. 243 and 294.

In *-ἰλλω* and *-ύλλω* we have only the primary verbs *τίλλω* and *σκύλλω*.

C. Verbs in *-πτω* and *-σσω*.

-πτω

1. § 170. It is an open question whether any of the *-πτω* verbs (except denominatives as *χαλέπτω* <*χαλεπός*, none of which occur in the NT) were originally *-ίζο-* verbs. The NT list consists of *ἄπτω*, *βάπτω*, *βλάπτω*, *θάπτω*, *θρύπτω*, *καλύπτω*, *κάμπτω*, *κλέπτω*, *κόπτω*, *κρύπτω*, *κύπτω*, *νίπτω*, *ράπτω*, *†ἐπιράπτω*, *ρίπτω*, *σκάπτω*, *σκέπτομαι*, (*ἐπισκ°*, late form of *ἐπισκοπέω*), *τύπτω*.

Of these *βλάπτω* and *νίπτω*, whose roots ended in a labiovelar (for *βλάπτω* cf. Skt. *marc-*, *νίπτω* <*√neig-*), must belong to the *-το-* class, for **neig-*-*ιδ* > *νίζω* (cf. *req*^u*ιδ* > *πέσσω*). Similarly with those whose roots ended in *φ*, viz. *βάπτω* (*ἐβάφην*), *θάπτω* (*√d̥h̥m̥d̥h-*), *κρύπτω* (*κρύφα*), *σκάπτω* (*ἐσκάφην*, *σκάφος*), where the similarity of the aorist forms (*ἐκρυψα*: *ἐκάλυψα*) reacted on the form of the present. The remaining verbs in the list may quite well have come from stems in *-ιο-*. *Σκέπτομαι* may be <**σκεπιόμαι* <**σπεκίόμαι* (=Lat. *specio*, Skt. *pr̥dyāmi*). See Brugmann, *Gr.*⁴ 343 f., also Debrunner *IF* xxi. 207 ff., Hirt *Handb.* 378 f.

-σσω

2. § 171. Verbs in *-σσω* are almost all from guttural stems and most are primary.

(a) *Guttural stems*.—Primary: *Δράσσομαι* (>*δράγμα*, *δραχμή*), *-μάσσω* (*ἀπο-*, *ἐκ-*), *πράσσω* (from **πράκ(ο)-*, cf. *πέρᾱ*, *πέρᾱ-ν*, *Grd.*³ π. i. 481), *ταράσσω* (*ταραχ-*), *τάσσω* (*ἐ-τάγ-ην*), *φράσσω* (**φρακίω*), *πλήσσω* (**πλᾱκίω*, cf. *πληγή*), *ρήσσω* (according to Wackernagel, *Hellenistica* 24, Fraenkel, *Nom. Ag.* ii. 40 f.) supplanted *ρήγνυμι* (*to break*) in the Hellenic age, under the influence of *ἔπληξα*: *πλήσσω*. There was a distinct verb, Att. *ράπτω*, Hellen. *ράσσω* Ion. *ρήσσω* (*to throw, strike, dash*). Debrunner (*Blass Gr.*⁴ 61) suggests that the two verbs coalesced in the Κοινή, and it is significant that the latter meaning fits the verb better in Mk 9¹⁸ (where, in fact, D reads *ράσσει*) and Lk 9⁴⁸, also in the cpd. *προσέρηξεν*, Lk 6⁴⁸. For derivation of *ράσσω* see *Vocab.* s.v. *ρήγνυμι*. *Φρίσσω* (cf. *φρίξι*), *νύσσω*, *ὀρύσσω* (**ὀρυκίω*), *πύσσω* (cf. *πύξι*, *-υχός*). For etym. see Boisacq 824). Denominative: *Πατάσσω* (*πάταγος*), *φυλάσσω* (*φύλαξ*), *χαράσσω* (*χάραξ*), which is represented in NT by its derivative *χάραγμα*, *ἀλλάσσω* probably from the adv. *ἄλλάζ* (Debrunner *IF* xxi. 219), *έλίσσω* (see above, p. 236), *βδελύσσω* (*βδελυρός*, cf. Aesch. *βδελύκτροπος*), *κηρύσσω* (*κήρυξ*).

(b) *Dental stems*.—Primary: Πλάσσω (*πλαθίω, following the -χ-ιω type in present, but aor. ἔπλασα, ἐπλάσθην. See Brugmann, *Gr.*⁴ 119, Anm.⁸). Denominative: πυρέσσω (πυρετός).

(c) Ἐτυλίσσω was formed from the prepositional phrase ἐν τύλῳ under the influence of ἔλισσω (see Debrunner *IF* xxi. 235, *Wortb.* 115); for its rarity and meaning see Abbott *JV* 346 f. and *Vocab. s.v.* By back-formation a simplex τυλίσσω was made (see LS *s.v.*).

(d) Σπαράσσω (<I.E. *spereg-) is taken by Debrunner (*IF* xxi. 224) as a -ζω verb, which follows the analogy of τaráσσω in the present (Aor. also ἐσπάραξα); τινάσσω (ἀπο-, ἐκ-) of uncertain etymology; φρούσσω (like its cognate φριμάσσομαι) a lengthened form, related to φρέαρ (<*φρήφαρ <I.E. *bhrēgh-) ; αἰνίσσομαι (>αἰνιγμα) from αἶνος. The origin of the -ίσσομαι is unexplained.

D. Verbs in -ζω.

1. -άζω.

§ 172. This suffix originated in the attachment of -ιω to stems in -ad-, thus λιθάς (λιθαδ-) λιθάίω. In a few instances a guttural stem was so used, e.g. ἀρπαξ (ἀρπαγ-): ἀρπαίω. The use was extended to neuter nouns with stems in -ατ-, e.g. ὄνομα: ὀνομαίω, and then to nouns in -ā- stems, e.g. ἀγορά: ἀγοραίω. In time -άζω was a suffix that could be added to any stem, though it is generally easy to trace the influence of semantic analogy.

(a) How productive this suffix became may be judged from the fact that out of about 70 verbs in -άζω in the NT only two are derived from stems in -ad-, the second being φράίω (<φραδ-ιω, see Brugmann *Grd.* II. iii. 182; cf. φραδή, ἀρι-φραδ-ής). Σεβάζομαι probably came from σέβας, which has not stem in -ad-, but see p. 258 above; and σκεπάζω (whence *σμα) from σκέπας, -αος.

(b) Κράίω and σφάίω are the only other verbs (cf. ἀρπαίω) from guttural stems, though a confusion of flexion is found sometimes in the conjugation. See *Proleg.* 56, § 95 above, and *Vocab. s.v.* ἀρπαίω, βαστάζω.

(c) Like ὀνομαίω are θαυμάίω (θαῦμα), χαιμάίω (χαίμα), δελεαίω (δέλεαρ, -ατος).

(d) From nouns in -ā we have ἀγοραίω (see Rutherford *NP* 214), ἀκμαίω, ἀλαλαίω, ἀναγκάίω, αὐγαίω (see *Vocab. s.v.*), βιάίω, δικαίω, δοξάίω (§ 118), ἐξουσιάίω, ἐορταίω, ἐπηρεαίω (see § 120), θηλαίω, κραυγαίω, πειραίω (poet. and late prose for ῥάω), παρρησιάζομαι,

σκληριάζομαι (Mt 4²⁴ 17¹⁶. A "late and rare" word. To reff. given in lexicons add Vett. Val. 113¹⁰, and °σμός, 127^{6, 30}), σκευάζω (παρα-), σκιάζω (ἐπι-, κατα-), σπουδάζω, -στεγαζω (ἀπο-), σχολάζω, τυρβάζω (Lk 10¹⁴ AP), χλευάζω (see Solmsen 246 n.¹).

(e) From nouns and adjectives in -(ι)ος, -(ι)ον: Ἐνυπνιάζω, ἐργάζομαι, θορυβάζω, †καυ(σ)τηριάζω, κοπάζω (κόπος), σινιάζω (ἀλ. in Lk 22³¹ for Attic σήθω; probably both σίνιον and its verb belong to the colloquial Κοινή), ὑπωπιάζω (from ὑπόπιον, but †μυωπιάζω from μύωψ, see § 108 above, and Mayor *Jude and 2 Pet* 95 n.¹), χορτάζω (for history of word see Lightfoot *ap. Phil* 4¹³).

†Αγιάζω (on this new word coined (or appropriated) by Jewish piety see *Vocab. s.v.*), ἀτιμάζω, γυμνάζω, δοκιμάζω, †ἐνταφιάζω (§ 118), ἐτοιμάζω, ἡσυχάζω, νηπιάζω (1 Co 14²⁰, elsewhere only Hipp., for νηπιαχεύω (Hom.), νηπιάχω), †παρομοιάζω (Mt 23²⁷, elsewhere only eccles.; for this and for the simplex read by B, 1, see § 123), †πυρράζω (Mt 16²⁹, from πυρρός; elsewhere only in Byzantine authors. In LXX and Philo πυρρίζω. The -άζω form may possibly be due to the accompanying verb), †τσυγνάζω (LXX, NT, late). To these should be added διστάζω from *διστος, cf. Skt. *divigthaḥ* (*uncertain*), ἐξετάζω (whence also ἐτάζω (Wis 2¹⁹) and †ἀνετάζω) from ἐτέος (<**ereFos*) true, real: see *Vocab.* 42a, κολάζω from κόλος docked (<I.E. **qolā-*).

(f) From adverbs: Διχάζω (δίχα), πλεονάζω (πλέον).

(g) From verbs: Ἀμφιάζω (on the form and spelling, see p. 228). "The back-formation ἀμφιέζω (from the aor. of -έννυμι) is an obvious first step towards ἀμφιάζω, which shows the influence of the large class of -άζω verbs" (*Vocab.* 28a). For derivation direct from ἀμφί see p. 68. -βιβαζω, causative of βαίνω, mostly in cpds. (in NT only a cpd. with ἀνα-, ἐμ-, ἐπι-, κατα-, προ-, συν-), from βα- <√g ā- in Skt. *jigāti*, cf. Lac. 3 pl. βιβαντι and Hom. ptc. βιβᾶς (=striding). Δαμάζω (according to Debrunner *Wortb.* 122 n.¹) is a back-formation from ἐδάμασα the aor. of the older present stem δάμνημι. Στενάζω, originally a frequentative of στένω. Φαντάζω from φαίνω.

(h) A few verbs come under none of the above headings:

Ἀσπάζομαι is derived from ἀ <**h* (cf. prep. ἐν, § 118), and √*seq*⁹, seen in the Hom. ἔννεπε (<**énsepe*) ἔσπετε (<**én-sepete*), Lat. *insequere*. Βαστάζω (for meaning and flexion see *Vocab. s.v.*), cf. Lat. *gero* (<**geso*), *gesto*, to carry.

Νυστάζω and its cognate νύσταλος from I.E. **sneudh-* <**snā*, cf. Lat. *nāre*.

†Πιάζω (see pp. 69, 254) from I.E. **pi-s(e)-d-*, cf. Skt. *pīdayati* (**pi-zd-*). See Boisacq, *s.v.*

NOTE.—1. Semantic analogy may account for a few groups of words in -άζω related by common meaning rather than by similarity of stem:

Thus for *utterance of sound*, ἀλαλάζω, κράζω, κραυγάζω, στενάζω :

for *reviling, ridiculing, reproaching*, ἀτιμάζω, χλευάζω, ἐπηρεάζω :

for *testing, judging, separating*, δικάζω, διχάζω, δοκιμάζω, ἐξετάζω, πειράζω, σινιάζω :

for *numerical relationships*, following μονάς : μονάζω (a verb found in Barn 4¹⁰, Herm. Sim. ix. 26³), δυνάς : δυνάζω etc., διχάζω, διστάζω, πλεονάζω :

for *mark of age*, ἀκμάζω, νηπιάζω :

for *state of health* : the related pair ὑγιαίνω : ὑγιαίνω represented the intrans. and the factitive conceptions. Hence *νοσαίνω : νοσάζω.

The obsolescence of νοσαίνω led to the use of the passive -άζομαι, to mark the possession of a disease. Hence †σεληνιαζομαι from which by analogous formation Deissmann (*LAE* 251, 256) accounts for δαμονι-άζομαι, in Wesseley *Zauberp.* (=P Par 574) ^{88. 3007}.

2. The termination -άζω does not always carry a transitive meaning. This is seen specially when it is attached to -ο- stems, for -όω here has a prescriptive right to the factitive meaning. Rutherford *NP* 284 says, "Verbs in -άζω from adjectives in -ος are rare at the best, and though ἀτιμάζω, διπλασιάζω and one or two more bear a transitive meaning, the majority of such words are neuter." The famous cruz βιάζομαι is discussed fully in *Vocab. s.v.*

2. -ίζω.

-ίζω

§ 173. The origin and extended use of this most productive suffix is closely parallel to

that of -άζω.

(a) From stems in -ιδ-.

Ἄγκαλιζομαι (ἐν-), the simplex poetical, from ἀγκαλίσ, Homeric for ἀγκάλη (Lk 2²⁸). †Ἐναγκαλιζομαι (LXX and Plut.) may be an old poet. word which survived only in vernacular. Mt and Lk avoid it when used by Mk 9³⁶ 10⁴⁶. For meaning see *Expos.* ix. ii. 300. †Βολίζω (*Vocab. s.v.*), ἐλπίζω, ἐρίζω, μερίζω, βαπίζω (for origin and meaning, see Rutherford. *NP* 264; *Field Notes* 105), ριπίζω (see Hort *ap. Jas* 1⁹), σφραγίζω, φροντίζω. So παίζω is from πάρις. Αἰδίζομαι might conceivably come from αἰδισ (Hom.), but is generally derived from αἰδή. Κομίζω from κομίδη (Brugmann *Grd.* π. iii. 231: cf. Skt. *çama-h* (<I.E. *komo-s) çamī, Boisacq 489. For various meanings of the word see *Vocab. s.v.*)

(b) Other stems with nominatives in -ις follow this type, with the mixed declension of ἔρις (acc. ἔριν and ἐρίδα) as a possible link (so Debrunner *Wortb.* 128).

Κιθαρίζω, ὄβριζω, χαρίζομαι, and, through similarity of declension (see p. 140), †πελεκίζω (<πέλεκυς. See Lob. *Phryg.* 341).

(c) Guttural stems supply *μαστιζω* (Ac 22²⁵, Ep. and late prose for *μαστιγώω*), *σαλπίζω*, *στηρίζω* (for mixed conjug. see p. 259), *φλογίζω* (<φλόξ, though possibly belonging to the class (h) below).

(d) From *-a-* stems come *αύλιζομαι*, *όργίζω*, *†συμυρνίζω* (Mk 15²⁵, *mingle with myrrh*. Elsewhere only Diosc. *be like myrrh*. In very late writers, *embalm*), *δυσλίζω* (both simplex and cpd. are late—from *ὑλη, sediment*), *φημίζω* (see p. 387 n.¹), *†φυλακίζω*.

(e) From (a) nouns and (β) adjectives, in *-ος (-ον)*. (a) *ἄφρίζω*, *†άνεμίζω* (elsewhere only schol. on *Od.* xii. 336. For class. *άνεμώω*. See Hort *ap.* Jas 1⁸, also Mayor, who shows that James has a fondness for verbs in *-ίζω*), *βασανίζω* (*βάσανος, touch-stone*), *βυθίζω*, *†γαμίζω* (see N. 2 below), *εὐαγγελίζω* (§ 106), *†ένουχιζω*, *†θεατρίζω* (first occurs Heb 10²³, but *έκθ'* twice in Polyb.), *θησαυρίζω*, *†ιματίζω* (*Vocab. s.v.*), *†κατοπτρίζω* (*κάτοπτρον, mirror*), *κεντρίζω* (*Xen.*), *†κολαφίζω* (not found earlier than NT, from *κόλαφος*, vernac. for *κόνδυλοι, knuckles*, see Lobeck *Phryg.* 175), *†κρυσταλλίζω* (*ά.λ. Rev* 21¹¹), *λογίζομαι*, *μυρίζω* (*Ion.* and *Comed.* also *par.*), *νομίζω*, *ξενίζω*, *-οικίζω (κατ-)*, Jas 4⁵ *κβα* (see N. 2 below), *†μετοικίζω* (<*μέτοικος*, *Arist.*), *όπλίζω*, *†όρθρίζω* (*LXX* and *Lk* 21²⁸ for class. *όρθρεύω*. *Hellen. acc. to Moeris*, see Thumb *Hellen.* 123), *όρίζω*, *όρκίζω* (sound Attic in spite of Phrynichus, as *Demosth. Fals. Leg.* 278 shows. See Rutherford *NP* 466 f., *Lob. Phryg.* 560 f.), *όρμίζω (προσ-)*, *πλουτίζω*, *ποντίζω (κακα-)*, *πορίζω* (whence *†°σμός*), *ποτίζω*, *ράβδίζω*, *†σκανδαλίζω* (only *LXX* and *NT*, see Thumb *Hellen.* 123, *Helbing Gr.* 127), *σκορπίζω* (an Ionic word, found in a fragment of *Hecataeus*, elsewhere only in *Hellen.* writers for Att. *σκεδάννυμι*, see p. 387 n.¹. Rutherford *NP* 295: from *σκορπίος*, an engine for throwing missiles, hence *to scatter*), *σπλαγγνίζομαι* (Thumb *ιδ.*, *Helbing ιδ.*, *Vocab. s.v.*), *τραχηλίζω* (*Xen.*; for meaning see *Moffatt ICC ap.* Heb 4¹³), *τυμπανίζω* (*Eupolis* and *Hellen.*, originally *to beat a drum*, *τύμπανον*, later *to beat to death*, see *Moffatt ap.* Heb 11²⁵), *φορτίζω*, *χρονίζω*, *ψηφίζω*, *ψωμίζω*.

(β) *ἄγνίζω*, *άθροίζω* (from *άθρός, assembled in a crowd, á copulative* (see § 107) for *ά* under the law forbidding successive aspirates, and *θρός, noise* <*I.E. *dhreu-, *dhru-*), *†αίχμαλωτίζω* (from *°τος*, see § 105), *άπτίζω* (*†έξ- κατ-*), *†ένορκίζω* (§ 118), *έξυπνίζω* (§ 119), *ισχυρίζομαι (δτ-, § 116)*, *†καθαρίζω* (for class. *καθαίρω*, see *Vocab. s.v.*), *άνακαινίζω* and *†ένκαινίζω* (see *Vocab. s.v.*), *κουφίζω*, *μετεωρίζομαι* (§ 122 (b), *Vocab. s.v.*), *όρφανίζω (άπ-)*, *προχειρίζω* (§ 125), *σοφίζω*, *†συμμορφίζω* (*Ph* 3¹⁰ *κabd*, 33; nowhere earlier), *σφίζω*, *†συνερίζω* (fr. *συνερός*), *Herm. Mand.* iv. 2¹, *Ep. Diogn.* 12⁹, (first found in *Arist.*).

(f) From other 3rd Declension nouns and adjectives.

Stems in *-es-* supply *γεμίζω* (unless this belongs to class (h) below), *δανείζω* (for spelling, see p. 77), *έθίζω*, *†έδαφίζω* (*Arist.* For meaning see *Field Notes* 74), *θερίζω*, *όνειδίζω*, *†σκοτίζω*. *ἄλιζω (συν-)* (<*άλης*,

ἀ-Φαλῆς, cf. ἀλλῆς: see Solmsen *Gr. Wortf.* 20), †ἀσφαλίξω (see *Vocab. s.v.*), ἀτενίξω, ἀφανίξω, and ἐμφανίξω (see pp. 236, 307).

Stems in -ον-, -ων-. Ἀγωνίζομαι, δαίμονίζομαι, †κλυδωνίζομαι (Eph 4¹⁴. Elsewhere only Is 57²⁰, Joseph., Vett. Val.), σωφρονίξω.

Stems in -ματ-. †Δειγματίξω (Mt 1¹⁹ N²BZ 1, Col 2¹³. See p. 320 n.¹. For other exx. of this rare word see *Vocab. s.v.*), †δογματίξω (see *Vocab. s.v.*), †καυματίξω, μετασχηματίξω and συνσχηματίξω, τραυματίξω. Χρηματίξω covers two entirely distinct words: (a) *to be called*, <χρήματα (<χρῶμαι, <*χρη-μομαι) *business*, hence *to do business under the name of X, to bear the name of*; (b) *to warn*, <χρήμα (<χρῶ, <*χρη-ιω)=χρησμός (<χρηξω), *oracle*.

Stem in -ωτ-. Φωτίξω.

Various stems supply †ἄλιξω (from ἀλς, ἀλός: Mk 9⁴⁹, Mt 5¹³, Ignat. *Mag.* 10², LXX; first in Arist.), ἀνδρίξω, μακαρίξω (<μάκαρ), μυκτηρίξω (<μυκτήρ, *nose*), *to sneer at, mock* (see *Vocab. s.v.*), διαχειρίξω (§ 116 (a)).

(g) From adverbs: Λακτίξω (<λάξ, *with the foot*), *to kick*. Νοσφίξω (<νόσφι, *apart, aside*) has in the two NT occurrences (Ac 5²⁻³, Tit 2¹⁰) a special middle force, *to purloin*, supported by the papyri (see *Vocab. s.v.*). This poet. word first appeared in prose in Xen. *Cyr.* iv. ii. 42, and is frequently found in Hellen. authors (as Wetstein shows). Χωρίξω (<χωρίς) †έγγίξω (<έγγυς) not very common in papyri (see *Vocab. s.v.*).

(h) From verbs: Γνωρίξω from the same verbal root as γι-γνώ-σκω, but with the *r* that appears also in γνώριμος, *norma* (<*gnōrimā), then gnōrus (<*gn̄-), narrō (<*gnārō), ignōrō (Boisacq *s.v.*). The original causative force is largely lost, but is to be recognised in all its NT occurrences, even Phil 1²² (see *Vocab. s.v.*). Ἐρεθίξω (έρέθω), †προσοχθίξω (Heb 3¹⁰ πκκ late form, rare outside the LXX, for προσοχθέω), πρίξω (πρίω); χρῆξω, *to need*, is closely related to χράω, but both are derived from an old noun χρή (see § 107 under ἀχρεῖος; also Boisacq p. 1069). Φλογίξω (if from φλέγω, but possibly it comes from φλόξ, and belongs to class (f) above).

The most common type of verbal derivative, as the ending -τίξω shows, is formed from the verbal adj. in -τος. These verbs are generally intensive or iterative. NT examples are αἰρετίξω (αἰρέομαι, ῥητός) (Hipp. and inscr. Polybius does not use the verb, but its deriv. ῥτιστής = *partisan*), βαπτίξω (βάπτω, βαπτός), †βαντίξω (βαίνω, βαντός).

(i) The productivity of this suffix may be seen from the freedom with which new verbs were coined from prepositional phrases. This began in the class. period, e.g. σκορακίξω = ἐς κόρακας (βάλλω), but grew considerably in later Greek. In the NT we have ἀποστοματίξω (see § 115, *Vocab. s.v.*), but ἐπιστομίξω (see § 120, for form cf. ἐνοστομίξω in P Par 574²¹⁷⁴), both of classical origin, †ἀποκεφαλίξω (see §§ 108, 109), †ένωτίξομαι (§ 118), †έξουδενίξω (Lk 23¹¹ W, see § 119), which are all Hellen., κατακρημνίξω (see §§ 109, 121) first appears in Xen.

As an example of new formations in papp. cf. ἐπιβωμίζω PSI iv. 435^b (258 B.C.).

(j) A few root verbs end in -ίζω and may be given here:

ίζω (καθίζω) < *si-zd-ō or *sd-īo < *_/sed*, cf. ἕζομαι.

κτιίζω, cf. Skt. *kṛṣṭi*, *kṛṣṭyāti* (see Boisacq *s.v.*).

σχιίζω, cf. Skt. *chid-*, *chināti*, *chintē*, to cut, split, Lat. *scindo*, pf. *scidi* (see Boisacq *s.v.*).

τριίζω (Mk 9¹⁸ τρ. τ. ὀδ. to grind the teeth), a word found from Homer onwards for the utterance of any sharp sound, from I.E. *(s)trei-g- with *strei-d- in Lat. *stridēo*.

NOTE.—1. This suffix was freely used in coining words on the analogy of groups with similar meaning. Thus (a) ἴουδαίζω follows the well-known type of "imitatives," μηδίζω, λακωνίζω and even φιλιππίζω, to ape the Medes, to imitate the Spartan manners, to side with Philip, to which we may add ελληνίζω (> ἰστίης) to Hellenise, to speak Greek. (b) The suffix was commonly used for the celebration of a festival; thus σαββαίζω (LXX, Logion in P Oxy i. 1, ὁμός Heb 4⁹) follows the example of πανηγυρίζω (< παήγυρις). In this way may have arisen γαμίζω (on which see N. 2 below), after the type παννυχίζω. (c) The only other group that calls for mention here is that of verbs describing a sound, whether vocal or instrumental. In the NT καθαρίζω, σαλπίζω, τυμπανίζω, originated thus: see (c) above.

2. The meaning of a verb in -ίζω often depends on the context, as Rutherford observes (*NP* 179). Sometimes the instrumental force is obvious, as in βαβδίζω, or the factitive, as in γεμίζω, or the causative, as in ποτίζω; but the lists given above show with how many verbs such a ready decision is impossible. Consistency in verb formation was sometimes hindered by the previous appropriation of a suffix to another root. An instance of this occurs in 1 Co 14⁷, where αὐλέω and καθαρίζω are parallel. Here the verb expected, αὐλίζω, had been coined from the root αὐλή as early as Homer, with an entirely different meaning (see (a) and (d) above). An important point arises over the distinction of meaning between a verb in -ίζω and a cognate formation. Sometimes the primary distinction between intrans. and trans. is maintained, as in σωφρονέω and σωφρονίζω, πλουτέω and πλουτίζω. On the other hand, although καθέζομαι and κάθημαι were available for the intrans. sense, καθίζω is *intrans.* in more than 20 passages and causal in only 3, unless we add Jn 19¹³ as evidently interpreted by Justin M. (*Ap.* i. 35) and *Ev. Petr.* iii. 7. The compounds of καθίζω are all used intransitively (ἀνα- Lk¹ Ac¹, ἐπι- Mt¹, περι- Lk¹), with the exception of συν-, which is intrans. Lk 22⁵⁶ ἤΑΒ, but trans. Eph 2⁶. The meaning of γαμίζω in 1 Co 7³⁸ has an important bearing upon exegesis. The verb is not found outside the NT, and here only in the active. It has generally been assumed that γαμίζω must stand in causative relation to γαμέω, but apart from *exx.* given above, we have the pairs ὑπερέω : ὑπερίζω, κομέω : κομίζω, to remind us that this

distinction is not invariably observed. Lietzmann *HNT in loc.* cites $\chi\rho\omicron\nu\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega$, $\epsilon\lambda\pi\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega$, $\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega$, $\delta\beta\rho\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega$ as intrans. verbs with this suffix, and calls attention to the tendency in Hellenistic towards the intrans. use of trans. verbs (so Radermacher *Gr.*¹ 18 f. 222 f.). He follows Wendland in conjecturing that itacistic pronunciation, $\epsilon\acute{\gamma}\alpha\mu\eta\sigma\alpha = \epsilon\acute{\gamma}\acute{\alpha}\mu\iota\sigma\alpha$, may have led to the confusion. It is significant that in the only other passages where the word occurs, Mk 12²⁵ (and ||s), Lk 17²⁷, $\gamma\alpha\mu\acute{\iota}\zeta\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ means no more than $\gamma\alpha\mu\acute{\epsilon}\iota\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$.

3. -ύζω.

-ύζω § 174. This suffix was mostly used in onomatopœic formations, as $\gamma\omicron\gamma\gamma\acute{\upsilon}\zeta\omega$ (papp., Epict., Marcus, as well as LXX and NT; classed as Ion., not Att., by Phrynichus; see NP 463 and *Vocab. s.v.*), $\delta\lambda\omicron\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\zeta\omega$ (see *Vocab. s.v.*), $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\kappa\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\zeta\omega$ from $\kappa\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\delta\omega\upsilon$ (common in papp., *Vocab. s.v.*).

4. -έζω.

-έζω Ἄμφιέζω (see pp. 228, 294, and 405 above).
Καθέζομαι (from $\sqrt{*sed}$). Πιέζω (see above, p. 254 and *Vocab. s.v.*).

5. -όζω.

-όζω The primary verb $\delta\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega$ (cf. $\delta\delta\text{-}\mu\acute{\eta}$), and the denominative $\acute{\alpha}\rho\mu\acute{\omicron}\zeta\omega$ (cf. $\acute{\alpha}\rho\mu\acute{\omicron}\delta\text{-}\iota\omicron\varsigma$) the Hellen. spelling for Att. $\text{-}\tau\tau\omega$; see Lobeck *Phryn.* 241, and, for other reff., *Vocab. s.v.*

APPENDIX
SEMITISMS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

SYLLABUS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTORY	413
A. GENERAL STYLE AND STRUCTURE OF SENTENCES	416
1. Position of Verb in Sentence.	
2. Parallelism.	
3. Tautology.	
4. Parataxis.	
5. <i>Casus pendens</i> followed by Resumptive Pronoun.	
6. Constructions with <i>kai éyévero</i> .	
7. Co-ordination of Participle or Infinitive with Finite Verb.	
B. THE SEVERAL PARTS OF SPEECH	430
1. Pronouns. (a) Definite Article; (b) Personal Pronouns; (c) Reflexive; (d) Indefinite; (e) Relative; (f) Distributive Pronouns and Pronominal Adjectives.	
2. Numerals and Distributives.	
3. Adjectives and Adjectival Substitutes.	
4. Degrees of Comparison.	
5. Adverbs and Adverbial Locutions.	
6. Verbs: (i) Voice; (ii) Infinitive; (iii) Participle; (iv) Indicative.	
7. Nouns: Cases.	
8. Prepositions and Improper Prepositions.	
9. Conjunctions and Particles.	
C. MISTRANSLATION OF SEMITIC WORDS OR PHRASES	470
1. Mk 2 ⁴ 7 ²¹ , Mt 23 ²⁵ 28 ¹ , Lk 1 ³⁹ 2 ¹ 11 ⁴¹ . 47-8 12 ⁴⁶ . 49 24 ³² , Ac 2 ⁴⁷ 3 ¹⁶ 4 ²⁵ 11 ³⁸ .	
2. Jn 7 ³⁷⁻⁸ 8 ⁶⁴ , Rev 10 ¹ 13 ³ . 11 15 ⁵ . 6 2 ²² .	
D. GENERAL SUMMARY.	477
1. Classification of Semitisms.	
2. The Semitic Stamp in Translation Greek.	
3. Conditions under which the Gospel Tradition became fixed.	
4. The Several Books.	

SEMITISMS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

THE right of such an essay to a place in a volume dealing with Accidence and Word-formation is obviously open to challenge. It may be defended on two grounds. First, it will be highly convenient when such constructions call for treatment in the volume on Syntax to be able to refer to their systematic classification in the present context, and thus to save space where compression is most needed. Secondly, the student who has found multitudinous references to this subject scattered through every part of the *Prolegomena*, both in the main text and in numerous additional notes, and who has felt the inadequacy of the brief survey in the Introduction to this volume, will rightly expect a more detailed and methodical investigation at the earliest possible place in this Grammar. To the Editor there is the additional and sufficient reason that such was the design of Dr. Moulton himself.

Before entering upon this survey, however, it seems necessary to remind the reader that in some respects Dr. Moulton's attitude to the subject of Semitisms in the New Testament was slightly modified after the first edition of the *Prolegomena* appeared. His main concern was to support Deissmann in his contention that the New Testament was written in no Judæo-Greek jargon but in the *lingua franca* of the first century. He would have quoted, with some exegetical freedom, the saying of a second-century writer, "The Christians use no strange variety of dialect."¹ But while he maintained this thesis to the end, a comparative study of the successive editions of the *Prolegomena*, of the articles in *Cambridge Biblical Essays* and Peake's *Commentary on the Bible*, and of the Introduction to the present volume of the Grammar, will reveal a progressive tendency to do full justice to the influence of translation where Semitic originals may be posited with good reason. It must be remembered that Wellhausen's *Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien* only came into the author's hands when the proofs of *Prolegomena* were in an advanced stage.² But the cumulative evidence set forth in that book, supported by Syriac parallels to which his attention was drawn by Dr. Rendel

¹ *Ep. ad Diognetum*, 5²: οὐτε γὰρ που πόλις ἰδίᾳ κατοικοῦσιν οὐτε διαλέκτῳ τι πη παραλλαγμένη χρῶνται οὐτε βίον παράσημον ἀσκοῦσιν.

² See *Proleg.*¹ xii. f. Additional notes were inserted at once at pp. 4 n.³, 11 n.¹, 14 n.², 58 n.¹, 91, 94 n.¹, 97 also n.⁴, 139 n.¹, 163 n.², 213, 224, 226^b, 231, 233, 235, 236^b, 237, 240, 241 f. In the 2nd and 3rd editions further points were considered on pp. 244, 247, 249.

Harris, unquestionably restrained the ardour of the "grammatical anti-Semitism" with which Dr. Moulton has so often been charged.¹ Some years later, after reading *Studies in the Apocalypse*, he wrote with reference to the grammatical anomalies of the Book of Revelation, "Dr. R. H. Charles has recently shown how many of its mannerisms are due to a literal transference of Semitic idioms."² None the less Dr. Moulton insisted that many locutions which suggest Semitic idiom to the specialist in Hebrew or Aramaic fall within the range of late vernacular Greek, and he was careful to distinguish between pure Semitisms and those to which that title can only be given in a secondary sense.³ The importance of these "secondary Semitisms" is best seen when we "are seeking for evidences of Semitic birth in a writer whose Greek betrays deficient knowledge of the resources of the language." A subtler test than that of pure Semitisms is found "in the *over-use* of locutions which can be defended as good Κοινή Greek, but have their motive clearly in their coincidence with locutions of the writer's native tongue."⁴ This statement of the case satisfies two such able critics of "Deissmannism" as Professor G. C. Richards⁵ and the late Canon C. F. Burney.⁶

One further point must be mentioned, though obviously this Appendix is not the place for its full discussion. In an additional note to the second edition of *Prolegomena*,⁷ Dr. Moulton hinted at the possibility that Aramaic-speaking populations in Egypt may have infected the Κοινή of that country. In the preface to the third edition⁸ this matter was examined in reply to criticisms offered along this very line by Drs. Redpath, Swete and Nestle. Dr. Moulton's fullest answer, supported by the weighty authority of Dr. A. S. Hunt, is to be found in *Cambridge Biblical Essays*.⁹ Quite recently the argument has reappeared in two forms. Canon Burney¹⁰ has attempted to turn Deissmann's flank by quoting the word *μαγδαλοφύλαξ* from the very papyrus letter written by two pig merchants at Arsinoe which Deissmann had used as an example of the paratactic style of sources where no Semitic influence can be predicated. Now this word contains the same root as the Hebrew *מגדל*, and is unquestionably Semitic, as Drs. Grenfell and Hunt show in their notes

¹ Père Lagrange has phrased it happily: "Il n'en est pas moins vrai que lorsqu'un helléniste ouvre le NT, en particulier les évangiles, il se trouve transporté dans les tentes de Sem. L'exagération de quelques hellénistes a été, reconnaissant chaque objet comme déjà vu dans le domaine de Japhet, de prétendre qu'il en venait toujours" (*S. Luc*, p. xvi).

² Peake's *Commentary on the Bible*, 592 b (art. "The Language of the New Test.").

³ *Supra* 14-18. This should be borne in mind in qualifying two footnotes by Dr. Charles (*ICC Revelation*, i. pp. x, n.¹, cxliii, n.¹. *Vide supra*, 33 f.

⁴ *OBE* 474.

⁵ *JTS* xxi. 286.

⁶ *Aramaic Origin of Fourth Gospel*, 7.

P. 242.

⁷ Pp. xvi ff

Pp. 468 ff.

¹⁰ *Aram. Orig.* 5 f.

on the document.¹ But then so was Μαγδάλα, the name of a village in the Fayum. Yet the reader who ransacks the volume of papyri found at Magdola² will find as many Hebraisms there as he would find Gallicisms in a bundle of letters written by a farmer of Ashby-de-la-Zouch. It is in vocabulary that the Egyptian papyri show any such influence. Even here, as Schubart remarks,³ but few foreign loan-words are to be found. There are several Semitic and Persian terms, even fewer Latin words than we have in the Gospels, in spite of the large number of Romans and Italians living in Egypt, and, most remarkable of all, the native Egyptian languages have contributed practically nothing.⁴

The other form of the argument emphasises the ubiquity of the Semitic stock.

"Some dialect of the Semitic family was spoken in nearly all the eastern regions subdued by Greeks and Romans. . . . The mixing of languages in the different provinces at this time will tend to explain the peculiar terms and formulae found in Aramaic and Greek inscriptions and papyri dating from the Imperial age. Many of these linguistic idioms may still be properly called 'Semitisms,' though no longer found exclusively in the LXX and the NT. We may reject the notion of a 'Judaico-Greek' dialect, but the Greek received something of its prevalent form 'by its passage through the Semitic mind.' . . . The Greek papyri show how Semitic influence was perpetuated in Greek-speaking regions. Many 'Semitisms' silted through into the Κοινή, and became naturalised in the Greek vernacular."⁵

This appears to be an overstatement for which no adequate evidence has yet been adduced. If, however, it were to be fully substantiated, this would be a striking confirmation of Deissmann's claim that the Greek of the New Testament is essentially the spoken Κοινή of the world of

¹ P Fay 108^a.

² *Papyrus Grecs de Lille*, tome ii.

³ *Einführung in die Papyruskunde*, 188 f.

⁴ Thackeray dealt with this question, *Gr.* 20. See also Maysen *Gr.* i. 35-43. Later writers confirm the statements of Thumb *Hellen* 107-120.

⁵ J. Courtenay James, *The Language of Palestine*, 70 ff. Unfortunately this argument is confused by the introduction of NT Semitisms. On the main issue, however, Mr. James has not made his position clear. He appears to agree with Harnack and Moulton that some natural productions of the Κοινή more or less accidentally coincide with Semitic forms. Six examples are given. "But even in these instances the prominence and frequency of such words and phrases must be attributed to a nearer or more remote Semitic influence." Five other constructions equally attested are then given as neither natural developments of the Greek, nor accidental coincidences with Hebrew or Aramaic. "These and many other forms found in Greek inscrip. and papyri could scarcely have come into the Κοινή except through Semitic." A complete list of such forms, with accurate information as to date and provenance, would provide a valuable test for Mr. James's theory. Meanwhile, it is difficult to recognise any principle behind the classification observed in n.³ and n.⁴ on p. 72.

Hellenism. The only difference would be that whereas the one school finds this unity in the comparative absence of distinctive Semitisms, the new school would have to concede this identity by postulating Semitism as a widespread characteristic of popular Hellenistic. Fortunately we have not to choose between these alternative routes to the same goal. We have rather to inspect every trace of possible Semitic influence in the Greek of the New Testament in order to determine the degree of probability that any book has reached us through a Semitic medium, whether near or more remote.

The method of treatment will be as follows. As far as possible all passages will be tabulated which Semitic scholars have claimed as obvious or possible Semitisms. They will be classified under grammatical headings, the passages under each heading being arranged in four groups, distinguished by numbers in bold type thus: 1. the Synoptic Gospels and Acts, 2. the Johannine writings, 3. the Pauline Epistles, 4. the remaining Epistles. The distribution of these constructions throughout the New Testament can thus be seen at a glance. The distinction between Hebraism and Aramaism will be observed wherever it should be recorded, and separate notice will be taken of passages where a difficulty in the Greek might be resolved by reference to a hypothetic Semitic original. Evidence will be offered, where it is available, of parallel usage in literary Greek, or in the Κοινή. To this extent the Appendix may serve as a fairly comprehensive and critical survey of the present stage of the discussion. It is an attempt to assemble the data upon which students will form their own judgments.

A. GENERAL STYLE AND STRUCTURE OF SENTENCE.

1. POSITION OF THE VERB IN THE SENTENCE.

An important consideration urged by Wellhausen (*W*¹ 18 f., ²10 f.) is the Semitic order of words. He claims that in Mark, with few exceptions, the verb is followed by the subject. This argument has been seriously discounted by Lagrange (*S. Marc*, lxxxviii) on three grounds: (a) This order is Hebrew and Arabic rather than Aramaic and Assyrian (*e.g.* in Aram. portions of Daniel the verb more often follows than precedes the subject). (b) Whilst the verb does more often precede than follow the subject, if those instances are taken into account where, under the form of a participle, the subject really precedes, the balance is changed. A statistical examination of Mk 1-2 shows the subject after the verb 27 times, the subject before the verb 18, sentence beginning with participle 18. Moreover, in the Passion narrative the verb is far less often before the subject. (c) In Greek the verb is often enough put before the subject, with the same rule as in Semitic, of leaving it in the sing. when it has two subjects. However vaguely Semitic the order of words may be in Mark, it does not in this respect give the un-Greek impression of 1 Maccabees.

Strangely enough, Wellhausen, as we have already observed (p. 32 above), does not attribute the priority of the verb in the word order of the Fourth Gospel to Aramaism, but rather to general imitation of the Biblical style, an explanation, which, in Prof. Torrey's opinion, "has not the least plausibility" (*HTR* xvi. 323). Burney is silent upon the question.

Strong support comes from E. Norden, for the judgment of such a Hellenist as the author of *Die antike Kunstprosa* carries great weight. "Placing the verb first is, next to parallelism of clauses—the two are very often combined—the surest Semitism of the NT, especially in those instances in which this position comes in a series of clauses. That has struck me specially in Luke among the Synoptists, although in other respects he inclines more to the Hellenic side. But he shows a greater preference than the others for a flowing style of narrative, in which there was naturally more opportunity for this position of the verb" (*Agnostos Theos* 365). Lk 1⁷⁷ is cited as illustrating the Semitic style of narrative, both by the position of the verb, and by the linking of parallel clauses with *καί*. The second half of the Magnificat is given as an instance of the priority of the verb without the repetition of *καί*. Of course the Hebraic style of these first two chapters of Luke is undeniable. The initial place of the verb in the series of clauses (bound by the common relative pronoun *ὅς*) in the credal hymn of 1 Ti 3¹⁴ is declared to correspond with its Hebraic parallelism of thought (*ib.* 257). So also the distinctive position of the imperatives in the Lord's Prayer is compared with the style of Jewish prayers, as in Is 37¹⁷⁻²⁰, Sir 38¹⁻¹⁷.

But the subject calls for more exact treatment than this, and Thumb's section on "Wortstellung," appended to Brugmann's *Gr. Gr.* 658 ff., is a useful corrective. Thumb points out a distinction observed in MGr between the order of words in a principal sentence and in a subordinate clause, and thinks that in the *Kovῆ* this distinction was beginning to assert itself. "In dependent clauses without exception the verb follows immediately upon the introductory particle, or is separated from it only by the negative or the conjunctive pronoun, and practically without exception the verb follows upon an interrogative word and a relative" (*Handb.* 202). We have therefore to give special attention to the place of the verb in principal clauses. Here he rejects the rule for classical Greek given in K-G ii. 595: "the subject takes the first place, the predicate the last, and the object comes before the predicate." Delbrück, with more caution, says, "We have the general impression that the position is a matter of freedom" (*Grd.* v. (iii.) 65). Emphasis could, of course, be gained by putting any word out of its usual order. The fullest investigation so far is that by Kieckers (see above, 32 n.), who examines the place of the verb in principal clauses (excluding direct imperatives) in a selection of passages from several classical and Hellenistic prose authors. For this purpose he has taken 20 pages from Herodotus, Thucydides, Polybius, and the Chronicle of Theophanes, 20 also from Xenophon (10 from the *Anabasis* and 10 from the *Hellenica*). Five pages are also taken from each of the four Evangelists. The position of the verb is classified

according to its occurrence in the initial (I), middle (M), end (E) position. The results are :

	I	M	E
Herodotus	47	165	71
Thucydides	54	149	82
Xenophon, <i>Anab.</i>	34	95	45
<i>Hell.</i>	16	89	48
	—50	—184	—93
Polybius	22	127	29
Matthew	37	51	20
Mark	40	66	24
Luke	63	55	31
John	71	48	25
Theophanes	50	167	77

This high ratio of verbs in the initial position in the Gospels is largely due to the considerable number of verbs of saying, which in accordance with regular Greek usage stand at the beginning of their sentence. Kieckers proves (p. 64) by numerous examples how very common this is in the simple narrative of Herodotus. It is very rare in the more dignified style of Thucydides, where important political speeches are generally introduced with more elaborate phraseology. Brugmann (*KVG* 683) states that the initial position of the verb is usual throughout I.E. speech, at the beginning of a narrative, or in the carrying on of the narrative in a recital consisting of a series of clauses. This order in narrative is less common in Skt. and Gr. than in Germ. and Slav., but more common than in Lat. When all allowance has been made for these factors, the predominance of initial position in Luke and John is remarkable.

2. PARALLELISM.

The questions raised under this head can hardly be treated in a Grammar of NT Greek. A reference to the principal authorities must suffice. It has long been recognised that much of the teaching of Jesus falls into the poetical style of Hebrew poetry and Wisdom Literature. See C. A. Briggs' "The Wisdom of Jesus the Messiah" (*Exp T* viii. 393-398, 492-496, ix. 69-75). Burney (*JTS* xiv. 414 ff.) showed that the Parable of the Last Judgment if turned into Hebrew is a rhythmical structure which is largely lost when rendered into Aramaic. But in his posthumously published work, *The Poetry of our Lord*, an elaborate proof is

attempted that very much of the teaching, when translated into Aramaic, conforms to the various metres of the poetry of the OT. It is for Semitic scholars to say how far a valid argument can be built upon such data for the contention that Mt preserves the teaching of Jesus as given in Q better than Lk. Inasmuch as the teaching of Jesus, and the original record of it, is assumed throughout this Grammar to have been in Aramaic, and since the Semitic colouring of our Greek documents in these very parts is not in dispute, no more need be said. For the influence of the LXX upon Paul's most exalted passages, and for a study of parallelism in the Epistles, see J. Weiss *Festschrift f. B. Weiss*, P. Wendland *Die urchristlichen Literaturformen* 355 f., and the appendix on "Semitischer und hellenischer Satzparallelismus," in E. Norden *Agnostos Theos* 355 ff.

3. TAUTOLOGY.

A Semitic colouring is seen in the continual repetition of an idea by (a) a subordinate clause, or (b) a co-ordinate parallel sentence. Thus :

(a) Mk 7¹² (cf. Mt 15⁶), Mk 12²³ (cf. Mt 22²³), Mk 13¹⁰ (cf. Mt 24²¹).

(b) Mt 2¹⁹ (cf. Mt 9¹⁵), Mk 4³⁰ (D ἐν ποίᾳ παραβολῇ παραβάλωμεν)
(cf. Mt 13³¹, Lk 13¹⁸), Mk 11²⁶ (=Mt 21²²=Lk 20²),
Mk 12¹⁴ (cf. Mt 22¹⁷, Lk 20²²).

Archdeacon Allen, who gives a much fuller list (*Exp T* xiii. 329), shows that in all these examples Mt has pruned some of the redundancy. The faithful rendering of the Aramaic teaching of Jesus is responsible for many "symmetrical tautologies" in non-Marcan sources (*W*¹ 18), e.g. Mt 6⁶, Mt 6³⁴ (=Lk 16¹³), Mt 7²² (=Lk 6⁴¹), Mt 7²¹ (=Lk 11³²), Mt 7¹², Mt 11¹² (toned down in Lk 16¹⁰). There is, of course, no violence to Greek idiom in these instances.

A special form of tautology is that accompanying the adverbial use of the relative pronoun (which is often attracted into another case) :

1. Mt 27⁹ τὴν τιμὴν τοῦ τετιμημένου δὲ ἐτιμήσαντο ἀπὸ οὐδὲν Ἰσραήλ.
Not from LXX of Zech 11¹²; probably from Testimonies.

See J. R. Harris, *Testimonies*, i. 58 f. Also McNeile, Lagrange, Allen *in loc.*

2. Jn 17²⁶ ἡ ἀγάπη ἣν ἠγάπησάς με.

3. 1 Th 3⁹ ἐπὶ πάσῃ τῇ χαρᾷ ἣ χαίρομεν.

1 Co 7²⁰ ἕκαστος ἐν τῇ κλήσει ἣ ἐκλήθη ἐν ταύτῃ μετέτω.

Eph 1⁶ χάριτος ἣς ἐχαρίτωσεν, 1¹⁰ ἐνέργειαν ἣν ἐνήργηκεν (cf. 3²⁰, Col 1²⁹), 2⁴ ἀγάπην ἣν ἠγάπησεν, 4¹ κλήσεως ἣς ἐκλήθητε.

(Eph 3⁹ 4⁴, 2 Ti 1⁹ illustrate a different tautology.)

Dr. J. Rendel Harris, who called attention to this characteristic of Eph. (letter to J. H. M., Dec. 28, 1913), also suggests that some of these "Aramaisms" have been corrected, and that 1⁶ τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς χάριτος ἣς ἐπερίσσευσεν, had ὁ for ἣς, 1¹⁰ εὐδοκίαν ἣν προέθετο was originally πρόθεσιν ἣν προέθετο, 3¹¹ κατὰ πρόθεσιν . . . ἣν ἐποίησεν was ἣν προέθετο (the pleonasm having been resolved in two different ways).

He further urges large elements of Aramaism in 2 Peter.

4. 2 Pet 3³ ἐμπαιγμονῇ ἐμπαίκεται, 2¹³ ἀδικούμενοι μισθὸν ἀδικίας, 2¹³ ἠδόνην ἠγούμενοι τὴν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τρυφῆν (regarding the almost meaningless ἠγούμενοι as a substitute for the pleonastic ἠδόμενοι). "The whole sentence is pleonastic and Aramaic."¹ P. Wendland also (*Die urchristl. Literaturformen*, 369 n.²) observes that 2 Pet 2¹³ 3³ give an impression of Semitism not found in the parallels in Jude.

In view, however, of Epict. i. 29. 49, ταῦτα μέλλεις μαρτυρεῖν καὶ κατασχύνειν τὴν κλήσιν ἣν κέκληκεν (ὁ θεός) . . . ; it seems needless to label this idiom Semitic.

4. PARATAXIS.

Under this heading we must bring :—

(a) Co-ordination of clauses with the simple καί, instead of the use of participles or subordinate clauses.—This is far more common in Mk than in either Mt or Lk. As a characteristic of John, see Burney *Aram. Orig.* 56.

Wellhausen (*W*¹ 21, *25), who regards B as more reliable than D for particles, shows that δέ has often been substituted for Mk's καί by the other evangelists or by copyists in all Gospels. He further claims that there is evidence in the MSS of resolved, or imperfectly resolved, parataxis in a number of passages, e.g. D retains parataxis Mk 3³¹ (ἤκουσαν καὶ ἐξῆλθον), similarly 4³⁴ 8¹⁰ 10²². Also Lk 22³² σὺ δὲ ἐπίστρεψον καὶ στήρισον. In Mk 6⁷⁻¹² B retains parataxis where D has participle. D sometimes links a participle and a finite verb with καί. E.g. Mt 26¹⁴ πορευθεὶς . . . καὶ εἶπεν, Lk 9⁶ ἐξερχόμενοι . . . καὶ ἤρχοντο. There are many such instances in the D text of Mark, but, as Lagrange has shown (*S. Marc.* p. lix), these are cases (Mk 5²⁷ 7³⁵ 11³ 14¹⁻²³) where καί has been inserted to correspond with the number of Latin words in *d* (16¹⁴ *d* is missing).

For bearing of this upon general question, see *Proleg.* 12.

Milligan (*Vocab. s.v. καί*) thinks it "impossible to deny that the use of καί in the LXX for the Heb. ׀ influenced the Johannine usage." Lagrange, in view of the slight trace of LXX influence on Jn, suggests Aramaic for Heb. For the hypotactic force of καί from Aristotle to MGr, see Thumb *Hellen.* 129, and for examples of some of the following usages, Thumb *Handb.* 184.

(b) The co-ordinate use of subjunctive after (a) an imperative, or (β) θέλειν.

E.g. (a) Mk 1⁴⁴ ὅρα μηδενὶ εἶπης (but see *Vocab.* 455 b).

Mt 7⁴ ἄφες ἐκβάλλω (but see *Prol.* 175. Common in Epict., e.g. i. 9. 15, ἄφες δείξωμεν αὐτοῖς; ii. 18. 24, ἄφες ἴδω τίς εἶ).

¹ In the absence of any textual warrant one must resist the tempting suggestion to read 2 Pet 2¹² ἐν φθορᾷ φθαρήσονται.

(β) Mk 10³⁶ τί θέλετέ με ποιήσω ὑμῖν (⌘B, numerous v.l.), Mk 10⁵¹ (=Mt 20³²=Lk 18⁴¹), Mk 14¹² (=Mt 26¹⁷=Lk 22⁹), Mk 15¹² (ADΘ), Lk 9⁵⁴, Mt 13²⁸.

Plummer *ICC Luke*, p. 264, who notes that ἵνα is not inserted when the first verb is in the second person, and the second verb in the first person, cft. Soph. *OT* 650. In class. Gr. common with βούλομαι, which is largely replaced by θέλω in NT. Cf. Plato *Gorg.* 521 d, βούλει σοι εἶπω; Xen. *Memor.* II. i. 1, βούλει σκοπῶμεν; 10, βούλει σκεψώμεθα; cf. Lat. *vis maneamus?* See *Prol.* 185. Cf. BGU i. 38 (ii/iii A.D.) τί θέλεις ἀπενέγκω αὐτῷ.

There is therefore nothing Semitic in Jn 18³⁹ βούλεσθε οὖν ἀπολύσω ὑμῖν τ. βασ. τ. Ἰουδαίων;

(c) **The conditional parataxis of the imperative.**—Wellhausen discovers a Semitic locution when two imperatives linked by καί represent the protasis and apodosis of an implied condition (*W*¹ 25).

1. *E.g.* Mk 8³⁴ (=Mt 16²⁴=Lk 9²³) ἀπαρνησάσθω ἑαυτὸν καὶ ἀράτω τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀκολουθείτω μοι (=then he will be my disciple), Lk 7⁷ εἰπέ λόγῳ, καὶ ἰαθήτω ὁ παῖς μου (=Mt 8⁸ . . . καὶ ἰαθήσεται). A less striking example is the imperatival protasis followed by καὶ and the future; *e.g.* Mt 7⁷ (=Lk 11⁹), Lk 10²⁸ τοῦτο ποιεῖ καὶ ζήση. Wellhausen adds Mt 12³³ with the remark, "The καὶ introduces the apodosis, and after this the nominative would have been used more fittingly—καὶ ὁ καρπὸς αὐτοῦ καλός. He recognises, however (*W*² 13), that this idiom, "*Divide et impera*," "Give a dog a bad name and hang him,"¹ is found in all languages. It is certainly good Greek, as in Soph. *El.* 1207, πιθοῦ λέγοντι, κοῦχ ἀμαρτήσσει ποσέ. For other exx. see K-G ii. 248. [MGr.—R. McK.]

Burney describes this as less characteristic of Aram. than of Hebr., "except where the sequence is clearly to be regarded as the result of the preceding imperative." For examples in Hebr. and Aram., see *Aram. Orig.* 95. He cites:

2. Jn 1³⁰ ἔρχεσθε καὶ ὄψεσθε. 16²⁴ αἰτεῖτε καὶ λήψεσθε. Elsewhere we find—

Rev 4¹ ἀνάβα ὧδε, καὶ δείξω σοι.

4. Jas 4⁷. s. 10.

(d) **The temporal use of καὶ in parataxis.**—(*W*¹. 20. In *13 recognised as quite good Greek.)

1. *E.g.* Mk 15²² ἦν δὲ ὥρα τρίτη καὶ ἐσταύρωσαν αὐτόν.

Lk 23⁴⁴ καὶ ἦν ἡδὴ ὥσει ὥρα ἕκτη καὶ σκότος ἐγένετο.

19⁴³ ὅτι ἤξουσιν ἡμέραι ἐπὶ σέ καὶ περικυκλώσουσιν σε.

Mt 26⁴⁵ ἰδοὺ ἤγγικεν ἡ ὥρα καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδοται.

¹ We might add "*Wait and see*" (=ἐὰν μείνητε, ὄψεσθε) in its historic use in the British House of Commons.

On this see *Proleg.* 12 n.³. Thumb, in Brugmann *Gr.*⁴ 640, cft. Xen. *Anab.* II. i. 7: καὶ ἤδη τε ἦν περὶ πλήθουσιν ἀγορὰν καὶ ἔρχονται . . . κήρυκες, and deprecates the suggestion of Hebraism. Bauer (*Lex.* 611) gives several ref. to classical authors. [Common in MGr.—R. McK.]

We may add an interesting example from Tob 1³⁸ (on which see D. C. Simpson *OA* i. 181, 203): ὅτι ὄρφανόν καταλείπεν με ὁ πατήρ καὶ ἀπέθανεν ("Because my father left me an orphan when he died").

Other possible instances in the NT are:

2. Jn 2¹³ 4³⁵ 7³².

4. Heb 8⁸ (LXX).

(e) The consecutive use of καὶ in parataxis (closely related to (c) and (f)). (See Lagrange *S. Matthieu* p. xo f., *S. Jean* p. cvii, Burney *Aram. Orig.* 68. For *Waw apodosis*, see Ges.-K., § 143 (d), Kautzsch *Aram. Gr.* § 69. 1, Marti *K.Gr.* 105 f.)

1. Mt 6⁴ καὶ ὁ πατήρ σου . . . ἀποδώσει σοι.

8²¹ ἐπίτρεψόν μοι ἀπελθεῖν καὶ θάψαι (contr. Lk 9⁵⁷ ἀπελθόντι θάψαι).

Lk 2²¹ καὶ ὅτε ἐπλήσθησαν ἡμέραι . . . καὶ ἐκλήθη τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦς.

2. Jn 5¹⁰ 6⁵⁷ 11⁴⁸ 14¹⁶. Lagrange cft. Plato *Phaed.* 59e, καὶ ἤκομεν καὶ ἡμῖν ἐξελθὼν ὁ θύρωρος εἶπε.

The clearest instances are in the Apocalypse. See Charles *ICC* i. 101, 265, ii. 16.

Rev 3²⁰ & 046. ἐάν τις ἀκούσῃ τῆς φωνῆς μου . . . καὶ ἐλεύσομαι πρὸς αὐτόν. . . .

10⁷ ὅταν μελλῇ σαλπίζειν, καὶ ἐτελέσθη τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ θεοῦ. . . .

14⁹. 10 εἴ τις προσκυνεῖ τὸ θηρίον . . . καὶ αὐτὸς πίεται ἐκ τοῦ οἴνου. . . .

3. Phil 1²³ εἰ δὲ τὸ ζῆν ἐν σαρκὶ τοῦτό μοι καρπὸς ἔργου, καὶ τί αἰρήσομαι; οὐ γνωρίζω. (But if . . . , then what shall I choose?)

Radermacher (*Gr.*³ 223) accepts this reading and punctuation, but counts it vernacular rather than translation Greek. [MGr.—R. McK.]

(f) Interrogative parataxis, where καὶ introduces (α) a temporal apodosis (*W*¹ 20, ²13), closely related to (e); or (β) a paradox (Burney *Aram. Orig.* 67).

(α)

1. E.g. Mt 18²¹ ποσάκις ἀμαρτήσῃ . . . ὁ ἀδελφός μου καὶ ἀφήσω αὐτῷ; 26³⁵ . . . ὅτι οὐ δύναμαι παρακαλέσαι τὸν πατέρα μου καὶ παραστήσει μοι . . . ;

Lk 14⁴ τίνας ὑμῶν υἱὸς ἢ βοῦς εἰς φρέαρ πεσεῖται καὶ οὐκ εὐθέως ἀνασπάσει αὐτόν . . . ;

24²⁶ οὐχὶ ταῦτα ἔδει παθεῖν τ. χριστόν καὶ εἰσελθεῖν . . . ;

3. Rom 11³⁵ (LXX).

(β)

2. Jn 2²⁰ τεσσαράκοντα καὶ ἐξ ἔτεσιν οἰκοδομήθη ὁ ναὸς οὗτος, καὶ σὺ ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις ἐγερεῖς αὐτόν; So 3¹⁰ 8⁵⁷ 9²⁴ 11⁶.

Lagrange adds 12³⁴ ἡμεῖς ἠκούσαμεν ἐκ τοῦ νόμου . . . καὶ πῶς λέγεις σὺ . . . ; with the comment that this interrogative phrase beginning with καί, "and yet" (often ironical), was quite good Greek. Cf. Eur. *Medea* 1398, κἀπειρ' ἔκτας; [MGr.—R. McK.]

For καί adversative see below, under *Conjunctions* (p. 469).

(g) Circumstantial clauses introduced by καί. (See *W*¹ 19, *Ev. Marci* 36, *Ev. Lucae* 110. Ges-K § 156). [Common in MGr.—R. McK.]

1. Mk 1¹⁹ καὶ προβάς ὀλίγον εἶδεν Ἰάκωβον . . . καὶ Ἰωάννην τ. ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ, καὶ αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ καταρτίζοντας τὰ δίκτυα.

4²⁷ καὶ καθέυθη καὶ ἐγείρηται νύκτα καὶ ἡμέραν, καὶ ὁ σπόρος βλαστᾷ καὶ μηκύνηται.

Lk 19⁴⁴ καὶ ἐδαφιοῦσίν σε καὶ τὰ τέκνα σου ἐν σοί (i.e. the enemy will beleaguer the city while her children are in her—not only the regular population, but all Jews from far and near who have fled to the metropolis). But Torrey (*C. H. Toy Studies*, p. 283 n.) shows from Nah 3¹⁰, Hos 10¹⁴ 14¹, that these words are the object of the verb, not a circumstantial clause.

Charles (*ICC* i. p. cxlviii; ii. 120, 417, 431) thus explains καί (= seeing that) in three passages in the Apocalypse:

2. Rev 12¹¹ καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐνίκησαν αὐτὸν διὰ τὸ αἷμα τοῦ ἀρνίου.

18⁹ καὶ οἱ βασιλεῖς τῆς γῆς μετ' αὐτῆς ἐπόρνευσαν.

19³ Ἀλληλούϊα· καὶ ὁ καπνὸς αὐτῆς ἀναβαίνει εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων.

(h) On καὶ εὐθύς in Mark (=οὖν in John)=*Waw Consecutive*, see Burkitt *Ev. da-Mepharreshe*, ii. 89, Burney *Aram. Orig.* 68 n.

On parataxis as a test of Semitism, see also E. Norden *Agnostos Theos* 367, with Deissmann's reply *LAE*² 132 n. Radermacher (*Gr.*² 218) cites many parallels from later Greek writers, and concludes that this was a feature common to the popular speech in Hebrew and Greek.

5. CASUS PENDENS, FOLLOWED BY RESUMPTIVE PRONOUN.

This is not to be confused with the construction in which the subject of an interrogative sentence is put first for emphasis or clearness, e.g. Mk 11³⁰ τὸ βάπτισμα τὸ Ἰωάνου ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ἦν ἢ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων;

The *casus pendens* is generally, but not always, the nominative; the resumptive pronoun may be in any case. This usage is specially frequent with participial clauses. Here, again, D seems to preserve the construction in several passages where most MSS have smoothed away the irregularity.

1. Two OT citations can be illustrated from the Hebrew original:

Mk 12¹⁰ (=Mt 21⁴²=Lk 20¹⁷) λίθον ὃν ἀπεδοκίμασαν οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες, οὗτος ἐγενήθη εἰς κεφαλὴν γωνίας. (Cited from Ps 117(118)²².)

ⲙⲁⲗⲁ ⲉⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ

Here the Greek syntax is obviously unaffected by the Hebrew. It is

suspects a similar correction of an original *nominativus pendens* in the gen. abs. of Mt 13¹⁹).

The Hebrew construction (see Ges-K § 116 *w*) may be illustrated by 1 Sam 2¹³ הַכֹּהֵן הָעָרַב אֶת־בְּרִיתֵי שָׂאֵל־לֶבַד, which, rendered quite literally into Greek, would be *pās thūōn thūsian, ἤρχετο ὁ παῖς τοῦ ἱερέως*. (The LXX, with a different verse division, reads *καὶ τὸ δικάϊωμα τοῦ ἱερέως παρὰ τοῦ λαοῦ παντὸς τοῦ θύοντος, καὶ ἤρχετο τὸ παιδάριον τοῦ ἱερέως . . .*). In 1 Sam 3¹¹ the same construction is rendered by gen. abs. in LXX.

Closely akin to this is

Sir 31²¹ *θυσιάζων ἐξ ἀδίκου, προσφορά μεμωκημένη, καὶ οὐκ εἰς εὐδοκίαν μωκήματα ἀνόμων.*

(RV 34¹⁸ He that sacrificeth of a thing wrongfully gotten, his offering is made in mockery,

And the mockeries of wicked men are not well-pleasing.)

Box and Oesterley (*O.A.* i. 435) supply an original *חֲבַח מַעֲלָה מִנְחָה*, pointing *מַעֲלָה מִנְחָה*, where the Greek translator read *מַעֲלָה מִנְחָה*, and rendering "The sacrifice of the unrighteous man is a mocking offering."

The *casus pendens*, followed by resumptive pronoun, is said by Radermacher (*Gr.*³ 21 f.) to appear quite early in Greek literature and to be common in the later language. His examples from Hom. *Od.* xii. 73 and Xen. *Cyrop.* i. vi. 18 are not parallel, but the Silco inscr. (*OGIS* 201¹⁹⁴) is near enough: *οἱ δεσπόται τῶν ἄλλων ἐθνῶν οὐκ ἀφ᾽ αὐτοὺς καθεσθῆναι εἰς τὴν σκιάν*. Quite a crop of instances has been gathered from Aelian *De Nat. Anim.* e.g. i. 48, *ὁ κόραξ, ὄρνιν αὐτόν φασιν ἱερόν*. Cf. i. 19. 55, ii. 51.

For other instances see K-G i. 47. 660. (The two cited by Mr. G. R. Driver, Lucian, *Dial. Mort.* xii. 5, Epict. *Ench.* 42, are not parallel.) A good papyrus example is BGU ii. 385⁷ (ii/iii A.D.) *καὶ ὁ ἐνυγὼν (i.e. ἐνεγκῶν) σοι τὴν ἐπιστολήν, δὸς αὐτῷ ἄλλην*. See also Thumb *Hellen.* 131, and, for survival in MGr, *Handb.* 32. [Dr. McKinlay shows that the idiom is so thoroughly vernacular that, out of 27 instances cited by Burney in Jn, Pallis retains 25 in his *Romaiic Gospels*. There is no parallel in MGr to the *nom. pend.* with part., but the constr. was common in Med. Gr.]

6. CONSTRUCTIONS WITH καὶ ἐγένετο.

These are (a) *καὶ ἐγένετο ἦλθε*, (b) *καὶ ἐγένετο καὶ ἦλθε*, (c) *ἐγένετο ἄλθειν*. See *Proleg.*³ 15 ff. for detailed treatment.

Thackeray (*Gr.* 50 ff.) shows that with a single exception LXX uses (a) and (b) only. His statistical table proves that (b) predominates in LXX as does its equivalent in Hebr., but this predominance is accounted for by the slavish imitation of the Hebr. in the later historical books. The first two books of the Pentateuch and the prophetic books prefer (a). Both (a) and (b) seem to have been "experiments of the translators, which must be classed as Hebraisms," but the asyndetic form (a) "was

rather more in the spirit of the later language, which preferred to say, e.g., 'It happened last week I was on a journey,' rather than 'It was a week ago and I was journeying.' We notice further that while the translator of 1 Mac uses (a) three times and (b) five times, the free Greek of 2-4 Mac avoids both and retains the classical *συνέβη* c. infin. (as in Gen 41¹⁸. 42²⁸).

The following tables (based partly upon the references supplied in Hawkins *HS* 37) will illustrate what has been written in *Proleg.* about the distribution of these constructions in the Gospels and Acts.

(a) καὶ ἐγένετο (†ἐγένετο δὲ) ἦλθε.

Temporal Clause.

	ἐν τῷ c. infin.	ὡς c. aor. ind.	ὄτε c. aor. ind.	Other Time Determination.
Mark . . .	4 ⁴	1 ⁰
Matthew	7 ²⁸ 11 ¹ 13 ⁵³ 19 ¹ 26 ¹	..
Luke . . .	1 ^{4†} 2 ^{6†} 9 ¹⁸⁻²² 11 ^{1-27†} 17 ¹⁴ 18 ^{24†} 24 ³⁰⁻³¹	1 ²⁸⁻⁴¹ 2 ¹⁶ 19 ²⁰	..	1 ⁵⁰ 21-† 4 ⁶ 7 ¹¹ 9 ^{28-†} 27 [†] 11 ^{14†} 20 ¹
Acts	[4 ⁵ D] ¹

(b) καὶ ἐγένετο (†ἐγένετο δὲ) καὶ ἦλθε.

Temporal Clause.

	ἐν τῷ c. inf.	ὡς c. aor. ind.	ὄτε c. aor. ind.	Other Time Determination.
Mark
Matthew	9 ¹⁰
Luke . . .	5 ^{1-†} 1 ² 9 ^{51†} 14 ¹ 17 ¹¹ 19 ¹⁵ 24 ⁴⁻¹⁵	5 ¹⁷ 8 ^{1-22-†}
Acts . . .	[2 ¹ D] ¹	[? 5 ^{7†}] ¹

¹ See *Proleg.* 16 n.² 70. 233.

(c) ἐγένετο δὲ (*καὶ ἐγένετο) ἔλθειν.

Temporal Clause.

	ἐν τῷ c. inf.	ὡς c. ind.	ὄτε c. ind.	Other Time Determination.
Mark . .	—	2 ^{22*} [2 ¹⁵ γίνεσθαι without temp. cl.]
Matthew
Luke . .	3 ²¹	3 ²¹ (gen. abs.) 6 ^{1. 6. 12} 16 ²² (without temp. cl.)
Acts . .	9 ⁹ 19 ¹	4 ⁵ 9 ^{22. 27. 42} 11 ²⁶ 14 ¹ 16 ¹⁶ [21 ^{1. 5}] 22 ^{6. 17} 27 ^{4*} (καὶ οὕτως ἐγ. without temp. cl.) 28 ⁸ (without temp. cl.) ¹⁷ .

These constructions are thus distinctively Lucan, with a marked contrast between the Third Gospel and Acts, which becomes still more striking when we observe that in the latter Luke not only uses (c) almost entirely to the exclusion of (a) and (b), but also avoids the more Hebraic form of the time clause. Twice the familiar ἐν τῷ c. inf. occurs (once in the Palestinian narrative, once in the later story), four times a prepositional phrase indicates the time, four times a participial construction is used, twice an accus. of time duration modifies the infin., and twice there is no temp. clause at all. In other ways the construction tends to depart from the Hebraic pattern. In 9⁹ the formula is changed to ἐν δὲ τῷ πορεύεσθαι ἐγένετο: it is hardly recognisable in 21¹ ὡς δὲ ἐγένετο ἀναχθῆναι ἡμᾶς . . . ἦλθομεν, or in 21⁵ ὄτε δὲ ἐγένετο ἐξαρτίσαι ἡμᾶς τὰς ἡμέρας . . ., still less in 10²⁵ ὡς δὲ ἐγένετο τοῦ εἰσελθεῖν τὸν Πέτρον (with which Plummer *ICC Luke*, p. 45, after J. R. Lumby, *oft. Acta Barn.* 7, ὡς δὲ ἐγένετο τοῦ τελέσαι αὐτοὺς διδάσκοντας).

The classical word συμβαίνω is used for γίνομαι in this sense once in Acts, possibly because γίνομαι has already appeared in the sentence: Ac 21²⁶ ὄτε δὲ ἐγένετο ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀναβαθμοὺς, συνέβη βασιτάζεσθαι αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τῶν στρατιωτῶν. This is good vernacular Greek also, as we see from Tob 3⁷ καὶ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ταύτῃ συνέβη Σάρρα . . . καὶ αὐτὴν ἀκούσαι ὀνειδισμούς. . . The equivalence of the two verbs in this sense in the Koινή can be illustrated from papyri. Thus P Par 49²⁹ (ii/B.C.) παρακαλέσας αὐτὸν ἀποστείλον πρὸς ἐμέ, γίνεσθαι γὰρ ἐντραπήναι, where Witkowiaki (*Ep. Priv.* 71) remarks, "γίνεσθαι c. inf. = συμβαίνει c. inf.

Cf. Atticum *ἔστιν* c. int. ut Plat. *Rep.* i. 331c . . . et *ἔστιν ὥστε* 'fieri potest, ut; fortasse' Sophocl." See *Vocab.* 126a for pap. exx. of *ἐὰν γένηται* c. inf. = 'if it should happen that' and *σοὶ γίνονται* c. inf. With these may be compared P Petr ii. 13(19)¹⁰ (iii/B.C.) as corrected by Wilamowitz (=Witkowski² p. 19) *ἔσται καὶ Θεόδωρον καταλειφθέντα ταῦτό ποιεῖν*. Thackeray also calls attention to *γίνεται εὔρειν* = 'it is possible to find' in Theognis, and Xenophon's use of *ἐγένετο ὥστε* or *ὡς* = 'it happened that.'

Dr. G. G. Findlay (letter to J. H. M., December '09) remarks: "The instances of *ἐγένετο* (*δέ*) with infin. in the non-Palestinian parts of Ac seem worth considering separately, as evidence that the usage was not mere Hebraism. It is curious there is no non-Biblical ex. Ac 20¹⁸ seems decisive evidence of the native (or thoroughly naturalised) stamp of the idiom."

[(a) Common in MGr (with *συνέβη, συνέβηκε*), see Pallis's *Romaiic Gospels*.

(b) Found occasionally in MGr dialects.—R. McK.]

7. CO-ORDINATION OF THE PARTICIPLE OR INFINITIVE WITH THE FINITE VERB.

(In addition to authorities cited below, see full treatment by Burney *JTS* xxii. 371-6.)

Driver *Hebrew Tenses* § 117, "It is a common custom with Hebrew writers, after employing a participle or infinitive, to *change the construction*, and, if they wish to subjoin other verbs which logically should be in the partop. or infin. as well, to pass to the use of the finite verb. Thus Gen 27²⁸ *אֲנִי הָיִיתִי בְּעֵינָיו, ὁ θηρεύσας θήραν καὶ εἰσενέγκας* (lit. *ὁ θηρεύσας θήραν καὶ εἰσήνεγκε*)."¹ The bearing of this upon the grammar of the Apocalypse was first shown by Archdeacon Charles (*Studies in Apoc.* 89 ff., *ICC Revelation* i. pp. cxliv ff.), but Burney (*Aram. Orig.* 96) extends the usage to cover two examples in the Fourth Gospel, and quotes Dn 4²⁸ to show that the construction is found in Aramaic also.

On the other hand Holden, in his note on Xen. *Cyrop.* II. iii. 8, cites 9 passages from the *Cyrop.* in which there is a transition from the participial construction to that of the *verbum finitum*. (The other eight are I. iii. 5, II. iii. 17, 21, III. iii. 9, IV. ii. 10, V. iii. 30, IV. 29, VIII. ii. 24). Cf. also Shilleto on Thuc. I. 57, 58, "The return from the subordinate to the primary construction in Greek is too well known to require more than a passing illustration. . . . IV. 100, *ἄλλω τε τρόπῳ πειράσαντες καὶ μηχανὴν προσήγαγον* (inst. of *προσαγαγόντες*). Plat. *Theæt.* 144c, *ἀνδρὸς . . . καὶ ἄλλως εὐδοκίμου καὶ . . . κατέλιπεν* (inst. of *καταλιπόντος* or *ὅτι κατέλιπεν*). Examples of this sort might be multiplied to any

¹ Dr. R. H. Charles *ICC Rev.* i. p. cxlv, wrongly refers to this for a literal translation in LXX. Even the reading of A *εἰσήνεγκας* does not secure that.

amount." For numerous examples see K-G ii. 100.¹ For later Greek see Jannaris *Gr.* § 2168b.

N.B.—In all these citations the participle is used for the *verbum finitum*, and in the great majority it is in the nominative.

The NT occurrences are :

(a) Participle.

1. None.

2. Jn 1³³ *τεθίαμαι τὸ πνεῦμα καταβαῖνον . . . καὶ ἔμεινεν ἐπ' αὐτόν.*

5⁴⁴ *πὼς δύνασθε ὑμεῖς πιστεῦσαι, δόξαν παρ' ἀλλήλων λαμβάνοντες, καὶ τὴν δόξαν τὴν παρὰ τοῦ μόνου θεοῦ οὐ ζητεῖτε (ἢ ζητοῦντες);*

2 Jn 2 *διὰ τὴν ἀλήθειαν τὴν μένουσαν ἐν ἡμῖν, καὶ μεθ' ἡμῶν ἔσται.*

Rev 15⁶ *τῷ ἀγαπῶντι ἡμᾶς καὶ λύσαντι ἡμᾶς . . . καὶ ἐποίησεν ἡμᾶς βασιλείαν.*

1¹⁸ 2². 9. 30. 23 3⁹ 7¹⁴ 14²⁻³ 15². [Charles (*ICC* i. p. 15) adds 20⁴, treating οἴτινες as an editorial gloss.]

3. Col 1²⁶ *τὸ μυστήριον τὸ ἀποκεκρυμμένον ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν γενεῶν, νῦν δὲ ἐφανερώθη.*

Of these examples R. H. Charles rejects Jn 1³³ in agreement with Abbott *JG* 335 ("the meaning is 'it abode once for all,' i.e. aor. ind. in contrast with pres. ptp.). J. H. Moulton disallows Col 1²⁶, accepting the punctuation in WH, and Burney dismisses Rev 15⁶ 20⁴ on the ground that the Hebrew construction requires that the finite verb should express the proper sequence of the ptp., and not describe an event actually prior in time to its antecedent.

The extreme frequency of this construction in Rev marks it as a Hebraism there. Moreover, Dr. Charles has strengthened his case by giving instances in which the ptp. is in an oblique case.

4. Heb 8¹⁰ 10¹⁸ (both LXX) are not pressed, for reasons given by Charles *Studies in Apoc.* 90 n.¹

(It is quite possible that a similar Aramaic construction lies behind the awkward Greek in Lk 10⁹ *καὶ εἰς ἣν ἂν πόλιν εἰσέρχησθε καὶ δέχωνται ὑμᾶς, ἐσθίετε. . .* R. H. Charles observes the loose construction in 1 Co 7¹⁸ *γυνὴ ἥτις ἔχει ἄνδρα ἄπιστον καὶ οὗτος συνευδοκεῖ (=καὶ συνευδοκοῦντα)* and suggests an idiomatic Hebrew background. But this could be paralleled in class. Gr. from Homer downwards, e.g. *Od.* ii. 114. See Monro *Hom. Gr.* 247, K-G ii. 432 f.)

Two papyrus examples may be given. BGU iii. 846¹⁴ (ii/A.D.) "Ἔκουσα παρὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ μου τὸν εὐρόντα σοι ἐν τῷ Ἀρσαιοσίῳ καὶ ἀκαίρως πάντα σοι διήγηται. P Ryl ii. 153⁴⁰ (A.D. 138-161) "If anything happen to my son being childless and intestate," ἢ καὶ τέκνα μὲν εἶχοντι ἐπιμεταλ(λ)άξῃ δὲ καὶ τὰ τέκνα "or if he has children, in the case of the decease of those children . . ." [Pallis renders Lk 10⁹ literally.—R. McK.]

¹ The construction illustrated by these examples from class. Greek is not close enough to that found repeatedly in Rev to discount Hebraism in the instances cited below.

(b) Infinitive.

The solitary instance of the resolution of the infinitive into a finite verb in the following clause is claimed by Charles for

2. Rev 13¹⁵ καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ δοῦναι πνεῦμα τῇ εἰκόνι . . . καὶ ποιήσῃ,

on the ground that the sense demands this co-ordination of ποιήσῃ with δοῦναι rather than with the intervening ἵνα λαλήσῃ ἢ εἰκόνι.

Cf. Tob 2⁴ καὶ . . . ἔθηκα μέχρι τοῦ τὸν ἥλιον δύνει καὶ θάψω αὐτόν (om. BA, -τω P Oxy). D. C. Simpson *OA* i. 206. : "An instance of the resolution of an infin. into a finite verb in Hebraistic style, and of its rejection or modification in a subsequent recension."

B. THE SEVERAL PARTS OF SPEECH.**1. PRONOUNS.****(a) Definite Article.**

(a) *Unusual insertion of the article.* "Peculiar to Hebrew (cf. analogous examples in Biblical Aramaic, Dan 2¹⁴ 3³ et al.) is the employment of the article to denote a single person or thing (primarily one which is as yet unknown, and therefore not capable of being defined) as being present to the mind under given circumstances. In such cases in English the indef. art. is mostly used." Ges-K *Heb. Gr.*²³ § 126, q. Wellhausen's examples (*W*¹ 26, ²¹⁹) support his assertion that Codex D preserves many Semitisms which have been pruned away in other MSS (see *Proleg.* 242). With one exception, Mk 10²⁸ διὰ τῆς τρυμαλίας τῆς βαφίδος (where Mt and Lk have dropped the def. art. before each genitive), all the examples are peculiar to D, viz. Mk 3²⁸ τὸ τέλος, 8¹¹ τὸ σημεῖον, 9³⁶ τὸ παιδίον, 12⁶ τοῖς γεωργοῖς, Mt 10²⁹ τοῦ ἀσπαρίου, 14²¹ ἐπὶ τῷ πίνακι. See *Proleg.*³ 81. 236.

(β) *Omission of the article* (*W*¹ 26, ²¹¹), see *Proleg.*³ 81. 236.

1. Blass² 150 called attention to illustrations of the Semitic rule which drops the art. with a noun in construct state, and quoted many examples, especially from the Hebraic songs in Lk. In prepositional phrases Debrunner (Bl-D § 259) recognises Greek usage. Wellhausen notices the omission of article with noun in construct state preceding a definite noun, Mt 12⁴³ (=Lk 11²¹), and compares two relics of this construction in D, Mt 10¹³ εἰρήνη ὑμῶν, Lk 11¹⁹ υἱοὶ ὑμῶν, emphasising "the extraordinary importance of this unpretentious Semitism."

In view of this, W. C. Allen's claim that Mk 3²⁸ τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων is a pure Aramaism seems questionable (*Exp T* xiii. 330. See also his *Comm. on Mk.* p. 50, "τ. υἱ. τ. ἀνθ. = נְשׂוּיָיָא. Cf. Dn 2³⁸ (Θ), where LXX substitutes ἀνθρώπων for οἱ υἱοὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων"). But see below, p. 441.

The evidence of D in this matter is of dubious value considering the long list of omissions and additions of the article furnished by Von Soden (*Die Schriften des NT*, I. ii. 1309), who comments on the remark-

able uncertainty of its treatment of the article and attributes the omissions partly to scribal blunders.

2. Torrey (*HTR* xvi. 323) finds "traces" of this Semitism in six phrases in John:

Jn 1⁴⁹ σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, σὺ βασιλεὺς εἶ τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ (for ὁ βασιλεὺς).

4⁶ ἦν δὲ ἐκεῖ πηγή τοῦ Ἰακώβ.

5²⁷ υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου.

5²⁹ εἰς ἀνάστασιν ζωῆς . . . εἰς ἀνάστασιν κρίσεως.

6⁴⁶ ῥήματα ζωῆς αἰωνίου ἔχεις.

9⁶ ὅταν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ᾧ, φῶς εἴμι τοῦ κόσμου (contr. 1⁴ 8¹²).

For the qualitative force of the anarthrous nouns in the last two *exx.*, see *Proleg.* 82.

(b) Personal Pronouns.

(a) *Redundant use to strengthen definition of noun* (*W*¹ 27, ²19).

1. Mk 5¹⁴ D αὐτῷ τῷ δαιμονιζομένῳ.

6¹⁷ αὐτὸς γὰρ Ἡρώδης.

6¹⁸ D αὐτὴν γυναῖκα τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου.

6²² AC αὐτῆς τῆς Ἡρωδιάδος.

Mt 12⁴⁶ D αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκείνου (but not in || Lk 11²⁶).

In Mt 3⁴ αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ Ἰωάννης may mean "John in his person," or "As to himself, John . . ." [Perhaps simply "John." So Med. and MGr.—R. McK.]

In Mk 6²² W. C. Allen suggests that whether αὐτῆς or αὐτοῦ (κBDL) be the original reading, the word is due to mistranslation of הַיְהוּדִיָּה or of $\text{בַּת־הַיְהוּדִיָּה}$ תב , the daughter of Herodias (*op. cit.* 330, also *Mark*, *in loc.*). In the former explanation ה the sign of the genitive has been confused with the Aramaic demonstrative pronoun. (Cf. Stevenson *Aram. Gr.* pp. 24 and 18).

2. Jn 9¹⁸ τοὺς γονεῖς αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἀναβλέψαντος.

¹⁸ ἄγουσιν αὐτὸν πρὸς τοὺς Φ. τὸν ποτε τυφλόν. (Burney *Aram. Orig.* 85, who quotes Pal. Syr. in support of these Aramaisms, adduces 9¹⁸ as a parallel to Mk 6²², and 9¹³ as reproducing "another peculiarly Aram. idiom," viz. "the anticipation of the direct object of a verb by a pronominal suffix.")

(β) *Unusual frequency of the oblique case of the unemphatic personal pronoun*, e.g. οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ, δύο ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ (for class. οἱ μαθηταί, δύο μαθηταί). [Idiomatic in MGr.—R. McK.]

Wellhausen (*W*¹ 29, ²22) was here following Blass (§ 48, 2), who found the reason for this in the Semitic usage where these pronouns are easily attached as suffixes to substantival and verbal forms. But the evidence from the *Koinḗ* given in *Proleg.* 85 is accepted by Debrunner (Bl-D § 278) as partial explanation. In addition to papyrus examples given in *Proleg.* and *Vocab.* 94, we may add P Iand 9⁴⁰ (ii/A.D.) σου τὸ πορφυρ[ιν ἐπὶ σε ᾶ] νέ [πεμφα], on which editor remarks, "persæpe pronominiis

genetivus sic collocatur, velut P Oxy vii. 1064⁴ (iii/A.D.) εἰδώς σου τὸ σπουδαῖον. Seiungitur etiam a substantivo uno pluribusve verbis, velut BGU ii. 5231⁸ οἰδᾶς μου γὰρ τὴν πρὸς ἐμὲ καὶ σὲ φιλίαν.”

(γ) *Confusion of personal and demonstrative pronouns.*

It is hardly necessary, with Wellhausen ('30, '23), to posit a Semitic identity of pronouns as in any way the cause of a Lucan peculiarity. That Luke writes, 10²¹ ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ, where Mt 11²⁶ has ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ, or again in 12¹² when Mt 10¹⁹ and Mk 13¹¹ have ἐκείνη, can hardly be accounted for by fidelity to an Aramaic original, when we observe this use of αὐτὸς ὁ by Luke when Semitic sources are not in question, e.g. Acts 16¹⁸ 22¹⁸. Other examples of this mannerism are Lk 2³⁸ 7²¹ 20¹⁹. For distribution of αὐτὸς ὁ in NT see Hawkins *HS*³ 16. For Hellenistic parallels to the Lucan idiom see *Proleg.* 91 and *Vocab.* 94.

(δ) Burney (*ut supr.* 80 ff.) accounts for the great frequency of the *unemphatic use of the personal pronouns in the nominative* in John by the Semitic idiom by which the pronoun marks the subject of the participle. This may well be a "secondary Semitism" in John, as in the LXX.

(c) *Reflexive Pronouns.*

The attempt (*W*¹ 30, '23) to find the general want of these pronouns reflected in the Gospels is sufficiently discussed in *Proleg.* 87. To what is said there about substitutes for the reflexive pronoun we may add that Mk 2⁸ shows the equivalence of διαλογίζεσθαι ἐν ἑαυτοῖς, and διαλ. ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν, which is a Semitism of vocabulary to be expected in sayings of Jesus or in passages which echo the language of the Old Testament.

The substitution of ἑαυτοῦς for ἀλλήλους in D (*esp.* Lk 24¹⁴. 17. 32) proves nothing, for it is not constant, and the reciprocal use of the reflexive pronoun is, apart from NT usage, common in papyri; e.g. BGU iv. 1101⁴ (i/B.C.) ἐπεὶ συνόντες ἑαυτοῖς ἔτ[η . . .] ἐχωρίσθημεν ἀπ' ἀλλήλων, 1110¹¹ συνχωροῦμεν πρὸς ἑαυτοῖς ἐπὶ τοῖσδε, and so 1157¹⁴ (i/B.C.).

(d) *Indefinite Pronouns.*

A Semitic origin is claimed (*W*¹ 27, '20) for three substitutes for τις, where the indef. art. would be used in English.

(a) *Εἷς.*

1. From Mt, Hawkins quotes (*HS*³ 30) 8¹⁹ 18²⁴(?) 21¹⁹, 26⁶⁹ ("Perhaps also 9¹³, which, if εἷς is the right reading, would correspond to εἷς τῶν in Mk 5²² as 26⁶⁹ does to μία τῶν in Mk 14⁶⁶." The difficulty of εἰσελθῶν is shown by the corrections προσελθῶν \aleph^b B, τις προσελθῶν LG). To these add Mk 10¹⁷ 12⁴² 14⁴⁷ (\aleph AL), Lk 5³ D (εἷς ἐν πλοίον). Torrey (*CDA* 7) would add Ac 12¹⁰ (here improbable).

2. Rev 8¹² 9¹² 18²¹.

Radermacher (*Gr.*² 76 n.²) cites Strabo (p. 230) ἐπηγγελῆστο ἕνα ἀγῶνα

ἰππικόν. For εἰς c. part. gen. (e.g. Lk 5¹³. 17 15¹⁵)=τις see *Proleg.* 96 f., *Vocab.* 187, where papyrus evidence is supplied. See also Bl-D § 247 who denies weakening in classical exx. In MGr ἕνας is indef. art., Thumb *Handb.* 328.

(β) ἄνθρωπος, corresponding to Aram. ܐܢܫܐ, which, in the st. abs. is used for *quidam*, and is put before and after nouns. This, of course, is also very common in Hebrew, and is sometimes reproduced in LXX, e.g. 1 Ki 17¹⁹ ܡܢ ܗܘܢܐ ܡܢ ܗܘܢܐ = γυνή χήρα (whence Lk 4²⁶).

Thackeray (*Gr.* 45) observes this use of ἀνὴρ and ἄνθρωπος, and while noting a similar use in Aristoph. regards it as Hebraism in OT.

Possible examples of ἄνθρωπος with another noun in this indef. sense are:

1. Mt 11¹⁹ (=Lk 7³⁴) 13²⁶. 45 D 5³ 18²³ 20¹ 21³² 22².

Simple ἄνθρωπος=τις.

3. 1 Co 4¹ 7²⁶ 11²⁶.

But Epict. iii. 23. 15 is quite parallel to this Pauline use. (For Greek usage see new LS, s.vv. ἀνὴρ, ἄνθρωπος; *Vocab.* 44.)

(γ) The plur. of indef. pron. often expressed by ἀπό or ἐκ c. gen. (=Hebr. and Aram. ܡܢ), e.g. Mk 9⁶⁷ 6⁴⁸, Mt 23³⁴ (=Lk 21¹⁶).

But in Κοινή ἀπό and ἐκ c. gen. had largely replaced part. gen. (*Proleg.* 72. 102, P Iand 8⁶ note), and even in class. Gk. the part. gen. was not unknown as subj. or obj. of a verb, e.g. Xen. *Hell.* iv. ii. 20, Πελληνεῖς δὲ κατὰ Θεσπιᾶς γενόμενοι ἐμάχοντό τε καὶ ἐν χώρᾳ ἐπιπτον ἐκατέρων. See further WM 253, Brug.-Th. 442, Jannaris § 1313, Bl-D § 164. Buck (*Gr. Dial.* 195) remarks that part. gen. as subj. is found in Av., Lith., and once in Umbrian.

(δ) The negative of the indef. pron. assumes some unusual forms.

(i) Εἰς . . . οὐ. Mt 10²⁹ ἐν ἐξ ἀνθρώπων οὐ πείσεται is claimed as "unadulterated Semitism" (W¹ 31, 24). It may be an extension of the usage found in Mt 5¹⁶, Lk 11⁴⁶, for which parallels in Dem. c. *Onet.* i. 33, Xen. *Anab.* v. vi. 12, are given in Bl-D § 302. [Med. Gr.—R. McK.]

The emphatic οὐδὲ . . . εἰς is sufficiently attested in classical and Hellenistic Gk., and οὐδεὶς ἐστίν ὅς is acknowledged (W² 24) to be "certainly not unGreek," though Wellhausen compares it with Syr. *laït de*.

(ii) Πᾶς . . . οὐ, for Hebrew and Aramaic ܠܗܘܢ . . . ܠܐ.

To what has been written by Moulton in *CR* xv. 442, add reff. given above, p. 22 n.². D. S. Sharp cites Epict. iii. 22. 36, πᾶσα ψυχὴ ἀκουσα στέρεται τῆς ἀληθείας. R. Law (*Tests of Life*, 379), commenting on 1 Jn 2¹⁹, "It seems questionable whether this is a Hebraism, as is usually said. The explanation of the idiom probably is, not that πᾶς was used in a consciously distributive sense, but that, in vernacular Greek, the negative was attached in sense to the verb, where we attach it to the nominative ('all are-not'='none are'). The attachment of οὐ to what seems to us the wrong word is not unusual in Greek [e.g. in Aristoph.

Vesp. 1091, πάντα μὴ δεδοικέναι=μηδὲν δεδοικέναι.—J. H. M., and is invariable in the common οὐ φημι τοῦτο εἶναι=I say that this is not so." [Rare in Med. Gr.—R. McK.]

1. Mk 13²⁰ (=Mt 24²²) οὐκ ἂν ἐσώθη πᾶσα σὰρξ.
Lk 1³⁷ οὐκ ἀδυνατήσει παρὰ τ. θεοῦ πᾶν ῥήμα. (Not a quot. from LXX or Heb. of Gen 18¹⁴.)
Ac 10¹⁴ οὐδέποτε ἔφαγον πᾶν κοινόν.
2. Jn 6³⁹ ἵνα πᾶν ὃ δέδωκέν μοι μὴ ἀπολέσω ἐξ αὐτοῦ. (See also p. 424.)
11³⁶ πᾶς ὁ ζῶν καὶ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμέ οὐ μὴ ἀποθάνῃ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.
12⁴⁶ ἵνα πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμέ ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ μὴ μείνῃ.
1 Jn 2²¹ πᾶν ψεῦδος ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας οὐκ ἔστιν. (In the similar construction in 2¹⁹, 2²³, 3⁶, 4³, 5¹⁶ the πᾶς is positive, and the οὐ negatives the verb.)
Rev 7¹⁶ οὐδὲ μὴ πείση ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ὁ ἥλιος οὐδὲ πᾶν καῦμα.
18²² καὶ πᾶς τεχνίτης πάσης τέχνης οὐ μὴ εὗρεθῆ ἐν σοὶ ἔτι.
21²⁷ καὶ οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθῃ εἰς αὐτὴν πᾶν κοινόν.
22³ καὶ πᾶν κατάθεμα οὐκ ἔσται ἔτι.

(Charles has not included this construction in his list of Hebraisms.)

3. Rom 3²⁰=Gal 2¹⁶ (=Ps 143³ LXX for : יְהִי לִי כִּי אֶפְרָיִם לִי יְהוָה).
Eph 4²⁹ πᾶς λόγος σαπρὸς ἐκ τ. στόματος ὑμῶν μὴ ἐκπορευέσθω.
5⁵ ὅτι πᾶς πόρνος . . . οὐκ ἔχει κληρονομίαν.
4. 2 Pet 1²⁰ ὅτι πᾶσα προφητεία γραφῆς ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως οὐ γίνεται.
Cf. *Didache* 2¹ οὐ μισήσεις πάντα ἀνθρώπων. *Protév. Jac.* vi. 1, πᾶν κοινὸν καὶ ἀκάθαρτον οὐκ εἶα διέρχεσθαι δι' αὐτῆς.

WM 215 observes that "this Hebraism should in strictness be limited to the expression οὐ (μὴ) . . . πᾶς; for in sentences with πᾶς . . . οὐ (μὴ) there is usually nothing alien to Greek usage."

For the latter Radermacher (*Gr.*³ 220) cites Dion. H. *Ep. ad Pomp.* 756 R, οὐκ ἀπὸ τοῦ βελτίστου πάντα περὶ αὐτῶν γράφων. Wackernagel, *Vorlesungen* ii. 274, cft. Propertius ii. 28. 13, *semper, formosae, non nostris parcere verbis*, "niemals versteht ihr."

(e) The Relative Pronoun.

(a) The Hebrew construction by which indeclinable $\text{וְהַ$ is followed by a pronoun or pronominal suffix is paralleled in Aramaic by the use of וְ or וְהַ indecl.

1. The passages which have been claimed as examples of this Semitism (see Blass *Gr.*³ 175, Bl-D § 297, W¹ 22, 215, Burkitt *Ev. d. M.* ii. 75) are Mk 1⁷ (=Lk 3⁴. Note Mt corrects, also Luke in Ac 13²⁸), 7²⁸ (Note NB omit αὐτῆς). Mt 10¹¹ D, ἡ πόλις εἰς ἣν εἰσέλθητε εἰς αὐτήν, 18²⁸ D, παρ' οἷς οὐκ εἰμι ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν. Lk 8¹³ D, ὃν ἔρχεται ὁ διάβολος καὶ αἶρει ἀπὸ τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν τὸν λόγον.

Mt 3¹³ (=Lk 3¹⁷) is normal Greek, as Burney *Aram. Orig.* 85 n. seems to allow.

The conjecture that Lk 10⁴¹ should read, in the absence of all textual evidence, ἡς (for ἥτις) οὐκ ἀφαιρεθήσεται αὐτῆς (=she has chosen the better part from which she shall not be taken away) was offered in W¹ 22, but is withdrawn in the 2nd ed.

Of the same kind is Mk 13¹⁹ θλίψις, οἷα οὐ γέγονεν τοιαύτη (N.B.—Mt corrects, θλίψις μεγάλη, οἷα οὐκ ἐγένετο). Hawkins HS² 134 points out that this does not occur "in Dn 12¹ (either LXX or Theod.), which is here being referred to. See, however, Gen 41¹⁹; and compare ἥτις τοιαύτη in Ex 9²⁴ and 11⁶. Somewhat similar is Mark's οἷα . . . οὕτως in the best texts of 9⁸."

Cf. Ac 15¹⁷ (LXX).

2. Burney (*Aram. Orig.* 85) cites Jn 1²⁷ 1³⁸ 13²⁶ 18⁹ (also 9²⁶, see (B) below. 18⁹ is doubtful).

In the Apocalypse Moulton notes six examples: Rev 3⁸ 7².⁹ 13⁸.¹² 20⁸ (to which Charles adds, ὅπου . . . ἐκεῖ 12⁶.¹⁴, and ὅπου . . . ἐπ' αὐτῶν 17⁹).

3. Philem 12 is not an instance, since αὐτόν is emphatic, with the following clause in apposition.

4. 1 Pet 2²⁴ ἡ*LP οὐ τῷ μάλωπι αὐτοῦ. (See *Proleg.*³ 237.)

Moulton discussed the question in *Proleg.*³ 94 f., 237, 249. In *Eintl.* 150 f. he cites, after Helbing (*Gr.* p. iv), P Oxy i. 117 (ii/iii A.D.) ἐξ ὧν δώσεις τοῖς παιδίοις σου ἐν ἐξ αὐτῶν, but quotes Wackernagel (*ThLZ* xxxiv. 227) as thinking that the equivalence of MGR ποῦ clauses and such sentences as οἷς ἐδόθη αὐτοῖς is not proved. (See Psichari, 182 f.).

Thackeray (*Gr.* 46) finds the construction in all parts of the LXX, where it "undoubtedly owes its frequency to the Hebrew original. But the fact that it is found in an original Greek work such as 2 Mac (12²⁷ ἐν ᾧ . . . ἐν αὐτῇ) and a paraphrase such as 1 Esdras (3⁶.⁹ 4⁵⁴.⁶² 6²³) is sufficient to warrant its presence in the Κοινή." We may add that sometimes, as in Is 1²¹ ἐν ᾧ . . . ἐν αὐτῇ, the construction is used in the Greek with no corresponding use in the Hebrew (see Ottley *Isaiah* i. p. 41, ii. p. 108).

Canon Box has shown how this Semitism has infected the Latin of 4 Ezra: e.g. 4²⁸ de quo me interrogas de eo. Cf. also 4⁴ 6¹⁴.²⁹ 13³⁶ (OA ii. 547).

A common classical usage, when a relative clause is continued by a clause co-ordinate with it, is to abandon the relative construction in the second clause and to replace the relative by a personal or demonstrative pronoun (cf. Xen. *Cyrop.* iii. i. 38, iv. i. 15, v. ii. 15). Mr. G. R. Driver (*Orig. Lang.* 4) quotes, for the extension of this idiom "to single-limbed relative clauses," Soph. *Phil.* 315 (MSS), οἷς Ὀλύμπιοι δοῖεν ποτ' αὐτοῖς. Callim. *Epigr.* 43, ὧν ὁ μὲν αὐτῶν. *Anth. Pal.* vii. 72, ὧν ὁ μὲν ὑμῶν. For further exx. see Radermacher *Gr.*³ 217, and Jannaris § 1439. We may add Clem. *ad Cor.* 21⁹ οὗ ἡ πνοὴ αὐτοῦ ἐν ἡμῖν ἐστίν. [Med. Gr.—R. McK.]

(B) The same particle ἤ (ἦ) can also introduce a subordinate clause and may be rendered by ὅτι, or ἵνα. (See below, pp. 469 f.)

1. It has been suggested that sometimes these particles in the Greek text mistranslate the Aramaic relative. Thus W. C. Allen (*Exp T* xiii. 330 and *Comm. in loc.*) explains Mk 8²⁴ *ὅτι ὡς δένδρα ὁρῶ περιπατοῦντας*, where *ὅτι* = *ܐܘܨܝܢ*. So W¹ 22, ²15, explains Mk 4²² *οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶν κρυπτόν, εἰ μὴ ἵνα φανερωθῆ* (= *nisi quod reveletur = quod non reveletur*). The parallels in Mt 10²⁶ and Lk 12² (*ὃ οὐκ ἀποκαλυφθήσεται*), and Lk 8¹⁷ (*ὃ οὐ μὴ γνωσθῆ καὶ εἰς φανερόν ἔλθῃ*) support Wellhausen.

We may, however, cite Epict. *Ench.* 51, *ποιόν οὖν ἔτι διδάσκαλον προσδοκᾷς, ἵνα εἰς ἐκείνον ὑπερβῆ τὴν ἐπανόρθωσιν ποιῆσαι τὴν σεαυτοῦ;* where Melcher (*De Sermone Epicteteo* 85) observes "Att. *εἰς ὄντινα ὑπερβήσῃ*."

So Epict. i. 24, 3, *οὐδεὶς δὲ δεῖλόν κατὰσκοπον πέμπει, ἢν', ἀν μόνον ἀκούσῃ ψόφου καὶ σκιάν ποθεν ἰδῆν, τρέχων ἔλθῃ τεταραγμένος . . .* (Att.: *δῶσει . . . ἐλεύσεται, vel πρόσεισιν . . .*).

Moulton (*Einkl.* 332 n.) accepted Wellhausen's explanation of Mk 4⁴¹ (retained in Mt 8²⁷, slightly changed in Lk 8²⁵), *τίς ἄρα οὗτός ἐστιν, ὅτι καὶ ὁ ἄνεμος καὶ ἡ θάλασσα ὑπακούει αὐτῷ;* where *ὅτι* is used only to avoid *ῥ* . . . *αὐτῷ*. Lagrange, however (*S. Marc.* p. xc), cites Plato *Euthyphr.* 2 a: *τί νεώτερον, ὃ Σώκρατες, γέγονεν, ὅτι σὺ . . . διατριβῆς;*

There seems less reason to follow Wellhausen in taking *ὅτι* = *ὅς* in Mt 11²⁰, or in reversing the process in Mt 11¹⁰ ("still more than a prophet is this, for about him (*Ἰησοῦν*) is it said").

2. Burney (*Aram. Orig.* 75 f., 101 ff.) discovers many such mistranslations, supporting his contention in some instances by quoting the Syriac or Arabic versions:

ἵνα for relative:

Jn 1⁶ 5⁷ 6³⁰. 50 9³⁶ 14¹⁶.

Rev 19¹⁵ is quite parallel to Jn 6⁵⁰.

ὅτι for relative:

Jn 8⁴⁵ 9¹⁷ (? 1¹⁶).

N.B.—The converse is suspected by Burney (*ib.* 29, 34) in Jn 14. 12, with Torrey's strong endorsement (*HTR* xvi. 328):

Jn 14 punctuating *ὃ γέγονεν ἐν αὐτῷ ζωὴ ἦν*, and taking *ὃ γέγονεν* = *ܐܘܨܝܢ*, the result is "inasmuch as in Him was life."

1¹² supporting the poorly attested *qui natus est* by showing that in Aramaic the final *ܝ* alone distinguishes the sing. verb from the plur., whilst the next sentence begins with *ܝ* (*καὶ*). "Who believe on His name, inasmuch as He was born, not . . ."

In neither instance is there any necessity for this explanation of the relative pronoun.

Mr. G. R. Driver (*ut supr.* 3) remarks (a) that if this usage is due to Semitic influence, it is strange that the Hebr. *כִּי* is never so rendered in the LXX; (b) in no case in Jn is this translation necessary; (c) in every case (exc. 1⁶ and 1¹⁰) the constr. occurs in words presumably spoken originally in Aramaic. The last observation tells against Burney's

theory that Jn was (mis-)translated from a written Aramaic original, but not against the possibility that we have here a genuine Aramaism.

Lagrange (*S. Jean*, p. cix) shows that in the Ancyra inscr. (Cagnat iii. 188) the Lat. *ex quo . . . darentur* is rendered, *ἵνα ἐξ αὐτοῦ . . . δίδωνται*, whilst in two other passages *ἵνα* represents *ut*. This, coupled with the examples given above from Epictetus, shows that by this time *ἵνα* was used in Greek as equivalent to a relative. We may therefore speak of this use in Jn as a secondary Semitism.

(γ) The indeclinable particle η is suspected by Burney (*ut supr.* 101 ff.) to lie behind the difficult syntax of the relative pronoun in this characteristic group of passages in the Fourth Gospel.

2. Jn 10²⁹ ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ δέδωκέν μοι πάντων μείζων ἐστίν. (δ NB*¹LW, ὅς A. μείζων NLW, μείζον AB).

17¹¹ τήρησον αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου ᾧ δέδωκάς μοι.

¹² ἐγὼ ἐτήρηον αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου ᾧ δέδωκάς μοι. (ᾧ NABCLW, οὗς D², ὅ D*¹).

Cf. 17²⁴ Πατήρ, ὁ δέδωκάς μοι, θέλω ἵνα ὅπου εἰμι ἐγὼ κἀκεῖνοι ᾧσιν μετ' ἐμοῦ.

17² ἵνα πᾶν ὁ δέδωκας αὐτῷ δώσει αὐτοῖς ζωὴν αἰώνιον. Burney suggests πᾶν ὅ = η \aleph \beth Aramaic for "all who," "every one who," "all which"; so Hebr. \aleph \beth "the whole of it," with plur. reference, cf. Ex 14⁷.

6³⁷ πᾶν ὁ δίδωσίν μοι ὁ πατήρ πρὸς ἐμὲ ἤξει.

³⁹ ἵνα πᾶν ὁ δέδωκέν μοι μὴ ἀπολέσω ἐξ αὐτοῦ, ἀλλὰ ἀναστήσω αὐτὸ τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ.

Cf. 1 Jn 5⁴ ὅτι πᾶν τὸ γεγεννημένον ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ νικᾷ τὸν κόσμον, which shows that the neut. πᾶν is used as a collective pronoun.

In none of these instances does Lagrange so much as suggest Aramaic; the attraction of the relative is offered as the explanation of 17^{11, 12}. Mr. G. R. Driver does not dispute the Aramaic origin of the idiom, but observes that in every case the passage is attributed to Jesus, and is not evidence of an Aramaic Gospel translated into Greek, but of the Aramaic of the *ipsissima verba* of our Lord.

(δ) By this ambiguous use of η Burney accounts for the Lucan variation οἱ βλέποντες for the Matthaean ὅτι βλέπουσιν . . . ὅτι ἀκούουσιν, . . . \aleph \beth \aleph \beth in Mt 13^{16, 17} = Lk 10^{23, 24} (*The Poetry of our Lord*, 145).

(f) Distributive Pronouns and Pronominal Adjectives.

(a) The absence in Hebrew and Aramaic of special words corresponding directly to *ἄλλος* or *ἕτερος*, involves the use of certain Semitic idioms to express the idea *alter . . . alter*. (See G-K § 139 (c).)

These are :

(1) \aleph \beth with \aleph \beth or \aleph \beth as correlate. Gen 13¹¹ (LXX ἕκαστος ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ).

(2) $\eta\eta$. . . $\eta\eta$ Ex 14²⁰ (LXX *καὶ οὐ συνέμιξαν ἀλλήλοις*), Is 6² (LXX *ἕτερος πρὸς τὸν ἕτερον*).

(3) $\eta\eta\eta$. . . $\eta\eta\eta$ 2 Sam 14⁶ (LXX *καὶ ἔπαισεν ὁ εἰς τὸν ἕνα ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ*).

(4) The substantive repeated Gen 47²¹ (LXX *ἀπ' ἄκρων ὀρίων Αἰγύπτου ἕως τῶν ἄκρων*), cf. Dt 4²³ 28⁶⁴.

(2) and (3) are both found in 1 Sam 14⁴ $\eta\eta$. . . $\eta\eta$ (LXX *ἔνθεν* . . . *ἔνθεν*) and $\eta\eta\eta$. . . $\eta\eta\eta$ (LXX *τῶ ἐνὶ . . . τῶ ἄλλῳ*).

Thackeray (*Gr.* 45) observes: "The rarity of phrases like *ἕτερος τὸν ἕτερον* (still found in the Pentateuch, Isaiah and the early chapters of Ezekiel) is partly due to the tendency in the *Κοινή* to abandon words expressive of duality. But it is noticeable that the use of *ἀνὴρ* = *ἕκαστος* is practically confined to one group of books," in which "*ἕκαστος*, which is freely used in other parts of the LXX, is either wholly or nearly unrepresented."

1. In the Synoptic Gospels (1) and (2) are not represented, but the idiom of (3) may possibly be found in Mk 15²⁷, Mt 20²¹ 24^{40a} 27²⁸, Lk 18¹⁰ D, *εἰς Φαρισαῖος καὶ εἰς τελωλῶνης* (*sic*), and (4) in Lk 11¹⁷ *οἶκος ἐπὶ οἶκον πίπτει*, Mk 13² (=Mt 24²=Lk 21⁶) *λίθος ἐπὶ λίθῳ*, Mt 23²⁴ *ἀπὸ πόλεως εἰς πόλιν*. (*W*¹ 30, 223.) "From city to city," however, is quite idiomatic English and is not necessarily Hebraic. A closer parallel than this seems to be Lk 17²⁴ *ὡς περ γὰρ ἡ ἀστραπή ἀστράπτουσα ἐκ τῆς ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανὸν εἰς τὴν ὑπ' οὐρανὸν λάμπει*.

2. (3) is found in Jn 20¹²,

3. and in Gal 4²³.

But in both *exx.* *ἕνα* . . . *καὶ ἕνα* is probably due to the gradual disappearance of *μὲν* . . . *δέ* in Hellenistic.

See Bl-D, § 247. 3, and for vernacular use, *Vocab.* 187. [(4) *Med.* and *MGr.*—R. McK.]

(3) Closely akin to the idiom of (3) above is 1 Ki 22¹³ $\eta\eta\eta$ $\eta\eta\eta$ $\eta\eta\eta$ $\eta\eta\eta$ *Let your speech be like the speech of the rest of them*. This has been cited (*W*¹ 30, 223) to explain Mk 6¹⁵ *ὅτι προφήτης ὡς εἰς τῶν προφητῶν*, *A prophet as another prophet, like any other prophet*. Moffatt translates, *It is a prophet like one of the old prophets*. Lk 9⁸ corrects, *ὅτι προφήτης τῆς τῶν ἀρχαίων ἀνέστη*.

(γ) For "the rest" as compared with a single example of a class, Hebrew and still more Aramaic use $\eta\eta$.

Thus Gen 3¹ "The serpent was more subtle than any other beast of the field," $\eta\eta\eta$ $\eta\eta\eta$ $\eta\eta\eta$.

Gen 43²⁴, "And Benjamin's mess was five times as much as any of the rest of theirs," $\eta\eta\eta$ $\eta\eta\eta\eta\eta$.

This use of *ἄς* may possibly be seen (so *W*¹ 31, 223) in Mk 4¹³, Lk 3²⁰. 21 13². 4, though in Lk 3²⁰. 21 the explanation is far-fetched. [*MGr* sometimes uses *ἄς* in much the same way.—R. McK.]

2. NUMERALS AND DISTRIBUTIVES.

Semitic influence has been suspected in—

(a) The use of Cardinals for Ordinals in dating Incidents.

Cf. Gen 1⁸ לִשְׁבַע יָמִים (LXX, *ἡμέρα μία*). So in Aramaic (Kautzsch *Gr.* 122, Marti *Gr.* 82, Dalman *Gr.* 131). See *Proleg.* 95 f., 237.

1. Cf. Mk 16², Lk 21¹, $\text{τῆ μὴ τῶν σαββάτων}$.

Mt 28¹ *eis mian sab.*

Ac 20⁷ *en tῆ mē τ. sab.* [Plummer (*ICC*, p. 407) suggests this meaning (unnecessarily) in Lk 17²² *ὅτι ἐπιθυμήσετε μίαν τῶν ἡμερῶν τοῦ υἱοῦ τ. ἀνθρώπου ἰδεῖν.*]

2. Jn 20¹⁻²⁰. [Charles unnecessarily suggests this in Rev 6¹. See *ICC* i. p. cxlviii.]

3. I Co 16².

See however p. 174, *Proleg.* 96, and for MGr, Thumb *Handb.* 82. [Med. Gr.—R. McK.]

(b) The use of Cardinals for Adverbials.

1. Mk 4⁸⁻²⁰ *eis triakonta kai en exēkonta kai en ekatōn*.

"The MSS offer many variations and combinations of *eis* and *en*. But whatever be original, it is no doubt due to over-scrupulous translation of שֶׁבַע ," W. C. Allen (*Exp T* xiii. 330), who cites Dn 3¹⁹ $\text{שֶׁבַע שֶׁבַע שֶׁבַע שֶׁבַע שֶׁבַע שֶׁבַע שֶׁבַע}$ *seven times*, and Gen 26¹² (Targ. Onk.) $\text{מֵאָסָם שֶׁבַע לַיָּמִים}$, *one hundredfold*. "The writer of the First Gospel has avoided the Aramaism by substituting $\delta \dots \delta \dots \delta$ " (*Comm. Mark*, 79).

(c) Distributives expressed by Repetition, either of the Cardinal Number or of the Noun itself.—The former is literally reproduced in LXX, e.g. in *eis eis* 1 Chr 24⁸, *δύο δύο* Gen 6¹⁸, *ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ* Gen 7². (This is also Aramaic, Dalman *Gr.* 135.) The latter e.g. in 2 Chr 34¹² *ἐργασία καὶ ἐργασία* (= עֲבֹדָה וְעֲבֹדָה , *in every department of work*). Sometimes *κατά* is combined with this reduplication, e.g. *κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν ἐνιαυτὸν* 1 K 7¹⁸, *κατὰ μικρὸν μικρὸν* Dt 7²², *κατὰ φυλὰς φυλὰς* Zech 12¹².

1. The NT supplies *δύο δύο* Mk 6⁷; *συμπόσια συμπόσια, πρασιαὶ πρασιαὶ* Mk 6²⁶; *δεσμός δεσμός* Mt 13³⁰ Epiph.; *ἀνά δύο δύο* Lk 10² Bal.; *eis κατά eis* (Mk 14¹⁹) is claimed as a hybrid confusion between the Aram. בְּיָמֵי בְּיָמֵי and the vulgar Greek *καθεῖς*.

3. 2 Co 4¹⁸ *ἀλλ' ὁ ἴσως ἡμῶν [ἄνθρωπος] ἀνακαινοῦται ἡμέρα καὶ ἡμέρα* is regarded as Hebraism by Bl-Debr. § 200. 1. = דִּי דִּי (contrast Heb 3¹³ *καθ' ἐκάστην ἡμέραν*).

See *Proleg.* 21 n.², 97, for the significance of these locutions, with the important additions made by Moulton in *Einl.* 156 f. (See also § 104 above.) Psichari (183 ff.) adduces MGr examples to support Thumb's denial of Hebraism (*Hellen.* 128, *Handb.* 83). Wackernagel (*ThLZ* xxxiv. 227), however, recognises a Semitism in Mk 6²⁶. G. and H. point out on P Oxy

vi. 940⁶ (vi/A.D.) that σου μίαν μίαν means *together with you*, and is not distributive in that passage. The new LS cites Soph. *Frag.* 201, μίαν μίαν (=κατὰ μίαν).

3. ADJECTIVES AND ADJECTIVAL SUBSTITUTES.

In Hebrew the wide use of the construct state largely took the place of the adjective. Greek has many corresponding uses of the genitive case of a noun to mark description, material etc. The two most characteristically Semitic idioms are (1) the genitive of an abstract noun in place of an adjective of quality, and (2) the use of νόμος with a following genitive of origin or definition.

(1) The so-called "Hebraic Genitive" is an extension of the construction found in Greek poetry, as shown in *Proleg.*³ 74, 235. In the LXX Thackeray regards it as "partly but not altogether due to literal translation" (*Gr.* 23). The same may be said of the NT instances. To the classical instances referred to in *Proleg.*³ (*ut supra*), Radermacher (*Gr.*² 109, 111) adds Herodotus iv. 136 αἱ τε ἡμέραι ὑμῖν τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ διοίχονται. From late Greek he cites Demosth. *In Midiam* 93 ("an interpolated document of the Hellenistic age") ἡ κυρία τοῦ νόμου (*the legal limit—contrast ἡ κυρία in § 84, the equivalent Attic term*); Marcellinus *Vit. Thuc.* 57, λόγοι εἰρωνείας (as well as λόγοι εἰρωνικοί), pseudo-Chion *Ep.* 16. 3, ἀπεχθείας ἔργον, and, in view of Pauline parallels, pseudo-Hippocr. *Ep.* 10. 6 σῶμα σοφίης. Thumb (*Brugmann Gr.*⁴ 677) dissents from Wackernagel's assumption that MGr ἀνθρώπος τῆς μπιστοσύνης, *a trustworthy man*, is a Hebraism.

1. Mk 2²⁶ (=Mt 12⁴=Lk 6⁴) οἱ ἄρτοι τῆς προθέσεως a t.t. from the OT.
Lk 4²² οἱ λόγοι τῆς χάριτος, 16⁵ οἰκονόμος τῆς ἀδικίας, ⁹ μαμωνᾶς τῆς ἀδικίας, 18⁹ κριτῆς τῆς ἀδικίας.
Ac 6¹¹ Ν* D ῥήματα βλασφημίας, 8²³ χολὴ πικρίας, 9¹⁵ σκευὸς ἐκλογῆς.
2. Rev 13¹ 17³ ὀνόματα βλασφημίας.
3. Rom 1³⁰ πάθη ἀτιμίας, 8²¹ τὴν ἐλευθερίαν τῆς δόξης κ.τ.λ., 12²⁰ (LXX) ἀνθρακες πυρός. Possibly Eph 1¹⁴ 4²² (see p. 485).
Phrases with σῶμα. Rom 6⁶ τὸ σ. τῆς ἀμαρτίας, 7²⁴ τὸ σ. τοῦ θανάτου, Ph 3²¹ τὸ σ. τῆς ταπεινώσεως ἡμῶν, τὸ σ. τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ, Col 1²² 2¹¹ τὸ σ. τῆς σαρκὸς (αὐτοῦ).
Phrases with ἡμέρα, Rom 2⁵ ἡμ. ὀργῆς, 2 Co 6³ ἡμ. σωτηρίας (LXX), cf. 1 Pet 2¹² ἡμ. ἐπισκοπῆς (LXX). These are rooted in the language of the OT, but they can only be termed Secondary Semitisms.
4. Heb 12¹³ ῥίζα πικρίας (LXX Dt 29¹⁸ AF; see Bl-D § 165).
Jas 1²⁵ ἀκροατῆς ἐπιλησημονῆς. Perhaps νόμον τέλειον τὸν τῆς ἐλευθερίας (ib.) and τὸ πρόσωπον τῆς γενέσεως αὐτοῦ (²²) come under the same head.

Debrunner (Bl-D § 165) includes Ac 1¹⁸, 2 Pet 2¹⁵. But μισθός (τῆς) ἀδικίας is an objective genitive. (Cf. Ezek 14⁴ ἡ κώλασις τῆς ἀδικίας αὐτοῦ, 44¹³ εἰς κώλασιν ἀδικίας.)

Mt 22³⁶ ποία ἐντολή μεγάλη, a less idiomatic rendering of the Aramaic (from Q?) than πρώτη πάντων in Mk 12²⁸. Note that Mt 22³⁸ μεγάλη καὶ πρώτη ἐντολή is quoted by Justin M. *Ap.* i. 16 as μεγίστη.

Lk 5²⁹ ὁ παλαιὸς χρηστός ἐστίν, according to Wellhausen (*Das Ev. Luc.* 19), must be taken as comp. or superl. Plummer (who regards χρηστότερος, AC vg, as a corruption) and Lagrange defend the positive interpretation.

Mk 9^{43, 45, 47} καλόν . . . ἢ, whilst in 4² μᾶλλον is inserted.

(b) The comparative particle is sometimes used after a verb as though by itself it meant "more than."

1. Mk 3⁴, Lk 15⁷.

Lk 17³ λυσίτελει αὐτῶ . . . ἢ . . . (contrast Mt 18⁶ σύμφερε αὐτῶ ἵνα, Mk 9⁴² καλόν ἐστίν αὐτῶ μᾶλλον εἰ . . .).

W³ 21 acknowledges that this is found in Plut.

For classical instances see WM 302, Riddell, *Plat. Apol.* p. 183, K-G ii. 303. [Rare in Med. and MGr.—R. McK.]

3. 1 Co 14¹⁹ θέλω . . . ἢ. Cf. the agraphon in Justin M. *Ap.* i. 15, θέλει γὰρ ὁ πατήρ ὁ οὐράνιος τὴν μετάνοιαν τοῦ ἁμαρτωλοῦ ἢ τὴν κόλασιν αὐτοῦ. Gildersleeve (*in loc.*), cft. *Eur. Tel.* fr. 714 N²:

σμίκερ' ἂν θέλομι καὶ καθ' ἡμέραν ἔχων
ἄλυπον οἰκείν βίον ἢ πλουτῶν νοσεῖν.¹

(c) For reduplication to express the *relative* force of the adjective, see Moulton's treatment, § 104 above; Delbrück *Grd.* v. (iii.) 139 ff. Wetstein (*ap. Heb* 10²⁷), cft. Aristoph. *Vesp.* 213 τί οὐκ ἀπεκοιμήθησαν ὄσον ὄσον στίλην; For numerous parallels see Radermacher *Gr.*² 68 n.¹. [MGr.—R. McK.]

1. Lk 5² D ὄσον ὄσον for ὀλίγον.

4. Heb 10²⁷, which may be an echo of Is 26²⁰, μικρὸν ὄσον ὄσον, in introducing the citation from Hab 2³¹.

Conybeare and Stock (*Selections from LXX*, 77) refer to σφόδρα σφόδρα, Ex 17.¹², Num 14⁷, Ezek 9⁹, Jdth 4²; σφόδρα σφοδρῶς Gen 7¹⁹, Jos 3¹⁶; θιμωνιάς θιμωνιάς Ex 8¹⁴, ἄνω ἄνω . . . κάτω κάτω Dt 28²⁸. They observe, "In all the above instances the kind of intensification involved is that of a repeated process."

(d) For the comparative use of παρά see below, *under* B 8.

(e) The superlative idea was sometimes expressed in Hebrew by adding עֲלֵי־כֹל to the adjective. This could be rendered literally in the LXX by the "dative of the person judging." Thus Jon 3⁸, πῶλις μεγάλη

¹ Mr. E. E. Genner tells me that this passage is cited by two authorities, one of which gives μᾶλλον instead of βίον.

τῆ θεῶ, an exceedingly great city. Two possible instances are found in NT:

1. Ac 7³⁰ ἀστέϊος τῷ θεῶ, exceedingly fair.
3. 2 Co 10⁴ δυνατὰ τῆ θεῶ divinely strong (Moffatt). In this passage more probably *dat. commodi*. For the former see *Prolog.* 104, also p. 166 above.

(f) A well-known Hebrew equivalent for the superlative עֲשֵׂרֶיךָ עֲשֵׂרֶיךָ has sometimes been discovered in—

2. Rev 19¹⁸ βασιλεὺς βασιλέων, κύριος κυρίων.
3. 1 Tim 6¹⁵ ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν βασιλευνόντων καὶ κύριος τῶν κυριευόντων.
4. Heb 9⁸ σκηνή ἡ λεγομένη ἁγία ἁγίων.

The last is Hebraic, but is introduced as a stereotyped t.t. In the other two, *bas. bas.* means "ruler over kings." Cf. P Leid. W^{xiv}. 9 (ii/iii A.D.) ἔνδοξο ἐνδοξοτάτων, δαίμων δαιμόνων, ἀλκιμε ἀλκιμοτάτων, ἅγιε ἁγίων. P Par 51²⁴ (=UPZ i. p. 360, ii/B.C.) ἐλθέ μοι θεὰ θεῶν. For MGr, Thumb (*Handb.* 33) gives γενάικα τῶν γεναικῶν "a queenly woman," σκλάβος τῆς σκλαβιάς "a vile slave."

5. ADVERBS AND ADVERBIAL LOCUTIONS.

"Adverbs derived from adjectives are certainly common in later Syriac, but are not properly Semitic" (*W¹* 28, 221).

Various substitutes are employed:

(1) In Hebrew "the infin. absol. occurs most frequently in immediate connexion with the finite verb of the same stem, in order in various ways to define more accurately or to strengthen the idea of the verb" (G-K § 113 l). This is extremely rare in pure Aramaic.¹ In the LXX there are two main forms adopted by the translators for rendering this idiom. Leaving on one side the purely Greek constructions, in which an adverb replaces the infin., or the infinitive is dropped without replacement, and on the other the solitary instance of barbarously literal employment of the Greek infinitive (Jos 17¹³ B), Thackeray (*Gr.* 48 f.) shows that the translators had recourse to—

(a) Finite verb with *dat.* of the cognate noun. So Gen 2¹⁶ βρώσει φάγη = ܠܚܝܬܐ ܠܚܝܬܐ, ¹⁷ θανάτω ἀποθανείσθε = ܡܝܬܘܬܐ ܡܝܬܘܬܐ.

Possible NT examples:

1. Lk 22¹⁵ ἐπιθυμία ἐπεθύμησα.
- Ac 2³⁰ ὄρκω ὤμοσεν (not citation, but in introducing LXX quotation), 4¹⁷ (EP syr²¹, Chrys.) ἀπειλῇ ἀπειλωσάμεθα, 5²⁸ παραγγελία παρηγγειλαμεν, 23¹⁴ ἀναθέματι ἀνεθεματίσαμεν.

Also the following in LXX citations: Mk 7¹⁰ = Mt 15⁴, Mt 13¹⁴, Ac 2¹⁷. With qualifying adjective, Mk 5⁴³ ἐξέστησαν εὐθὺς ἐκστάσει μεγάλῃ, Lk 1⁴² ACD ἀνεφώνησεν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ (κραυγῇ NBL). (With this BGU ii. 427²², καὶ βεβαιώσει πάσῃ βεβαιώσει, has been compared. But this stereo-

¹ See Dalman *WJ* 34. Torrey (*CDA* 33) disputes the rarity.

typed formula which occurs in scores of contrasts is not parallel to any of these examples, but rather to Eph 1³.)

2. Jn 3²⁹ χαρῆ χάρει. (Jn 18³² 21¹⁹ must not be placed under this heading.)

4. Jas 5¹⁷ προσευχῆ προσήξατο.

See the discussion in *Prol.*³ 75 f. 245, and more fully in *Einkl.* 118 n.¹, where P Oxy i. 5¹⁶ (early Christian document iii/iv A.D.) is mentioned, *οτι δοχη δεκτικον εστιν*. Radermacher (*Gr.*³ 129) adds Anderson-Cumont Grégoire *Studia Pontica* III. 71a. 1. βιώσασα βίω, and calls attention to the many parallels in the language of Attic tragedy and the Old Comedy, e.g. φόβω ταρβείν, φόβω δεδιέναι, φύσει πεφυκέναι, νόσω νοσείν. He rightly sees the Semitic influence only in the extension of such expressions in the NT.

(b) Finite verb with participle of the same verb or a verb of kindred meaning. Thus Gen 3¹⁸ πληθύνων πληθυνῶ = פְּרָרָה פְּרָרָה . The only decisive NT examples are in quotations from LXX:

1. Mt 13¹⁴ (= Mk 4¹²) βλέποντες βλέψετε (LXX).

Ac 7³⁴ ἰδὼν εἶδον (LXX).

3. [1 Co 2¹ (so Wendt on Ac 7³⁴). But the only possible meaning is "When I came".] Eph 5⁵ ἵστε γινώσκοντες. (See *Prol.*³ 245, also *supra*, 22 and 222.)

4. Heb 6¹⁴ εὐλογῶν εὐλόγησα σε καὶ πληθύνων πληθυνῶ σε (LXX).

Canon Box (OA ii. 547) calls attention to the extreme frequency of this Hebraism in 4 Ezra as one of the reasons for postulating a Hebrew original behind the Latin text. He instances 4³ *excedens excessit cor tuum*, 4²⁶ *festinans festinat*, 5²⁰ *odiens odisti*. Another example illustrates (a) above: 4³⁷ *mensura mensuravit tempora et numero numeravit tempora*.

See discussion in *Prol.* 76¹ and *Einkl.* 118.

A good *Koinḗ* instance is P Tebt ii. 421¹² (iii/A.D.) καὶ μὴ σκύλης τὴν γυναῖκά σου ἢ τὰ παιδιά, ἐρχόμενος δὲ ἔρχου ἰς Θεογονίδα, "but in any case came to Theogonida." (The editors' trans. "when you come," misses the pleading note of the urgent appeal.) See Goodspeed *AJT*, xii (1908), p. 249 f. With this cf. instances of redundant participles in class. Gr. given by K-G ii. 99. (Radermacher *Gr.*³ 210, cft. Schol. Dem. c. *Androt.* 17, ἀποδράς φῆγο, and Bekker *Anecd.* 425: 5 ἀπιὼν φῆγο· συνήθης ὁ πλεονασμὸς τοῖς Ἀττικοῖς.) This may explain Eph 5⁵. In the LXX Hebraism is undeniable.

(2) The cognate accusative of the abstract noun is sometimes used in the LXX, where the Hebrew uses a similar construction to strengthen the force of the verb, e.g. Gen 27²³ ἐξέστη δὲ Ἰσαὰκ ἔκτασιν μεγάλην σφόδρα. The construction is common to Hebrew and Aramaic. But

¹ Against the parallel from Aeschylus given there, Mr. C. D. Chambers wrote (letter, Aug. 1921), "The passage in P.V. would only be even remotely parallel if it ran. *μάτην βλέποντες, μάτην ἐβλεπον, οὐ κλύοντες οὐκ ἤκουον.*"

Lagrange prefer ἡπόρει (NBL boh) as giving better sense ("car avec ἐποίει ce qui suit est absolument banal"). Strangely, neither commentator recognises a possible Semitism.

The two exx. under (b) are not found in the LXX, but Thackeray's comment on the adverbial use of all such auxiliary verbs may apply. "The classical language had used verbs like λανθάνειν and φθάνειν with a participle in a similar way; in the later language the participle with (προ)φθάνειν was replaced by an inf.: the constructions given above may be regarded as a sort of extension of this use" (Gr. 54).

Πολλά adverbial (W¹ 28).

"The frequent πολλά as an adverb may be due to translation of the Aramaic ܢܝܫܘܢ. Cf. Dn Θ 2¹² ܢܝܫܘܢ = πολλή, 5⁹ 6¹⁵. 24 = πολύ" (W. C. Allen *Exp T* xiii. 330). Marti (Gr.² 92*) gives ܢܝܫܘܢ, pl. fem. ܢܝܫܘܢܝܘܬ much; adv. very, Dan. Pap. El. i. 2 [= Strasb. 2]. Dalman (Gr.² 102) says, "Peculiar to the Galilean dialect is a special preference for the ending in ܝ. This accounts for the form ܢܝܫܘܢ very for ܢܝܫܘܢ."

The NT occurrences of πολλά adverbial are given by Hawkins *HS*² 35 thus:

1. Mk 1⁴⁵ 3¹² 5¹⁰. 22. 28. 43 6²⁰ 9²⁶ 15³. He regards all other instances as accusatives.
3. Rom 16⁶. 12, 1 Co 16¹². 18.
4. Jas 3².

The free use of the adverbial accus. in Greek removes this from the category of Semitisms. See LS s.v. πολύς. The disproportionate use of πολλά in the second Gospel is a Marcan mannerism which may be due to Aramaic influence.

Πάλιν and εὐθύς as conjunctions.

Πάλιν, a favourite Marcan word (in narrative, Mt 6, Mk 26, Lk 2), is sometimes an inferential conjunction, not merely *again*, but *further*, *thereupon*, and has been claimed as a translation of the Aramaic *tub* (Dalman *Gr.*² 213, חוב חוב *ferner noch*). So W¹ 28, 221, endorsed by Souter *Lex. s.v.* But in many even of the Marcan instances, the meaning is really iterative, and where the meaning is inferential it is unnecessary to go back to Aramaic. "Might not πάλιν come to have the same secondary meaning as 'again' in English, i.e. 'however' ? See P Oxy xiv. 1676²⁰" (Moffatt *Expos* viii. 20. 141). [Med. and MGR. —R. McK.]

Εὐθύς (εὐθείως) is not only extremely frequent in Mark, but is sometimes an inferential conjunction (e.g. Mk 1²¹. 22. 28. 30 "So then"). Hawkins *HS*² 12) gives the relative occurrences in the Gospels as Mt 18, Mk 41, Lk 7, Jn 6; in narrative Mt 12, Mk 34, Lk 1. Dalman (*WJ* 28) equates the temporal εὐθύς (-έως) with Aram. ܕܝܢܝܘܬ, which, however, is far less common. Lagrange (*S. Marc* p. xcii) suggests that its other meaning resembles ܕܝܢܝܘܬ or ܕܝܢܝܘܬ, which occurs often in Daniel (see Marti *Gr.*² 57*).

Burkitt (*Ev. da-Meph.* ii. 89) suggests influence of Hebr. ׀ consec. But Mk's freedom from Hebraisms weakens this contention. Dalman

2. Jn 15²⁰ 20², Rev 12⁶.
3. 1 Co 10²⁰ BDG. [An echo of several passages in LXX.]
4. Heb 10¹ (see *Proleg.* 58 f.).

(c) The use of an intransitive verb in place of the normal Greek passive

1. Mk 4²¹ 7¹⁹ (contr. Mt 15¹⁷) 9⁴⁸ (contr. v.⁴⁷) 14²¹.
Mt 17²⁷ 8¹² (contr. Lk 13²⁸).
Lk 4⁴¹ 8³.

(W. C. Allen, *Exp T* xiii. 330, found in *ἐρχεται* Mk 4²¹ a mistranslation of the Aphel or Ittaphal of *ἔρξ* "bring" or "be brought." Lagrange, *S. Marc* p. xcvi, proposes that the text should read *ἔρξθη* 3rd plur. Aph. as in Dn 5³, and that the *η* was mistaken for the interrogative particle.)

Archdeacon Allen has strengthened the case for Mark's Aramaism by giving a list of thirteen places where Mt. has changed an active or middle verb in Mk. into a passive (*ICC, Matthew* p. xxiii).

The three groups of data given above vary in value. The statistics of (a) are not very convincing, especially as the free use of *ὑπό* after a pass. verb is found in reported sayings of Jesus; (b) is more weighty, as this use is uncommon in Greek apart from *λέγουσι, φασί*. [Yet note that in all the exx. from the Gospels under (b) Pallas preserves the idiom. The passive is rarely used in MGr.—R. McK.]

(ii) The Infinitive.

In the LXX the influence of the prep. *ἐν* has given the infin. a very wide range. Thackeray (*Gr.* 24) observes the great extension of the inf. with *τοῦ*, and an enlarged use of the "epexegetic infinitive."

As examples of the former cf. Gen 18²⁵, 2 Sam¹⁹ 21, 1 Chr 11¹⁰. For the latter cf. Dt 29⁴ *καὶ οὐκ ἔδωκεν Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ὑμῖν καρδίαν εἰδέναι καὶ ὀφθαλμοὺς βλέπειν καὶ ὦτα ἀκούειν*.

Moulton (*Einvl.* 346) denies that such infinitival constructions in the NT owe anything to Semitism, except in those books where actual translation from Hebrew or Aramaic is in evidence.

(a) *τοῦ c. inf.*—To the full treatment accorded to this construction in *Proleg.* 216 f. little need be added here. Hawkins (*HS*² 48) classifies all the NT uses, and adds, "the telic use of *τοῦ* with the infinitive remains a decidedly Lucan characteristic."

Radermacher (*Gr.*² 189) recognises its moderate employment in correct Greek (as also by Mt and Mk), but remarks on the frequency and freedom of the use in Lk, Ac, and Paul as resembling the "Jewish-Greek" of the LXX. For class. ref. see Stahl *Synt.* 675, K-G ii. 40. Thumb (*Dial.* 373) recognises ultimate Ionic influence on Attic.

Only one NT example deserves examination as direct Semitism.

- 2 Rev 12⁷ *καὶ ἐγένετο πόλεμος ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, ὁ Μιχαὴλ καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ τοῦ πολεμῆσαι μετὰ τοῦ δράκοντος.*

Charles (*ICC*, i. 322) rejects Moulton's explanation (*Proleg.* 218), and shows that this is a literal translation of a Hebrew construction,¹ already followed by the LXX in several passages. *E.g.* Hos 9¹³ Ἐφραὶμ τοῦ ἐξαγαγεῖν = אֶפְרַיִם לְהוֹצִיא, *Ephraim must bring forth*; Ps 25¹⁴ καὶ ἡ διαθήκη αὐτοῦ τοῦ δηλῶσαι αὐτοῖς = : וּבְרִיתוֹ לְהוֹדִיעַם; (Vulg. *et testamentum ipsius ut manifestetur illis*); 1 Chr 9²⁸ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτῶν . . . τοῦ εἰσπορεύεσθαι κατὰ ἐπτὰ ἡμέρας = לְבוֹא לְשִׁבְעַת יָמִים *their brethren had to come in every seven days*. So Eccles 3¹⁵ ὅσα τοῦ γίνεσθαι = אֲשֶׁר לְהִיוֹת. "Thus in the Hebrew the subject before לְ and the infin. is in the nom., and the Greek translators have literally reproduced this idiom in the LXX." The original Hebrew is then taken to be מִיכָאֵל וּמְלַאכָיו לְהִלָּחֵם בְּתַנְיָן *Michael and his angels had to fight with the Dragon*. (N.B.—א, 046 omit τοῦ.) Charles claims that the same use of the infinitive (this time without τοῦ) accounts for the reading of A in 13¹⁰ εἴ τις ἐν μαχαίρῃ ἀποκτανθῆναι, αὐτὸν ἐν μαχαίρῃ ἀποκτανθῆναι, and suspects that αὐτὸν is a corruption of αὐτός. The Hebrew would be אֲשֶׁר בְּחַרְבַּ לְמוֹת הוּא בְּחָרְבַּ לְמוֹת.

Apart from the uncertainties of the text in this passage, this is a useful parallel, as it enables Dr. Charles to meet an obvious objection to his claim that τοῦ πολεμῆσαι is a Hebraism. For τοῦ c. inf. does not seem the most literal translation of לְ c. inf. He gives (*ICC*, i. 356) a list of the various attempts made by the LXX to reproduce this Hebrew idiom. Ps 32⁹ (אB) is a close parallel to Rev 13¹⁰ (A). For the Hebrew constr. and a full list of examples see G-K § 114 h-k, Driver *Tenses* § 204. Guillemard, *Hebraisms in the Greek Testament*, p. 3, *ap.* Mt 2⁶, quotes the Heb. and LXX of Mic 5¹. "An apt example of the practice almost universal, in that version, of rendering לְ with infinitive, after neuter or passive verbs, by τοῦ with Greek infinitive; to the loss very often of all intelligibility or sense: *e.g.* 2 Sam 19²¹, Gen 18²⁸, 1 Chr 11¹⁸. The translators appear to have concluded that a Greek idiom, which was the appropriate interpretation of the Hebrew idiom under certain conditions, was always to be employed as its equivalent: and so have introduced into their version renderings which are otherwise inexplicable. And to this we owe, in great measure, the strange and startling instances of the τοῦ with infinitive, occasionally met with in the NT."

With the one exception of Rev 12⁷ this sweeping assertion is disproved by the analysis given in *Proleg.* 216 ff. "The general blurring of the expressions which were once appropriated to purpose";

¹ This gerundival use of לְ with the infinitive is common to Aramaic and Syriac as well as Hebrew, and Burkitt (*Ev. da-M.* ii. 66) has pointed out that Jn 9²⁰ in syr^{sin} is a good example of the infin. used without a finite verb to express "must." The alleged Aramaised Greek of Jn is free from the inflection that might be looked for, since the Syriac *hādē l-metdammārā bah* is a translation of ἐν τούτῳ γὰρ τὸ θαυμαστὸν ἐστίν.

the tendency to substitute *iva* c. subj. for a noun clause leading to the similar use of *rou* c. inf. in a few cases; the original adnominal use of the genitive of the articular infinitive: these account not only for the examples dealt with in that analysis, but also for the six LXX passages (viz. Lk 4¹⁰, Ac 13⁴⁷, Rom 11¹⁰, Gal 3¹⁰, Heb 10⁷, 1 Pet 3¹⁰). The LXX is not accountable for this construction in the Pauline mosaic of Rom 11⁰).

See also Radermacher *Gr.* 188 ff., D. Emrys Evans *OQ* xv. 26 f. (*Vide infra*, pp. 484 f.)

(b) *The simple infinitive (α) in jussive sense*, corresponding to late Hebrew independent infin. c. \int .

1. Lk 24⁴⁷ *καὶ κηρυχθῆναι ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ μετάνοιαν*. Thus *W*¹ 23, *Das Ev. Lucae*, 141. The sense precludes the dependence of the infin. on *οὕτως γέγραπται*, as seen by syr^{ald} and arm., which substitute *ἔδει* for *γέγραπται*, and by AC^{sq} vg., which insert *καὶ οὕτως ἔδει* after *γέγραπται*. But possibly the infin. depends, by zeugma, on the *εἶπεν* of v.⁴⁶. See (β) below.

2. Rev. 13¹⁰ A. See (α) above.

(β) *After εἶπεν*. This is not set forth in G-K or in Driver *Tenses*, but W. C. Allen (*Mark*, p. 50) shows that in late Heb. and Aramaic $\text{נִצְוָה} = \text{command}$, was followed by \int c. infin., and is represented in LXX or Θ by *εἶπεν* c. infin. Thus 1 Chr 21¹⁷, 2 Chr 1¹⁰ 14³ 29²¹. 27. 30 31⁴. 11 35²¹, Esth 1¹⁰ 6¹, Dn 2² e 2⁴⁶ e 3¹⁰ e 5².

1. Mk 5⁴³ *καὶ εἶπεν δοθῆναι αὐτῇ φαγεῖν*.

8⁷ *καὶ εὐλογήσας αὐτὰ εἶπεν καὶ ταῦτα παρατιθέμαι*.

Lk 12¹³ *εἰπέ τῷ ἀδελφῷ μου μερίσασθαι μετ' ἐμοῦ τὴν κληρονομίαν*.

Allen grants that the usage in Mt 16¹³ and Lk 9⁶⁴ is not quite parallel.

3. Rom 2²³ *ὁ λέγων μὴ μοιχεύειν μοιχεύεις*;

But Lk 12¹³, Rom 2²³ (cf. Mt 5²⁴. 29) are sufficiently close to P Fay 109³, cited in *Vocab.* 372a, to remove them from this category. For Mk 5⁴³ see Bl-D § 392 (4). We may add that the simple inf. in jussive sense after *λέγω* and *εἶπον* is quite classical: v. LS.

(c) *ἐν τῷ c. infinitive*.—Regularly used in LXX to render \int c. inf. According to Dalman, *WJ* 33, the Targums copy the Hebrew idiom, in Biblical Aramaic the kindred construction of \int c. inf. is used (Dan 6²¹), but the construction was wanting in spoken Aramaic.

The NT occurrences are:

1. Mk 4⁴ (=Mt 13⁴=Lk 8⁶) 6⁴⁵.

Mt 13⁴. 25 27¹³.

Lk 1⁸. 21 2⁶. 27. 43 3²¹ 5¹. 13 8⁵. 40. 43 9¹⁵. 29. 33. 34. 36. 51 10²⁵. 28

11¹. 27. 27 12¹⁵ 14¹ 17¹¹. 14 18³⁵ 19¹⁵ 24⁴. 15. 30. 51.

Ac 2¹ 3²⁰ 4²⁰ 8⁶ 9³ 11¹⁵ 19¹.

3. Rom 3⁴ (LXX) 15¹³, 1 Co 11²¹, Gal 4¹⁸.

4. [Heb 2⁸ 3¹². 15 8¹³. But none of these clearly temporal.]

Mk 4^a and the majority of the Lucan examples are found in καὶ ἐγένετο constructions (see tables p. 426 above). All the above passages use ἐν τῷ c. inf. in the temporal sense (including Lk 12¹⁵, see Moulton *Eintl.* 342 n.¹) except Ac 3²⁸ 4³⁰, Ro 15¹³ and those from Hebrews.

The treatment of this construction in *Proleg.* 14, 215 was slightly modified in *Proleg.*³ 249 (*Eintl.* 341) under the influence of E. A. Abbott, who wrote (Nov. 1907): "Of course ἐν τῷ c. infin. = *consisting in*, etc., would be allowable in Attic. But I confess I go with Blass in thinking that ἐν τῷ c. inf. = *during* is non-existent or very rare in Thucydides." The instinctive feeling of two such scholars as Dr. Abbott and Dr. Henry Jackson led to the transference of this "Hebraism" to the category of "possible but unidiomatic Greek." This, of course, does not apply to Ac 3²⁸ 4³⁰ or the examples in Hebrews, which do not depart from classical usage. Moffatt's rendering of Rom 15¹³ "with all joy and peace in your faith," confirms us in removing this also from the class of Semitisms. The remarkably large number of examples in Luke and Acts is one more evidence of the great influence of the LXX on the style of Luke.

That the temporal sense of ἐν τῷ c. inf. is not impossible Greek seems to be shown by Soph. *Ajax* 554 ἐν τῷ φρονεῖν γὰρ μηδὲν ἡδίστος βίος.

(iii) The Participle.

(a) *The Use of the Participle in Periphrastic Tenses.*—See the very full discussion of this question in *Proleg.* 226 f., where the periphrastic imperfect is recognised to be a secondary Semitism in the Synoptics and Acts (cc. 1-12), inasmuch as these books are based on direct translations from the Aramaic. Blass's treatment (*Gr.* 202 ff., B1-D § 353) is on the whole accepted (as also by Thumb *Hellen.* 132). The construction is classical enough in itself (see K-G i. 38 ff.), but with a certain emphasis, that justifies its use in John and Paul, but can hardly be maintained elsewhere in the NT. Moulton's papyrus examples of ἔσομαι c. perf. part., and of the periphrastic πλυεῖν are supplemented in *Eintl.* 358, and more might be given. Here we must only stop to note Mt 24²⁹ πεισοῦνται as a correction for the more vernacular ἔσονται πίπτοντες of Mk 13²⁵. [Med. but not MGr, though found in Laconian dialect.—R. McK.]

Restricting our survey to the periphrastic imperf. we notice that this is fairly frequent in the LXX (see Conybeare and Stock, *Selections*, p. 69). The construction is found in Hebrew, though its frequent use is a mark of the later writers, and of the decadence of the language (Driver *Tenses*, § 135 (5)). In Aramaic, however, this analytic tense often supersedes the imperfect. In Biblical Aramaic the periphrastic tense rather emphasised the duration or the repetition of the verbal action or condition (Kautzsch *Aram. Gr.* § 76 (f), Marti *Gr.*³ § 102 (d)). Duration was emphasised by this use in the Aramaic of the Babylonian Talmud (Margolis *Gr.* § 58 (f)). The same construction is rarely used in the Targums, but is common in the Palestinian Talmud, though generally to bring out the thought of duration, repetition or habit (Stevenson *Aram. Gr.* § 22 (2)).

In the NT we find the imperf. of εἰμί with the present partic. as follows :

1. Mk 1¹² 2⁶. 18 4³⁸ 5⁵. 11 9⁴ 10²². 32^(b4) 14⁶. 40. 49. 54 15⁴⁰. 42.
Mt 7⁸⁰ 8³⁰ 19²².
Lk 1¹⁰. 21. 22 2²². 51 4³⁰. 31. 33. 44 5¹. 16^(b4) 29 6¹³ 8⁴⁰ 9³² 11¹⁴ 13¹⁰. 11^(b4)
14¹ 15¹ 19⁴⁷ 21³⁷ 23⁶. 53 24¹³. 32.
Ac 1¹⁰. 12. 14 2². 5. 42 3¹. 12. 28 9². 28 10²⁴. 20 11⁵ 12⁵. 6. 20 14⁷ 16⁹. 12
18⁷ 21³ 22¹⁹. 20.
2. Jn 1⁹. 26 2⁶ 3²² 10⁴⁰ 11¹ 13²² 18¹². 25. 30.
3. (2 Co 5¹⁹),¹ Gal 1²². 22, Phil 2²⁶.
4. 1 Pet 2²⁵.

The most important results from an analysis of these data are Mt's almost complete avoidance of this locution when following Mark's narrative, Luke's rejection of it in every instance where a Marcan parallel allows comparison, and yet the freedom with which it occurs in the Lucan writings. It is so often introduced by Luke when absent from the Marcan source that one hesitates to suggest its frequency in cc. 1, 2, in "Proto-Luke," and in Ac 1-12 as evidence of fidelity to Aramaic originals. (Lagrange *S. Luc.* p. cv, observes that most of the examples in the Gospel accord with Greek usage.)

Blass finds in most of the Johannine passages that ἦν "has a certain independence of its own." It is strange that though Burney devotes a page and a half to a list of the instances of this usage in the Aramaic of Daniel, it is merely to show that the LXX and Theodotion generally translate by the imperfect, whereas he is silent about the 10 instances that might possibly be adduced from the Fourth Gospel.

A similar construction in which ἐγένετο is joined with a present participle appears in Mk 1⁴ 9².⁷ (to be changed by Mt every time). Archd. Allen (*Exp T* xiii. 328 f., *ICC, Matthew xxii.*) quotes Dn 1¹⁶ and La 1¹⁶ as evidence of its use in LXX or Theod. to render the same idiom in Biblical Aramaic. The construction only comes once in the Apocalypse, here with γίνομαι.

Rev 3⁸ γίνου γρηγορῶν.

(b) *Redundant use of Participle.*—For the various forms of this Semitic pleonasm see Dalman *WJ* 20 ff.; W¹ 17, ²14; Lagrange *S. Matthieu* p. xciv, *S. Marc* p. lxxxvii, *S. Luc* p. cvi; W. C. Allen *Exp T* xiii 330; Burney *Aram. Orig.* 52 ff.

It is hard to say when the participle is really pleonastic, but a Semitic flavour clings to the following examples :

(a) Ἐλθῶν (ἐρχόμενος), ἀπελθῶν, πορευθεῖς, coupled with finite verb. [Med. and MGr.—R. McK.]

1. Ἐλθῶν. Mk 5²³ 7²⁶ 12⁴² 14⁴⁰. 45 16¹, Lk 15²².
Ἀπελθῶν. Mt 13²⁸. 46 18³⁰ 25¹². 26.

¹ I include 2 Co 5¹⁹ in spite of the disclaimer in *Prolog.* 227. Of recent commentators Windisch agrees with Moulton, but Plummer, Bousset and Lietzmann treat ἦν . . . καταλλάσσω as a periphrastic imperfect.

Πορευθεῖς. Lk 7²² (= Mt 11⁴) 13²² 14¹⁰ 15²⁶. (In 8¹⁴ the Syr. versions have not translated πορευόμενοι.)

[Ac 16²⁷. 39 ελθόντες emphatic.]

3. Eph 2¹⁷ ελθὼν εὐηγγελίσαστο might possibly come into this class, but ελθὼν is probably significant. (See E. Haupt in Meyer's *Kommentar*, in *loc.*)

N.B.—This construction, corresponding to the redundant $\text{לָךְ} \text{וְלָךְ}$ and לָךְ in Hebrew, which is also Jewish-Aramaic, is absent from John.

(β) Ἀφείς, καταλιπὼν (with verb of departure).

1. Mk 4³⁶ 8¹³ 12¹³ 14⁵⁰.

Mt 13³⁶ 16⁴ 21¹⁷ 22²².

N.B.—Jewish-Aramaic rather than Hebrew. It is absent from Luke and John.

(γ) Ἀναστᾶς or ἐγερθεῖς (followed by verb of motion).

1. Mk 1³⁵ 2¹⁴ 7²⁴ 10¹.

Mt 9⁹ 1²⁴ 2¹³ 14. 20. 21 9⁷. 19.

Lk 1³⁹ 4²⁹. 38. 39 5²⁸ 15¹⁸. 20 17¹⁹ 23¹ (24¹²) 24²³.

Ac 5⁶ 8²⁷ 9³⁹ 10²⁰. 23 22¹⁰.

N.B.—This idiom is common to Hebrew and Aramaic (see Dalman *loc. cit.*). It is absent from John.

(δ) Ἀποκριθεῖς εἶπεν.

This locution is of interest apart from the element of redundancy. It is strictly redundant (in the sense that nothing has been said to which an answer is needed) only in a few places, viz. Mk 9⁵ 11¹⁴ 12²⁵, Mt 11²⁵ 12²⁸ (? 15¹⁵) 17⁴ 28⁵. It deserves mention here because of its extreme frequency in the Synoptic Gospels, and its close resemblance to the common Hebrew idiom $\text{אָמַרְתָּ וְעַתָּה} \text{אָמַרְתָּ}$. This Hebrew construction is copied by the LXX and the Targums and in Biblical Aramaic $\text{אָמַרְתָּ וְעַתָּה} \text{אָמַרְתָּ}$ is often found. But Dalman goes on to say that in later Jewish Aramaic this formula is quite unknown. "Direct speech is introduced by the simple אָמַרְתָּ The word for 'answer' in Galilean-Aramaic אָמַרְתָּ is rarely used. . . . אָמַרְתָּ , the word for 'answer' used by Onkelos, appears to be as yet a learned term for 'making good an objection.' Probability supports the view that the formula in question was unknown in genuine Aramaic." This statement is the more significant in view of the following data. The locution is found (sing. or plur. with an occasional λέγει, εἶπη or εἶπει).

1. Mk 15 times, but with a high proportion of λέγει for εἶπεν.

Mt 45 ..

Lk 38 ..

Ac 5 .. (4¹⁹ 5²⁹ 8²⁴. 24 25⁹).

2. In John the participial construction is not found once, but, as Burney shows, ἀπεκρίθη (-θησαν) occurs at asyndeton opening 65 times (and with ἀποκρίνεται once), whilst the verb with a connective particle opens a sentence 11 times. Mk 12²⁹ is the only other instance of ἀπεκρίθη as an asyndeton opening. Burney's conclusion is remarkable. "It is difficult to resist the conclusion that ἀπεκρίθη καὶ εἶπεν is a literal rendering of the Aramaic ܘܕܢܐ ܡܢ ܗܘܢܐ and ἀπεκρίθησαν καὶ εἶπαν of ܘܕܢܐ ܡܢ ܗܘܢܐ, for which, as we have seen, they stand in Theodotion's Daniel." But in 38 instances ἀπεκρίθη (-ησαν) introduces the words spoken without further verb.

In other words, the first three Evangelists have modelled themselves here on the familiar language of the LXX, whereas John in 26 passages follows the example of the Aramaic part of Daniel, and in the remaining 38 passages uses the ordinary Hellenistic word, betraying his Aramaic cast of thought only by asyndeton.

(e) Ἐλάλησεν (εἶπεν) λέγων.

1. Mk 8²⁸ 12²⁶, Mt 23¹⁴ 28¹⁸, Lk 14⁸ 24⁴⁷, Ac 8²⁸ 26²¹.

2. Jn 8¹².

(For the indeclinable use of λέγων (λέγοντες) = ܘܕܢܐ in Rev 4¹ 5¹¹. 11¹. 11¹⁵ 14⁶, see Charles *ICC*, in *loc.*)

The Hebrew ܘܕܢܐ . . . ܘܕܢܐ is also imitated in Biblical Aramaic twice (Dn 6²², Ezr 5¹¹), and in the Targums, but Dalman denies its place in the later Jewish-Aramaic dialects. On the other hand, Lagrange (*S. Math.* p. lxxxix) finds it a dozen times in the Elephantine papyri and accepts it as commonly spoken, but not very pure Aramaic.

For the constant introduction of oratio recta by *dicens* in 4 Ezra, esp. *dixit dicens*, 11³⁷ 12⁴⁰, see G. H. Box in *OA* ii. 548.

Other participial uses, such as καθίσας, ἐστώς, σταθεῖς, are less pleonastic than idiomatic, and belong to the category of Semitisms of vocabulary rather than of grammar. See Dalman *WJ* 22 f., *Proleg.*³ 230, 241. To the same class belongs Mt 5³, καὶ ἀνοίξας τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ ἐδίδασκεν αὐτοὺς λέγων, on which see Bornhäuser *Die Bergpredigt*, 6 ff.

Wellhausen accounts for the wealth of pleonastic verbs in these constructions by the lack of compound verbs in Semitic languages, which necessitated the use of a special root to express every shade of meaning.

(ζ) Ἀρξάμενος. [See *Proleg.*³ 182, 240 (*Eini.* 287), *Vocab.* 82 b.]

1. Mt 20⁸.

Lk 23⁶ 24⁴⁷.

Ac 1²² 10²⁷ 11⁴.

2. [Jn] 8⁹.

Torrey's claim (*CDA* 25) that this is an Aramaic idiom in Acts is disputed by J. W. Hunkin (*JTS* xxv. 401) on the ground of the papyri usage, also of its occurrence in Xenophon and Plutarch. See further *ἄρξα(ν)το* c. infin., below under iv (a).

(iv) Indicative Mood.

(a) *Redundant Auxiliary Verb.*

This characteristic of Hebrew and Aramaic has already been dealt with under the Participle, and we there saw that in 26 instances John substitutes the indicative for the participle so familiar to us in the Synoptic formula ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν. The Johannine ἀπεκρίθη καὶ εἶπεν is not the only example of a redundant verb in the indicative. The most striking example is ἄρχομαι.

1. Ἔρχα(ν)το c. *infin.*

Mk 1⁴⁶ 2²³ 4¹ 5¹⁷ 20 6² 7. 24. 55 8¹¹. 31. 32 10²⁸. 32. 41. 47 11¹⁵ 12¹ 13⁵
14¹⁸. 22. 45. 59. 71 15⁸. 18.

Mt 4¹⁷ 11⁷. 20 12¹ 16²¹. 22 26²². 27. 74. [Also in other tenses, in sayings of Jesus, 18³⁴ and 24⁴⁹, and in 14³⁰.]

Lk 4²¹ 5²¹ 7¹⁵. 24. 28. 49 9¹² 11²⁹. 53 12¹ 14¹⁸. 30 15¹⁴. 24 19³⁷. 45 20⁹ 22²³
23². [Also in other tenses, in five passages from sayings of John the Baptist or of Jesus, 3⁸ 12⁴⁶ 13²⁵. 26 14⁹.]

Ac 1¹ 2⁴ 18²⁶ 24³ 27²⁵.

2. Jn 13⁵.

This cannot be called a Hebraism, for though it is found fairly often in the LXX a glance at H-R shows that it has no fixed Hebrew original. Sometimes it represents a word with a definite meaning (e.g. Hiph. of לָּחַץ), often the Hiph. of לָּחַץ, sometimes (e.g. Gen 2³) it is without warrant in the Hebrew, and occurs quite freely in books without a Hebrew source.

On the other hand, it is claimed that its use in Mark is due to the use of אָרַח in Aramaic as an auxiliary verb. See W. C. Allen, *Comm. Mark*, 49 f., who points out (a) all the 26 instances in Mk are in narrative, and not one has special emphasis. (b) Mt omits all but 6 of Mk's instances, probably from the perception that the word was Aramaic rather than Greek. (c) Luke's use is remarkable. He retains only 2 of Mk's cases. Of the remaining 25, 12 are in sayings, 13 occur in narrative, 5 of which occur in passages with Marcan parallels. His conclusion is that the frequency in Mk is due to translation from Aramaic, in Luke partly to the Aramaised Greek of his sources, partly to a feeling that (especially in "began to say") such phrases were quite natural in Greek. I venture to add that its comparative frequency in the LXX may have inclined Luke to its use, as was possibly the case with ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν (see above, pp. 453 f.).

G. H. Box (*OA* ii. 548) accounts for the very frequent use of *incipere* c. *infin.* in 4 Ezra as a literal rendering of Heb. לָּחַץ, and cft. the similar use of ἀρχεσθαι in the Gospels.

Radermacher¹ calls attention to a parallel to ἤρξατο λέγειν in the vulgar Latin *coepit dicere, c(o)epimus ascendere, ubi coeperit lucescere.*

¹ *Idg. F.* xxxi. Anz. 6 (his valuable review of Moulton's *Einleitung*). The point is not mentioned in the recent 2nd ed. of his *Neutestamentliche Grammatik*.

The fullest treatment that this idiom has received is by J. W. Hunkin *JTS* xxv. 390-402, "Pleonastic" ἀρχομαι in the New Testament. Here Dalman's examples of the Aram. ܐܪܚܘܡܝܐ and post-Biblical Hebrew לְהַתְּחִיל are examined closely, the former being found to carry the ordinary meaning, whilst the latter is sometimes semi-pleonastic. Test. Levi (Charles's ed. pp. 249 f.) is quoted in Aramaic and Greek in support and Enoch lxxxix. 42-49 (which is based on an Aramaic original) is shown to favour this locution strongly. Archd. Hunkin then adduces numerous parallels from Xenophon and two from Aristophanes. This leads him to the conclusion: "The above parallels are quite sufficient to show that the usage of ἀρχομαι with the infin., as we have found it in Mt or Lk, is no indication that either St Matthew or St Luke was acquainted with Aramaic. Nor does it necessarily suggest that any of the documents used by St Matthew or St Luke was originally written in that language. . . ." The loose and somewhat pleonastic way in which "begin" is used by Mark, and in some of the Lucan records of the speeches of Jesus, is admitted to be due to Aramaic.

(b) Tense.

(a) Historic Present and Imperfect as renderings of Aramaic participle.

a. Historic Present.—The proportionately high frequency of this in Mark has been claimed as an Aramaism by W. C. Allen, and in John by Burney. [MGr.—R. McK.]

The statistics (given by Hawkins *HS*² 144 ff., Burney *Aram. Orig.* 87) are as follows:

1. Mk	151	(of which 72 are words signifying speaking, e.g. λέγει, φησίν).
Mt	93	" 68 " "
Lk	9	" 6 " "
Ac	13	" 11 " "

[N.B.—Of Mt's 93 examples, 21 are retained from Mk, and 15 occur in Parables.

Of Lk's 9 examples, 5 come in Parables.]

2. Jn 164 (of which 121 are words signifying speaking, e.g. λέγει, φησίν).

It is evident that both Mt and Lk regarded this as a vulgarism to be removed when possible (see *Proleg.* 121), but Thackeray, *Schweich Lectures*, 20 ff., has shown strong reason for denying that it is due to Aramaism. Taking the first three books of each of the four leading historians he finds the historic present in Herod. 206 times, Thuc. 218, Xen. 61, Polyb. 40. Thus in the classical age it was common to the literary style and to vernacular, whereas in Hellenistic it was increasingly regarded as vernacular. Hawkins (*HS*² 213) shows that out of 337 instances in the LXX, 232 occur in the four books of Kingdoms, of which 151 are found in 1 Kgd. Thackeray's thorough examination shows that in Mk as in 1 Kgd the historic present tends to come at or near the beginning of a paragraph. The exceptions are specially dramatic, as Mk 15^{24, 27} (pictorial). Verbs of (a) saying, (b) seeing, (c) coming and going, (d) bring-

ing and sending, are conspicuous. The tense as a rule is dramatic in the sense that it serves to introduce new scenes in the drama. Cf. stage directions, "Enter . . .," "Scene . . ." "Loquitur . . ." He considers Archd. Allen's claim for Aramaism in the Marcan use quite untenable. "Would he maintain that 1 Samuel lay before the Greek translator in Aramaic?"

Allen pointed out (following Nöldeke, *Syr. Gr.* 190)¹ that in Syriac this participial expression of action described as taking place is practically limited to the verb "to say" (*Exp T* xiii. 329).

β. Imperfect.—Stevenson *Aram. Gr.* 56. In Palestinian Talmud and Midrash "the use of participles in place of perfect tenses in narratives of past events is very characteristic." "In Old Test. Aramaic the participle . . . is a very frequent alternative to a perfect in narratives of past events. It is also used as a progressive tense descriptive of events in the present or the past, and in stating general truths." In the Targums participles often represent Hebr. imperfects, but not to the same extent as in the Palestine Talmud and not in the same uses.

Allen (*ut supr.* also *ICC, Matthew*, p. xxiii) observes that there are about 220 imperfects in Mark, about 30 of which Mt changes to aorist. He finds a striking parallel in Theodotion's version of Daniel (which contains 149 verses from Hebr. and 206 from Aram.). "In rendering Hebr., Theod. uses about 9 imperfects; in rendering Aram., about 64. Of these 64 about 4 correspond to perf., about 12 to imperf., but about 27 to a part., and about 21 to a part. with ܩܘܠ . That is to say, a literal translator, where he had an Aram. partic., or partic. with ܩܘܠ , thought it natural to render them by imperfects."

To estimate the force of this argument we must examine the other historical books in the NT. Hawkins's figures for the imperfect (excluding ᾠφη , and with Burney's correction of that for John) are:

Mt 79, Mk 222, Lk 252, Ac 314, Jn 165,

and he adds the explanation that the smaller proportion in Mt and Jn is partly due to the larger amount of discourse in proportion to narrative which they contain (*HS*² 51).

If we adapt these figures to an average per WH page, the results are:

Mt 1-16, Mk 5-4, Lk 3-5, Ac 4-5, Jn 3-1.²

A further test reduces the significance of this argument for Aramaic. "I find that in Milligan's *Selections from the Greek Papyri* there are 22 impf. to 111 aor.; in Mk 1, 19:39; in Mt 3 and 4, 7:29, in Polybius (7 pages in Wilamowitz *Lesebuch*) 37:54; and in Appian (6 pp. in *do.*) 90:25. So Appian here uses impf. seven times as much as Mk does, and Polybius 1½ times." (Note by J. H. M.)

¹ Nöldeke *Syr. Gr.*² 206: "Die Erzählung verwendet das Part. act. (als Praes. histor.) fast nur bei 'amar, aber dies 'amar, 'am'ra, 'am'rin, 'am'ran, 'er, sie sagte'; 'sie sagten' ist sehr häufig."

² Burney counts 118 cases in Jn 4-12, i.e. 4:37 per WH page.

(b) *Future for Imperative.*

Lagrange (*S. Matthieu*, p. xciv) traces this use in the Gospels to the Semitic use of the imperfect for both jussive and future, calling attention to the alternation of imperatives and jussives in Dan 4¹¹⁻¹².

Thus he accounts for Mt 5⁴⁸ ἔσεσθε (Lk 6³⁶ γίνεσθε), 6⁵ οὐκ ἔσεσθε, 20²⁶. 27 ἔσται (so Mk 10⁴³. 44, but Lk 22²⁶ γινέσθω), 23¹¹ ἔσται (so Mk 9²⁸).

On the other hand, Mt 21⁸ (=Lk 19²¹) ἐρέετε, where Mk 11³ has imper. εἶπατε.

(c) *Aorist for Present.*

In *Proleg.* 134 f. reason was given for regarding a number of NT examples, which seem to come under this heading, as either epistolary or gnomic aorists, or else as instances of the very old use (ordinary in early Sanskrit) of the aorist of the proximate past.

Two instances stand apart from the others.

Mk 1¹¹ (=Mt 3¹⁷=Lk 3²²) ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα. This may be explained as summary aorist (referring to the "30 blameless years," so G. G. Findlay), or the aor. of indefinite time reference, or else as the aor. of proximate past (the Dove the sign). All these are fully in accord with Greek usage. Notice, however, the allusion to Is 42¹ שְׁבַח לַיהוָה יְהוָה, LXX, ὁ ἐκλεκτός μου, ὃν εὐδόκησεν ἡ ψυχὴ μου (B προσεδέξατο αὐτὸν ἡ ψ. μου.), quoted again (with ὁ ἀγαπητός for ὁ ἐκλεκτός) in Mt 12¹⁸. Here the Hebr. perf. (*delighteth*, יִשְׁבַּח is stative) is represented by Greek aor. Allen (*ICC*, *Matthew* 29) says, "The aor. εὐδόκησα is modelled on the aorists of the LXX in this passage, which were probably interpreted as implying the divine election of Israel, and so here the divine election of the Messiah."

Mt 23² ἐπὶ τῆς Μωϋσέως καθέδρας ἐκάθισαν οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φ. One naturally remembers Ps 1¹ with the three perfects שָׁבַח שָׁבַח שָׁבַח rendered in the LXX by three aorists ἐπορεύθη, ἔστη, ἐκάθισεν; cf. Ps 122⁶. For the whole subject see Driver *Tenses* §§ 12, 35.

Prof. G. C. Richards, reviewing *Proleg.* in *JTS* x. 284, wrote: "Is it ingressive, 'they came to sit,' effective, 'they seated themselves,' or constative, 'they sat' ? It would be very inappropriate to call it gnomic. Wellhausen claims it as an Aramaism. Is it not probable that he is right, and that a limited number of verbal forms in the NT will defy analysis on Greek lines ?" To which Moulton replied (*Einl.* 220 n.¹): "I am not sure of this, although, as often shown, I am in no way opposed to the assumption of 'translation-Greek.' It may be translated by 'they seated themselves,' an act of indefinite time reference in the past, as every rabbi in turn claimed this *ex-cathedra* authority on beginning his life-work; the tense is then natural. It is ingressive, and expresses the self-assertion of the would-be Moses more vigorously than the present could; and it is iterative, for it applies to many individual scribes."

Wellhausen¹ admits that ἐβάπτισα Mk 1⁸ (=βαπτίζω Mt 3¹¹, Lk 3¹⁶) and ἐδίστασας Mt 14²¹ are rather different, as they refer to an action

¹ See *W*² 25, 218.

completed in a moment, or, as we should prefer to describe the tense, "the acrist of the thing just happened" (proximate past).

7. NOUNS.

The peculiar idioms in the treatment of nouns come more conveniently under other headings. One or two special uses are mentioned below.

(1) *Casus Pendens*: see above, A 3.

(2) *Accusative Case*: see under adverbial expressions, B 5. A special instance of alleged Hebraism is Mt 4¹⁵ ὁδὸν θαλάσσης for $\text{דִּי הַיָּם הַיָּבֵשׁ}$. But see W. C. Allen (*ICC in loc.*), who shows that it is not from LXX, but probably due to careless copying from some other version.

(3) *Genitive Case*: see under adjectival substitutes, B 3.

A Hebraic use of the genitive after a perf. pass. part., or a verbal adj., has been suspected in such passages as:

1. Mt 25³⁴ οἱ εὐλογημένοι τοῦ πατρὸς (הַבְּרָכָה הַזֶּה , LXX εὐλογητὸς κυρίου, or εὐλογημένος ὑπὸ κυρίου).
Lk 2²⁷ τὸ εἰθισμένον τοῦ νόμου. [But is quite class. = τὸ ἔθος τοῦ νόμου.]
Mt 11¹¹ (=Lk 7²⁶) ἐν γεννητοῖς γυναικῶν (cf. Job 14¹ 15¹⁶ 25⁴, γεννητὸς γυναικός, $\text{הַיָּבֵשׁ הַיָּבֵשׁ}$) and contr. Gal 4⁴ γενόμενον ἐκ γυναικός).
2. Jn 6⁴⁴ (LXX) καὶ ἔσονται πάντες διδασκαλοὶ Θεοῦ (=Is 54¹³ $\text{הַיָּבֵשׁ הַיָּבֵשׁ}$).
3. 1 Co 2¹³ οὐκ ἐν διδασκατοῖς ἀνθρωπίνης σοφίας λόγοις, ἀλλ' ἐν διδασκατοῖς πνεύματος.

If in some of these we must acknowledge the influence of the LXX, we can also see an extension of a use common in poetry, e.g. Soph. *Ajax* 807 φῶτος ἡπατημένη, Eur. *Or.* 497 πληγεις θυγατρὸς. See K-G i. 376.¹

(4) *Dative Case*: see under adverbial substitutes, B 5. A few special uses remain for treatment.

(a) Dat. of agent after pass. part. is claimed by Wellhausen as Aramaic, "as *amandus mihi*, or rather *amatus mihi*" (*W*¹ 25, ¹18). Nöldeke (*Syr. Gr.* ² § 279) attests the fondness of Syriac for this construction. The one NT example is Lk 23¹⁵ ἐστὶν πεπραγμένον αὐτῷ. It is not easy to see why Lk should have preserved the Roman procurator's statement in Aramaised Greek. But the numerous examples of the dat. of the agent after a perfect passive given by K-G i. 422 show that it was perfectly good Greek. Cf. Thuc. i. 51, 118; Hdt. vi. 123; Isoc. iv. 4; Lys. xxiv. 4; Xen. *Anab.* i. viii. 12, vii. vi. 32; *Cyr.* vii. ii. 15, and more closely Dem. c. *Arphob.* 1: δέῃ διηγῆσασθαι τὰ τοῦτ' πεπραγμένα περὶ ἡμῶν. Cf. Kälker 279: "Dativus, qui cum passivo conjungitur, eadem notione qua ὑπὸ c. genit., saepissime a Polybio usurpator: e.g. i. 13. 3." P Petr ii. 13(19)¹³ (iii/B.C.) (=Witk. 8¹³) οὐθέν σοι μὴ γενηθῆι λυπηρόν, ἀλλὰ πᾶν εἰμὸι ἔσται) κεφροντισμένον τοῦ σε γενέσθαι ἄλυπον.

¹ With Jn 6⁴⁵, 1 Co 2¹³, Mr. E. E. Genner oft. Soph. *El.* 343-4 νοουθετήματα κείνης διδασκᾶ, and such phrases as τὰ πεπολιτευμένα αὐτῶν in the orators.

(b) Dat. after *ἐνοχος*, claimed by Wellhausen as "ungriechisch." (*W*¹ 33 f. omitted in ed.²). Mt 5²² *ἐνοχος ἔσται τῇ κρίσει*.

J. C. James, *Language of Palestine* 72 n.⁴, observes: "It is equivalent to *לְרִשְׁתָּא אֲלֻרְרְחָא* Onk. Gen. 26¹¹, LXX *θανάτῳ ἐνοχος ἔσται*." But *θανάτου* has the best MS support, and it is not easy to see what bearing the Hebrew original *לְרִשְׁתָּא אֲלֻרְרְחָא*, or the Aramaic of Onkelos, has upon the alleged Semitism of the Greek idiom. Moulton has shown conclusively (*Einl.* 378 n.¹ *Vocab.* 217) that this, as well as other NT uses of *ἐνοχος*, accords with Greek usage.

(c) Dr. Charles explains the difficult dative in Rev 21⁸ *τοῖς δὲ δειλοῖς καὶ ἀπιστοῖς . . . τὸ μέρος αὐτῶν* as a reproduction of the Hebrew idiom by which *ב* introduces a new subject (*ICC* i. p. cxlviii, ii. 216 n.¹). Viteau *Étude* ii. 41 f., cft. 2 Es 10¹⁴ *καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς ἐν πόλεσιν ἡμῶν . . . ἐλθέτωσαν*.

8. PREPOSITIONS AND IMPROPER PREPOSITIONS.

The extensive use of many prepositional phrases in LXX is recognised by Thackeray as due to Hebrew influence.

Ἄπο and *ἐκ* in constructions influenced by *מִן*.

(a) Thackeray (*Gr.* 46) notes that in LXX *ἀπό* c. gen. is thus used instead of acc. after *αἰσχύνησθαι*, *εὐλαβεῖσθαι*, *λανθάνειν*, *προσέχειν*, *τρέμειν*, *ὑπερηφανεύεσθαι*, *ὑπερορᾶν*, *φοβείσθαι*, *φυλάσσεσθαι*.

NT instances are:—

1. Mt 7¹⁶ 10¹⁷ 16⁶. 11. 13 (=Lk 12¹), Lk 20⁴⁶ *προσέχειν ἀπό*.
Mt 10²⁸ = Lk 12⁴ *μὴ φοβηθῆτε ἀπὸ τῶν . . .* Hawkins (*HS*² 64) observes that against this NT example the LXX contains the idiom 49 times, 25 of them with *ἀπὸ προσώπου*, out of about 440 occurrences of the verb.
Mk 8¹⁶ 12²⁸, *βλέπειν ἀπό* (see p. 31 above).
Lk 12¹⁸ *φυλάσσεσθε ἀπό*. (Cf. Xen. *Cyr.* ii. iii. 9, *Hell.* vii. ii. 10.)
2. 1 Jn 5²¹ *φυλάξατε ἑαυτὰ ἀπὸ τ. εἰδ.*
2²⁸ *μὴ αἰσχυθῶμεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ αὐτοῦ*.

*W*¹ 32 attributes *φεύγειν* and *φοβείσθαι ἀπό* to Semitic influence, but *W*² 25 concedes that they can also be Greek. So *κρύπτω ἀπό* is as old as Homer (*Od.* xxiii. 110) (*Bl-D* § 155. 3). For *ἀπὸ προσώπου*, however, see below. Mr. Emrys Evans touches upon this idiom in a paper upon Case-Usage in the Greek of Asia Minor (*OQ* xv. 28). He cites *C. and B.* ii. p. 565 (no. 466), *ἐὰν δὲ τις μὴ φοβηθῆ τούτων τῶν καταρῶν*. By the side of this ablatival genitive he sets *Pelagius* x. 12 (Usener, p. 12), *μὴ δειλιάσῃς ἀπ' αὐτοῦ*, and concludes that the NT construction is a development quite natural to Greek—a "secondary" Hebraism. [*Προσέχω* and *φυλάσσω ἀπό* in Med. and MGr, *βλέπω ἀπό* in Med. Gr, *φοβοῦμαι ἀπό* in MGr, which prefers *φοβ. c. acc.*—R. McK.]

(b) Mt 11¹⁹ = Lk 7³⁶ δικαιούσθαι ἀπό is taken as Aram. ܕܢܦܢ ܢܐ = Hebr. ܘܢܦܢ by Wellhausen (*W*¹ 32, *25). But it seems far better to take this ἀπό (as so often in the Κοινή) as = ὑπό, marking the agent after a passive verb.

(c) The causal use of ἀπό has been explained thus. (For ἀπό in LXX = causal ܢܐ, cf. Gen 9¹¹, Ps 76⁷.) *W*¹ 32, *25 cites from Synoptics:

1. Mk 2⁴ D ἀπό τοῦ ὄχλου (for διὰ τὸν ὄχ.).

Mt 18⁷ οὐαὶ ἀπὸ τῶν σκανδάλων, 14³⁶ 28⁴ ἀπὸ τοῦ φόβου [add 13⁴⁴ ἀπὸ τῆς χαρᾶς αὐτοῦ].

Lk 22⁴⁶ ἀπὸ τῆς λύπης, 24⁴¹ ἀπὸ χαρᾶς [add 19³ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄχλου, 21³⁹ ἀπὸ φόβου].

Ac 11¹⁹ ἀπὸ τῆς θλίψεως, 12¹⁴ ἀπὸ τῆς χαρᾶς, 22¹¹ ἀπὸ τῆς δόξης.

2. Jn 21⁶ ἀπὸ τ. πλήθους τ. ἰχθύων.

4. Heb 5⁷ ἀπὸ τ. εὐλαβείας.

This usage is classical (see LS). For vernacular examples see Kuhring 35 f., *Vocab.* 58 f. For parallels to Mt 18⁷ see *Prot.*³ 246. [Med. and MGr.—R. McK.]

(d) A special kind of ablative use appears in—

1. Mt 27³⁴ ἀθῶρος ἀπό, Ac 20³⁶ καθαρὸς ἀπό [cf. Gen 24⁴¹ ἀθῶρος ἀπό (ἐκ) = ܢܐ ܢܦܢ], for which abundant parallels from papyri are given by Kuhring 52 f. See also Vogeser *Spr. d. gr. Heiligenlegenden* 26.

Lk 24³¹ ἄφαντος ἐγένετο ἀπ' αὐτῶν, claimed as a Hebraism by Psichari *Essai* pp. 204 ff. See *Vocab.* 95b.

(e) The partitive use of ἀπό after ἐσθίειν.

Mk 7²⁸ = Mt 15²⁷. McNeile *Comm. in loc.* "The Hebraic ἐσθίειν ἀπό (ܢܐ ܠܢܦܢ), frequent in the LXX, is not found elsewhere in NT; cf. ἐσθ. ἐκ." It is an instance of the more general use of ἀπό or ἐκ c. gen. to replace the partitive gen. in later Greek. Cf. MGr. δειπνῶν ἀπὸ χῶμα, *I eat (of) earth* (Thumb *Handb.* 102). [Very common in MGr.—R. McK.]

(f) The phrase ἀπὸ μιᾶς Lk 14¹⁶, has been claimed as a literal translation of Aramaic ܢܐ ܢܦܢ "all at once," "suddenly." See above, p. 28. Moulton asks (*Eintl.* 15 n.¹), "But why μιᾶς fem.? Simply because it is a Greek idiom." Blass (*Gr.* 140 f., Bl-D § 241, n. 6) regards it as a stereotyped phrase, "with one mind or voice," and cft. Aristoph. *Lysistr.* 1000, ἀπὸ μιᾶς ὑσπλαγίδος (strictly of runners in a race, who rush off together at the fall of the single rope). Plummer *ICC in loc.* supplies γνώμης for an "expression unique in Gr. literature," and cft. Philo (*De Spec. Legg.* ii. p. 311), ἀπὸ μιᾶς καὶ τῆς αὐτῆς γνώμης. For the Semitic use of the fem. see G-K, § 122 q. I cannot trace the Aramaic idiom in the grammars of Marti, Kautzsch, or Dalman, or in Dalman's *Wörterbuch*. But the Syriac *mech'dâ* supplies that meaning.¹ Moulton (*op. cit.*)

¹ As Mr. C. R. North informs me.

3. With εἶναι. 2 Co 6¹⁸ (LXX), Eph 5³¹ (LXX). Cf. Ro 5¹⁸ (εἰς κατέκριμα (sc. ἐγένετο).

With λογισθῆναι Rom 2²⁶ 4³ (LXX) 9⁸.

4. With εἶναι Heb 1⁵ (LXX) 8¹⁰ (LXX).

(b) πιστεύειν eis o. acc. See Burney, *Aram. Orig.* 34, and *Proleg.* 68, where a table is given showing the distribution of the various constructions with πιστεύειν. Semitic influence is recognised in the literal translation of אֱלֹהֵי הַשָּׁמַיִם by the prepositional phrase, reserving the simple dative for הַשָּׁמַיִם.

1. Mt 18⁶ (= Mk 9⁴² ABLΘ), Ac 10⁴² 14²⁸ 19⁴.

2. Jn 1¹² 2¹¹. 23 3¹⁶. 18. 28 4²⁹ 6²⁹. 35. 40 7⁵. 31. 38. 39. 48 8³⁰ 9³⁵. 38 10⁴² 11³⁶. 26. 45. 48 12¹¹. 26. 37. 42. 44. 46 14¹. 12 16⁹ 17³⁰.

1 Jn 5¹⁰. 12.

3. Rom 10¹⁴, Gal 2¹⁶, Phil 1²⁰.

4. 1 Pet 1².

(c) A curious use of εἰς appears in Ac 7⁵³ εἰς διαταγὰς ἀγγέλων, where Torrey (*ODA* 33) explains that εἰς = לְ, which sometimes means "according to," "by." אֱלֹהֵי הַשָּׁמַיִם לְכַלְכֵּל אֱלֹהֵי הַשָּׁמַיִם "by the ordering of angels." Cf. Ps 119⁹¹ אֱלֹהֵי הַשָּׁמַיִם לְ "according to thy ordinances."

(d) The phrase πορεύου (ὑπάγε) εἰς εἰρήνην (Mk 5³⁴, Lk 7⁵⁰ 8⁴⁶) must be due to the LXX, where it often represents the Hebrew הָלַךְ לְשָׁלוֹם. See *OHL*, p. 516, for similar examples of this adverbial use of לְ with abstract nouns.

(e) For εἰς ἀπάντησιν = אֶתְּרָאֵם see *Proleg.* 14 n.⁴. [Med. Gr.—R. McK.]

Ἐν.

(a) For the instrumental use of ἐν see *Proleg.* 12, 61, 104, and above p. 23; also Kuhring 43 f., Rossberg 28. [Med. Gr.—R. McK.]

(b) The causal use of ἐν has some support from the papyri: see Kuhring 43, Rossberg 29, *Vocab.* 210. H. A. A. Kennedy (*Exp T* xxviii. 323), however, gives a list of passages in which the LXX rendering of אֵל has probably left its influence, with the meaning *because of, by reason of, for the sake of*.

1. Mt 6⁷, Ac 7³⁰ (LXX). Add Ac 24¹⁶.

2. Jn 16²⁰.

3. Rom 1²¹. 24 5², 1 Co 4⁶ 7¹⁴, 2 Co 12⁵. 9, Ph 1¹². Add Rom 9⁷ (LXX).

4. Add Heb 10¹⁰ 11¹² (LXX).

(c) Dr. Moulton acknowledged a Semitism in ἡμολογῆν ἐν (*Proleg.* 104), and observes Nestle's warning that the construction with אֵל is Aramaic rather than Hebrew (*Einl.* 169). Lagrange *S. Matthieu*, p. civ, "En aram. אֵל à Pa. ou plutôt Aph. Le syr sin met le אֵל même à Jo 12⁴²."

Moulton also accepted G. G. Findlay's suggestion that *ἀμύνουαι ἐν* and *εἰς* (LXX, but not in Pent.) are Hebraistic, occurring in religious formulae, and only in Mt and Rev.

1. Mt 5²⁵. 26 23¹⁶(*δια*) 18(*δια*) 20(*δια*) 21(*δια*) 22(*δια*).

2. Rev 10⁶ (LXX).

Lagrange (*l.c.* p. civ) "En grec on emploie l'accus. ou κατά, ou le dat. La construction avec *ἐν* est donc sûrement sémitique; en aram. ܘܢܘܬ à l'Ïtpe. et ܘܢ."

The *πιστεύειν ἐν* of Mk 1¹⁵ Moulton afterwards accepted as translation Greek (*contra*, *Proleg.* 67) under the influence of Dr. Burkitt, who compared Jer 12⁶ *μη πιστεύσης ἐν ἀνθρώποις ὅτι λαλοῦσιν πρὸς σέ καλά*.¹

"Then *εὐδοκεῖν ἐν τινι* (once in Polyb.) would be encouraged by the same tendency, in place of regular simple dative (see Milligan *Thess.* p. 106)—the acc. also is used" (J. H. M.).

To the same class belongs *σκανδαλιζέσθαι ἐν*.

1. Mt 11⁶ 13⁶⁷ 26²¹. 22, Mk 6³, Lk 7²⁸.

Lagrange *S. Matthieu*, p. cviii, "Le prép. *ἐν* est un reflet du sémitique . . . L'araméen est probablement ܘܢܘܬ à *Itpa*. Les vers. syrr. ont repris ܘܢܘܬ comme l'héb."

In addition to these verbal constructions with *ἐν*, W¹ 32 24 claims *ἔρχεσθαι ἐν* = "to come with," "to bring."

1. Mt 21²² *ἦλθεν . . . ἐν ὁδοῦ δικαιοσύνης* = *brought the method of righteousness*.

16²⁸ *ἐρχόμενον ἐν τῇ βασ. αὐτοῦ* = *bringing his kingdom*.

Lk 23⁴² *ὅταν ἔλθῃς ἐν τῇ βασ. σου* (BL *eis* = *ἐν* acc. to Wellh. Note that D reads *ἐν τ. ἡμέρα τ. ἐλεύσεώς σου*).

This interpretation seems gratuitous in every instance.

Other uses of this preposition mentioned by Wellh. may be simply instances of the intrusive *ἐν* so common in the *Κοινή* (Kuhring 12), e.g. *ἐν ποίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ* (Mk 11²⁸), *ἐν δυνάμει* (Mk 9¹), *ἐν δόλῳ* (Mk 14¹). Add to these Mt 7³ *ἐν ᾧ μέτρω*, 7⁶ *ἐν τοῖς ποσὶν αὐτῶν*, 22¹⁶ *ἐν ἀληθείᾳ* (*contr.* Mk 12¹⁴ = Lk 20²¹ *ἐπ' ἀληθείας*).

I. Lk 16²⁸ *ἐν πᾶσι τοῦτοις* (NBL) is corrected to *ἐπί* in AD; cf. *ὁὶν πᾶσιν τοῦτοις* (24²¹). Possibly both represent ܘܢ.

Mk 1²³ 5³ *ἐν πνεύματι ἀκαθάρτῳ* is a Semitism of thought which naturally employs this possible construction in Greek.

(d) *ἐν τῷ* c. infin. with *temporal* force. See pp. 25, 450 f. A distinctive feature of Luke. Hebraic, not Aramaic construction.

¹ F. C. B. to J. H. M. (letter, 30/8/10), "*ὄχι ἐπιστεύσατε αὐτῷ* (Mk 11²¹ = Mt 21²⁰) is trd. by the Old Syriac, 'believed not in him': in the Peshitta is 'believed not him.' The Peshitta is literal: the Old Syriac gives the Aramaic idiom."

*Ἐμπροσθεν, ἔναντι, ἐναντίον, ἐνώπιον. (See above, § 130.)

Radermacher (*Gr.*² 145) speaks of the first and last of these, together with *πρὸ προσώπου* and *ἀπὸ προσώπου*, as Semitising substitutes in the province of *πρό*.

*Ἐμπροσθεν 84 times in LXX for עֲנַף . *Ἐνώπιον hundreds of times in LXX, for either עֲנַף or עֵינָי , ἔναντι and ἐναντίον both very common in LXX, generally for עֵינָי . Burney remarks (*Aram. Orig.* 15) that Hebrew distinguishes between "ע" in the (physical) sight of, and "ע" in the (mental) sight of, and finds a corresponding distinction in the NT use of ἐνώπιον and ἐναντίον.

For the three Hebrew expressions, Aramaic uses ܕܪܦ .

*Ἐμπροσθεν is good Greek, surviving in MGr as *ἐμπρός*, *μπροστά*. The two following uses, however, are undeniably Semitic.

1. Mt 11²⁶ = Lk 10²¹ οὕτως εὐδοκία ἐγένετο ἔμπροσθέν σου.

Hebrew $\text{עֲנַף} \text{עֵינָי}$, Aram. $\text{ܕܪܦ} \text{ܢܝܥܢ}$ = *thy good pleasure, thy will*.

Mt 18¹⁴

Mt 23¹³

οὕτως οὐκ ἔστιν θέλημα ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν.

ὅτι κλείετε τὴν βασιλείαν τ. οὐρ. ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, may be due to wrong translation of ܕܪܦ which serves also for ἐναντίον

*Ἐναντι. For *Κοινή* use see Wackernagel *Hellenistica* 1 ff. and *Vocab. s.v.*

Lk 1⁸, Ac 7¹⁰ (LXX) 8²¹ ἈΒΔ (LXX).

*Ἐναντίον. *Before, in the presence of*. For use in this sense in papp. see *Vocab. s.v.*

Lk 1⁶ 20²⁶ 24¹⁹, Ac 7¹⁰ ABCD (LXX) 8²² (LXX).

*Ἐνώπιον. See above, p. 15, and *Vocab. s.v.* Survives in the *καθαρεύουσα*, not in MGr vernacular. [Med. Gr.—R. McK.]

1. Lk 22 times, Ac 13 times.

2. Jn 20³⁰, 1 Jn 3²², 3 Jn 6, Rev 34 times.

3. Rom (3), 1 Co (1), 2 Co (3), Gal (1), 1 Ti (6), 2 Ti (2): 4 of which from LXX.

4. Heb (2), Ja (1), 1 Pet (1)

Κατέναντι. *Opposite, over against*, Mt 21⁸, Mk 11⁸ 12⁴¹ 13⁸.

In the presence of, Mt 27²⁴ (BD).

Rom 4¹⁷, 2 Co 2¹⁷ 12¹⁹.

For the former meaning in *Κοινή*, see *Vocab. s.v.* Very common in LXX.

Κατενώπιον. *In the presence of*, Eph 1⁴, Col 1²³, Jude 24.

LXX 7 times (+ Dan Θ, 1). See *Vocab. s.v.*

*Ἀπέναντι. *Over against*, Mt 27⁶¹; *against*, Ac 17⁷.

In the presence of, Mt 27²⁴ (NAL), Ac 3¹⁶ Rom 3¹⁸ (LXX).

Here we may conveniently take the prepositional phrases with *πρόσωπον*.

Ἀπὸ προσώπου = ʾבְּפָנָיִם.

1. Ac 3²⁶ 5⁴¹ 7⁴⁶.
2. Rev 6¹⁶ (? LXX) 12¹⁴ 20¹¹ (LXX).
3. 2 Th 1⁹ (LXX).

Ἐπὶ πρόσωπον = ʾעַל פְּנֵי.

1. Lk 21²⁸.

Ἐπὶ προσώπου.

1. Ac 17²⁸ (cf. Jer 32¹² [LXX=25²⁶ Heb.]).

Πρὸ προσώπου = ʾבְּפָנָיו.

1. Mk 1³=Mt 11¹⁰=Lk 7²⁷ (LXX).
Lk 1⁷⁶ (LXX), 9⁶² 10¹, Ac 13²⁴.

In all these passages the influence of the Greek of the LXX is unmistakable.

Κατὰ πρόσωπον used adverbially, as in Ac 25¹⁶, 2 Co 10¹, Gal 2¹¹, is certainly not Semitic, but its prepositional use in Lk 2²¹, Ac 3¹⁸, though not uncommon in Greek (cf. Xen. *Cyr.* vi. iii. 35, τὴν κατὰ πρόσωπον τῆς ἀντίας φάλαγγος τάξιν, "the post immediately in front of the enemy's phalanx"), is suggested by the OT idiom.

Radermacher (*Gr.*² 143) observes that while some of the improper prepositions and prepositional substitutes so common in NT are good enough Greek (e.g. *ἀπέρ*, *ἐναντι*, *κατέναντι*, *ἀπέναντι*), as a general rule this wealth of substitutes (esp. periphrastic substitutes as *ἀπὸ προσώπου*, *πρὸ προσώπου*) is due to Semitic influence, from which those papyri are not free which exhibit corresponding usages (e.g. *ἐνώπιόν τινος*).

Μετά.

(a) Ποιεῖν (ἔλεος) μετὰ τινος corresponding to עָשָׂה רַחֲמֵי עִיִּי (as often in LXX, e.g. Gen 26²⁹).

1. Lk 1⁷⁸ 10²⁷: 1⁵⁸ (μεγαλύνειν ἔλεος μετὰ).

Ac 14²⁷ 15⁴ (ὅσα ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς μετ' αὐτῶν).

Cf. Tob 12⁶ περὶ ὧν ἐποίησεν μεθ' ὑμῶν.

1 Mac 10²⁷ καὶ ἀνταποδώσομεν ὑμῖν ἀγαθὰ ἀνθ' ὧν ποιεῖτε μεθ' ἡμῶν.

Herm. *Sim.* v. 1¹ περὶ πάντων ὧν ἐποίησε μετ' ἐμοῦ.

See *Proleg.*³ 246 and *Vocab.* 401a, where, on the strength of Kuhring's citation from a Byzantine pap., this "solitary Hebraism left to μετὰ" was said to be demolished. But J. H. M. afterwards was inclined to withdraw this statement and recognise translation Greek (note by W. F. H., 1914). For Hebr. and Aram. idiom see Torrey *CDA* 38).

(b) Πολεμεῖν μετὰ τινος.

2. Rev 2¹⁶ 12⁷ 13⁴ 17¹⁴ (also ποιῆσαι πόλεμον μετὰ, Rev 11⁷ 12¹⁷ 13⁷ 19^{4*}).

See *Proleg.*³ 106, 246, *Vocab.* 401a for use in papp. and MGr (for which see Thumb *Hellen.* 125, *Handb.* 103). But in view of Charles's treatment of Rev 12⁷ (*ICC* i. 322, 356: see above, pp. 448 f.), we should probably allow for the influence of the LXX in all these passages.

Μεταξύ.

The idiom in Mt 18¹⁸ μεταξύ σου καὶ αὐτοῦ μόνου = *privately* is Aramaic (*W¹* 32, 226, "unter vier augen," Nöldeke, *Syr. Gr.* 189 n.¹: "Even the Greek text has the Aramaising idiom"). This is literally rendered by syr^{vo}, which gives the same idiom for κατ' ἰδίαν in 17¹⁹ 20¹⁷, Mk 9²⁸ (see *W¹* 32, 226 also McNeile *Comm. Matthew*, 266).

Παρά.

Παρά c. acc. to mark comparison after a positive adj. or a noun, or a verb. Semitic acc. to *W¹* 28, 221 (= 𐤒).

1. Lk 13⁹. 4 18¹⁴ (NBL).

The use of παρά after a comparative is very common in Hellenistic, merely extending a classical usage. There are many exx. in NT, esp. in Hebrews. But the instances given above conform to the very frequent construction in LXX, where Thackeray (*Gr.* 23) recognises influence of Hebr. 𐤒 𐤂𐤏𐤃, but notices that in MGr μεγαλύτερος ἀπό has become a normal phrase (see Thumb *Handb.* 102).

Πρός.

Πρός c. acc. = *with* has been claimed as due to Aram. 𐤒𐤏𐤃 (= *apud*, παρά, or *ad*, πρὸς) by J. R. Harris (*OPJ* 7 ff.), Burney (*Aram. Orig.* 28 f.).

1. Mk 6⁸ (=Mt 13²⁸) 9¹⁹ (=Lk 9⁴¹) 14⁴⁹.

2. Jn 1¹, 1 Jn 1².

3. 1 Th 3⁴, 2 Th 2⁵ 3¹⁰, 1 Co 16⁸. 7, 2 Co 5³ 11⁹, Gal 1¹⁸ 2⁵ 4¹⁸. 20, Ph 1²⁰, Philem 12.

4. Heb 4¹².

Mr. G. R. Driver (*Orig. Lang.* 2a) denies Aramaism in any strict sense, regarding this as "an extension of many classical usages, particularly in such phrases as ἐνθυμῆσθαι πρὸς αὐτόν." He cft. πρὸς με παῖσαι "to play with me," quoted by Stephanus (*Theas.* iii. 573).

Hellenistic usage may be seen in *Syll.*³ 1109⁴¹ (A.D. 178) διδόντες ἡμφόριον μέχρις οὗ πρὸς γυναῖκας ὄσιν. D. S. Sharp cites Epict. iv. 9. 13, πρὸς ὃν ἐστὶ σου πιθανώτερος. With Heb 4¹² cf. the formula ἐς πρὸς σέ τοῦ λόγου ἐσόμενου, "Knowing that you will be held accountable," P Hib 53⁸ (B.C. 246), P Oxy ix. 1188¹⁷. [Med. Gr.—R. McK. See also Jannaris *Gr.* § 1658 (c).]

A Hebrew idiom. "Aramaic has nothing like it, except in the Targums. Probably a reminiscence of LXX; Gen 14²³ etc." Lagrange, *S. Marc*, p. lxxxii.

καί.

The use of *καί* in contrasted statements is a characteristic of the Fourth Gospel. Burney (p. 66) treats this as a literal rendering of \imath adversative, which is common to Hebrew and Aramaic. This use of *καί* "but" is a slight extension of *καί* "and yet," discussed under A, 4 (f) (β), and can be found in class. Gr., both with and without *οὐ*. (See K-G ii. 248.) The best examples in the Gospel are Jn 1⁵ 17¹¹. Cf. also 11⁰. 11 31¹. 19. 32 4²⁰ 5³⁹. 40. 43. 44 6⁷⁰ 74. 19. 30 8²⁰. 52 9³⁰ 12⁸⁴ 16⁵ 20²⁹ 21¹¹. [Med. and MGr.—R. McK.]

For other uses of *καί* see under A, 4 above (Parataxis).

*Οτι.

(a) *Οτι *recitativum* is of course well established in Greek, (Goodwin *MT* 285 f). Guillemard observes that in Gen 28¹⁶ 44²⁸ [v.l.] it is used to translate אֱמֵן or אֱמֵן "verily," and is often used for אֱמֵן , which is sometimes (e.g. Gen 29³³, Jos 2²⁴, Jer 22²²) strongly asseverative. He claims that in many NT passages (e.g. Mt 7²³ 10⁷ 14²⁶ 19⁸ 26⁶⁵. 72. 74 27⁴³) that is the force of *οτι*.

Archd. Allen (*Exp T* xiii. 330, *Comm. Mark* 48) attributes frequency in Mark to influence of Aramaic ܕܝܢܝܢ . For use of *οτι recitativum* in papp. see *Vocab. s.v.* [Med. and MGr.—R. McK.]

(b) *Οτι for relative pronoun. See above B, 1 (e) (β).

(c) *Οτι for temporal particle. Burney (*Aram. Orig.* 78) detects confusion of ܕܝܢܝܢ = *οτι* and ܕܝܢܝܢ = *οτε* in two passages:

Jn 9⁸ οἱ θεωροῦντες αὐτὸν τὸ πρότερον οτι προσαιτης ἦν.
12⁴¹ ταῦτα εἶπεν Ἡσαίας οτι εἶδεν τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ.

In the latter this explanation is unnecessary, whilst in the former Mr. G. R. Driver (*ut supra*) *oft.* 4³⁵, also Ps-Nicod. I. B. i. 3 εἶδον τοὺς Ἑβραίους οτι ἐστρώωνον ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτῶν, where the *οτι* clause, according to the late Greek use, plainly means "strewing their garments in the way."

Similarly—

*ἵνα.

(a) *ἵνα for relative pronoun. See above B, 1 (e) (pp. 434 ff.).

(b) *ἵνα for temporal particle. Burney (*l.c.* 78) accounts for *ἵνα* as for *οτι* above in the phrase *ἔρχεται ὡρα ἵνα* c. subj.,—a characteristic of Jn (who however uses *οτε* in 4²¹. 23 5²⁵ 16²⁵, and *ἐν ᾧ* in 5²⁸).

2. Jn 12²⁸ 13¹ 16². ss¹[Rev 2²¹, but here *ἵνα μετανοήσῃ* is clearly final.]

Mr. G. R. Driver cites several instances from late Greek of *καρὸς ἔρχεται* (*ἔστιν*) *ἵνα*, whilst MGr *εἶνε καρὸς νὰ ἔλθῃς* is the regular idiom for "it is time for you to come." To this we may add, *ἦρθεν ἡ ὥρα νὰ πεθάνῃ*, "the hour came to die" (Thumb *Hdb.* 187). This usage is therefore at most a secondary Semitism, and can quite as easily be explained by the writer's strong partiality for this particle, which had already gained great flexibility in the *Κοινή*.

**ἵνα μή*.

Burney (*Aram. Orig.* 100) finds very cogent proof of translation from Aramaic in

Jn 12⁴⁰, where *ἵνα μή* represents the Aram. ܢܠܝܢ , though the Hebr. לֹא is rendered *μήποτε* in LXX, which is retained when the same citation (Is 6¹⁰) is given in Mt 13¹⁵ and Mk 4¹². Moreover, the Pesh. translates *d'ld*. But *ἵνα μή* is perfectly good Greek (see K-G ii. 378 f., Goodwin *MT* § 315), and its general use in the Ptolemaic papyri is clear from Mayser *Gr.* ii. 240 ff. When Burney says that *μήποτε* never occurs in Jn, though found in Mt 8 times, Mk 2, Lk 6, he does not add that *ἵνα μή* is found in every book of the NT except 2 Th, 2 Tim, 1 Pet, 3 Jn, often with the meaning "lest." It is equally significant that *μήποτε* does not occur in Rev, though *ἵνα μή* is found there 11 times. Yet Dr. Charles claims that Hebr. not Aram. is the background of the Apocalypse.

Dr. McKinlay observes that in the Modern Version of the NT *διὰ νὰ μή* is used in every passage in Jn where *ἵνα μή* occurs. Pallas generally has *γὰρ νὰ μή*, but sometimes *μήπως*.

C. MISTRANSLATION OF SEMITIC WORDS OR PHRASES.

The following instances are amongst those that have been offered :

1. Mk 2⁴ *ἀπεστύγασαν τὴν στέγην καὶ ἐξορύξαντες χαλῶσι*. Wellhausen, because of the reversed order and the redundancy, retranslates the first clause ܢܪܝܢܐ ܕܗܘܢܐ ܕܗܘܢܐ which might also mean "they brought him to the roof" (*W*¹ 37). Schulthess (*ZNTW* xxi, 220) protests that this Aramaic phrase would mean "to uncover the roof," but not "to bring him to the roof," for which ܕܥܘܢܐ would be the right word.

¹ C. J. Bell *Exp T* xxi. 91 so takes it in 8²⁶, reading *ἔσται* for *ἔστω* "rejoiced when he saw my face." For a different explanation see under C, below (p. 475). But see *Vocab. a.v.* *ἵνα* (5).

Mk 7³¹ ἐξελθὼν ἐκ τ. ὀρίων Τύρου ἦλθεν διὰ Σιδῶνος εἰς τ. θάλασσαν τ. Γαλ.
Wellh. (ib. 37) suspects διὰ Σιδῶνος=רַיָצַב, which should
have been rendered πρὸς Βησσαϊδάν (so 6⁴⁵ D). But this
geographical correction is unnecessary.

See also Archd. W. C. Allen, *Comm. Mark*, 50 f.

Mt 23³⁵ καθαρίζετε τὸ ἔξωθεν τοῦ ποτηρίου κ. τῆς παροψίδος, ἔσωθεν δὲ
γέμουσιν ἐξ ἀρπαγῆς κ. ἀκρασίας. Luke 11³⁹, rightly, τὸ δὲ
ἔσωθεν ὑμῶν γέμει. The sense in Mt requires γέμειτε for
γέμουσιν. In Aram., participle in both clauses. (W¹ 36, *27.)

28¹ ἀφ' ἐξ ἑσπέρης τῆς σαββάτων, τῇ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ εἰς μίαν σαββάτων. Torrey
(*C. H. Toy Studies*, 300) postulates an Aram. מְרִינָה מְרִינָה מְרִינָה
מְרִינָה מְרִינָה מְרִינָה, "after the Sabbath, in the night introducing the
first day of the week." This is not a case of mistranslation,
but of a painfully close rendering of an Aramaic phrase.
We are asked to believe that Mt adds this Aram. clause to
the sentence in the Greek Mk, which he is following pretty
closely, and then translates it into Greek!

Lk 1⁸⁹ εἰς πόλιν Ἰουδα. Torrey (*l.c.* 290 ff.) solves this palpable difficulty
by supposing Hebr. יְהוּדָה לְמִדְיָנָה (better than Aram.
מְרִינָה מְרִינָה מְרִינָה), which should have been translated εἰς τ.
χώραν τῆς Ἰουδαίας. During the first century A.D. the
meaning "city" supplanted the earlier "province" as the
force of מְרִינָה.

2¹ ἀπογράφεσθαι πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην. Torrey (*l.c.* 293) conjectures
רְאֵה לְכָל הָאָרֶץ, i.e. "all the land" (γῆν), not "all the world."

11⁴¹ τὰ ἐνόητα ὅστε ἐλεημοσύνην, καὶ ἰδοὺ πάντα καθαρὰ ὑμῖν ἐστί.

For the first clause Mt 23³⁵ has καθάρισον πρῶτον τὸ ἐντὸς,
which alone gives the right sense. Wellh. (W¹ 36, *27)
attributed the variants to a confusion between רְבֵי "cleanse,"
and רְבֵי "give alms." Torrey (*l.c.* 312) doubts such a use of
רְבֵי in the time of the evangelists, but had independently
conjectured an Aram. original מְרִינָה מְרִינָה מְרִינָה "that
which is within make righteousness." Here מְרִינָה מְרִינָה
is the regular idiom for "give alms," and exactly repre-
sents δικαιοσύνην ποιεῖν, which has that meaning in Mt 6¹⁻⁴.
On the other hand, Burney (*Aram. Orig.* 9) gives evidence that
in New Hebr. and Aram. רְבֵי means both "to purify" (as well
as the normal רְבֵי) and also "to give alms."

11⁴⁷⁻⁴⁸ οὐαὶ ὑμῖν, ὅτι οἰκοδομεῖτε τὰ μνημεῖα τ. προφητῶν, οἱ δὲ πατέρες
ὑμῶν ἀπέκτειναν αὐτούς. Ἄρα μάρτυρες ἐστε καὶ συνευδοκεῖτε
τοῖς ἔργοις τῶν πατέρων ὑμῶν ὅτι αὐτοὶ μὲν ἀπέκτειναν αὐτούς,
ὑμεῖς δὲ οἰκοδομεῖτε.

Torrey (*l.c.* 313) shows that ὑμεῖς δὲ οἰκοδομεῖτε should

be as Mt 23³¹ *υιοί ἐστε (αὐτῶν)*. The Aram. ܕܢܗܘܘܢ ܒܢܝ ܕܗܘܢ "and ye are children of theirs," was misread, the noun ܒܢܝ being easily confused with the participle ܕܢܗܘܢ which had come in the previous verse, and the word ܕܢܗܘܢ , now taken as the direct object, was omitted from the Greek as unnecessary.

Lk 12⁴⁶ *καὶ διχοτομήσει αὐτὸν καὶ τὸ μέρος αὐτοῦ μετὰ τῶν ἀπίστων θήσει* (=Mt 24⁵¹, where *ὑποκριτῶν* for *ἀπίστων*). Torrey (*l.c.* 314 f.) suspects Aram. original $\text{ܕܝܘܠܦܢܝܘܬܝܗܘܢ ܕܥܡ ܕܢܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܝܘܠܦܢܝܘܬܝܗܘܢ}$ "and will divide him his portion with the unfaithful," assuming that ܝ was inserted before ܕܢܗܘܢܝܢ through mistaking the indirect object of the first suffix for a direct object. The verb ܕܝܘܠܦܢܝܘܬܝܗܘܢ would then be added to the sentence to complete the sense, and the whole now ran $\text{ܕܝܘܠܦܢܝܘܬܝܗܘܢ ܕܥܡ ܕܢܗܘܢܝܢ ܕܝܘܠܦܢܝܘܬܝܗܘܢ}$.

On the other hand, the commentators point to the barbarous methods of punishing oriental slaves. Plummer cites Herodotus for *διατέμνω*, and Suetonius *Calig. xxvii: multos honesti ordinis . . . medios serra dissecavit*. Moulton, *Exp T* xiv. 430, *Vocab.* 165, quotes from a sepulchral inscr. (iii/iv A.D.) *διχοτομέω* in a figurative sense.

In any case Q seems to have been followed by both Mt and Lk without question.

12⁴⁹ *καὶ τί θέλω εἰ ἤδη ἀνήφθη;* The required meaning, "How I wish that it were already kindled," can hardly be got from the Greek, but appears at once if the two Hebraisms are recognised. (a) ܗܘܐ not only = *τί* "what?" but is used in exclamations = "how," for *exh.* see G-K § 148. (b) *Θέλω εἰ* found twice in LXX (unfortunately the underlying Hebr. is not available in either passage), "to wish that": Is 9⁶ *καὶ θελήσουσιν εἰ ἐγενήθησαν πυρίκαυστοι* "and they shall wish that they had been burned with fire" (see Ottley *Isaiah* i. p. 97); Sir 23¹⁴ *καὶ θελήσεις εἰ μὴ ἐγεννήθης* "so shalt thou wish that thou hadst not been born."

The exclamatory use of *τί* is found in MGr, *τί καλὰ* "how fine!" (Thumb *Handb.* 181).

Torrey (*l.c.* 315) finds that literal translation into Aramaic gives the regular idiom for the meaning required ܕܢܚܝܘܬܝܗܘܢ ܕܡܗܘܢ
 $\text{ܕܢܚܝܘܬܝܗܘܢ ܕܢܚܝܘܬܝܗܘܢ}$.

24⁴⁹ *οὐχὶ ἡ καρδία ἡμῶν καιομένη ἦν;* Variants for *καιομένη* in D and oldest verss. (syr. lat^{vet}) testify to difficulty felt from beginning. Torrey (*l.c.* 316) suggests ܕܗܘܐ "heavy," "slow to understand" for ܕܗܘܐ "burning" (*καρδία* = ܕܢܚܝܘܬܝܗܘܢ = intelligence).

ἐστερέωσεν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡ πίστις ἣ δι' αὐτοῦ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ τὴν δλοκληρίαν ταύτην ἀπέναντι πάντων ὑμῶν.

Torrey (*l.c.* 14 ff.) remarks that "the ugly repetition of τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ obscures the sense and spoils the sound." A literal rendering into Aramaic is given.

וּבְהִימְנָתָא דִּי שְׁמֵהּ לְהָרָה דִּי חֲוָן אֲנַתָּא וְיִדְעִין אֲנַתָּא חֲקָה שְׁמָהּ
וְהִימְנָתָא דִּי בְּחַ יְהִבְתָּ לֵּהּ חֲלִימְנָתָא דָּא קְרָם בְּכָלְהֵן :

By pointing שְׁמֵהּ חֲקָה (=ἐστερέωσε τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ) as שְׁמֵהּ חֲקָה (=ὕψη ἐποίησεν αὐτόν) the sentence now reads : "And by faith in His name He hath made strong this one whom ye see and know ; yea, the faith which is through Him hath given him this soundness before you all."

Dr. Burkitt, however, secures excellent sense, as well as "characteristically Lucan rhetoric," by placing a colon before τοῦτον and omitting ἐπί with N*B. The passage now runs : "Ye killed the Prince of Life, whom God raised from the dead, whereof we are witnesses, even to the faith in His name : this man whom ye see and know His name hath made strong, and the faith which is through Him hath given Him this perfect soundness before you all."

Ac 4²⁵ ὁ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου στόματος Δαυεὶδ παῖδός σου εἰπῶν.

Torrey (*l.c.* 16 f.) offers an Aramaic rendering

הוּא דִּי אֲמֹנָא לְפִימֵן רוּחָא דִּי קֹדֶשׁא דְיִדְ עֲבַדְתָּ עִבְרָא מְאָר :

and shows that the common confusion between הוּא and הוּיָא has obscured the true meaning, "that which our father David, Thy servant, said by the mouth (command) of the Holy Spirit." The feminine הוּיָא must be so rendered, but the masc. הוּא gave rise to the first clause in the Greek text.

11²⁵ Here, as in Lk 2¹, Torrey would remove the rhetorical exaggeration by supposing that an original אֲמַרְתָּ has been rendered by *αἰκουμένη* instead of by *γῆ*. In neither case is the explanation convincing. The remaining instances given by Professor Torrey are less impressive (Ac 8¹⁰ 13¹ 15⁷). See CDA 18 ff., and discussions by Burkitt, Vazakas, and de Zwaan already referred to.

2. Burney (*Aram. Orig.* 103 ff.), in addition to the many examples of mistranslated 7, thinks that mistranslation is to be traced in the following passages : Jn 1¹⁵. 2⁹ 2²³ 6⁵³ 7²⁷. 25 8⁵⁵ 9²⁵ 20¹. 18. But since so eager a supporter of his thesis as Professor Torrey confesses that he is "unable to follow Burney in any one of these instances" (*HTR* xvi. 329), it will be enough to take the two most important.

Jn 7³⁷.³⁸ Dr. Rendel Harris (*Expos* VIII. xx. 196) followed some Old Latin and Western texts (e.g. D) in redivision of verses, which Burney, it seems (*l.c.* pp. 385 ff.), had already adopted for Semitic parallelism. Thus the passage reads:

Ἐάν τις διψᾷ ἐρχέσθω πρὸς με
καὶ πινέτω ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμέ,
καθὼς εἶπεν ἡ γραφή, Ποταμοὶ ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας αὐτοῦ
ρέουσιν ὕδατος ζῶντος.

Burney's solution of this "scripture" allusion is gained by a blending of Joel 3¹⁸ (4¹⁸ Hebr.) and Zech 14⁸, together with an identification of ܦܘܢܝܢ, the word for "fountain" in Joel (also found in the Targum of Ps 104¹⁰, Pr 5¹⁸ 8²⁸) and ܦܘܢܝܢ (Hebr. ܦܘܢܝܢ) used of "belly" (Dn 2³²).

Mr. G. R. Driver (*Orig. Lang.* 6 n.) quotes G. B. Gray's criticism, that this explanation ignores the pronoun αὐτοῦ, whilst ܦܘܢܝܢ and ܦܘܢܝܢ would not easily be confused either by eye or ear.

Dr. Rendel Harris's explanation is drawn from the very slight difference between the Syriac words for "belly" *Karṣā*, and for "throne" *Kurs'yd*. His theory is that in an early Aramaic Book of Testimonies a composite quotation from Zech 14⁸, "Living water shall go out of Jerusalem," and Jer 3¹⁷, "They shall call Jerusalem the Lord's throne" occurred, which may also be traced in Rev 22¹⁻¹⁷. It is to be noted that ὁ θέλων in the last passage corresponds closely to ὁ πιστεύων in Jn 7³⁸. Under this treatment the words καθὼς εἶπεν . . . ζῶντος are a comment by the evangelist.

For explanations dispensing with any emendation of the Greek text, see W. E. Barnes *JTS* xxiii. 421, H. St. J. Thackeray, *The Septuagint and Jewish Worship*, 66 f.

8⁵⁸ Ἀβραὰμ ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ἠγαλλιάσατο ἵνα ἴδῃ τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν ἐμὴν, καὶ εἶδεν καὶ ἐχάρη.

Burney, observing that "rejoiced to see" does not give a satisfactory meaning, suggests that "longed to see" is what we should expect. This he finds in the Syriac *s'wah*, used in the Pesh. for this verb. The ordinary meaning of *s'wah* is "long for," but in Mt 12¹⁸ "delights in," "rejoices," where in the quotation from Is 42¹ it represents the Hebr. ܦܘܢܝܢ.

He acknowledges that the verb is not known to occur in W. Aramaic.

Torrey (*HTR* xvi. 340) improves on this by showing that in the Targums ܘܒܝܢ (ܘܒܝܢ) is the regular equivalent of the Hebr. ܘܒܝܢ and the Gr. ἀγαλλιᾶσθαι, whilst the most common Aramaic verb for "seek," "pray," is ܘܒܝܢ. It is easy to see how the final ܢ might be dropped by haplography, ܘܒܝܢ ܘܒܝܢ.

"Abraham prayed that he might see," thus becoming אַבְרָהָם בָּעָרָא "Abraham exulted to see." Lagrange seems to doubt whether the form $\psi\bar{\alpha}$ is found. In any case Burney's suspicion of an Aramaism in the *iva* clause is needless.

Dr. McKinlay quotes *ἀγιαλλοῦται ἡ ψυχὴ νὰ μάθῃ διὰ τὴν κόρην* from a mediaeval romance, and cft. MGr *χαίρομαι νὰ σε θωρῶ*, "I'm glad to see you."

It should be added that Torrey proposes (*i.c.* 338 ff.) emendations of the text by working back to an Aramaic original at 7^s. 37 11^{ss}. 38 14^s. 31 20¹⁷.

Archdeacon Charles has shown with abundance of illustration throughout his Commentary on the *Revelation of John* that the successful resolution of difficulties in the text lies often in retranslation into Hebrew. The following examples are the most impressive:

Rev 10¹ καὶ οἱ πόδες αὐτοῦ ὡς στῦλοι πυρός.

Hebr. רַגְלָיו, which normally = "foot," also means "leg" (so rendered by LXX in 1 Sam 17^s, Dt 28⁶⁷), whilst πόδες also translates מַגְפָּיִם = "legs," "thighs," Ex 29¹⁷, and other passages.

This is obviously the meaning here. (See *Charles Studies* 97 ff., *ICC* i. 259.) [So often in Med. and MGr.—R. McK.]

13^s καὶ ἐθαυμάσθη ὅλη ἡ γῆ ὀπίσω τοῦ θηρίου.

That is תִּהְיֶה מִן הָאָדָמָה מִן הָאָדָמָה לְפָנָיו מִן הָאָדָמָה, where מִן הָאָדָמָה is corrupt for מִן הָאָדָמָה = βλέπουσα. Cf. 17^s καὶ θαυμασθήσονται οἱ κατοικοῦντες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ὧν οὐ γέγραπται τὸ ὄνομα ἐπὶ τὸ βιβλίον τῆς ζωῆς ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου βλέπόντων τὸ θηρίον. Also 17^s ἐθαύμασα ἰδὼν αὐτήν. (See *ICC* i. 351.)

13¹¹ καὶ ἐλάλει ὡς δράκων = דְּרָקוֹן דְּרָקוֹן probably for דְּרָקוֹן דְּרָקוֹן = καὶ ἀπόλλυε οἱ καὶ ἦν ἀπολλύων. This very confusion occurs in 2 Chr 22¹⁰ הַפְּמַלְלָה עָרַץ לְחַסְדָּה דְרָקוֹן דְרָקוֹן (LXX ἀπόλεσε, Vulg. interfecit, scribal error for דְרָקוֹן דְרָקוֹן 2 Ki 11¹. *Oxf. Hebr. Lex.* 181b). Cf. Rev 9¹¹ ὄνομα αὐτῶ Ἑβραϊστὶ Ἀβαδδὼν, καὶ ἐν τῇ Ἑλληνικῇ ὄνομα ἔχει Ἀπολλύων. (See *Charles Studies* 100 f., *ICC* i. p. cli.)

15^s (ἡνοίγη) ὁ ναὸς τῆς σκηνῆς τοῦ μαρτυρίου ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ.

This very difficult phrase = מִיָּמֵינוּ מִיָּמֵינוּ הָאֵלֵּי הַיְכָלִים which may be a corruption of מִיָּמֵינוּ מִיָּמֵינוּ הָאֵלֵּי הַיְכָלִים = ὁ ναὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ. (Cf. 11¹⁸ where this very sentence occurs, ἡνοίγη ὁ ναὸς τ. θεοῦ ὁ ἐν τ. οὐρ.)

15^s ἐνδεδυμένοι λίθον καθαρὸν λαμπρὸν.

Λίθον AC (defended as original text against λίνον by WH *App.* 2 139) is extremely difficult. Charles (*ICC* ii. 38) shows

that *ἐνδεδουμένοι λίθον* = $\psi\psi$ מִשִּׁבְּרֵי . But $\psi\psi$ = *βύσσιμος* in Gen 41⁴², Ex 28³⁵, whilst it seems to mean *λίθος* in Esth 1⁶, and the phrase which is there rendered *στῦλοι λίθινοι* ($\psi\psi$ לִּישָׁנִים) is given as *στῦλοι μαρμάρινοι* in Cant 5¹⁵. For the same mistranslation as here in Ep Jer ⁷² see Dr C. J. Ball's note *OA.* i. p. 610.

(2²² *ἰδοὺ βάλλω αὐτὴν εἰς κλίνην* = $\text{בַּבְּשִׁמְרֵי הַקְּלִינָה לְבַשְׂתָּהּ}$, where *βάλλω* represents the causative of *πίπτω* and $\text{בַּבְּשִׁמְרֵי לְבַשְׂתָּהּ}$ = "fall ill." See Charles *Studies* 99, *ICC* i. 71. Here retroversion does not remove a mistranslation, but explains an obscure idiom.) [But the pass. of *βάλλω* = "to be laid up" occurs in Aesop *Fab.* colvii (cited *Field Notes* 70 n.³); *πίπτω* in *Med. Gr.* = "to fall ill," and in *MGr* *πέφρω* = "to go to bed," "fall asleep."—R. McK.]

D. GENERAL SUMMARY.

I. CLASSIFICATION OF SEMITISMS.

In the Introduction to this volume (pp. 14 ff.) Semitism has been defined as "a deviation from genuine Greek idiom to a too literal rendering of the language of a Semitic original." The term secondary Semitism marks a possible but unidiomatic Greek construction, which strains ordinary Greek usage to conform to a normal Semitic construction. Dr. J. de Zwaan¹ has analysed the possibilities very carefully by distinguishing between (a) a "Greek," i.e. a writer with a perfect knowledge of Greek, and (b) a "Semite," i.e. one who writes Greek with an imperfect knowledge of the language. He then shows that either (a) or (b) may attempt four things: translation from a Semitic dialect into (1) idiomatic, or (2) Semiticising Greek; original composition in (3) idiomatic, or (4) Semiticising Greek. Primary Semitisms are said to be those which a "Semite" commits in attempting (1) and (3), though his imperfect knowledge of natural Greek may betray him in (2) and (4). Secondary Semitisms are said to be those deviations which a "Greek" may let pass in cases (1), (2) and (4) "through such factors as the exigencies of his readers or of the documents he is translating." Another factor is the degree of familiarity which this "Greek" translator has with the Semitic idiom of the source which he is using. This subjective aspect is important, but in many of the points in dispute we cannot say whether the author, or the translator of the source which he is following, is properly to be designated (a) or (b). We start from the objective data and consider them in their double relationship to Semitic usage, and to the tendencies that appear in the later stages of the development of the Greek language. When all allowance has been made for the coincidence of many Semitic constructions with those found in Hellenistic, the presence of a large number of apparent Semitisms in any writing

¹ *Beginnings of Christianity*, I. ii. 53 ff.

will justify the application of de Zwaan's term "Semiticising Greek." But what criteria will enable us to determine whether this "Semiticising Greek" is due to literal translation, or has found its way into original composition in Greek through inadvertence, or habit, or design? Professor Torrey¹ mentions three methods by which the fact of translation can be demonstrated in a document which resembles an original composition. (1) The precarious evidence of the feeling that certain phrases and constructions "sound Semitic rather than Greek." (2) Mistranslation, i.e. the removal of a grave difficulty in the Greek text by the restoration of the Semitic original, which was thus evidently misunderstood or misread by a translator. (3) The cumulative argument based on "the continual presence, in texts of considerable extent, of a Semitic idiom underlying the Greek." But obviously the first and third of these tests will not enable us to distinguish between (2) and (4) in de Zwaan's classification, whether the writer be a "Semite" or a "Greek." Even a translator may by force of habit introduce Semitisms into his Greek when the Hebrew original is quite different, as many examples from the LXX would show. But when once the LXX had become a standard of sacred speech for Hellenistic Jews and proselytes, its idioms would easily find their way into free composition. Dr. H. J. Cadbury² very aptly uses the analogy of extempore prayer in public worship, and the use of Biblical language by Bunyan and Lincoln. Torrey writes of the second test, that it is "immensely valuable in the rare cases where it is convincing: there is no other internal proof of translation which is so immediately cogent." Certainly it is a method to be applied with caution, for even Dr. Torrey confesses that "it happens in nine cases out of ten that renewed study of the 'mistranslations' which we have discovered shows us that there was no translation at all, or else that it was quite correct."³ A striking example of this difficulty is furnished by the *Acts of Thomas*. This work survives in both a Greek and a Syriac text. Here there can be no question that one of these is a translation of the other. But even with the two texts available for comparison, Professor Burkit finds most of the more obvious lines of argument "double-edged," and points to the "ambiguous nature of much that might have been expected to produce results." "The only way by which we can prove the Greek to be taken from the Syriac is to find instances where the Greek translator has actually mistranslated a Syriac idiom, or has followed a reading which rests upon a palaeographical corruption in the Syriac."⁴

It is for this reason that so much importance attaches to such instances of possible mistranslation as are collected in *C* above. Even here, however, we must observe that the Semitists themselves are not in agreement. Dr. Burney, in face of Wellhausen's well-marshalled evidence, declares with regard to Mark, "What is needed to substantiate the theory

¹ *C. H. Toy Studies*, 283 ff.

² *AJT* xxiv. 453. An instructive contrast can be drawn between the simple Biblical English of John Wesley's published sermons (see p. 9) and the crisp conversational English of his *Letters and Journals*.

³ *C. H. Toy Studies*, 284.

⁴ *JTS* i. 282.

of an Aramaic original is some cogent evidence of mistranslation; and this has not yet been advanced." ¹ In the same way Dr. Torrey, who promises to produce such evidence of mistranslation in Mark as Wellhausen failed to give, thinks that the case for John is weaker. "Burney's argument, for all its learning and acumen, weakens at the crucial point. Among those who are inclined to demand in John what Burney demands in Mark, I think the verdict is likely to be 'Not proven.'" ²

Even when there is the strongest reason to suspect a translator's error, we are often left in doubt whether this is due to a corruption in the original document, to a mistranslation of the original text, or to a linguistic confusion in the writer's mind with no documentary cause at all. Thus in the notorious example referred to by Mr. G. R. Driver, did the translator of Mommsen faithfully reproduce a printer's blunder *Feuerwerk* for *Feuerwehr*, or did he, by some inexplicable confusion, translate *Feuerwehr* by *fireworks*? We know that the book is a translation, and that the context requires *fire-brigade*. Only a reference to the original German edition can settle the point.³ But such errors occur when there is no documentary explanation. I once heard so perfect a bilingualist as Mr. Hilaire Belloc in a lecture on the French Revolution speak of the "sermon in the tennis court." Though the speaker instantly corrected himself, the audience could recognise at once the confusion between *serment* (oath) and the other French word indistinguishable in sound. There is no more brilliant conjecture in Wellhausen's work on the Gospels than his solution of the difficult *τὰ ἐνόντα δόξε ἀληθοσύνην* (Lk 11⁴¹). The sense requires *καθάρισον*, which is actually found in the Matthaean parallel (Mt 23³⁶), and, as we have seen above (p. 471), Wellhausen makes this a moral certainty by restoring the Aramaic. But what inference are we to draw? There are three alternatives. (a) Mt and Lk may both have translated from a common Aramaic original, one correctly, the other incorrectly; (b) Mt and Lk may have had the same Greek translation, but whilst Mt knew enough Aramaic to correct the mistranslation, Lk faithfully retained it; (c) Mt and Lk may have used different editions of a Greek translation of Q. Similarly, if we are convinced that some of the idioms in the Fourth Gospel presuppose Aramaic, we have still the further point to settle, whether there ever was an Aramaic Fourth Gospel, elsewhere than in the mind of the author who wrote directly in Greek. In other words, granted that "John" was a "Semite," to which of de Zwaan's four classes does the Greek Gospel belong?

2. THE SEMITIC STAMP IN TRANSLATION GREEK.

We have seen that Professor Torrey emphasises the importance as also the precariousness of his first test. It is the starting-point in any investigation. Nor is it entirely subjective, for it can be applied, especially where Hebraisms are concerned, by watching the tendencies of

¹ *Aram. Orig.* 19.

² *HTR* xvi. 332.

³ I have failed to discover the passage.

translators when we know Hebrew originals to underlie the Greek. The comparative study of the LXX with the Hebrew text is invaluable for this purpose, and helps to furnish the list of suspected Semitisms provided by the Oxford Apocrypha in the critical introductions to several of the books. Still more valuable is the evidence which Canon Box gives in his edition of the Ezra-Apocalypse to show that the Latin text preserves a number of Hebrew constructions mediated through a lost Greek text. But if the presence of many such constructions in any one book raises a presumption of translation (or else suggests a deliberate adoption of Semiticising Greek), the absence of such constructions will tell against translation. The Semitic mind of the writer may, however, sometimes betray itself by the repetition of a solitary Semitism,¹ such as the adverbial use of *προσριθμη* in Josephus (see p. 445). Generally speaking, the presence of numerous Hebraisms will suggest the influence of the LXX, whereas numerous Aramaisms or idioms common to Hebrew and Aramaic will point to a background of Aramaic. With the exception of parts of the Apocalypse and the first two chapters of Luke, it seems hardly likely that Hebrew sources were translated by any of the NT writers.

3. CONDITIONS UNDER WHICH THE GOSPEL TRADITION BECAME FIXED.

The four Gospels record events which happened on the soil of Palestine, and preserve the sayings of One whose mother tongue was Aramaic. The primitive Christian tradition was inevitably formulated and transmitted with an Aramaic colouring. The second stage of the Christian movement had Antioch as its headquarters, a bilingual city where this tradition passed over into its Greek form. It was only after evangelists and teachers had carried the Christian message into the world of Hellenism that the *paradosis* was stereotyped in documents. It is hardly open to question that our first and third evangelists drew material from documentary sources, and it is almost certain that these were written in Greek. A factor often overlooked in discussions of the Semitic tinge of the Gospels is the linguistic *milieu* in which the authoritative tradition grew up. Its pre-documentary history lies in a region and a community where there would be a tendency to fit the idioms of the *Κοινή* as closely as possible to the Aramaic tradition.² This was a community in which the OT was not only studied in its authoritative Greek translation, but widely used in the form of *Testimonia*, compiled first in Aramaic, then translated into Greek.³ The leaders in those formative years when the Church was acquiring a Christian vocabulary and phraseology were men whose habits of thought were Jewish. It is thus not surprising that we

¹ I recall a German friend who spent all his boyhood in London, and speaks perfect English but for the German idiom, "I should like to go with" (*Ich möchte gern mitgehen*, omitting the unaccented pronoun "you").

² See Schulthess *Das Problem*, pp. 43, 56.

³ J. Rendel Harris *Testimonies*, i. 125.

find "Semitisms of Vocabulary" ¹ in the Pauline letters and in *Hebrews*, where grammatical Semitisms are very rare and purely "secondary."

4. THE SEVERAL BOOKS.

1. Synoptic Gospels and Acts.

Mark is the most Aramaic of the Gospels. The very few Hebraisms may be attributed to the use of the LXX in the Gentile mission, but they are echoes few and faint. Burney's misgivings have already increased the doubtfulness of Archdeacon Allen's claim that the earliest of our Gospels was originally written in Aramaic. When Dr. Torrey's promised list of mistranslations appears, a good case may be made out for the partial use of Aramaic memoranda. But so far we remain of the opinion so well expressed by Père Lagrange, "His Greek is always Greek, yet translation Greek; not that he translates an Aramaic writing, but because he reproduces an Aramaic *κατήχησις*."

When we turn to *Matthew* it is perplexing to find these two eminent Aramaists in reverse disagreement, for while Dr. Allen bases his belief, with most scholars, on the demonstrable use of a Greek Mk by the author of the first Gospel, the French commentator argues that our Mt is a translation from an Aramaic original. This is perhaps largely due to the great stress which the Roman Catholic scholar puts upon early Church tradition. But his masterly array of the linguistic data is not convincing, especially when one observes how many of the Aramaisms are found in the teaching of Jesus. It is just in this part of the Gospel that we should look for the Aramaic idiom to emerge, however free the author's Greek elsewhere. There is one point, however, on which the present writer thinks that fresh evidence may modify the judgment passed by Dr. Moulton.² Dr. Burney's remarkable study of the parallelism of the sayings of Jesus gives weighty support to Harnack's preference for the Matthaean as the more faithful record of the discourses.³ Though this is a matter of poetic structure rather than of syntax, it may well be urged that the author of the first Gospel was familiar with Aramaic, and recognised the Semitic form behind the Greek rendering that lay before him.

On two points only is it needful to add anything to what has been written above (pp. 18 ff.), regarding the Lucan books; ⁴ for the Infancy narratives, and more especially the hymns in Lk 1-2, constitute a special problem, and the theory that we have a translation of an Aramaic docu-

¹ See *Proleg.* 11 f., also p. 26 above.

² See pp. 10 and 20 above. But in view of Burney's argument it is the more important to re-read Moulton's two *Expositor* articles referred to on p. 10 n.²

³ See *The Poetry of our Lord*, 7.

⁴ As a footnote to Moulton's judgment from the Hellenistic side that Luke probably did not speak Aramaic, we add the opinion of a distinguished Aramaist, "Il n'était pas juif de naissance ni d'éducation, et s'il était Syrien d'origine, rien ne prouve que l'araméen ait été sa langue maternelle" (Lagrange *S. Luc* xcvi).

ment throughout Ac 1-15 has entered on a new phase since Dr. Moulton's *Introduction* was left unfinished in 1915.

It may be well to refer to Harnack's thorough investigation of the linguistic phenomena in Lk 1-2,¹ and to quote his emphatic judgment: "The vocabulary and style characteristic of Lk 1-2 are so absolutely Lucan that, in spite of all conjectures that have been made, the hypothesis of a Greek source is impossible, for there is almost nothing left for it. Two things only are possible: either Luke has here translated an Aramaic source, or he was dependent for his subject-matter upon no written source at all, but has followed oral tradition, with which he has dealt quite freely, so far as form is concerned. At all events the two great psalms of Lk 1-2 were not handed down to the author (either in Greek or Aramaic), but were composed by himself." "It is possible that for the narrative an Aramaic source has been used, but this hypothesis is not probable. On closer view the Magnificat and the Benedictus present the form of a single complicated, correctly constructed Greek period that does all honour to the author of the prologue. This period is simply forced into its Hebrew dress. The hands are Esau's hands, but the voice is that of Jacob. But if this is so, then it is plain that Luke in composing these canticles has *purposely* kept to the language of the Psalms and prophets (LXX). The Hebraisms, whether adopted or inserted from the Old Testament, are *intentional*; the whole style is artificial, and is intended to produce an impression of antiquity." Now Professor Torrey² will not hear of such deliberate imitation of the language of the LXX, "for the motive for such a grotesque performance on his part is by no means apparent." But he is as convinced as is Harnack that "the Gospel of the Infancy" is by every consideration of vocabulary and style the language of Luke himself. In his judgment the only satisfactory theory is "that the author of the Third Gospel himself translated the Narrative of the Infancy from Hebrew into Greek." The strongest argument for translation from Hebrew, either by Luke or by the translator of his source, is the use of a phrase which does not occur in the LXX and is yet a "translation of the painfully literal kind." The example given by Dr. Torrey is Lk 1⁶¹, ἐποίησε κράτος ἐν βραχίονι αὐτοῦ, obviously a rendering of עָשָׂה כֹּחַ בְּיָדָיו "or (less probably) its Aramaic equivalent." But if we examine this verse with care its diction can easily be paralleled from the LXX. Thus, Lk 1⁶¹:

ἐποίησεν κράτος ἐν βραχίονι αὐτοῦ,
 διεσκόρπισεν ὑπερῆφανους διανοίᾳ καρδίας αὐτῶν.

Cf. Ps 88¹⁰:

σὺ ἐταπείνωσας ὡς τραυματίαν ὑπερήφανον,
 καὶ ἐν τῷ βραχίονι τῆς δυνάμεώς σου διεσκόρπισας τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου,
 and 117¹⁵:

δεξιὰ Κυρίου ἐποίησεν δύναμιν.

¹ *Luke the Physician*, 96-105, 199-218.

² See *C. H. Toy Studies*, 286, 295.

The Hebraic phraseology is beyond question, but there is nothing that lies beyond the range of composition by one who was steeped in the diction of the Greek version of the Psalter.¹

The theory that the first fifteen chapters of *Acts* are Luke's literal translation of an Aramaic document has been urged with a mass of detailed illustration by Professor Torrey, who claims that his argument is cumulative. We have already considered some of his strongest instances of possible mistranslation, and can only mention here one or two reasons for the failure of this great Semitist to win general consent to his conclusions. Several of the alleged Aramaisms can be paralleled from Paul's letters and other writings in free Greek. Others are found in the second part of *Acts*, where they are attributed to the influence of the LXX on the writer's style. Others can be paralleled in Luke's Gospel, but not from Mt and Mk, which are declared by Dr. Torrey to be translated directly from the Aramaic. Finally, instances are given of mistranslation although in the same part of the book the correct phrase is found, thus proving that ignorance of the true meaning of the idiom must not be imputed to the author.²

2. The Johannine Writings.

The case for an Aramaic original of our *Fourth Gospel* has been greatly strengthened since the editor wrote the sentences on this subject in the Introduction to this volume (p. 32). It was but natural to rely upon the great authority of Wellhausen, as Dr. Torrey³ has generously allowed. But Dr. Burney's masterly work has proved convincingly the Semitic cast of mind of the author. His attempt to prove that the Gospel was written in Aramaic by one man, and translated into Greek by another, has not carried the same conviction. The decisive factor in the establishment of such a theory is a few instances of almost certain mistranslation. Now, as we have seen above (p. 474), Dr. Burney has furnished us with several plausible examples, but it is significant that such highly competent Semitists as Père Lagrange and Mr. G. R. Driver recognise that even the most difficult passage can be understood without recourse to this kind of treatment. Moreover, the most impressive evidence which is offered for the confusion of the particles *iva* and *ετι* with the relative loses much of its force when this same tendency is found to be increasingly prevalent in the later stages of the Greek language. The weakness of Dr. Burney's case is that he has not allowed for the coincidence of many of the Aramaic constructions found in the Greek of the *Fourth Gospel* with usages that were equally common in the colloquial Greek of that period. It is only to be expected that one whose

¹ A striking feature of the Third Gospel is, to use a phrase of Lagrange's, the "nests of Semitisms" which we meet with here and there in Lk.

² All these statements are exemplified in Dr. H. J. Cadbury's searching examination of Professor Torrey's contention: see *Luke: Translator or Author?* (*AJT* xxiv. 436-455).

³ *HTR* xvi. 324.

native tongue was Aramaic would tend to fall into those forms of speech when writing Greek which most closely resembled his own idiom. Again, when we notice how many of the Aramaisms are found in passages that profess to record the actual words of Jesus, we may well suppose that John "was mentally translating, as he wrote, *logia* handed down by tradition and current in Christian circles in Aramaic, from that language into the Greek in which he was actually composing his Gospel."¹ Finally, it is only right to point out that Dr. Torrey, who is entirely with Burney in his main contention, disagrees with all his attempts at the recovery of a mistranslated original. The same might almost be said of Dalman's verdict.² A written Aramaic original is therefore by no means established.

The Hebraic style of many passages in *Revelation* was made clear by Archdeacon Charles in his *Studies in the Apocalypse* (see p. 33 above). Since the closing page of the Introduction to the present volume was written nine years ago, Dr. Charles's incomparable edition of the Apocalypse has appeared, with a wealth of material for those who study the grammar of this book.

The solution of the tangled problem of the language of the Apocalypse is said to be this: (a) The author writes in Greek, but thinks in Hebrew; (b) he has taken over some Greek sources already translated from the Hebrew; (c) he has himself translated and adapted some Hebrew sources. The instances of mistranslation corrected by retroversion which have been given above go some way to proving the third statement, though they might still better come under the second heading. One ventures to wonder whether the first assertion has been made good. The writer's familiarity with Hebrew seems to lie beyond question, but why should not Aramaic be his mother-tongue, the language in which his thoughts would first frame themselves? Many of the peculiarities of idiom, such as the use of the resumptive pronoun after a relative, the co-ordination of a participle with a finite verb, the *casus pendens*, might betray an Aramaic cast of sentence. It is also noteworthy that several of the instances of the very free use of *iva* in the Fourth Gospel can be paralleled in Revelation. All of these come within the range of late Greek usage, and show that the writer was more familiar with the vernacular than with literary models, and naturally adopted such locutions as he found most in accord with his Semitic habit of speech. But we are convinced that more importance should be allowed to the influence of the LXX. One instance must suffice. We have already referred to Dr. Charles's acute perception of the Hebraic idiom behind the *crux* in 12'. But why should ὁ c. inf. in Hebr. be rendered by τοῦ c. inf. by one who has to give a desperately literal transla-

¹ G. R. Driver *The Original Language of the Fourth Gospel*, 1 n. (This reprint from *The Jewish Guardian* is the most complete and competent criticism of Dr. Burney's thesis that has yet appeared.)

² *TALZ*, xlvi. 8. "Die angenommenen Uebersetzungsfehler, von denen oben nur eine Auswahl mitgeteilt wurde, sind nicht zwingender Natur."

tion? He might have used εἰς τό c. inf. Dr. Charles himself shows that at Hos 9¹³ the LXX translates the same idiom in precisely the same way.¹ Is it not likely that one who was trying to write in Greek, a language with which he was not perfectly familiar, would prepare himself for the sacred task of declaring his heavenly message by studying the revelation of bygone seers, not only in the sacred tongue of the Hebrews, but also in the version which was hallowed as the Bible of the Greek-speaking Dispersion and of the Gentile Christian Church? We therefore think that the material supplied in Dr. Charles's great commentary would justify us in finding a solution of the linguistic problem in a combination of factors: (a) a mind that thought in Aramaic and found in the vernacular Greek of his world many idioms sufficiently close to his mother-tongue for his purpose; (b) sources in translated Greek and in Hebrew, which he worked into his book in Hebraic Greek; (c) a knowledge of the LXX and of various apocalypses already current in a Greek form, which supplied him with a vocabulary and often suggested an idiom.²

Of the remaining books of the New Testament there is little to add to what has already been said in the Introduction. Those who think that Paul's amanuensis or colleague, who was allowed a freer hand in the composition of *Ephesians* than of any other letter, was deeply under the Hebraic influence of the LXX, will find a few additions to the data offered on p. 22. Secondary Hebraisms may be discovered in Eph 1³ εὐλογήσας ἐν πάσῃ εὐλογίᾳ. Apart from the use of ἐν, we are reminded of the group of pleonasm in this Epistle to which Dr. Rendel Harris has called attention (p. 419). An unidiomatic use of the genitive of definition may perhaps be termed the Hebraic genitive in 1¹⁴ τῷ πνεύματι τῆς ἐπαγγελίας ("the promised Spirit") and 4²³ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας τῆς ἀπάτης ("deceitful lusts"). The breathless sentence which spans the second half of chapter 1 is built after no Hebrew model, yet a keen eye may possibly detect Dr. Charles's construction (see pp. 34 and 429) in 1²² ἐγείρας αὐτὸν . . . καὶ καθίσας . . . καὶ πάντα ὑπέταξεν. The next line shows us ἔδωκεν (clearly יָתַן, cf. 4¹¹). Yet another secondary Hebraism may lurk in the phrase (6¹⁹) ἐν ἀνοίξει τοῦ στόματός μου (אֲנִי c. infin. "when I open . . ."). We have already seen (p. 453) that exegesis is against treating the participle as otiose in 2¹⁷ ἐλθὼν εὐαγγελίσασθαι. Nor does there seem good reason for agreeing with Guillemard that μαρτύρομαι ἐν Κυρίῳ (4¹²) is the familiar אֲמַר בַּיהוָה. Rather is it analogous to Paul's παρακαλοῦμεν ἐν κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ (1 Th 4¹) and to the words in Rom 16²⁶, with which another Tertius would now bring his pious duty to a close, ἀσπάζομαι ὑμᾶς ἐγὼ Τέρτιος ὁ γράψας τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ἐν Κυρίῳ.

¹ For further ex. of τοῦ c. inf. as common LXX equivalent for ἰ c. inf. in Hebr., see p. 449 above.

² For a rather different explanation of the language of the Apocalypse, see Lohmeyer's recent commentary, *HNT* iv. iv. 193 ff.

This page intentionally left blank

I. INDEX TO QUOTATIONS.

(a) NEW TESTAMENT.

MATTHEW		MATTHEW—continued		MATTHEW—continued	
	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
1. 5	109	5. 41	67	9. 7, 9	453
1. 6	146	5. 48	458	9. 10	426
1. 7	109, 145	6. 1 ff.	471	9. 15	419, 441
1. 15	144	6. 4	422	9. 17	206
1. 18	61	6. 5	458	9. 18	129, 432
1. 19	408	6. 6	419	9. 19	453
1. 20	120, 144	6. 7	68, 272, 463	9. 20	171
1. 23	30, 447	6. 11	313	9. 36	192, 193
1. 24	453	6. 12	202	10. 7	469
1. 34	424	6. 24	419	10. 10	100
2. 2	129	6. 26	165	10. 11	424, 434
2. 3	147	6. 27	173	10. 13	204, 430
2. 6	60, 108	6. 28	195	10. 15	147
2. 10	129, 445	6. 30	10, 68, 202, 294	10. 17	460
2. 11	106	6. 34	313	10. 19	204, 432, 447
2. 13 f.	453	7. 2	464	10. 25	377
2. 20 f.	453	7. 3 ff.	419	10. 26	29, 436
2. 23	149	7. 6	75, 464	10. 28	245, 460
3. 4	431	7. 7	83, 419, 421	10. 29	430, 433
3. 5	147	7. 9	60	10. 33	29
3. 11	10, 458	7. 13	419	10. 36	377
3. 12	10, 434	7. 15	460	11. 1	171, 426
3. 14	302	7. 16	447	11. 2	29, 462
3. 17	50, 458	7. 20	452	11. 4	453
4. 2	172	7. 22	208	11. 6	464
4. 8	202	7. 23	469	11. 7	455
4. 13 112, 149, 158, 191		7. 24	424	11. 8	68
4. 15	332, 459	7. 25	190	11. 10	436, 466
4. 16	424	7. 28	426	11. 11	459
4. 17	455	8. 3	67	11. 12	365, 419
4. 24	405	8. 4	209	11. 16	69, 70
5. 2	454	8. 8	327, 421	11. 19	433, 461
5. 13	132, 402, 408	8. 12	448	11. 20	455
5. 15	30, 447	8. 19	432	11. 21	50
5. 18	433	8. 20	347	11. 25	215, 432, 453
5. 20	165	8. 21	422	11. 26	465
5. 22	152, 460	8. 25	206	11. 27	10
5. 33	99, 236, 315	8. 26	61	11. 29	436
5. 34	450	8. 27	436	12. 1	128, 455
5. 35 f.	464	8. 30	452	12. 4	440, 468
5. 36	129	8. 32	208	12. 12	128
5. 37	154	9. 2	206	12. 13	189
5. 39	450	9. 3	16	12. 18	458 475
5. 40	424	9. 5	70, 206	12. 20	106, 126 189

MATTHEW—continued		MATTHEW—continued		MATTHEW—continued	
	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
12. 33	421	18. 6 .	442, 463	23. 23	126, 215
12. 36	424	18. 7 .	461	23. 25 f.	471, 479
12. 38	453	18. 12 f.	172	23. 27	121, 405
12. 39	468	18. 14	465	23. 31	472
12. 42	146, 430	18. 16	467	23. 34	433, 438
12. 45	431	18. 19	75	23. 36	471
12. 49	129	18. 20	434	23. 37	10, 133, 148
13. 4 .	450	18. 21	422	24. 2 .	424, 438
13. 8	202	18. 22	175	24. 9 .	447
13. 13	60, 202	18. 23	433	24. 13	424
13. 14	443, 444	18. 24	432, 455	24. 15	144, 160
13. 15	74, 470	18. 28	298	24. 21	419
13. 16 f.	437	18. 30	452	24. 22	434
13. 19 f.	205, 424	19. 1 .	426	24. 26	89
13. 22	424	19. 4 .	104, 160	24. 29	451
13. 23	205, 424	19. 5 .	67, 462	24. 32	60, 264
13. 25	450	19. 8 .	469	24. 40	438
13. 28	421, 433, 452	19. 22	452	24. 41	80, 136, 366
13. 30	439	19. 24	72	24. 43	252
13. 31	419	19. 28	103, 171, 424	24. 45	339
13. 36	453	20. 1 .	433	24. 49	455
13. 38	424, 441	20. 8 .	454	24. 51	472
13. 44	481	20. 17	467	25. 8 .	106, 206
13. 45	433	20. 21	438	25. 10	157
13. 46	452	20. 22	89	25. 15	114
13. 52	400, 433	20. 23	468	25. 18, 25	452
13. 53	426	20. 26 f.	458	25. 29	424
13. 56	467	20. 31	165	25. 34	459
13. 57	464	20. 32	421	26. 1 .	426
14. 11	430	20. 33	83	26. 12	445
14. 26	461, 469	21. 2 .	465	26. 14	91, 420
14. 30	455	21. 3 .	458	26. 15	88
14. 31	458	21. 8 .	203	26. 17	421
15. 4 .	443	21. 9 .	194	26. 18	179
15. 6 .	419	21. 11	112, 149	26. 22	455
15. 11	424	21. 17	453	26. 23	424
15. 13	339	21. 19	108, 432	26. 31, 33	464
15. 14	71	21. 22	247	26. 37	455
15. 15	453	21. 23	419	26. 42	468
15. 17	448	21. 25, 32	464	26. 45	421
15. 20	193	21. 33	191, 212, 433	26. 46	205
15. 23	195	21. 42	423, 462	26. 53	76, 161, 422
15. 27	345, 461	21. 46	462	26. 65	193, 469
15. 32	132	22. 2 .	433	26. 67	193
16. 2 .	101, 405	22. 16	464	26. 69	432
16. 4 .	453, 468	22. 17	419	26. 72	469
16. 6, 11	460	22. 22	453	26. 73	25
16. 12	450, 460	22. 28	419	26. 74	205, 455, 469
16. 19	131	22. 30	410	26. 75	11
16. 21	205, 455	22. 36	30, 442	27. 6 .	153
16. 22	455	22. 38	442	27. 9 .	419
16. 24	421	22. 39	60	27. 12	450
16. 28	464	23. 1 .	454	27. 24	461, 465
17. 4 .	453	23. 2 .	458	27. 28	129
17. 14	424	23. 7 .	245	27. 33	195, 149
17. 15	405	23. 13	465	27. 34	90
17. 19	467	23. 15	166, 441	27. 38	438
17. 20	210	23. 16, 18	464	27. 40	210
17. 27	369, 448	23. 19	161	27. 43	469
18. 5 .	179	23. 20 ff.	464	27. 56	146

INDEX TO QUOTATIONS.

489

MATTHEW—continued		MARK—continued		MARK—continued	
	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
27. 57	63, 400	4. 9	205	7. 9	100
27. 61	465	4. 10	195	7. 10	443
28. 1	439, 471	4. 12	204, 444, 470	7. 11	85, 153
28. 4	461	4. 13	438	7. 13	209, 419
28. 5	453	4. 20	60, 439	7. 19	74, 448
28. 18	454	4. 21	448	7. 20	424
28. 19	400	4. 22	436, 468	7. 24	318, 453
		4. 27	231, 423	7. 25	420, 434, 452
		4. 28	61, 68, 158, 162	7. 26	279, 349
		4. 29	211	7. 28	345, 461
		4. 30	319, 419	7. 30	129
		4. 36	420, 453	7. 31	471
		4. 38	206	7. 32	106, 129
		4. 41	436, 445	7. 34, 35	83
		5. 2	464	8. 2	447
		5. 5	452	8. 3	132, 221
		5. 10	446	8. 6	204
		5. 11	12, 452	8. 7	194, 450
		5. 15	76, 195	8. 10	420
		5. 16	431	8. 11	209, 430, 455
		5. 17	455	8. 12	468
		5. 18	204	8. 13	453
		5. 20	455	8. 14	212
		5. 22	432	8. 15	31, 460
		5. 23	446, 452	8. 16	194
		5. 27	92, 420	8. 17	202
		5. 29	60	8. 19	162
		5. 34	463	8. 21	202
		5. 37	433	8. 24	436
		5. 38	446	8. 25	189
		5. 42	443	8. 28	454
		5. 43	211, 446, 450	8. 31 f.	455
		6. 2	455, 462	8. 34	421
		6. 3	146, 464, 467	8. 37	211
		6. 4	138, 350	9. 1	88, 464
		6. 7	420, 439, 455	9. 3	435, 452
		6. 12	420	9. 4	452
		6. 14	194, 447	9. 5	453
		6. 15	438	9. 7	452
		6. 16	424	9. 8	468
		6. 17 f.	431	9. 9	209
		6. 20	445, 446	9. 12	99, 111 f., 396
		6. 21	112, 364	9. 18	71, 257, 403, 409
		6. 22	431	9. 19	467
		6. 23	177	9. 21	164
		6. 27	109, 129	9. 22 f.	206
		6. 34	455	9. 26	446
		6. 36	164	9. 28	195, 467
		6. 37	75	9. 30	211
		6. 39	439	9. 33	209
		6. 41	204	9. 34	195
		6. 43	433	9. 35	458
		6. 45	471	9. 36	406, 430
		6. 48	450	9. 37	75
		6. 55	455	9. 42	442, 463
		6. 56	202	9. 43	106, 442, 448
		7. 2	249	9. 45, 47	442
		7. 3	352	9. 48	206
		7. 4	420	9. 49	132, 408
		7. 6	189	9. 50	132

MARK

I. 2	466
I. 4	452
I. 6	104
I. 7	10, 434
I. 8	458
I. 9	426
I. 11	458
I. 12	452
I. 15	464
I. 19	423
I. 21	446
I. 23	446, 464
I. 24	83
I. 29, 30	446
I. 32	194, 209
I. 34	114, 189
I. 35	453
I. 38	276
I. 40	206
I. 41	129
I. 42	67, 242
I. 44	181, 420
I. 45	446, 455
2. 4	324, 461, 470
2. 5	206
2. 6	452
2. 7	16
2. 8	432
2. 9	206
2. 14	453
2. 15	427
2. 18	452
2. 19	419, 441
2. 22	206
2. 23	389, 427, 455
2. 26	440
3. 1	223
3. 4	442
3. 5	189, 325
3. 6	202
3. 12	446
3. 17	441
3. 19	145
3. 21	420
3. 22	105
3. 26, 28	430
3. 32	206
4. 1	110, 455
4. 4	18, 426, 450, 451
4. 8	176, 202, 439

INDEX TO QUOTATIONS.

491

LUKE—continued		LUKE—continued		LUKE—continued	
	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
3. 22	458	7. 22	453	10. 3	135
3. 25, 26	144	7. 23	464	10. 6	441
4. 9	148	7. 24	455	10. 8	429
4. 10	450	7. 27	466	10. 13	50
4. 16	149	7. 28	459	10. 14	405
4. 17	92	7. 34	433	10. 21	432, 465
4. 18	67	7. 35	461	10. 23 f.	437
4. 19	57	7. 38	455	10. 25	309
4. 20	452	7. 42 f.	165	10. 27	181
4. 21	455	7. 44	127	10. 28	421
4. 22	440	7. 47	206	10. 30	241
4. 25	123, 145	7. 49	455	10. 34	108
4. 26	433, 468	7. 50	463	10. 35	108, 450
4. 27	67	8. 1	428	10. 37	466
4. 29	191, 250, 453	8. 2	448	10. 38	450
4. 31	452	8. 5	450	10. 39	145, 319
4. 34	150	8. 6	375	10. 41	435
4. 36	126	8. 10	204	10. 42	145
4. 38	452, 453	8. 12	434	11. 1	426, 450
4. 39	453	8. 14	424, 453	11. 3	313
4. 40	194, 205	8. 15	424	11. 5	73
4. 41	448	8. 16	202	11. 9	83, 419, 421
4. 44	452	8. 17	436	11. 10	83
5. 1	426, 450, 452	8. 22	426	11. 14	426, 452
5. 3	270, 432, 442	8. 23	394	11. 17	438
5. 5	208	8. 24	206	11. 19	430
5. 6	193, 206	8. 25	436	11. 22	190
5. 12	426, 433, 450	8. 29	121, 386	11. 26	431
5. 14	204	8. 30	76	11. 27	110, 426, 450
5. 16	452	8. 38	90, 195, 199	11. 29	455, 468
5. 17	426, 433	8. 40	450, 452	11. 31	146, 165, 430
5. 21	16, 455	8. 42	60, 450	11. 37	450
5. 28	453	8. 43	171	11. 39	471
5. 29	452	8. 48	463	11. 41	471, 479
5. 34	441	8. 53	195	11. 42	73, 256
5. 38	188, 224	9. 3	100	11. 46	433
5. 39	442	9. 6	420	11. 47 f.	471
6. 1	175, 269, 427	9. 8	438	11. 52	131
6. 4	440	9. 12	171, 455	11. 53	455
6. 6	427	9. 13	75	12. 1	455, 460
6. 10	189	9. 17	171	12. 2	436
6. 11	216	9. 18	426, 450	12. 4	245, 460
6. 12	427, 452	9. 23	421	12. 10	424
6. 16	145	9. 28	426	12. 11	447
6. 17	158	9. 29	450	12. 12	432
6. 22	67	9. 32	301	12. 13	450
6. 35	62, 98	9. 33	426, 450	12. 14	365
6. 36	458	9. 34	103, 450	12. 15	450, 451, 460
6. 38	69	9. 36	221, 450	12. 20	447
6. 39	71	9. 37	426	12. 23	165
6. 41	103, 419	9. 38	60	12. 25	173
6. 44	447	9. 42	193, 403	12. 28	10, 68, 202, 228, 294
6. 47	424	9. 47	319	12. 32	346
6. 48 101, 193, 250, 403		9. 51	259, 426, 450	12. 33	108
7. 4	114	9. 52	466	12. 36	83
7. 7	421	9. 53	452	12. 39	252
7. 11	426	9. 54	421, 450	12. 42	339
7. 12	60	9. 57	422	12. 45	455
7. 15	455	9. 58	347	12. 46	472
7. 21	432	10. 1	439, 466		

LUKE—continued		LUKE—continued		LUKE—continued	
	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
12. 48	424, 447	17. 7	70	21. 16	433
12. 49	472	17. 11	426, 450	21. 23	105
12. 55	103	17. 14	67, 426, 450	21. 25	126, 143
12. 58	191	17. 17	67	21. 26	461
12. 59	210	17. 19	453	21. 34	230, 379
13. 2	438, 467	17. 22	98, 100, 439	21. 35	466
13. 4	171, 424, 438, 467	17. 23	447	21. 37	60, 152, 452
13. 7	447	17. 24	438	21. 38	407
13. 10	452	17. 27	410	22. 3	145
13. 11	171, 172, 452	18. 5	75	22. 4	211
13. 13	190, 252	18. 6	440	22. 9	421
13. 15	100	18. 10	438	22. 12	121
13. 16	171, 172, 447	18. 12	394	22. 15	443
13. 18	419	18. 14	467	22. 23	455
13. 19	462	18. 29	67	22. 26	458
13. 22	453	18. 33	447	22. 30	60, 207, 238
13. 25	179, 455	18. 35	426, 450	22. 31	405
13. 26	455	18. 37	150	22. 32	259, 420
13. 28	218, 251, 448	18. 39	195	22. 35	111
13. 34	10, 130, 133, 148, 245	18. 41	421	22. 42	70, 197
14. 1	426, 450, 452	19. 3	461	22. 44	213
14. 3	454	19. 4	73	22. 45	461
14. 5	422	19. 5	210	22. 55	409
14. 9	455	19. 8	79, 177	22. 61	11
14. 10	70, 210, 453	19. 11	445	23. 1	453
14. 12	135	19. 13	69, 70, 200	23. 2	455
14. 13	72	19. 14	339	23. 4	341
14. 16	123	19. 15	190, 211, 426, 450	23. 5	89, 454
14. 17	69, 70, 200	19. 20	426	23. 8	452
14. 18	28, 455, 461	19. 29	60, 148 f., 152, 369	23. 11	72, 111, 408, 458
14. 21	72	19. 31	458	23. 12	180, 348
14. 30	455	19. 36	203	23. 14	111, 341
14. 32	15, 339	19. 37	455	23. 15	459
14. 34	132, 402	19. 43	421	23. 22	341
14. 35	447	19. 44	423	23. 31	114, 447
15. 1	452	19. 45	455	23. 35	194
15. 4 ff.	172	19. 47	452	23. 39	181
15. 6	135	19. 48	192, 206	23. 40	198
15. 7	442	20. 1	426	23. 42	464
15. 14	123, 455	20. 2	419	23. 43	92
15. 15	433	20. 9	212, 455	23. 44	421
15. 16	63	20. 11, 12	445	23. 48	194
15. 17	206	20. 17	423	23. 50, 52	424
15. 18, 20	453	20. 19	432	23. 53	452
15. 24	455	20. 21	464	24. 1	160
15. 25	452, 453	20. 22	419	24. 3	100
15. 30	92	20. 26	465	24. 4	133, 426, 450
16. 2	206	20. 28	204	24. 6	454
16. 4	83	20. 31	208	24. 10	194
16. 8	440, 441	20. 34	383, 441	24. 12	453
16. 9	440, 447	20. 35	410	24. 13	424, 452
16. 13	419	20. 36	292, 383, 441	24. 14	432
16. 16	113, 419	20. 42	79	24. 15	426, 450
16. 20	190, 192	20. 43	204	24. 17	432
16. 22	427	20. 46	460	24. 19	150, 465
16. 26	464	21. 1	439	24. 21	105
16. 29	148	21. 3	161, 165	24. 22	213, 358
17. 2	102, 193, 442	21. 6	424, 438	24. 26	422
17. 6	68	21. 11	110, 364, 369	24. 27	190
				24. 30	426, 450

LUKE—continued		JOHN—continued		JOHN—continued	
	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
24. 31	461	4. 7	90	7. 8	210
24. 32	83, 432, 452, 472	4. 9	49	7. 17	369
	453	4. 10	90	7. 18	424
24. 33	121	4. 15	74	7. 19	469
24. 39	461	4. 17	208	7. 23	139
24. 41	343	4. 20, 21	469	7. 30	469
24. 42	450, 454	4. 23	365, 469	7. 31	165, 194, 463
24. 47	426, 450	4. 31	195	7. 33	422
24. 51		4. 35	422, 469	7. 34, 36	60
		4. 39	463	7. 37	196, 474, 475, 476
		4. 41	161	7. 38	463, 474, 475
		4. 46	378, 380	7. 39	463
		4. 49	210, 380	7. 41	194
		5. 2	85	7. 48	463
		5. 5	172	7. 51	211
		5. 7	436	7. 52	86
		5. 9	190	8. 4	193
		5. 10	422	8. 9, 12	454
		5. 11	73, 139, 424	8. 20	469
		5. 19	424	8. 22	194
		5. 20	73, 202	8. 26	424
		5. 25	469	8. 28	441
		5. 27	431, 441	8. 30	463
		5. 28	469	8. 44	100
		5. 29	431	8. 45	436
		5. 35	225	8. 52	469
		5. 36	113, 161, 424	8. 53	208
		5. 37, 38	424	8. 56	470, 474, 475
		5. 39	469	8. 57	221, 422
		5. 40, 43	469	9. 5	431
		5. 44	429, 469	9. 7 ff.	32
		6. 2	189, 195	9. 8	469
		6. 3	32	9. 10	194
		6. 13	171	9. 13	431
		6. 18	190	9. 16	194
		6. 19	122	9. 17	83, 436
		6. 23	60	9. 18	431
		6. 27	441	9. 22	190
		6. 29	463	9. 25	474
		6. 30	436	9. 26	83
		6. 33	205	9. 30	83, 449, 469
		6. 35	463	9. 32	83
		6. 37	437	9. 34	422
		6. 39	424, 434, 437	9. 35	441, 463
		6. 40	463	9. 36	435, 436, 463
		6. 45	459	9. 41	194
		6. 46	424	10. 1	424
		6. 50	436	10. 3	75
		6. 53	441	10. 23	146, 190
		6. 54	129	10. 24	194, 400
		6. 57	422	10. 25	424
		6. 62	441	10. 29	74, 437
		6. 63	474	10. 40	452
		6. 67	171	10. 42	463
		6. 68	431	11. 1	144, 452
		6. 70	469	11. 8	422
		6. 71	145, 171	11. 9	171
		7. 3	210, 476	11. 20	145
		7. 4	469	11. 25	463
		7. 5	463	11. 26	434, 463

JOHN

1. 1	467
1. 4	436
1. 5	469
1. 8	436
1. 9	452
1. 10, 11	469
1. 12	208, 424, 463
1. 13	436
1. 14	72, 162
1. 15	474
1. 16	436
1. 18	424
1. 27	435
1. 28	452
1. 29	474
1. 30	421
1. 32	429
1. 33	424, 435
1. 35	113
1. 38	152
1. 41	269
1. 49	431
1. 50, 51	161
1. 52	441
2. 4	83
2. 6	452
2. 9	32
2. 10	161
2. 11	105, 463
2. 13	422
2. 20	172, 191, 422
2. 22	474
2. 23	463
2. 24	180
3. 8	195, 199
3. 10	422
3. 11	469
3. 13, 14	441
3. 16	139, 463
3. 18	463
3. 19	469
3. 21	193
3. 23	452
3. 26	424
3. 29	444
3. 32	424, 469
3. 36	463
4. 5	431

JOHN—continued		JOHN—continued		ACTS—continued	
	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
11. 28	211	16. 30	468	2. 1	426, 450, 473
11. 30	190	16. 32	204, 470	2. 2	452
11. 32	145	17. 2	218, 424, 437, 441	2. 4	455
11. 33	476	17. 3	75	2. 5	452
11. 36	194	17. 6	221	2. 7	98, 100
11. 37	83	17. 7	215, 221	2. 13	381
11. 38	201, 476	17. 8	215	2. 17	443
11. 39	337	17. 11	437, 469	2. 23	462
11. 44	72, 190	17. 12	437	2. 25	190
11. 45	463	17. 20	463	2. 26	191
11. 48	422, 463	17. 23	473	2. 30	443
11. 52	473	17. 24	60, 424, 437	2. 42	452
11. 54	50	17. 26	419	2. 46	195
11. 56	194	18. 1	121, 149	2. 47	173, 473
11. 57	190, 211	18. 9	435	3. 2	202, 447
12. 3	379	18. 18	424, 462	3. 6	100
12. 6	272	18. 25, 30	452	3. 7	112
12. 11	463	18. 32	444	3. 10	126
12. 23	441, 470	18. 33	32	3. 11	146
12. 34	423, 441, 469	18. 34	181	3. 13	466
12. 36, 37	463	18. 37	60	3. 16	465, 473
12. 40	470	18. 39	421	3. 19	227
12. 41	469	19. 3	202	3. 20	486
12. 42, 44	463	19. 13	409	3. 23	71
12. 46	434, 463	19. 17	148	3. 26	450, 451
12. 48, 49	424	19. 23	67, 170	4. 4	173
13. 1	470	19. 31	189, 226	4. 5	426, 427
13. 1 ff.	32	19. 38	32	4. 9	260
13. 2	211	19. 39	106	4. 11	112
13. 4	76	20. 1	439	4. 17	443
13. 5	368, 455	20. 2	448, 474	4. 19	453
13. 7	83	20. 3	237	4. 22	190
13. 10	248	20. 12	438	4. 25	474
13. 23	452	20. 17	476	4. 30	450, 451
13. 24	204	20. 18	474	4. 33	202
13. 26	345, 435	20. 19	439	4. 35	202, 206
13. 29	211, 272	20. 23	206	4. 36	441
13. 31	441	20. 25	129	5. 2, 3	408
14. 1	463	20. 29	469	5. 6	453
14. 2	476	20. 30	465	5. 7	426
14. 3	60, 247	21. 6	461	5. 12	146
14. 7	190	21. 8	141	5. 14	206
14. 12	424, 463	21. 11	469	5. 15	102
14. 13	424	21. 15	165	5. 17	126
14. 16	422, 436	21. 18	203	5. 28	443
14. 17	60	21. 19	444	5. 29	453
14. 21	424	21. 25	216, 219	5. 36	96, 462
14. 22	181			5. 39	92
14. 26	424			5. 41	466
14. 31	211, 476			6. 1	158
15. 2, 5	424	Acts		6. 3	162
15. 6	448	1. 1	9, 455	6. 5	129, 162
15. 16	211	1. 6	195	6. 7	473
15. 22, 24	194	1. 10	133, 452	6. 11	440
16. 2	470	1. 12	152	7. 2	102
16. 5	469	1. 13, 14	452	7. 7	75
16. 9	463	1. 15	473	7. 10	465
16. 20	462	1. 18	49, 246, 323, 440	7. 11	151, 192
16. 24	247, 421	1. 19	49, 153	7. 12	122
16. 25	469	1. 20	157	7. 19	309
		1. 22	454		

INDEX TO QUOTATIONS.

495

ACTS—continued		ACTS—continued		ACTS—continued	
	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
7. 20 . . .	78, 443	11. 19 . . .	210, 461	17. 18 . . .	73, 275
7. 21 . . .	309, 462	11. 26 . . .	72, 163, 427	17. 19 . . .	151
7. 23 . . .	58	11. 28 . . .	123, 474	17. 21 . . .	191
7. 26 . . .	325	12. 3 . . .	445	17. 22 . . .	151
7. 29 . . .	463	12. 4 . . .	176	17. 26 . . .	466
7. 30 . . .	172	12. 5, 6 . . .	452	17. 27 . . .	196, 211, 216
7. 34 . . .	214, 444	12. 7 . . .	210	17. 28 . . .	9, 73, 244
7. 35 . . .	123	12. 10 . . .	83, 158, 432	18. 7 . . .	386, 452
7. 36 . . .	151	12. 14 . . .	461	18. 12 . . .	398
7. 40 . . .	429	12. 20 . . .	452	18. 14 . . .	189
7. 41 . . .	384	12. 24 . . .	87, 191	18. 17 . . .	139
7. 44 . . .	146	13. 1 . . .	88, 91, 474	18. 18 . . .	105
7. 45 . . .	189, 266, 466	13. 5 . . .	128	18. 26 . . .	212, 455
7. 47 . . .	146, 191	13. 8 . . .	83, 165	18. 27 . . .	160
7. 53 . . .	463	13. 10 . . .	441	18. 28 . . .	205, 301
7. 56 . . .	83, 302, 441	13. 12 . . .	255	19. 1 . . .	121, 427, 450
8. 1 . . .	453	13. 18 . . .	58, 109, 390	19. 4 . . .	463
8. 6 . . .	450	13. 19 . . .	391	19. 7 . . .	171, 172
8. 10 . . .	194, 474	13. 20 . . .	172	19. 12 . . .	72
8. 13 . . .	452	13. 22 . . .	462	19. 13 . . .	365
8. 17 . . .	194, 202	13. 24 . . .	466	19. 14 . . .	194
8. 21 . . .	465	13. 25 . . .	434	19. 25 . . .	110
8. 23 . . .	440	13. 31 . . .	161	19. 27 . . .	111, 462
8. 24 . . .	301, 463	13. 47 . . .	450, 462	19. 28 . . .	162
8. 26 . . .	157, 464	13. 48 . . .	157	19. 29, 31 . . .	124, 369
8. 27 . . .	453	14. 1 . . .	427	19. 31 . . .	124
8. 28 . . .	452	14. 7 . . .	388, 452	19. 32 . . .	67, 161
8. 31 . . .	71	14. 12 . . .	129, 142	19. 37 . . .	125
8. 32 . . .	465	14. 14 . . .	102	19. 38 . . .	57
8. 34 . . .	453	14. 17 . . .	91, 106	19. 40 . . .	341
9. 3 . . .	427, 450	14. 19 . . .	194, 240	20. 7 . . .	439
9. 8 . . .	83	14. 21 . . .	400	20. 8 . . .	328
9. 9 . . .	452	14. 23 . . .	190, 463	20. 9 . . .	286
9. 11 . . .	210	14. 27 . . .	466	20. 14 . . .	72, 79
9. 15 . . .	440	15. 4 . . .	148, 466	20. 15 . . .	113, 362
9. 28 . . .	452	15. 7 . . .	474	20. 16 . . .	148, 392
9. 32 . . .	147, 427	15. 9 . . .	111	20. 18 . . .	203
9. 34 . . .	60	15. 17 . . .	435	20. 23 . . .	121, 122
9. 35 . . .	147	15. 20 . . .	387	20. 33 . . .	111
9. 37 . . .	427	15. 28 . . .	69, 70, 165	21. 1 . . .	67, 101, 121, 427
9. 38 . . .	147	15. 29 . . .	193	21. 3 . . .	452
9. 39 . . .	108, 453	15. 32 . . .	259	21. 5 . . .	427
9. 43 . . .	427	16. 4 . . .	195, 202	21. 7 . . .	129
10. 11 . . .	171	16. 5 . . .	192	21. 10 . . .	161
10. 14 . . .	434	16. 7 . . .	194	21. 22 . . .	221
10. 15 . . .	67	16. 8 . . .	129	21. 24 . . .	74
10. 20 . . .	210, 453	16. 9 . . .	452	21. 27 . . .	91, 188, 195, 265
10. 23 . . .	453	16. 11 . . .	100, 151, 278	21. 35 . . .	427
10. 24 . . .	452	16. 12 . . .	452	22. 3 . . .	144
10. 25 . . .	427	16. 16 . . .	100, 427	22. 6 . . .	427
10. 28 . . .	100, 164	16. 18 . . .	432	22. 10 . . .	453
10. 30 . . .	452	16. 22 . . .	102	22. 11 . . .	461
10. 37 . . .	454	16. 26 . . .	121, 122, 190	22. 13 . . .	432
10. 38 . . .	149	16. 36 . . .	221	22. 17 . . .	427
10. 42 . . .	57	16. 37 . . .	453	22. 19, 20 . . .	452
10. 43 . . .	463	16. 39 . . .	195, 453	22. 23 . . .	129
11. 4 . . .	454	17. 5 . . .	57, 194, 389	22. 25 . . .	407
11. 5 . . .	171, 452	17. 6 . . .	129, 194	23. 3 . . .	206
11. 9 . . .	67	17. 7 . . .	465	23. 9 . . .	389
11. 15 . . .	450	17. 15 . . .	165	23. 12 . . .	89, 90

INDEX TO QUOTATIONS.

497

1 CORINTHIANS— <i>contd.</i>		2 CORINTHIANS— <i>contd.</i>		GALATIANS— <i>continued</i>	
	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
9. 21 .	60, 243, 307	3. 6 .	245	4. 28 .	23, 441
9. 27 .	75	3. 10 .	67	5. 20 .	126, 131
10. 4 .	208	3. 16 .	61, 321	6. 11 .	8
10. 7 .	90	4. 2 .	205, 212	6. 12 .	74
10. 9 .	206	4. 6 .	105		
10. 10 .	71, 206, 365	4. 8 .	310	EPHESIANS	
10. 20 .	448	4. 16 .	439	1. 3 .	444, 485
10. 22 .	196	5. 8 .	467	1. 4 .	465
10. 29 .	181	5. 19 .	452	1. 6, 8, 9 .	419
11. 6 .	199, 200, 250	6. 2 .	440	1. 14 .	440, 485
11. 18, 20 .	473	6. 4 .	205	1. 19 .	419
11. 21 .	195, 450	6. 8 .	287	1. 22 .	485
11. 22 .	226	6. 14 .	390	2. 2, 3 .	441
11. 23 .	206	6. 18 .	463	2. 4 .	419
11. 28 .	433	7. 12 .	100	2. 6 .	409
11. 34 .	195	9. 2 .	126	2. 8 .	260
12. 31 .	202	9. 7 .	191, 366	2. 17 .	453, 485
13. 2 .	111, 205	9. 8 .	390	3. 8 .	166
13. 3 .	74, 111, 219	10. 1 .	466	3. 11 .	419
13. 4 .	400	10. 2 .	102	3. 17 .	193
14. 7 .	60, 204, 409	10. 4 .	71, 443	3. 18 .	310
14. 8 .	108	10. 10 .	112	3. 19, 20 .	419
14. 18 .	473	11. 8 .	111	4. 1, 4 .	419
14. 19 .	442	11. 9 .	467	4. 9 .	166
14. 20 .	405	11. 23 .	328	4. 11 .	485
14. 23 .	473	11. 24 .	173	4. 14 .	339, 408
14. 38 .	70	11. 25 .	193, 269	4. 17 .	485
15. 6 .	315	11. 27 .	125	4. 22 .	440, 485
15. 8 .	60	12. 2 .	172	4. 29 .	434
15. 9 .	166	12. 5 .	463	5. 5 .	22 f., 203, 222, 434, 444
15. 17 .	157	12. 9 .	165, 463	5. 6, 8 .	441
15. 19 .	92	12. 13 .	396	5. 14 .	210
15. 24 .	204	12. 15 .	165	5. 16 .	309
15. 27 .	49	12. 19 .	465	5. 26 .	359
15. 33 .	9, 61, 63	13. 3 .	390	5. 27 .	361
15. 49 .	74			5. 29 .	311
15. 52 .	335	GALATIANS		5. 30 .	121
15. 54 .	126	1. 18 .	387, 467	5. 31 .	463
15. 55 .	22, 119	1. 19 .	468	6. 4 .	311
15. 56, 57 .	126	1. 22, 23 .	452	6. 9 .	205
16. 2 .	191, 200, 203, 238, 439	2. 1 .	172	6. 11 .	339
16. 4 .	204	2. 4 .	75	6. 16 .	347
16. 6, 7 .	467	2. 5 .	191, 467	6. 19 .	485
16. 11 .	112	2. 11 .	466	6. 26 .	369
16. 12, 19 .	446	2. 12 .	327		
16. 22 .	154, 204	2. 14 .	100		
		2. 16 .	463, 468		
		2. 17 .	60		
		3. 10 .	450	PHILIPPIANS	
		3. 17 .	172	1. 13 .	122, 463
		3. 19 .	113	1. 15 .	54
		3. 28 .	104	1. 16 .	339
		4. 4 .	459	1. 22 .	408, 422
		4. 17 .	75, 196	1. 26 .	467
		4. 18 .	69, 200, 450, 467	1. 29 .	463
		4. 19 .	113	2. 11 .	73
		4. 20 .	467	2. 18 .	61
		4. 22 .	438	2. 23 .	98
		4. 27 .	157	2. 26 .	452
				2. 27 .	173
2 CORINTHIANS					
1. 10 .	193				
1. 12 .	378				
1. 13 .	295				
1. 19 .	110				
2. 6 .	165				
2. 9 .	72				
2. 14 .	400				
2. 17 .	465				
3. 1 .	205, 379				
3. 2 .	295				

REVELATION—continued		REVELATION—continued		REVELATION—continued	
	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
1. 10	377	7. 9	435	14. 13	74
1. 11	106, 128	7. 11	190	14. 14	121, 441
1. 13 110, 120, 139, 441		7. 14	429	14. 19	123
1. 15	280	7. 16	434	14. 20	123, 173
1. 18	131, 429	8. 1	341	15. 2	67, 197
2. 1	120, 121, 359	8. 3	218, 372	15. 3	429
2. 2	34, 206, 230, 429	8. 5	123	15. 5, 6	476
2. 3	221	8. 11	123, 343, 462	16. 1	91, 196, 265
2. 4	215	8. 12	60, 262	16. 2	126
2. 5	221	8. 13	278, 432	16. 6	90
2. 7	197, 250, 424	9. 4	129	16. 9	445
2. 8	106	9. 8	194	16. 16	149
2. 9	429	9. 11	205, 476	16. 19	462
2. 12	151	9. 13	432	17. 3	440
2. 13	119	9. 16	168, 173	17. 5	60
2. 16	467	9. 19	157	17. 6, 8	476
2. 17	197, 250, 424	9. 20	75, 121	17. 9	435
2. 18	280	10. 1	476	17. 14	467
2. 20	89, 202, 429	10. 2	347	18. 3 127, 221, 381, 423	
2. 21	470	10. 6	464	18. 12	72
2. 22	75, 477	10. 7	422	18. 13	155, 362
2. 23	429	10. 8	347	18. 17	335
2. 24	60, 128, 160	10. 9	208, 347, 402	18. 21	432
2. 26	424	11. 1	454	18. 22	434
2. 27	379	11. 2	172	18. 23	60, 262
3. 2	452	11. 7	467	19. 3	221, 423
3. 5	30	11. 9	178	19. 4	170
3. 7	83, 131	11. 10	264	19. 9	123
3. 8	435	11. 11	178	19. 10	54
3. 9	202, 429	11. 12	210	19. 13 192, 230, 256, 321	
3. 12	424	11. 15	454	19. 15	123, 436
3. 16	67	11. 17	221	19. 16	443
3. 17	92	11. 19	476	19. 17	123
3. 18	60, 78, 265	12. 3	101	19. 19	467
3. 20	422	12. 5	104, 161	20. 1	131
3. 21	424	12. 6	75, 435, 448	20. 4	429
4. 1	210, 421, 454	12. 7 448, 449, 467, 484		20. 8	171, 435
4. 3	157, 359	12. 10	127	20. 9	400
4. 4	67, 121, 170	12. 11	100, 423	20. 11	466
4. 6	67, 157, 170	12. 13	104, 129, 161	21. 6	221, 424
4. 8	67, 170	12. 14	435, 466	21. 8	349, 460
5. 4	81	12. 17	467	21. 10	124
5. 6	159, 222	13. 1	440	21. 11	123, 407
5. 8	120, 121, 170	13. 2	112	21. 16	173
5. 11 168, 169, 173, 454		13. 3	476	21. 17	141
5. 12	454	13. 4	467	21. 18	67, 124, 307
5. 14	170	13. 5	172	21. 19	122, 376
6. 1	439	13. 7	467	21. 20	79, 90, 124, 362
6. 4	75, 101, 424	13. 8	435	21. 21	67, 303
6. 6	81	13. 10	449, 450	21. 27	434, 468
6. 8	176, 424	13. 11	476	22. 1	475
6. 9	129	13. 12	435	22. 2	129, 205
6. 11	75, 245	13. 14	129	22. 3	434
6. 12	83	13. 15	75, 430	22. 5	264
6. 14	236	13. 18	169	22. 8	205
6. 15	139	14. 1	160, 222	22. 9	54
6. 16	466	14. 2	429	22. 11	395, 400
7. 2	171, 435	14. 3	173, 429	22. 17	475
7. 4	172, 173	14. 6	454	22. 18	173
7. 6	146	14. 9, 10	422	22. 20	154

INDEX TO QUOTATIONS.

501

(b) OLD TESTAMENT.

N.B.—The numbering of the chapters is according to the English Bible; where the LXX differs, the numbers are added in brackets. So with titles of Books.

	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
Gen. 1. 1 . . .	17	Deut. 8. 2 . . .	309	Job 4. 13 . . .	126
" 1. 2 . . .	122	" 8. 4 . . .	447	" 12. 5 (6) . . .	222
" 1. 5 . . .	439	" 8. 16 . . .	309	" 14. 1 . . .	459
" 2. 3 . . .	455	" 28. 43 . . .	442	" 15. 14 . . .	459
" 2. 16, 17 . . .	443	" 28. 57 . . .	476	" 21. 24 . . .	162
" 3. 1 . . .	438	" 28. 64 . . .	206, 438	" 25. 4 . . .	459
" 3. 16 . . .	444	" 29. 3 . . .	448	Ps. 1. 1 . . .	458
" 4. 24 . . .	175	" 29. 18 . . .	440	" 2. 8 . . .	379
" 6. 4 . . .	195	Jos. 2. 24 . . .	469	" 16 (15). 8 . . .	190
" 6. 19 . . .	439	" 3. 16 . . .	442	" 25 (24). 14 . . .	449
" 7. 3 . . .	439	" 17. 13 . . .	443	" 32 (31). 1 . . .	190
" 7. 19 . . .	442	" 18. 16 . . .	153	" 32 (31). 9 . . .	449
" 9. 11 . . .	461	Judg. 9. 34 . . .	171	" 48 (47). 8 . . .	189
" 9. 23 . . .	124	" 16. 15 . . .	447	" 49 (48). 13, 21 . . .	189
" 13. 11 . . .	437	1 Sam. (1 K.) 2. 13 . . .	425	" 63 (62). 2 . . .	251
" 14. 23 . . .	469	" 3. 11 . . .	425	" 65 (64). 8 . . .	126
" 18. 14 . . .	434	" 7. 16 . . .	439	" 76 (75). 8 . . .	461
" 18. 25 . . .	448, 449	" 13. 14 . . .	462	" 83 (82). 10 . . .	149
" 21. 26 . . .	468	" 14. 4 . . .	438	" 94 (93) . . .	174
" 26. 11 . . .	400	" 14. 45 . . .	468	" 104. 10 . . .	475
" 26. 12 . . .	439	" 17. 6 . . .	476	" 118 (117). 22 . . .	423
" 26. 29 . . .	199	" 31. 10 . . .	342	" 119. 91 . . .	463
" 27. 33 . . .	428, 444	2 Sam. (2 K.) 11. 11 . . .	468	" 122 (121). 5 . . .	458
" 27. 36 . . .	447	" 14. 6 . . .	438	" 143 (142). 2 . . .	434
" 28. 16 . . .	469	" 15. 23 . . .	149	Prov. 3. 6 . . .	274
" 29. 33 . . .	463	" 19. 21 . . .	448, 449	" 5. 16 . . .	475
" 30. 38, 41 . . .	123	1 Ki. (3 K.) 14. 6 . . .	198	" 8. 28 . . .	475
" 31. 41 . . .	447	" 15. 13 . . .	149	" 9. 18 . . .	86
" 41. 13 . . .	426	" 17. 10 . . .	433	" 11. 5 . . .	274
" 41. 19 . . .	435	" 17. 12 . . .	346	" 24. 5, 30 (45) . . .	341
" 41. 42 . . .	477	" 18. 16 . . .	335	" 25. 21 . . .	196
" 42. 38 . . .	426	" 18. 19, 25 . . .	152	" 26. 8 . . .	205
" 43. 34 . . .	438	" 20. 18 . . .	335	Eccles. 3. 15 . . .	449
" 44. 28 . . .	469	2 Ki. (4 K.) 1. 6, 16 . . .	152	Cant. 5. 15 . . .	477
" 47. 21 . . .	438	" 2. 15 . . .	335	Isa. 1. 9 . . .	190
Ex. 1. 7, 12 . . .	442	" 5. 26 . . .	335	" 1. 21 . . .	435
" 3. 14 . . .	154	" 11. 1 . . .	476	" 3. 23 . . .	223
" 8. 14 . . .	442	" 21. 3 . . .	152	" 9. 2 . . .	424
" 9. 24 . . .	435	" 21. 13 . . .	122	" 9. 5 . . .	472
" 11. 6 . . .	435	1 Chr. 9. 25 . . .	449	" 19. 17 . . .	110
" 14. 7 . . .	437	" 11. 18 . . .	448, 449	" 26. 20 . . .	442
" 14. 20 . . .	438	" 21. 17 . . .	450	" 29. 2 . . .	127
" 16. 33 . . .	124	" 24. 6 . . .	439	" 37. 17-20 . . .	417
" 28. 20 . . .	362	2 Chr. 1. 18 . . .	450	" 42. 1 . . .	458, 475
" 28. 35 . . .	477	" 14. 3 . . .	450	" 42. 3 . . .	189
" 29. 17 . . .	476	" 22. 10 . . .	476	" 44. 16 . . .	177
Lev. 2. 13 . . .	132	" 29. 21, 27, 30 . . .	450	" 48. 8 . . .	206
Num. 14. 7 . . .	442	" 31. 4, 11 . . .	450	" 54. 13 . . .	459
" 14. 22 . . .	447	" 34. 13 . . .	439	" 57. 20 . . .	408
" 20. 10 . . .	152	" 35. 21 . . .	450	" 59. 13 . . .	246
" 28. 13 (14) . . .	177	Ezr. 5. 11 . . .	454	" 63. 2 . . .	123
Deut. 1. 31 . . .	390	Esth. 1. 6 . . .	477	Jer. 2. 27 . . .	124
" 2. 7 . . .	447	" 1. 10 . . .	450	" 3. 17 . . .	475
" 4. 32 . . .	438	" 6. 1 . . .	450	" 11. 13 . . .	152
" 7. 22 . . .	439	Job 3. 21 . . .	251	" 22. 22 . . .	469

	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
Jer. 23. 16 . . .	395	Dan. 3. 19 . . .	439, 450	Hos. 10. 14. . .	423
" 25. 26 (32. 12)	466	" 4. 22 . . .	428	" 14. 1 . . .	423
" 32 (39). 35 . .	83	" 5. 2 . . .	450	Joel 4 (3). 18 .	475
" 36 (43). 30 . .	192	" 5. 3 . . .	448	Jon. 1. 10, 16 . .	445
" 38 (45). 6 . . .	363	" 5. 9 . . .	446	" 3. 3 . . .	442
Lam. 1. 16 . . .	452	" 6. 14 (15) . .	446	Mic. 5. 1 (2) . .	449
Ezek. 9. 9 . . .	442	" 6. 18 . . .	132	Nah. 3. 10 . . .	423
" 14. 4 . . .	440	" 6. 22 . . .	454	Hab. 2. 3 . . .	442
" 44. 12 . . .	440	" 6. 23 (24) . .	446	" 3. 12 . . .	189
Dan. 1. 16 . . .	452	" 7. 10 . . .	169	Zech. 7. 3 . . .	447
" 2. 2 . . .	450	" 7. 13 . . .	441	" 9. 11 . . .	25
" 2. 12 . . .	446	" 7. 25 . . .	177	" 11. 12 . . .	419
" 2. 32 . . .	475	" 12. 1 . . .	435	" 12. 12 . . .	439
" 2. 38 . . .	430	Hos. 9. 13 . . .	449	" 14. 8 . . .	475
" 2. 46 . . .	450				

(c) APOCRYPHA AND PSEUDEPIGRAPHA OF OLD TESTAMENT.

	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
1 Esd. 3. 5, 9 . . .	435	Sir. 19. 26 . . .	162	4 Ezra 4. 26 . . .	444
" 4. 30 . . .	205	" 23. 14 (19) . .	472	" 4. 28 . . .	435
" 4. 31 . . .	86	" 34. 18 (31. 21)	425	" 4. 37 . . .	444
" 4. 54, 63 . . .	435	" 36 (33). 1-17 .	417	" 5. 30 . . .	444
" 5. 66 . . .	86	" 39. 26 . . .	132	" 5. 32 . . .	445
" 6. 32 . . .	435	Sus. 56 . . .	100	" 6. 14, 29 . . .	435
" 9. 48 . . .	144	Tob. 1. 8 M . . .	422	" 8. 55 . . .	445
2 Esd. 7. 22 . . .	132	" 2. 4 M . . .	430	" 9. 41 . . .	445
" 10. 14 . . .	460	" 3. 2 M . . .	427	" 10. 19 . . .	445
Ep. Jer. 72 . . .	477	" 10. 10 B . . .	177	" 11. 37 . . .	454
Jdth. 4. 2 . . .	442	" 12. 6 . . .	466	" 12. 40 . . .	454
" 6. 13 (9) . . .	192	" 13. 17 B . . .	362	" 13. 26 . . .	435
1 Mac. 10. 8 . . .	445	" 14. 4 B . . .	147	Test. XII. Patr.—	
" 10. 27 . . .	466	Wis. 2. 19 . . .	405	Test. Reub. 4. 1	211
" 10. 89 . . .	138	" 6. 9 . . .	99	" 4. 8 . . .	67
2 Mac. 7. 27 . . .	390	" 7. 26 . . .	298	" 6. 1 . . .	203
" 12. 27 . . .	435	" 10. 7 . . .	118	Test. Sim. 4. 5 .	211
4 Mac. 12. 7 . . .	375	" 11. 14 . . .	108	Test. Benj. 7. 4	175
" 16. 15 . . .	375	4 Ezra 4. 2 . . .	444	Enoch 89. 42-49 .	456
Sir. 6. 7 . . .	198	" 4. 4 . . .	435		

(d) EARLY CHRISTIAN WRITINGS.

Clement of Rome (i/A.D.)

	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
ad Cor. 12. 7 . . .	445	ad Cor. 20. 9 . . .	358	ad Cor. 28. 3 . . .	344
14. 4 . . .	365	21. 9 . . .	435		

Ignatius (ii/A.D.)

Eph. 3. 2 . . .	445	Magn. 7. 1 . . .	473	Philad. 6. 2; 10. 1	473
13. 1 . . .	473	10. 2 . . .	408	Polyc. ad init. . .	106
18. 1 . . .	365	11. 1 . . .	369	7. 2 . . .	166
20. 1 . . .	346	Tral. 2. 3 . . .	372		

Didache (ii/A.D.)

2. 7 . . .	434	10. 3 . . .	372
5. 2 . . .	366	10. 6 . . .	154

Barnabas (i/ii A.D.)

	PAGE		PAGE	PAGE
4. 10	406, 473	12. 2	352	
10. 11	372	20. 2	366	

Shepherd of Hermas (ii/A.D.)

<i>Vis.</i> ii. 1. 3	347	<i>Mand.</i> iv. 2. 1	407	<i>Sim.</i> v. 1. 1	358, 466
iii. 1. 4	346	v. 2. 4, 8	397	vi. 1. 5; 2. 6	376
iii. 6. 7	198	viii. 3	354	ix. 1. 4	376
iii. 10. 7	198	xi. 2	374	ix. 10. 5	390
iii. 13. 3	273	xii. 1. 3, 4	376	ix. 23. 3	397
iv. 3. 3	376	<i>Sim.</i> iii. 1. 4	346	ix. 26. 1	376
				ix. 26. 3	406

Martyrdom of Polycarp (ii/A.D.)

5. 1; 16. 1	346	18. 3	364	21	398
-------------	-----	-------	-----	----	-----

Epistle to Diognetus (ii/A.D.)

5. 2	413	6. 9	372	12. 9	407
------	-----	------	-----	-------	-----

Justin Martyr (ii/A.D.)

<i>Apology</i> i. 15, 16	442	<i>Ap.</i> i. 35	409	<i>Ap.</i> i. 37	362
--------------------------	-----	------------------	-----	------------------	-----

Gospel of Peter (ii/A.D.). (Roman numerals mark J. A. Robinson's sections, Arabic figures, Harnack's verses).

ii. 3	383	vi. 24	387
iii. 7	409	x. 40	388

Apocalypse of Peter (ii/A.D.). (Preuschen's *Antilegomena*.)

4	445
---	-----

Book of James (ii/A.D.). (*Proteuangelium Jacobi*.)

vi. 1	434
-------	-----

Pseudo-Nicodemus, Acts of Pilate (? iv/A.D.). (Tischendorf's *Ev. Apocr.* I. B.)

i. 3	469
------	-----

Acts of Barnabas (iv/v A.D.). (Tischendorf's *Act. Apost. Apocr.* p. 60.)

7	427
---	-----

(e) INSCRIPTIONS AND OSTRACA.

Archiv

Archiv für Papyrusforschung, ed. U. Wilcken.

	PAGE		PAGE
i. 209	170	v. 163	270

Audollent

Defixionum Tabellae, ed. A. Audollent (Paris, 1904).

no. 92	213
--------	-----

BCH

Bulletin de Correspondence Hellénique.

xvii. p. 78	307
-------------	-----

Cagnat

Inscriptiones Graecae ad Res Romanas pertinentes, ed. R. Cagnat (Paris 1911-).

	PAGE	PAGE	PAGE
i. p. 26 (no. 41) . . .	79	iii. p. 75 (no. 159) 437	iii. p. 427 (no. 1145) 70

GDI

Sammlung der griechischen Dialektinschriften, ed. H. Collitz and F. Bechtel, (Göttingen, 1884-).

2561 D47 . . . 277

IG

Inscriptiones Graecae, ed. cons. et auct. Acad. Regiae Borussicae (Berlin, 1873-).

IGSI (=IG vol. xiv.)

Inscriptiones Graecae Siciliae et Italiae, ed. G. Kaibel (Berlin, 1890).

no. 966 . . . 79 | no. 1671 . . . 349

IM Ae (=IG vol. xii.)

i. 406 . . . 106	iii. 248 . . . 127		
iii. 168 . . . 178	iii. 525, 526 . . . 124	v. 653 . . . 86	

JHS

Journal of Hellenic Studies (Hellenic Society).

iv. 385 . . . 126

Kaibel

Epigrammata Graeca ex lapidibus collecta, ed. G. Kaibel (Berlin, 1878).

no. 426 . . . 140

Larfeld

Handbuch der Epigraphik, W. Larfeld (Leipzig, i. 1907, ii. 1902).

i. 16 . . . 174

Letr.

Recueil des inscriptions grecques et latines de l'Égypte, ed. M. Letronne (Paris, i. 1842, ii. 1848).

i. 12 . . . 91 | i. 525 . . . 189

Magn.

Die Inschriften von Magnesia am Maeander, ed. O. Kern (Berlin, 1900).

no. 17 . . . 195 | no. 47 . . . 195

OGIS

Orientalis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae, ed. W. Dittenberger (Leipzig, 1903-5).

no. 193 . . . 66	no. 201 . 202, 380, 425	no. 214 . . . 200	
194 . . . 90			

Perg.

Die Inschriften von Pergamon (in *Altertümer von Pergamon*, viii.), ed. M. Fränkel (Berlin, 1900).

no. 248 . . . 72

Preisigke, Sammelbuch

Sammelbuch griechischer Urkunden aus Ägypten, ed. F. Preisigke (Strassburg, 1915-).

	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
no. 1323 . . .	264		no. 1540 . . .	154	

PAS

Papers of American School of Classical Studies at Athens (Boston).

iii. 204 . . .	177
----------------	-----

Ramsay, C. and B.

Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia, by W. M. Ramsay, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1895, 1897).

ii. p. 662 (no. 627)	272		ii. p. 565 (no. 466)	460
----------------------	-----	--	----------------------	-----

REGr.

Revue des Études grecques (Paris, 1838 ff.).

xviii. 205 . . .	127
------------------	-----

Syll.

Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum, ed. W. Dittenberger (Leipzig, ed. 2, 1898-1901, ed. 3, 1915-1924).

ed. ² 177 (=ed. ³ 344)	66,	ed. ² (=ed. ³)		ed. ² 737 (ed. ³ 1109)	101,
	200				487
493 (722)	178	596 (1011)	178	757 (1125)	154
583 (996)	73,	598 (1012)	178	803 (1169)	83
	307				
588 (om.)	328	615 (1024)	299	805 (1171)	132
594 (1009)	178	641 (1044)	386	901 (1251)	108

Viereck SG

Sermo Graecus quo Senatus Populusque Romanae . . . usi sunt, by P. Viereck (Göttingen, 1888).

p. 16 . . .	199
-------------	-----

Meyer Ostr.

Ostraka der Sammlung Deissmann, ed. P. M. Meyer in *Griechische Texte aus Ägypten* (Berlin, 1916).

no. 57 . . .	380
--------------	-----

Preisigke Ostr.

Die Prins-Joachim-Ostraka, edd. F. Preisigke and W. Spielenberg (Strassburg, 1914).

no. 15 . . .	114
--------------	-----

Wilcken Ostr.

Griechische Ostraka, ed. U. Wilcken (2 vols. Leipzig, 1899).

i. 190 . . .	306		i. 493 . . .	339		ii. 1089 . . .	73
i. 255 . . .	339		ii. 1084 . . .	73			

Mélanges Nicole

Recueil de Mémoires de Philologie, Classique et d'Archéologie offerts à Jules Nicole (Geneva, 1905).

p. 184 . . .	102		p. 185 . . .	210
--------------	-----	--	--------------	-----

(f) PAPYRI.

N.B.—For the references given in brackets, see pp. 511 f. of this Index. Wilcken and Mitteis's *Chrestomathie* is cited by volume and page.

P Amh

The Amherst Papyri, i. ii., ed. B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt (London, 1900–1).

	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
ii. 37 (Witk. p. 93)	189	ii. 75	119	ii. 93 (Chr. i. 373)	189
ii. 68 (Chr. i. 439)	189				

Archiv (see under (e) above)

ii. 126	338	v. 232	72	vi. 104	344
v. 38	286				

BGU

Ägyptische Urkunden aus den königlichen (staatlichen) Museen zu Berlin: Griechische Urkunden i.–vii. (Berlin, 1895–1926) Vol. i. nos. 1–361 (1895).

no. 16 (Chr. i. 145)	133	no. 86 (Chr. ii. 350)	205	no. 250 (Chr. i. 114)	221
27 (Chr. i. 525, Sel. p. 101)	62	93	67	282	101
38	421	133	66, 170	326 (Chr. ii. 365)	206
71	119	163	221	350	205

Vol. ii. nos. 362–696 (1898).

no. 385 (Chr. i. 133)	91,	no. 427	443	no. 538	177
127, 425		511 (Chr. i. 26)	119	602	202
388 (Chr. ii. 107)	261	523	432	647	189
422	177				

Vol. iii. nos. 697–1012 (1903).

no. 781	347	no. 883	44, 113, 144	no. 916	66
785	109	896	101	948	447
816	70	907	349	975	63
830	113	910	141		
846 (Sel. p. 94)	136, 429	912	90		

Vol. iv. nos. 1013–1209 (1912).

no. 1013	66	no. 1110	432	no. 1134	297
1024	287	1115	205, 374	1157	432
1079 (Chr. i. 85, Sel. p. 40)	31	1117 (Chr. ii. 129)	111, 310	1170	172
1101	432	1126	355	1175	106
1102	347	1127	204	1188	114
1105	172	1130	200, 355	1194	90

P Catt

P. Cattoui, ed. G. Botti in *Revista Egiziana*, vi. 529 ff. See Chr. ii. 420 ff. col. i. . . . 69

CP Herm

Corpus Papyrorum Hermopolitanorum, i., ed. C. Wessely (Leipzig, 1905).

no. 6	202	no. 101	374	no. 125	355
73	374	102 (Chr. i. 346)	86	127	109, 355
83	374	119	374		
94	374	121	355		

CPR*Corpus Papyrorum Raineri*, ed. C. Wessely (Vienna, 1895).

	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
no. 1 (<i>Chr.</i> ii. 240)	90	no. 175	214	no. 242	66, 170
21	67	220	66		

P Fay*Fayûm Towns and their Papyri* (1900).

no. 82	174	no. 108	415	no. 347	70
83	174	109	450		

P Flor*Papiri Fiorentini*, i.-iii., edd. G. Vitelli and D. Compàretti (Milan, 1906-15).
Vol. i. nos. 1-105 (1906).

no. 1 (<i>Chr.</i> ii. 274)	66	no. 61 (<i>Chr.</i> ii. 89)	66	127	76
37	66	86 (<i>Chr.</i> ii. 282)	66		

Vol. ii. nos. 106-278 (1908).

no. 160	347	no. 175	70	no. 177	79
170	359	176	256	262	141

P Gen*Les Papyrus de Genève*, i., ed. J. Nicolle (Geneva, 1896-1900).

no. 24	66	no. 54	108	no. 74	101
--------	----	--------	-----	--------	-----

P Giss*Griechische Papyri zu Giessen*, i., edd. O. Eger, E. Kornemann, and P. M. Meyer (Leipzig, 1910-1912).

no. 10	70	no. 49	199	no. 79	70
12	70	54	213	86	70
40	224				

P Grenf i.*An Alexandrian Erotic Fragment, and other Greek Papyri, chiefly Ptolemaic*, ed. B. P. Grenfell (Oxford, 1898).

no. 1	275	no. 53 (<i>Chr.</i> i. 158)	445
-------	-----	------------------------------	-----

P Grenf ii.*New Classical Fragments, and other Greek and Latin Papyri*, edd. B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt (Oxford, 1897)

no. 36 (<i>Witk.</i> p. 120)	221	no. 74	147
-------------------------------	-----	--------	-----

P Gurob*Greek Papyri from Gurob* ("Cunningham Memoirs," no. xii.; see under P Petr), ed. J. G. Smyly (Dublin, 1921).

no. 32	342
--------	-----

P Hamb*Griechische Papyrusurkunden zu Hamburg*, i., ed. P. M. Meyer (Leipzig, Berlin, 1924).

no. 4	72	no. 10	70, 347	no. 89	346
-------	----	--------	---------	--------	-----

P Hib*The Hibeh Papyri*, i., edd. B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt (London, 1906).

no. 53	467
--------	-----

P Iand

Papyri Iandanae, parts 1-4, edd. E. Schäfer, L. Eisner, L. Spohr, and G. Spiess (Leipzig, 1912-1914).

	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE		
no. 8 . . .	433		no. 9 . . .	431		no. 62 . . .	68

P Leid

Papyri Graeci Musei antiquariae publici Lugduni-Batavi, 2 vols., ed. C. Leemans (1843, 1885).

O . . .	161, 162		G (UPZ 106)	. 89		W . . .	120, 443
---------	----------	--	-------------	------	--	---------	----------

P Lille

Papyrus grecs de Lille, i, edd. P. Jouguet, P. Collart, and J. Lesquier (Paris, 1907-28).

no. 5 . . .	83, 85		no. 11 . . .	221		no. 17 (Witk. p. 28)	83
-------------	--------	--	--------------	-----	--	----------------------	----

P Lips

Griechische Urkunden der Papyrussammlung zu Leipzig, i, ed. L. Mitteis (Leipzig, 1906).

no. 69 . . .	346		no. 87 . . .	174		no. 121 (Chr. i. 205)	72
--------------	-----	--	--------------	-----	--	-----------------------	----

P Lond

Greek Papyri in the British Museum, vols. i. and ii., ed. F. G. Kenyon; vol. iii., edd. F. G. Kenyon and H. I. Bell; vols. iv. and v., ed. H. I. Bell (London, 1893-1917).

Vol. i. nos. 1-138.

no. 22 (p. 7)(UPZ 17)	80		no. 121 (p. 112)	. 379		no. 130 (p. 134)	. 263
23 (p. 38)(UPZ 14)	110		124 (p. 122)	. 120		131 (pp. 166-188)	130, 162

Vol. ii. nos. 139-484.

no. 191 (p. 265)	102, 103		no. 262 (p. 177)	66, 172			
			(Chr. ii. 193)				

Vol. iii. nos. 485-1331.

no. 924 (p. 134)			no. 1170 (p. 196)	133		no. 1178 (p. 216)	
(Chr. i. 418)	. 150		1171 (p. 178)	270		(Chr. i. 185,	
1159 (p. 113)			1177 (p. 183)			Sel. p. 99)	. 127
(Chr. i. 493)	. 272		(Chr. i. 277)	344			

P Oxy

Oxyrhynchus Papyri, vols. i.-vi., edd. B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt; vols. vii.-ix., ed. A. S. Hunt; vols. x.-xvi., edd. B. P. Grenfell, A. S. Hunt, and H. I. Bell (London, 1898-1924).

Vol. i. nos. 1-207.

no. 1 . . .	80, 191, 409		no. 63 . . .	272		no. 117 . . .	223, 435
5 . . .	444		92 . . .	272		119 (Sel. p. 102)	215
33 (Chr. i. 35)			101 . . .	60			
	109, 206		113 . . .	332			
38 (Chr. ii. 65,							
Sel. p. 53)	. 189						

INDEX TO QUOTATIONS.

509

Vol. ii. nos. 208-400

PAGE		PAGE		PAGE	
no. 208 . . .	81	no. 248 . . .	171	no. 270 (<i>Chr.</i> ii.	
209 . . .	75, 81	252 . . .	189	262) . . .	60
237 . . .	110, 280	265 . . .	90	281 (<i>Chr.</i> ii.	
242 . . .	103, 141			74) . . .	188
				294 . . .	63, 86, 151

Vol. iii. nos. 401-653.

no. 404 . . .	81	no. 502 . . .	132	no. 513 (<i>Chr.</i> i. 217)	291
406 . . .	81	505 (<i>Chr.</i> ii. 397)	113	531 (<i>Chr.</i> i. 567)	70
478 (<i>Chr.</i> i. 253)	349			532 . . .	205

Vol. iv. nos. 654-839.

no. 654 . . .	80	no. 657 . . .	75, 80, 83	no. 744 (<i>Sel.</i> p. 32,	
655 . . .	72, 81	736 . . .	70, 127	<i>Witk.</i> p. 131)	63
656 . . .	72, 81				

Vol. v. nos. 840-844.

no. 840 . . .	81, 343
---------------	---------

Vol. vi. nos. 845-1006.

no. 847 . . .	81	no. 896 (<i>Chr.</i> i. 73)	173	no. 940 . . .	270, 440
849 . . .	81	912 . . .	199	967 . . .	175
850 . . .	81, 90	933 . . .	70, 87	986 . . .	205
889 . . .	174	936 . . .	70		

Vol. vii. nos. 1007-1072.

no. 1007 . . .	81	no. 1010 . . .	81	no. 1064 . . .	432
1008 . . .	81	1029 . . .	161	1066 . . .	203
1009 . . .	81	1036 . . .	199	1067 . . .	215

Vol. viii. nos. 1073-1165.

no. 1075 . . .	81	no. 1088 . . .		no. 1148 . . .	72
1078 . . .	81	79, 106, 113, 132		1151 . . .	85
1079 . . .	81	1119 (<i>Chr.</i> i. 474)	221	1157 . . .	204
1080 . . .	81	1142 . . .	66	1172 . . .	80
		1146 . . .	349		

Vol. ix. nos. 1166-1223.

no. 1166 . . .	81	no. 1168 . . .	81	no. 1188 . . .	213
1167 . . .	81	1171 . . .	81	1204 . . .	467

Vol. x. nos. 1224-1350.

no. 1224 . . .	81	no. 1226 . . .	81	no. 1229 . . .	80
1225 . . .	81	1228 . . .	81	1230 . . .	86

Vol. xiv. nos. 1626-1777.

no. 1676 . . .	446
----------------	-----

P Par

Paris Papyri, in *Notices et Extraits*. xviii. part 2, ed. Brunet de Presle (1865).

no. 16 . . .	306	no. 48 (UPZ 72) . . .	221	no. 63 (UPZ 110) . . .	224
32 (UPZ 61; . . .		49 (UPZ 62, . . .			
<i>Witk.</i> p. 67) . . .	222	<i>Witk.</i> p. 71) . . .	427		
40 (UPZ 12) . . .	110	51 (UPZ 78, . . .			
46 (UPZ 71, . . .		<i>Sel.</i> p. 19) 70, 443			
<i>Witk.</i> p. 86) . . .	222				

P Par 574

The Paris Magical Papyrus, ed. C. Wessely, in *Denkschriften der philosophisch-historischen Classe der kaiserlichen Academie der Wissenschaften zu Wien*, xxxvi. (1888), pp. 75 ff. (= Wessely, *Zauberpap.*).

line 86 . . .	406	line 2838 . . .	89, 202	line 3037 . . .	296
2174 . . .	408	3007 . . .	406		

P Petr

Flinders Petrie Papyri, edd. J. P. Mahaffy and J. G. Smyly (in *Proc. Royal Irish Acad.*, "Cunningham Memoirs," nos. viii., ix., xi.; 3 parts, Dublin, 1891-1905).

Part i. (J. P. M. 1891).

	PAGE	PAGE	PAGE
no. 29 (p. 78) (Witk. p. 31)	270		

Part ii. (J. P. M. 1893-4).

no. 4 (7) (p. 11)	221	no. 13 (19) (p. 45)		no. 23 (3) (p. 70)	60
4 (9) (p. 12)	221	(Witk. p. 19)	428	35 (p. 115)	349
4 (11) (p. 14)	147	13 (19) (p. 45)		45 (iii) (p. 147)	107
		(Witk. p. 20)	459		

Part iii. (J. P. M. and J. G. S. 1905).

no. 53 (n) (p. 153)		no. 53 (p) (p. 154)	91
(Witk. p. 44)	63		

Preisigke, Sammelbuch (see under (e) above).

no. 2632	162	no. 4317	113	no. 5224	314
----------	-----	----------	-----	----------	-----

P Rein

Papyrus grecs et démotiques, ed. Th. Reinach (Paris, 1905).

no. 11	60
--------	----

P Ryl

Catalogue of the Greek Papyri in the John Rylands Library, Manchester, 2 vols., edd. A. S. Hunt, J. de M. Johnson, and V. Martin (Manchester, 1911-15).

Vol. i. (A. S. H. 1911).

no. 29	79
--------	----

Vol. ii. (J. de M. J., V. M., and A. S. H. 1915).

no. 90	113	no. 154	91	no. 231	91
113	22	157	174	233	70
127	110	160	113	239	346
130	91	202	169	441	98
153	106, 429	209	369		

PSI

Papiri e cetera Latini della Società Italiana, i.-viii. (Florence, 1912-27).

i. 93	346	iv. 339	351	iv. 435	409
iii. 175	343	iv. 358	351	vi. 600	346
iv. 338	351				

P Strass

Griechische Papyrus zu Strassburg, ed. F. Preisigke (Leipzig, i. 1912, ii. 1920).

i. 52	291
-------	-----

P Tebt

The Tebtunis Papyri (University of California Publications), 2 vols. (London, 1902-7).

Vol. i., edd. B. P. Grenfell, A. S. Hunt, and J. G. Smyly. (nos. 1-264.)

no. 20	395	no. 104 (Chr. ii. 320)	113	no. 114	90
33 (Chr. i. 9, Sel. p. 30)	88	110	66	119	98
61	113, 220, 224				

Vol. ii., edd. B. P. Grenfell, A. S. Hunt, and E. J. Goodspeed. (nos. 265-689.)

	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
no. 265 . . .	66	no. 333 (<i>Chr.</i> ii. 134)	204	no. 421 (<i>Sel.</i> p. 107)	444
272 . . .	125	388 . . .	66	472 . . .	163
295 . . .	163	409 . . .	210	Ostr. 6 . . .	66

P Thead

Papyrus de Thèadelphie, ed. P. Jouguet (Paris, 1911).

no. 1 349

P Tor

Papyri Graeci Regii Taurinensis Musei Aegyptii, 2 vols., ed. A. Peyron (Turin, 1826-7).

no. 13 (UPZ 118)
(*Chr.* ii. 26) . . . 139

UPZ

Urkunden der Ptolemäerzeit (ältere Funde), i., ed. U. Wilcken (Berlin and Leipzig, 1922-7).

no. 12 P Par 40 . . .	110	no. 62 P Par 49 . . .	427	no. 106 P Leid G. . .	89
14 P Lond i. 23	110	71 P Par 46 . . .	222	110 P Par 63 . . .	224
17 P Lond i. 22	60	72 P Par 48 . . .	221	118 P Tor 13 . . .	139
61 P Par 32 . . .	222	78 P Par 51 . . .	443		

Chrest. i. and ii. (also, in this index, *Chr.*)

Grundzüge und Chrestomathie der Papyruskunde, i. 2, ed. U. Wilcken, ii. 2, ed. L. Mitteis (Leipzig and Berlin, 1912).

Vol. i.

no. 3 P Tebt i. 33	88	no. 156 P Lond iii.		no. 314 P Amh ii. 93	189
14 BGU ii. 511	119	1178 . . .	127	355 P Lond iii.	
48 P Oxy ii. 896	173	173 P Lipsi. 121	72	924 . . .	160
60 BGU iv.		183 P Oxy iii.		374 P Amh ii. 68	189
1079 . . .	31	513 . . .	291	397 P Oxy viii.	
87 BGU i. 250	221	193 P Lond iii		1119 . . .	221
100 BGU ii. 385		1177 . . .	344	415 P Lond iii.	
91, 127, 425		218 P Oxy iii.		1159 . . .	272
114 BGU i. 16 . . .	133	478 . . .	349	445 BGU i. 27 . . .	62
131 P Grenf. i		296 C P Herm		482 P Oxy iii.	
53 . . .	158	102 . . .	86	531 . . .	70

Vol. ii.

no. 29 P Tor 13 . . .	139	no. 115 P Tebt ii		no. 247 P Flor i. 61	66
58 P Oxy i. 38	189	333 . . .	204	285 P Tebt i.	
66 P Oxy ii. 281	188	181 P Lond ii.		104 . . .	113
80 P Flor i. 61	66	262 . . .	66, 172	306 BGU i. 86 . . .	206
91 BGU ii. 388	261	220 CPR I . . .	90	316 BGU i. 326	206
107 BGU iv. 1117		236 P Oxy ii.		350 P Oxy iii	
111, 310		270 . . .	60	505 . . .	113
		243 P Flor i. i . . .	66	372 P Catt col. i.	69

Selections (also, in this index, *Sel.*)

Selections from the Greek Papyri, ed. G. Milligan (Cambridge, 1910).

no. 6 P Par 51 . . .	443	no. 19 P Oxy i. 38	189	no. 41 BGU i. 27 . . .	63
11 P Tebt i. 33	88	37 BGU iii. 846		42 P Oxy i. 119	215
12 P Oxy iv.		36, 429		44 P Tebt ii	
744 . . .	63	4 P Lond iii.		421 . . .	444
15 BGU iv		178 . . .	127		
1079 . . .	31				

With

Epistulae Privatae Graecae quae in papyris aetatis Lagidarum servantur,
ed. S. Witkowski (2nd edition, Leipzig, 1911).

no.	PAGE	no.	PAGE	no.	PAGE
8 P Petr ii.		27 P Petr iii		64 P Grenf ii.	
13 (19) 428, 459		53 (π) .	63	36 .	221
16 P Lille i. 17	83	38 P Par 49 .	427	72 P Oxy iv.	
18 P Petr i. 29	270	50 P Amh ii. 37	189	744 .	63

(g) GREEK LITERATURE.

i. Classical.

Homer (? viii/b.c.)

	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
<i>Iliad</i> ii. 545 .	66	<i>Odyssey</i> ii. 114 .	429	<i>Odyssey</i> xxiii. 110	460
iv. 422 .	361	vi. 59 .	192		
vii. 475 .	286	xii. 73 .	425		

Hesiod (? x/viii b.c.)

Scut. 348 . . . 177

Mimnermus (vii/b.c.). (Bergk⁴, *Poetae Lyrici Graeci*.)

Fr. 11⁹ . . . 166

(t) Epimenides (vi/b.c.). (Diels, *Fragm. der Vorsokratiker*, ii. 185 ff.)

9, 137, 158

Pindar (v/b.c.). (Bergk⁴.)

Fr. 314 . . . 192

Aeschylus (v/b.c.).

Supp. 248 . . . 386

Sophocles (v/b.c.). (Fragments cited from Pearson.)

<i>Aja</i> 54 . . . 451	<i>Electra</i> 343 . . . 459	<i>Philoct.</i> 123 . . . 310
807 . . . 459	1207 . . . 421	315 . . . 435
<i>Ant.</i> 51 . . . 272	<i>Oed. Tyr.</i> 650 . . . 421	<i>Frag.</i> 201 . . . 440
	1331 . . . 468	

Euripides (v/b.c.). (Fragments cited from Nauck, ed. 2.)

Medea 1398 . . . 423 | *Orestes* 497 . . . 459 | *Telephus* fr. 714 . . . 442

Aristophanes (v/b.c.)

Acharn. 687 . . . 361 | *Nubes* 410 . . . 246 | *Vespae* 213 . . . 442

Lysistr. 1000 . . . 461 | *Ranae* 35, 377 . . . 210 | 1091 . . . 434

Hippocrates (v/b.c.)

Art. 824 . . . 389

Herodotus (v/b.c.)

i. 32 . . . 72 | iv. 136 . . . 440 | vi. 123 . . . 459

ii. 22 . . . 340 | v. 58 . . . 38 | vii. 197 . . . 278

Thucydides (v/B.C.)

	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
i. 51 . . .	459	i. 93 . . .	122	iv. 100 . . .	428
i. 57, 58 . . .	428	i. 118 . . .	459		

Batrachomyomachia (v/B.C.)

97 . . .	311
----------	-----

Xenophon (iv/B.C.)

<i>Anabasis</i> —		<i>Cyrop.</i> II. iii. 8 . . .	428	<i>Cyrop.</i> v. iii. 30 . . .	428
I. viii. 12 . . .	459	II. iii. 9 . . .	460	v. iv. 29 . . .	428
II. i. 7 . . .	422	II. iii. 17, 21 . . .	428	VI. iii. 35 . . .	466
V. vi. 12 . . .	433	III. i. 38 . . .	435	VII. ii. 15 . . .	459
VII. vi. 32 . . .	459	III. iii. 9 . . .	428	VIII. ii. 24 . . .	428
<i>Cyropaedia</i> —		IV. i. 15 . . .	435	<i>Hellen.</i> II. ii. 10 . . .	468
I. iii. 5 . . .	428	IV. ii. 10 . . .	428	IV. ii. 20 . . .	433
I. v. 3 . . .	397	IV. ii. 42 . . .	408	VII. ii. 10 . . .	460
I. vi. 18 . . .	425	V. ii. 15 . . .	435	<i>Memorabilia</i> II. i. 1 . . .	421

Plato Comicus (v/iv B.C.)

i. 43 . . .	300
-------------	-----

Plato (iv/B.C.)

<i>Cratylus</i> 404b . . .	129	<i>Hippias Major</i> —		<i>Phaedrus</i> 274d . . .	145
<i>Euthyphro</i> 2a . . .	436	301b . . .	303	<i>Republic</i> i. 331c . . .	428
<i>Gorgias</i> 521d . . .	421	<i>Laws</i> viii. 839a . . .	303	<i>Theaetetus</i> 144c . . .	428
		<i>Phaedo</i> 59e . . .	422		

Andocides (v/iv B.C.)

<i>de Myst.</i> 89 . . .	468
--------------------------	-----

Lysias (v/iv B.C.)

xxiv. 4 . . .	459
---------------	-----

Isocrates (iv/B.C.)

iv. 4 . . .	459
-------------	-----

Demosthenes (iv/B.C.). (Cited by orations and Bekker's sections. Reiske's pages in brackets.)

iii <i>Aphob.</i> 1 (844) . . .	459	<i>Lacr.</i> 32 (933) . . .	347	i <i>Onet.</i> 33 (873) . . .	433
<i>Fals. Leg.</i> 278 . . .	407	<i>Meid.</i> 93 (544) . . .	440	<i>Timocr.</i> 7 (702) . . .	194
(430) . . .					

Lycurgus (iv/B.C.)

139 . . .	288
-----------	-----

Aristotle (iv/B.C.)

<i>Metaph.</i> ix. 4 . . .	166	<i>Polit.</i> viii. 3. 10 . . .	154
----------------------------	-----	---------------------------------	-----

ii. *Hellenistic.*

Aratus (iv/iii B.C.). (Ed. Bekker.)

	PAGE
<i>Phaenomena</i> 5 . . .	9

Cleanthes (iv/iii B.C.). (Cited from von Arnim, *Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta.*)

Fr. 537 ^a . . .	9
----------------------------	---

Menander (iv/iii B.C.). (*Fragmenta*, ed. Meineke.)

	PAGE	PAGE	PAGE
Fr. 75 . . .	9		

Theocritus (iii/B.C.)

iv. 35 . . .	69
--------------	----

Callimachus (iii/B.C.). (S=O. Schneider's ed., M=Meineke's ed.)

<i>Epigr.</i> 43(S), 42(M)	435
----------------------------	-----

Polybius (ii/B.C.). (Cited by book, chapter and section.)

i. 13. 3 . . .	459	ii. 47. 1 . . .	392	iii. 44. 5 . . .	380
ii. 41. 15 . . .	355	ii. 50. 10 . . .	343	iv. 19. 10 . . .	307
ii. 42. 1 . . .	355	ii. 54. 5 . . .	340	xxxviii. 10. 10 . . .	400
ii. 42. 7 . . .	354				

Dionysius Halicarnassensis (i/B.C.). (R for Reiske's pages.)

<i>Ant. R.</i> 2. 12 . . .	343	<i>Ant. R.</i> 4. 24 . . .	361	<i>Ep. ad Pomp.</i> 756n	434
----------------------------	-----	----------------------------	-----	--------------------------	-----

Meleager (i/B.C.).

83. 4 . . .	128
-------------	-----

Strabo (i B.C./i A.D.). (Cited by Casaubon's pages.)

v. p. 230 . . .	432	vii. p. 319 . . .	272	xiv. p. 648 . . .	85
-----------------	-----	-------------------	-----	-------------------	----

Philo Judaeus (i/A.D.). (Mangey's volume and page in brackets.)

<i>De Agric.</i> 19 (i. p. 314M) . . .	365	<i>De Somn.</i> 13 (i. p. 632M) . . .	278	<i>De Spec. Leg.</i> (ii. p. 311M) . . .	461
<i>De Mutat. Nom.</i> 9 (i. p. 588M) . . .	126				

Flavius Josephus (i/A.D.). (Niese's sections in brackets.)

<i>Antiq.</i> —		<i>Antiq.</i> —		<i>Bell. Jud.</i> —	
iii. 6. 5 (137) . . .	152	xvi. 6. 4 (168) . . .	128	i. 20. 1 (390) . . .	445
vi. 13. 7 (305) . . .	445	xviii. 5. 2 (118) . . .	445	v. 4. 2 (145) . . .	162
viii. 3. 3 (72) . . .	152	xviii. 9. 7 (363) . . .	445	v. 12. 2 (505) . . .	162

Plutarch (i/A.D.). (The *Lives* cited by chapter and section, the *Moralia* by Xylander's pages [Venice, ed. 1670].)

<i>Ages.</i> xiii. 5 . . .	348	<i>C. Grac.</i> xvii. 4 . . .	400	<i>T. Grac.</i> xxi. 2 . . .	400
<i>Cic.</i> xx. 2 . . .	377	<i>Mor.</i> 336M . . .	201		

Epictetus (i/ii A.D.). (See under Arrian.)

<i>Enchiridion</i> 12 . . .	347	42 . . .	425	51 . . .	436
-----------------------------	-----	----------	-----	----------	-----

Arrian (ii/A.D.)

<i>Anabasis</i> i. 3. 2 . . .	202	<i>Epicteti Dissertationes</i> —		<i>Epicteti Dissertationes</i> —	
<i>Epicteti Dissertationes</i> —		i. 29. 49 . . .	490	iii. 22. 36 . . .	433
i. 9. 15 . . .	420	ii. 16. 29 . . .	390	iii. 23. 15 . . .	433
i. 24. 3 . . .	436	ii. 18. 24 . . .	420	iv. 9. 13 . . .	468

Aelian (ii/A.D.)

<i>De Nat. Anim.</i> i. 19, 48, 55 . . .	425	<i>De Nat. Anim.</i> ii. 51 . . .	425
--	-----	-----------------------------------	-----

Appian (ii/A.D.)

	PAGE	PAGE	PAGE
<i>Hist. Rom. Praef.</i>			
10 . . .	166		

Lucian (ii/A.D.)

<i>Bis Accusatus</i>	<i>De Syria Dea</i>	<i>Dialogi Mortuorum</i>	
17 . . .	389 55 . . .	201 xii. 5 . . .	425

Marcus Aurelius (ii/A.D.)

vii. 3 . . .	345
--------------	-----

Vettius Valens (ii/A.D.). (Cited by page and line in W. Kroll's ed., 1908.)

113. 10 . . .	405 127. 6, 30 . . .	405 240. 15 . . .	367
---------------	------------------------	---------------------	-----

Artemidorus (ii/A.D.)

<i>Oneirocritica—</i>			
ii. 12 . . .	361 ii. 32, 66 . . .	379 iii. 54 . . .	379

Athenaeus (ii/iii A.D.). (Cited by Casaubon's pages.)

474F . . .	123 657D . . .	352
------------	------------------	-----

Philostratus (ii/iii A.D.)

<i>Vitae Sophistarum</i>	
ii. 13 . . .	94

Sextus Empiricus (iii/A.D.)

iii. 54 . . .	166 ix. 406 . . .	166
---------------	---------------------	-----

Diogenes Laertius (iii/A.D.)

iv. 5. 27 . . .	122 vi. 2. 37 . . .	345
-----------------	-----------------------	-----

Marcellinus (iv/A.D.)

<i>Vita Thucydidis</i>	
57 . . .	440

Pseudo-Callisthenes (iv/A.D.). (Cited, after Helbing, from von Meusel.)

ii. 41 . . .	445
--------------	-----

Pseudo-Chion

<i>Epistolographi</i>	
16. 3 . . .	440

Pseudo-Hippocrates

<i>Epistolae</i> 10. 6 . . .	440
------------------------------	-----

Pelagia. (*Legende der hl. Pelagia*, ed. H. Usener.)

x. 12 . . .	460
-------------	-----

Anthologia Palatina

vi. 185 . . .	166 vii. 72 . . .	435 x. 101 . . .	166
---------------	---------------------	--------------------	-----

Aesopi Fabulae. (F=de Furia's collection, 1810; T=Teubner, ed. C. Halm, 1889.)

257(ϑ), 284(τ) . . .	477
----------------------	-----

Scholia on—

Homer, <i>Od.</i> xii.	Demosth., <i>c. Androt.</i>	
336 . . .		
407	17 . . .	444

(h) LATIN.

Varro. (Cited by book, chapter and section, Spengel's numeration.)

De Lingua Latina

	PAGE	PAGE
ix. 42, 71 .	360	

Cicero

Ad Att. xiii. 29. 2 390

Catullus

lxxxiv. 1 f. . 99 | xv. 1 . . . 106

Virgil

Aen. ix. 20 . . . 302

Horace

Carm. iv. 10. 1 . . 314

Propertius

ii. 28. 13 . . . 434

Persius

vi. 50 . . . 270

Martial

ix. 12. 14 . . . 313

Tacitus

Ann. ii. 55 . . . 82

Suetonius

Calig. xvii. . . 473

II. INDEX OF WORDS AND FORMS.

(a) GREEK.

- α: origin 39—sound of 43—vowel changes 65 ff., 253
 -α as suffix 335
 ἀ- (=α privative) opds. 280, 286— (=ση-) 285
 ἀβρασαξ (number of the year) 169
 ἀβυσσος: gender 122
 ἀγαθοεργῶ 75— -εργεῖν 91
 ἀγαθοποιία 83
 ἀγαπακτέω 281
 ἀγάπη 335— -άω 384
 ἀγγαρεύω 67, 398
 ἀγγεῖον 344
 ἀγια, ἀγια 60
 ἀγκιστρον 369
 ἀγναφος 371
 ἀγενετήριον 343
 ἀγνωεῖτε or ἀγνωεῖται 70
 ἀγνωια, -οεω 281, 390
 ἀγνωστος 276, 280, 370
 ἀγόραιος and ἀγοραῖος 57, 296, 337
 ἀγοράστρια 349
 ἀγορονομεῖον 344
 ἀγραυλιέω 283
 ἀγρίδιον 346
 ἀγριέλαιος 276
 Ἀγρίππας 119
 ἀγρυπνέω, -νία 290
 -ἀγυγέω: opds. in 388
 ἀγών 58, 136
 ἀδελφε 58—ἀδελφός 285— -ότης 367
 ἀδημονέω 281, 391
 ἄδης 22, 119
 Ἀδραμυτηνός 106, 157
 ἀδύνατος 280, 370
 αἰεῖ and αἰεῖ 81, 163
 αἰετός (not αἰετός) 81
 -αἰζω: vbs. in 68, 404
 Ἄζωτος 106 f.
 ἀψῖδα 348
 ἀψ 137, 363
 ἀθέμιτος 371
 ἀθερίζω 326
 ἀθεσμος 353
 ἀθετέω 398
 ἀθροίζω 407
 ἀθυμέω 308
 ἀθώς 84
- αι: fusion with ε 80, and α 81
 αἰγιαλός 361
 αἰδώς 167, 336
 αἰδώς 140
 αἰέν 136
 αἶμα 354
 αἱμαροῦσα for αἱμο- 73
 αἱματοεσχυσία 271
 -αινα as suffix 348
 Αἰνέας 119
 αἰνεσις 374
 αἰνέω 386
 αἰνιγμα 354, 404
 -αἰνω: vbs. in 214, 401
 -αἰος, -αἰός, -αἰος as suffixes 337
 αἰρετίζω 408
 αἰρετικός 379
 -αἰρω: vbs. in 214, 402
 αἰσχροκερδής 284
 αἰσχρολογία 284
 αἰσχύνη, -ύνω 356, 402
 αἶτιον 341
 αἰτίωμα 354
 αἰφνίδιος, ἐφν- 70, 157
 αἰχμάλωτος 271, 352, 370— -εύω 400—
 -ίζω 407
 αἰών 135
 αἰώνιος 157
 ἀκαιρέομαι 390
 ἀκανθα 118
 ἀκατάπατος 87, 253, 317, 370
 Ἀκελδαμάχ (-ἀκ) 106, 109, 163
 ἀκέραιος 285
 ἀκμήν 163
 ἀκοή 335
 ἀκολουθέω 285
 ἀκροβυστία 277
 ἀκρογωνιαίος 277
 ἀκροητήριον 342
 ἀκροβῖλια 277, 341
 Ἀκύλας 119
 ἀλάβαστρος 122
 ἄλας, ἄλας 132, 136, 333
 ἄλας 76, 90, 142
 ἀλεκτροφωνία 271
 ἀλέκτωρ 365, 387
 Ἀλέξανδρος 291, -δρευός (or -ῖνος) 359,
 -δρεός 350

- ἀληθής 289, -ινός 359, -εὖν 399
 ἀλήθω 383
 ἀλίξω 408
 -αλις as suffix 362
 ἀλλογήμα 354, 387
 ἀλλά ἴσθι εἰ μή 468
 ἀλλάσσω 403
 ἀλλῆ 84
 ἀλληλουιά 154
 ἀλλος 336
 ἀλλοτριωσκόπος 63, 92, 272
 ἀλλότριος 369
 ἀλοᾶν 100
 -αλος as suffix 361
 ἀλυκός, ἀλικός 80, 377
 ἀλυσις 100, 374
 Ἄλφαῖος 91
 ἀλων for ἄλωος 121, 127
 ἀλώπηξ 130, 377
 ἄμα 328
 ἄμαρτωλός 158, 361
 ἀμέθυστος 370, 371
 ἀμήν 154
 ἀμήτωρ 276
 ἀμνός 135
 ἀμφί 294—ἀμφι- cpds. 294
 ἀμφιάζω for -έννημι 10, 214, 228—for
 -εῖω 68, 228, 405
 ἀμφίβληστρον 294, 369
 ἀμφοδον 123, 295
 ἀμφοτέρος 182, 369
 ἀν for ἐάν 91
 -αν: acc. ending 3rd decl. 129
 -αν for -ασι in perf. 221
 -ἄν (not -ῆν) 82, 84, 197
 ἀνά 295—ἀνα- cpds. 295
 ἀνάγειον: Hellen. for -γειον 70, 76,
 296
 ἀναγνώσκω 295
 ἀνάθημα and ἀνάθημα 57, 354
 ἀνακαινίζω, -ῶν 295, 394, 407
 ἀνακεφαλαίωσ 296, 395
 ἀναλίσκω, -λῶν 228, 296, 383
 ἀναλογία 296, 339
 ἀναπέθω 296
 ἀνάπειρος 72, 296
 ἀνάπεσε or -σαι 70
 ἀναπτύσσω 311
 ἀνασι for ἀνασειέει 89
 ἀναστατός 296, 394
 ἀναστρέφωμαι, -τροφή 26
 ἀνδραποδιστής 286 365
 Ἄνδρας 119
 ἀνέκλειπτος (ἀνέγλιπτος) 108
 ἀνεμος 351
 ἀνένδεκτος 305
 ἀνεξίκακος 291
 ἀνεξιχνίαστος 311, 371
 ἀνευ 328, 329
 ἀνήρ 136, 363, 433
 ἀνθρωπολόγος 297, 390
 ἀνθρωποπάρεσκος 271
 ἀνθρωπος 364, 433
 ἀνθύπατος 297, -εὖν 398
 ἀνόλω 83, 188 f., 228, 294, 296
 -ανός as suffix 359
 Ἄντανδρος 297
 ἀνταπόδομα 355
 ἀντί 296—ἀντι- cpds. 297
 ἀντιάζω 68
 ἀντικρυς 113, 328
 Ἄντιοχεύς 350
 Ἄντιπας 119, 297
 ἀντιπέρα 328
 ἀντίχριστος 297
 ἀντοφθαλμέω 297, 390, 392
 ἀνω or ἀνώ 58—ἄνω 296, 330
 ἀνώγειω 121
 ἀνωφελής 287
 ἀξιόω 397
 ἀόρατος 281, 371
 ἀπαλός 361
 ἀπαρτάω 296, 384
 ἀπαρτή 335—-ησις 335, 374—ets ἀπά-
 τησιν 463
 ἀπαξ 286, 376
 ἀπαράβατος 371
 ἀπαρτί, ἀπαρτί 299
 ἀπαρτίζω (-σμός) 299, 387
 ἀπας 285
 ἀπάτωρ 276
 ἀπαύγασμα 298, 354
 ἀπειρος 72
 ἀπέκδυσις (-εγδ-) 108, 373
 ἀπελεύθερος 299
 ἀπέναντι 328, 329, 465
 ἀπηλλαχώς 298
 ἀπλοῦς 285
 ἀπό 297—ἀπο- cpds. 297 ff.—Semitic
 uses 29, 31, 460
 ἀπό μᾶς 28, 461
 ἀποδεκατός, -εὖν 394, 399
 ἀπόδεκτος 58, 370 f.
 ἀπόδημος, -έω 192, 299, 311
 ἀπόδομα 355
 ἀποθνήσκω 84, 96, 240, 298
 ἀποκαθιστάνω: spelling 99
 ἀποκαθιστήμι 10—double augm. 189
 ἀποκαρδοκία 274, 299
 ἀποκεφαλίζω 288, 291, 408
 ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν 453
 ἀπόκριμα (for -σις) 355
 ἀποκτείνω 245
 ἀποκτέω or -ύω 60, 246
 Ἄπολλών 121
 ἀπολογέομαι 192, 299, 389
 ἀποστείλω or -στελῶ 70
 ἀποστοματίζω 299, 408
 ἀποσυνάγωγος 299
 Ἄπσιος, Ἄπφ., Ἄπφια, Ἄπφ. 102, 109
 ἀπρόσιτος 324
 ἀπρόσκοπος 287
 ἀπροσωπολήμπτος 26
 ap changed to ep 67

ἀρά, ἀρα, ἀρα 58
 ἀραφος 335, 371
 ἀργός 158, 287, 309, 335
 ἀργυρός, 120
 Ἄρεσπαγίτης 82, 151, 277, 366
 ἀρεσκεία 57, 339
 ἀριθμός 351
 -ἀριον as suffix 346
 ἀριστέρος 369
 ἀριστον 271, 372
 ἀρκαλος 112
 ἀρκος 112
 ἀρκυς 112
 ἀρμόζω 410
 ἀρμός 350
 ἀρνας: stem 135
 ἀρνίον 135, 345
 ἀρξάμενος and ἤρξαντο: Aramaic use
 of 454
 -αρος, -αρα, -αρος as suffixes, 363
 ἀρπάζω: mixed stems 229, 404
 ἀρραβίων 101 f., 136, 153
 ἀρρην, ἀρρην 103 f.
 ἀρσενοκόιτης 367
 ἀρτέμων 136, 355
 ἀρτιος 336
 ἀρτοκόπισσα 349
 ἀρτόκρεας 289
 ἀρτύω 398
 ἄρχε-, ἀρχι- cpds. 70, 277, 290
 Ἀρχέλαος 70, 289, 290
 -αρχέω: cpds. in 388
 ἀρχηγός 71, 275, 277
 -ἀρχης and -αρχος cpds. 124, 271, 276
 ἀρχιερατικός 379
 ἀρχιερεὺς for ἀρχιερέως 91
 ἀρχομαι: redundant use of 454 f.
 -ας: nouns in 375
 -ας: names in, Greek 119, Semitic
 146
 -ασαι in 2 s. pres. mid. 9 f., 198
 Ἄσάφ 109
 ἀσάφεια 287
 Ἀσιάρχης 124
 ἀσοφος 276
 ἀσπάζομαι 405
 ἀσπάριον 347
 ἀσπον 164
 ἀστέιος 78, 338—δοτ. τῷ θεῷ 166, 443
 ἀστήρ 137, 368
 ἀσχήμων 287, -μονέω 391
 ἀσωτος 281
 ἀτενίζω 304
 ἀτερ, 328
 ἀτοπος 287
 αυ: sound of 43—changed to α 87
 αὐθάδης 272
 αὐθαίρετος 272
 αὐθάντῳ 278
 αὐθόπται 98
 αὐλέω and -ίζομαι 409
 αὐξάνω: augment 87

Αὐξιμηγόρειος, Αὐξισπόρειος 291
 αἶψα 185, 229
 αὐτάρκης 272
 αὐτοκατάκριτος 272
 αὐτόματος 158, 272
 αὐτόπτης 98, 276, 367
 αὐτός 181
 αὐτός cpds. 272
 αὐτοῦ (etc.) 87, 100, 180
 αὐτόφωρος 272
 αὐτόχειρ 283
 αὐχμηρός 87, 363
 ἀφαίρεμα 355
 ἀφεδρών 136, 299, 356
 ἀφειδία 348
 ἀφελότης 287, 367
 ἀφελπίζω (for ἀφ-) 98
 ἀφήμι 202—206, 241—ἀφέεις for ἀφίεις
 89, 202—ἤφειεν 189, 192, 202—ἀφει
 (-ere) as quasi-auxiliary 210
 ἀφίδω et sim. 98, 252
 ἀφίεις 298
 ἀφρων 134
 ἀφυσκνύω 298, 394
 ἀφυστερέω 298, 393
 Ἄχαλα 84—Ἀχαιῶκος for Ἀχαιῶκος 81
 ἀχρεῖος, -έως, -είως 58, 81, 287, 338
 ἀχρη, -is 113, 164, 329
 ἀψιθός, -θιον 123, 343
 -άω and -έω vbs.: mixed flexions 195
 β for a w sound 110
 βάθεα and βαθέα 60
 βαθμός for Attic βασμός 112, 351
 βαίνω: simplex nearly extinct in
 Hellen. 11, 230—2 aor. imper. -βα,
 -βηθι 209
 βαίον 342
 βάλλω: see 230—causative of πίπτω
 477
 βαρέω and βαρύνω 230, 387, 402
 Βαρσαβ(β)ᾶς 102
 βασιλικός 378
 βασιλικός 380
 βασίλισσα 348 f.
 βαστάζω 10, 387, 405
 βάτος 123, 153
 βατταλογέω 68, 272, 389
 βαῦ=digamma. See F
 βδελυκλέων 290
 βδελύκτροπος 403
 βέβαιος 157, 337
 βεβαίωτρια 349
 βέβηλος 158, 360
 Βεεζεβοὺλ 105
 Βελίαρ 103
 Βελόνη 357
 Βέλτιον 164
 Βερνίκη 64, 92, 290
 Βηθσαϊδά 84
 βήμιλλος, βήμιλλος, βημιλλιον 79, 362
 βιάζομαι 406, -αστής 366

-βιβάζω 406
βιβλίον (βιβ-) 79, 343, -ιδιον 346,
-άριον, -αρίδιον, -ιδάριον 347
βιωτικός 379
βλάπτω 403
βλαστάνω (-άνω) 214, 231, 382
βλασφημέω 18, 290—-μος 272, 352
βλέπειν από 31, 460
βλητέον 224
βόθυνος 358
Βορράς 92, 113, 119
βουλευτήριον 343
βούλομαι 231: augm. with ἦ 188—
2 s. pr. ind. mid. -ει for ῥ 97, 197
βοῦς 127, 142, 333
βουστροφηδόν 40
βραδυπλοέω 284, 390
βραδυτής 368
βωμός 350

γ as guttural nasal 41, 108
γάγγραινα 348 f.
γαζοφυλάκιον 272, 342
Γάϊος not Γαῖος 50
γάλα 133
γαμέω, -ίζω, -ίσκω 231, 383, 409
γαστήρ 137, 368
γείτων 135
γελᾶω 385
γέλως 133
γενέθλια 112, 364
γένημα dist. from γέννημα 101
γεννάω 356, 384
Γεν(ν)ησαρέτ 102
γεωργός 271, -ιον 341
γῆ 119
γῆρας 140
γίνομαι 108, 232—γέγονα 220—γέγονεν
9—γενόμενος meaning of 30—καί
ἐγένετο 18, 425—γίν. c. part. 452
γιώσκω 108, 185, 232, 383—forms:
γροῖ 2 aor. subj. 83, γροῦμαι for
γνώμαι 211
γλώσσα 348
γλωσσόκομος 6, 58, 272
γραφεύς 108, 349
γνωρίζω 408
γνώσις 374
γνώστης 366
γῆης 127
Γολγοθᾶ (for -γολθᾶ) 105
Γόμορρα 109
-γανέω: opds. in 388
γόνυ 133
γαστριτής 271
γραφεῖον 344
γραφή 335
γηγορέω 220, 386
γυμνατεύω 72, 399
γυναικεῖος 338
γυνή 129 f., 377

δ intrusive between ν and ρ
Δαβίδ and Δαυιδ 86, 110
δαιμονιάζομαι 406
δαιμόνιον 341
δάκρυον and δάκρυ 127, 141
δάκτυλος 382
Δαλματία (Δελμ-) 67
δάμαλις 362
δανίζω (for -είζω) 77
δειγματίζω 408—-ισμός 351
δεινά, δείνα: accent 58—δείνα: flexion
179
δεῖπνον: gender 123
δεισιδαίμων 291
δέκα 107 ff.—δεκαδύς, δεκαμία 171—
δεκαοκτώ 91, 171—δεκάπρωτος 276
δεκανός 276
δεκατόν 394
δεξιολάβος 272, 334
δεξιός 336
δέρις 104
δεσμός δεσμός, 270, 439
δεσμός 121, 351
δεσμοτήριον 342
δευτεραίος 176, 337
δευτερόπρωτος 176, 269
δέχομαι, Ion. δεκ- 108
-δημέω: opds. in 388
δημηγορέω 273, 389
δημιουργός 278
δημος 351, 355
δημοσίη 84, 163
δηράριον 347
δι- (= δFi-) opds. 286
διά 300—δια- opds. 301 ff.—πέμπειν
διά 29, 462—διά χειρός 462
διαζεύγνυμαι 301
διαζώννυμαι 301
διακατελέγομαι 301
διακονέω 192, 195, 303, 390
διακρίνω 302
διακωλύω 302
διάλεκτος 303, 371
διάνοια 303
διανυκτερεύω 399
διασαφέω 302, 391
διασεύω 301
διάταγμα 355
διαχειρίζω 302
διδακτικός 379
δίδραχμον 280, 286
δίδυμος 352
δίδομι: forms after -ω and -έω vbs.
10, 202-206, διδοί 83—δοίς, δοί aor.
subj. 83, 210—δώη, δώη 83, 211—
δώμαι for δοῦμαι 88, 211—δώσωμεν
75—δώσῃ 218, 233
διεσθυμέομαι 302
διέξοδος 303
διερέω 280
διηρεκής 303
δικαιώω 397

- διον as suffix 346
 διόπερ 303
 διοπετής 271
 διόρθωμα -σις 303
 Διδασκouroi and -κοροι 88, 271
 διότι 303
 διπλοῦς 120, 156—διπλότερος 166
 διχοτομέω 281, 392
 διψάω 195 ff., 233, 253
 δίψος: flexion and gender 125
 διώκτης 366
 δοκιμαίον 78
 δοκιμή 352
 δοκίμιος 336
 δόμα 353-5
 Δορκός 375
 δότης 366 f.
 δράκων 356
 δύναμαι 234—augm. 188—δύνη 206
 δυνατέω 390, 392
 δύναω 214, 234—δύνω 208 f.
 δύο δύο 270, 439
 δυσβάστακτος 276, 371
 δυσεντέριον, -ία 125, 287, 342
 δύσκολος 281
 δυσμή 306
 δυσνόητά τινα 9
 διάρεια, διάρεια 82
 διάρεια 163
- e: sounds 40 ff.—vowel changes 68 ff.
 —e for η 73
 εάν for αν after δς, etc., 92
 εαντόν 87, 180 f.
 εβδομηκοντάκις ἐπτά 175
 εβδομος 353
 ἐβίων 239
 ἐγγυος 307
 ἐγγύς 164, 329
 ἐγειρε or -ραι 70
 ἐγκάθετος 386
 ἐγκακέω 307, 392
 ἐγκαλέω 305
 ἐγκαταλείπω 305
 ἐγκλημα for -σις 355
 ἐγκοίμητρον 369
 ἐγκομβόμοι, 305
 ἐγκόπτω 306
 ἐγκρατής, -εια, -εύομαι 306 f., 400
 ἐγκυος 306
 ἐγγυισαί or -ισαί 60, 265
 ἐδαφος 364
 ἐδέετο for ἐδέιτο 90, 199
 ἐδετο for ἐδετο 212
 -εδήσαν or -έδωσαν 209
 -έξω: vbs. in 68
 ἐθελοθησία 290, 339
 ἐθελω not Hellenistic 89, 188
 ἐθνάρχη 124
 ἐθνος 138 f.
 ἐθνος 139
 ἐθόθη for ἐνόθη 112
- ει νερανδι 468
 εἰ μή for ἀλλά 468
 εἰ μήν 71
 -εία as suffix 339—-εἰα 348
 εἰδῶλιον 342
 εἰδωλόθυτος 271
 εἰρή 84, 163
 εἰλικρινής, -ία (or -εἰα) 100, 273, 348
 εἰμί: flexion 201 ff.—middle forms
 10, 203—accent 203
 -εἰμι see 235
 -εινός as suffix 357
 -εἶον as suffix 342, 344
 -εἶος as suffix 338
 εἰπέ, εἰπών: accent 55, 57 f., 209
 -εἰρημαί for -ῆρημαί 96, 226
 -εἶρω: vbs. in 402
 εἶς 134, 169, 333, 439—εἶς . . . καὶ
 εἶς 438
 εἶς (neither εἶσω nor εἶ in Κοινή) 82,
 304—εἶσ- cpds. 304—Semitic uses
 of 174, 462
 εἰσακούω 304
 εἰστρατιώτης (prothesis) 89
 εἶπεν, ἔπειπεν 68
 ἐκ, ἐξ 308—ἐκ- cpds. 309—Semitic
 use of ἐκ 460
 ἐκάτερος, ἕκαστος 182
 ἐκατονηκοντάκις 58, 286
 ἐκατόνταρχος 124 f.
 ἐκγονος sometimes ἐγγ- 108
 ἐκδέχομαι 310
 ἐκδικος 311
 ἐκεῖνος 89, 176
 ἐκζητέω 310
 ἐκκαίω 309
 ἐκλεκτός 58, 371
 ἐκλύομαι (ἐγλ-) 108
 ἐκπέω 309
 ἐκνήφω 309
 ἐκπαλαί 311
 ἐκπειράζω 309
 ἐκπλήττω or -σσω 107
 ἐκρίζω 310, 396
 ἐκτός 329
 ἐκτρέφω 310
 ἐκτρωμα 311, 354, 387
 ἐκφύω or -φύη 60, 264
 ἐκχέετε 265
 ἐκών 158, 330
 Ἐλαιῶν or Ἐλαιών 60, 152, 356
 ἐλάκησε or ἐλάκησε 246
 ἐλάν for ελαιάν in papyri 91
 ἐλάσσω (or -ττ) 107, 164
 ἐλαττώ 107, 396
 ἐλαύνω 235, 402
 ἐλαχιστότερος, -τατος 166
 ἐλεάω and -έω 195-8, 235, 385
 ἐλευός 92, 126, 357
 ἐλευόκεισαν 10, 221
 ἐλεος 126
 ἐλευόθερος 363

ελθέ: accent 209
 ελίσσω and ελίσσω 236, 403 f.
 ελκος 126, 129
 ελκω: stem ελκω- in aor. and fut. 236
 ελλογῶ (or -τω) 196, 198, 307, 385
 -ελος, -ελη as suffix 361
 ελπίς (ελ.) 98
 ελπῶ for ελπῖσω 236
 ελυες 10
 ελῶ for αἰρήσω 226
 -εμα for -ημα: nouns in 73
 ἐμᾶτον 87, 180
 ἐμβατεύω 306, 400
 ἐμβριμάομαι, -βομαι 198-201, 305, 384, 397
 ἐμπαιγμῶν: ἐν ἐμπ. ἐμπαίκεται 28, 420
 ἐμπικλάω 205, 254, 384
 ἐμπορία, ἐμπόριον 78, 342, -εύομαι 305, 400
 ἐμπροσθεν 329, 331, 465
 ἐμπυρισμός 351
 ἐμφανής, -ίζω 236, 307, 408
 ἐν 25, 304—ἐν- cpds. 305—ἐν or ἐν 60, 439—Semitic use of 23, 25, 27, 463
 —intrusive ἐν common in Κοινή 464
 —ἐν τῷ c. inf. 25, 450 f., 464
 ἐναγκαλίζομαι 406
 ἐνάλιος 336
 ἐναστι 329, 465
 ἐναστῖος 308
 ἐνάρχομαι 305
 ἐνατος 101
 ἐνδής 307
 ἐνδοξάζομαι 305
 ἐνδύω 305
 ἐνδύωσις 73, 307, 374
 ἐνέδρα, -εύω 125, 307, 399
 ἐνεκα, -κεν, ἐνεκεν 67, 329
 ἐνεηκόοντα 101, 168, 172
 ἐνεός (spelling) 101
 ἐνεργής, -εια 308, -έω 308, 388
 ἐνεστι 309
 ἐνέχω 306
 ἐνθάδε 308
 ἐνθεν 308
 ἐνθυμέομαι 308, 392
 ἐνι 306
 ἐνιαυτός 308, 372
 ἐνίστημι 306
 ἐννέα 101, 167
 ἐννοια 307
 ἐννομα (obsolete) 228
 ἐννοχος 307
 ἐνορκίζω 305
 ἐνοχλέω, 189, 306
 ἐνταφιάζω 307, 405
 ἐντέλλομαι, ἐνταλμα, ἐντολή, 306
 ἐντεῦθεν 308
 ἐντός 330
 ἐντρέπομαι, 306, 387
 ἐντυγχάνω, ἐντευξίς 306
 ἐντυλίσσω 404

ἐντυπῶν 395
 ἐντύπιον 291, 307, 341
 ἐνώπιον 15, 330, 465
 ἐνωρίζομαι 308, 408
 ἐξαγοράζομαι 309
 ἐξαίφνης, ἐξέφνης 69 f., 81, 311
 ἐξαίφθηναι 227
 ἐξαπατάω 311
 ἐξάτινα 163, 311
 ἐξαπορούμαι 310
 ἐξαιτής 311
 ἐξέραμα 311, 354
 ἔξεστι 309
 ἐξετάζω 310, 405
 ἐξηγέομαι 310
 ἐξίστημι 309
 ἐξίσχυω 310
 ἐξολοθρευθήσεται 71
 ἐξορκίζω, -ιστής 309, 365
 ἐξουθενέω -ύω, -θενέω -ύω, -θενίζω 72, 111, 310, 392, 396, 408
 ἔξω 330
 ἐξῶσαι for ἐκῶσαι 108
 ἐορτή 92
 -εος: Att. gen. sing. 160
 ἐπανέσω 226
 ἐπάναγκες or ἐπ' ἀνάγκης 69, 315
 ἐπάνω 315, 330
 ἐπαρχεῖος, -χλια 157, 315
 ἐπαύριον 315
 Ἐπαφρᾶς 119, 314—ὀδίτος 314
 ἐπέκεινα 315, 330
 ἐπενδύτης 277, 366, -δύω 313
 ἐπηρεάζω 314
 ἐπιρῶθησαν, ἐπειρασθ-, ἐπειρώθ- 72
 ἐπι 311—ἐπι- cpds. 312 ff.—multipli-
 cative use of 173—ἐπι τὸ αὐτὸ 173, 473
 ἐπίβλεψαι or ἐψαι 60
 ἐπίγειος 157, 315, 338
 ἐπιγινώσκω 10, 312
 ἐπιδιγνύμεναι (for -δεικ-) 108
 ἐπιδιορθῶ 313, 395
 ἐπιεικής, -εια (or -ια) 89, 314, 348
 ἐπιθανάτιος 315
 ἐπιθυμέω 192, 314
 ἐπιζητέω 312
 ἐπικέλλω 243, 294, 312
 ἐπικεφάλαιον 315
 ἐπικουρία 314
 ἐπιλοκος, -έω 99, 314
 ἐπιούσιος 91, 313
 ἐπίσημος 314
 ἐπισκοπέω 258, 386
 ἐπίσταμαι 312
 ἐπίστασται for -ασθαι 110
 ἐπιστάται for ἐφ- 99
 ἐπιστόλιον, -ίδιον 346
 ἐπιστομίζω 315, 408
 ἐπισυνάξαι 10
 ἐπισφαλής 314
 ἐπιτήδειος 315, 338

ἐπιτιμῶν 312
 ἐπιφανής, -εια 314
 ἐπιφώσκω 263
 ἐπιχειρέω, 192, 315, 392
 ἐπόπτης 314, 367
 ἐπουράνιος 157, 315
 -er- changed to -ar- 65
 ἐραυνάω 36, 356, 384
 ἐργάζομαι 189, 237
 -εργέω: cpds. in 388
 ἐρημος 58, 157, 352
 ἐριθεία 57, 339
 ἔρις 131
 ἔριφος 364, 387
 -eros, -era as suffixes 363
 ἔρρειν 90
 ἐρρέθην 73, 102, 235
 ἐρ(ρ)ιμμαι 102, 193, 257
 ἔρρωσθε 102, 257
 ἔρχεσθε or -σθαι 70, 200
 ἔρωτάω 385
 -σαι in 2 s. pres. mid. 10, 198
 ἔσθής, ἔσθησις 133, 374
 ἔσθω, ἔσθω 92, 238, 397
 ἔσπατρον 82, 304, 369
 ἔσπερινός 358
 ἔσσω: Ion. for Att. ἤττω 107, 240,
 396
 ἔσταναι, ἔστώς 232: ἔστηκεν or ἔστηκεν
 (impf.) 100
 ἔσχατος 329
 ἔσω 330
 ἑταίροις or ἑτέροις 69
 ἑτερο- cpds. 284
 ἑτεροζυγέω 284, 390
 ἕτερος 182, 329, 369, 437
 -έτης as suffix 366
 ἑτι 293
 Ἐτοιμῶς for Ἐλύμως 83
 ἔτοιμος 58, 157, 353
 ἔτος 139
 ἑτροποφόρησεν or ἑτροφ- 109
 eu: sound of 43—*eu* with augm. 191 f.
 eu in comp. 281, 287
 εὐαγγέλιον 281, 341—*-ιστής* 365
 εὐδως 289
 εὐδοκέω 292, 392—*εὐδοκ. ἐν* 464
 εὐεργέτης 276
 εὐθυδρομέω, 282, 391
 εὐθύς 164—inferential *euθ.*, Aram. use
 of 446
 εὐκόλως 441
 εὐλογέω 389—*-ητός* 371
 εὐοδῶται 191, 200, 238
 εὐπαρέδρος 320
 εὐπερίστατος 282, 321
 εὐποιῶ 83, 282
 εὐράμενος 213
 εὐρέ: accent 209
 εὐρεμα 73, 355
 εὐρίσκω 86 f., 192, 238
 εὐροισαν 196, 211

-εύς as suffix 349
 εὐτραπέλια 282
 εὐφημος 287
 εὐφράτης 281
 εὐχαριστέω 391
 εὐχείων 344
 -εύω: vbs. in 398
 εὐωδία 348
 εὐώνυμος 287
 εὐφαπαξ 315
 εὐφ' αὐριον 98
 εὐφ' ἐλπιδι 9, 98 f.
 Ἐφεσίνος 359
 εὐφ' ἔτος 98
 εὐφρευτής 314
 εὐφιδεῖν 98
 εὐφίλοκος, -έω 99, 312, 314
 εὐπίστασθαι for ἐπίστασθε 100
 εὐπίδιος (αἰφν-) 70, 81
 εὐφώπτης (for ἐποκ-) 98
 Ἐφρέμ, -ραμ 50
 εὐφραθᾶ 102, 109
 εὐχεα 215
 εὐχθές 87
 εὐχιδνα 357
 εὐχυρός, -όω: Attic for *dy-* 71
 εὐψημα 355
 -έω: vbs. in 385
 εὐρών 188 f.
 εὐς 330—*εὐς οὐτου* 179—*εὐς πότε* 14

F Digamma: origin and disappearance 39, 41—wrongly used to explain *ἐλπίς* 99—numerical sign (otherwise stigma *ϛ*) for six 167—preventing contraction 195—later represented by *β* 110.

Ἐδῆς 272
-Ἐαλής 408
Ἐαλίσκω 228, 297
Ἐαρήν 135
Ἐαριω 227
Ἐεθόνη 357
Ἐεῖδ- 234, 251
Ἐευκ- 235, *Ἐεῖκω* 314
Ἐεκ-, Ἐέκων 280, 330
Ἐεμεμ 236
Ἐεπ- 237, 247
Ἐέπος 280
Ἐέτος 279
Ἐέρις 375
Ἐεράω 281
-Ἐερός and cpds. 273, 363
Ἐεϛ- 398

ζ: sound of 45—in *Κοινή* 106—substituted for *σ* before voiced sounds 106, 257—in transliteration 107

ζαφθαυει 153
ζβ-, ζμ- in *Κοινή* and in NT 106
Ζεύς 142
ζέω 195, 239, 381

ἦλας 126
 ἠλοῦσθε, -σθαι 69, 200
 ἠλοῦτε: subj. 9, 75, 196
 ἠσώμεν 74
 ἦω 195 ff., 239
 ζεῖδιον 344
 ζυγός: gender 123
 ζωγράφω 288, 392
 ζῶω 84, 343
 ζωκυρέω 284, 391

 η: origin 39 f.—in Attic, Ionic, Κοινή
 71—replaced by ει 71—η extruded
 after ο 73—ἦ- preverb 188, 294—
 augment with ἦ 188—η 48, 118
 -η as suffix 335
 -ηγέω, -ηγός cpds. 68, 71, 275, 389
 -ηγорέω, -ηγорος cpds. 389
 ἠδέω: comparison of 165
 ἠδασή 357
 ἠδωάσθην and -ἠσθην 234
 ἠθαλον 188, 294
 ἦω: flexion 221
 ἠλικός 379
 -ηλος as suffix 361
 ἡμεῖς and ὑμεῖς: confusion of 73, 79
 ἡμέρα: phrases with 440
 ἡμιθανής 282
 ἡμιόλος 178
 ἡμιον: spelling and declension 10,
 161, 178 f.
 ἡμίωρον 176, 280—-ιον 341
 ἦν: subj. of εἶμι 113
 -η as suffix 356
 -ηνος as suffix 359
 -ἦρημαι or -εῖρημαι 191, 226
 ἦρον, but ἦρα, ἦρθην 84, 226
 -ηρος as suffix 363
 Ἡρώδης 84
 -ἦς: Semitic names in 146
 Ἡσαίας 84
 ἦσσαν 107, 165
 ἠτάσμαι 384—-ημα 107, 354
 ἦ- in augm. syllable 50, 86 f., 191
 ἦχος 71, 125, 126
 ἦχώ 126, 140, 143
 -ἦω: vbs. in 68

 θ and τ interchanged 100, 110
 -θ- stem 133
 θαμβέω 387, -ος 126
 θάρρην, but θάρσει, -εῖτε 103 f.
 θέατρον 369
 θέων 344
 θέλω: augm. 188
 θέμα 73
 θεμέλιος 122, -ιον 341
 -θεν: quasi-ablat. suffix 164
 θεοδιδάκτος 271
 θεός, θεά 125
 θεοστυγής 278
 θεραπεία 339

θεράπων 356
 θέρμα or -μη 118, 352
 -θετέω: cpds. in 389
 Θευδᾶς 88, 91
 θεωρέω 363, 391
 θησαυρός: spelling 106
 θηρίον 343
 θλίψις: accent 57
 -θμός as suffix 351
 -θνήσκω 84, 240, 383
 θρησκέα 339
 θριαμβεύω 400
 θρίζ 130, 333
 -θρος, -θρα, -θρον 364
 Θυάτειρα 128
 θυγάτηρ 136, 368 f.
 θυμάω and θυμώω 385, 395
 θυμομαχέω 273
 θυρεός 347
 θυρίς 375
 θυρουρός 75
 θυρωρός 273, 363

 ι: origin 39—ι subscript 50—ι ανεκ-
 φώνητον 84
 ι, η, υ, ει, οι, υ approximating sounds
 38, 42
 ι for η 72
 ι and ε, ι and ο, ι and οι, ι and ει 76
 ι sounds: two successive coalesce 89
 -ι: irrational final 113
 -ια as suffix 338
 -ιακός as suffix 377
 Ἰαμβρῆς 103
 -ιανός as suffix 359
 ιαται, ιᾶται 60
 -ιδιον as suffix 346
 ἴδιος 181—ἴδιε 84, 163—καθ' ἴδιαν 98
 ἴδον for εἶδον 77, 190
 ἴδου: "Hebraic" use of 15, 23, 447—
 ἴδέ: accent 209
 ἰδρώς 133
 Ἰεράπολις 278
 ἰέρισα 349
 ἰεροπρεπής 284
 Ἰεροσόλυμα (Ἰερ-), Ἰερουσαλήμ 101,
 147 f.
 ἰερούργειν 91
 ἰερωσόνη: Ion. for Att. ἰερωσόνη 91
 Ἰεσσαί 84
 -ίζω: vbs. in 406
 -ιημι 201 ff., 241
 -ικός as suffix 377
 ἰλάσκομαι 283
 ἰλαστήριον 342
 ἰλωις 121
 -ιλος as suffix 361
 ἰμάς 134
 ἰμάτιον 78, 341, 342
 ἰμείρομαι 76, 251
 -ιμοι: adjs. in 158, 358

- βα for rel. pronoun 434 ff.—for temp.
 particle 469—c. fut. ind. 75
 βα μή 470
 -ῶς as suffix 358—-ῶς, -ῖος 359
 -ῖος as suffix 340 ff.
 Ἰόν(τ)η 102
 -ῖος as suffix 336
 ἱπποτετρόφῃκεν 288
 -ῖος: barytones in, flexion 131
 -ῖος (-ῖος): nouns in 131, 375
 ἰσασί 221
 ἰσος: accent 58—ἰσος opds. 291 f.
 ἰσσε: imper. or indic. 221 f.—ἰσσε
 γινώσκοντες 22
 ἰσθήκειν for εἰσθήκειν 77
 ἰσθήλη, ἰσθαρή (prothetic ι) in certain
 districts of Κουή 89
 ἰσθημι: see 241
 -ιστί: suffix 163
 -ίτης as suffix 366
 ἰχθύς 141, 333—-ῖος 348
 ἰχθυος 356
 Ἰωάνης: spelling 102
 Ἰωσήχ 108
 ι: κ and γ—contiguous κ and σ, κ
 and χ: Semitic words with 108
 ἀγῶς 84
 καθαιρω or καθαιρῶ 58: see 241
 κάβαλος 317
 καθαρῖος 67, 242, 406, 409
 καθ' ἔτος 98
 κάθημαι 206 f.
 καθημερινός 168, 291, 317, 358
 κάθησε or ἤθεσε 60—κάθησται for
 -σθαι 110
 καθ' ἰδίαν 98
 καθίζω 242, 409
 καθολικός 317, 378
 καθώς 317
 καί spelt κá in some MSS 81—various
 syntactical uses of 34, 420 ff., 469
 καί ἕτερο: constrns. with 8, 18,
 425 ff.
 Κάιν 84
 καιροφονίας (for κεν-) 69
 καίω not κάω 81, 242
 κακοήθεια 284
 κακοπαθία 78
 κακούργος 91, 271
 κακουχέω 392
 κάλαμος 351
 καλέω 242, 387
 καλοδιδάσκαλος 278
 κάλφος for καρ- 103
 κάμιλος for -ηλος 72
 καμμύς 92, 243, 398
 Καναβαίος 109, 150
 καπηλεύς 399
 κᾶτα 84
 κατά 315—κατα- opds. 316 f.
 καταγγελεύς 350
 κατάγλωττος 317
 κατάγγυμι 189, 226
 κατάδενδρος 317
 κατακληροδοτέω 391
 κατακρημνίζω 291, 317, 408
 καταστήσειν 216, 219
 κατείδωλος 317
 κατέναντι 329, 465
 κατενώπιον 330, 465
 κατεπέστην 316
 κατέχευε: aor. 91
 κατήγορος, -ῶ 192, 317—-ῖα 317
 κατήγορ 127, 136, 317, 363
 κατήφεια 317, 326
 κατηχεῖν 71
 κατιών 395
 κάτοξος 317
 καυθήσωμαι 74, 219
 καυσός 242, 395
 καυστημάξω 342, 405
 καυχᾶσαι 9, 198
 κείμαι 206, 243
 κεραία, κέρα 69, 81
 κέραμος 351—-ῖος 343—-ῖος 379
 κέρας 132—-ῖος 343
 κερβικάριον 346
 κερδαίνω 60, 74, 243, 401
 κερματιστής 366
 κεφαλαῖος 395
 κημύς 395
 κήσος 106, 155
 κηπουρός 273
 κηρίαίς 72
 κηρίον 243
 κηρύξ (κηρύξαι): accent 57—-ξ 130,
 377—-σσω 403
 κιβωτός 372
 κιθαρωδός 271
 κιθών: Ion. for χιτών 100
 ΚΩιξ, -ισσα 349
 κινδυνος 358
 κινέω 244, 382
 κλαίω not κλάω 51, 244
 κλαυθμός 87, 351
 κλάω 185, 382
 κλείς 131
 Κλεότας and Κλωπᾶς 88, 91, 109
 κλίβανος: Ion. and Dor. for κρήβ- 103
 κλίμα: accent 57, 364
 κλινίδιον 346
 κλύδων 136
 κνήθω 383
 κοινωνικός 378
 κολαφίζω 364, 407
 κολλυβιστής 366
 κολλύριον 78, 343, 363
 Κολοσσεύς 73, 350
 κοπάξω 387, 405
 κόπτα 39, 168
 κόρος 153
 κοσμάριον 347
 κόσμος: flexion 157

κόσμος 351
 κράβατος 102
 κράνιον 342
 κράσπεδον 278
 κραταιός 337— -ω 397
 κρέας 140
 κρείσων, κράτιστος 165
 κρεπάλη (κραί-) 81, 361
 Κρήσκη and Κλήμη: flexion 134
 κριθόπυρος 270
 κρίμα: accent 57, 354
 κρίνουσι, κρινούσιν 60
 κριτήριον 342 f.
 κρόβη 214, 245, 382
 κρυφή 84, 163
 -κτεν(ν)ω 214
 κτήνος 139
 κτίσις 374
 κυκλεύω 400
 κυλίω 214, 246, 397
 -κυνέω 346, 382
 κυπάρισσος 349
 Κυρήνιος 72
 κυριακός 377
 κύων 134 f.
 κωμόπολις 276
 κώμος 351
 Κῶς 121

λ 41, 45—variations between λ and ρ 103
 λαβέ, λαβοῦ 55, 57, 209
 λαβρα 84, 163
 λακέω, 246, 388
 λαλέω 388
 λαμβάνω: forms and flexion 103, 106, 246 f.
 λαός 68, 71, 121
 λάρυξ: spelling 108
 Λασέα, -αία 81
 Λεββαῖος 86
 λεγεών, -ων 76, 136, 155
 λείπω and λιμπάνω 214, 247
 λειτουργός 96, 278— -έω and -ία 278
 λέλυκας 10
 λέπτια 76
 Δευί 86
 λευκαῖω 401
 λεφέλη for νεφ- 103
 λίων 356
 ληρός: gender 123
 ληστής 96
 λιβανωτός 123, 372
 λιβεργίω 359
 λιθοβαλέω 392
 λίθος: gender 123
 λιμός 123, 350
 λογία 339
 -λογέω: opds. in 398
 λογικός 378
 λόγιον 341
 λόγος 9

-λογος: opds. in 284 f.
 λοιμός 350
 -λος, -λη as suffixes 360
 Λουκάς, Δούκιος, Δεύκιος 88
 λυμαινομαι 401
 Λυσανίας 119, 291
 λυσiteléw 291
 λύχνος 122, 356

μ: intruded -μ in λήμψομαι, ελήμψθην, -λημπτός 10, 246
 -μ- stems assimilated to -ν- stems 134
 μαγδωλοφύλαξ 414
 μαθητής 366— -τεύω 400— -τρια 349
 Μαθηταῖος 102, 144
 μακράν 163, 332
 μακροχρόνιος 286
 μαλακός 377
 μάλλον, μάλιστα 165—relative use of μάλλον 165—μᾶλλον μᾶλλον 270
 Μάμβρη 103
 μάμη 118
 μάντις 374
 μαράνω 401
 μαρναθά 154
 μαργαρίτης 366
 μάρτυς 137 f.—μαρτύριον 341
 μαστός 110, 372
 -ματ-: stems in 132
 μάταιος: flexion 157
 μάχαιρα: flexion 118
 -μαχέω: opds. in 389
 μεγαλαῖος 338
 μέγας: flexion 160—comparison 165—μέγας μέγας 30, 270
 μεγιστάν 135
 μεθοδεία 318, 339
 μεθόριον 318, 341
 μεθύσκω 354, 383— -υμα 354
 μείζων: flexion 113, 161—μειζότερος 166—μείζους not contr. from -οτες 161
 μείζω, εμείζω, μεικτός 78
 μελανοπαλάκισσα 349
 μέλας 135, 160— -αυα 348
 μέλλω: augment 188
 μέλος: flexion, 139
 μεμψίμοιρος 289
 μέριμνα 356— -άω 384
 μεσημβρία 103, 278
 μεσογενής 276, 286
 μεσονύκτιον 341, 387—μεσα- for μεσο- 73
 Μεσοποταμία 291
 μέσος 336
 μεστόχοχος 276
 μεσουράνημα 278, 354
 μετά 317—μετα- opds. 318 f.—Semitic uses of 466
 μετακαλοῦμαι 318
 μεταμέλωμαι 318
 μετανοέω 318

μετατό 317, 324, 330, 467
 μεταπέμποιμα 318
 μετέπειτα 293, 318
 μετέχω 318
 μετεωρίζομαι 318
 μετριοπαθής 284
 μέτωπον 318
 μέχρι, -is 113, 164, 317, 330 f.
 -μή as suffix 352
 μηδεις, μηθεις 111, 170
 μηλωτή 372
 μήν 136
 μητήρ 136, 368 f.
 μητρολόγος 68, 83, 85, 119, 274
 μαίνω 401
 μίγμα: accent 57
 -μίγνυμι 249
 Μιθραϊον 342
 μμνήσκω (or -ήσκω) 84, 249, 383
 μμσο- cpds. 289
 Μυτιλήνη, -ινή 72—Μυτιλήνη, -υλήνη 79
 -μμαι for -σμαι in pf. pass. 223, 249
 μωδ 19
 μογδαλος or μογγι- 106
 μοιχαλεις 362, 375
 μολώνω 402
 -μός as suffix 350, 355—-μος 351 f.,
 355
 μωσχάριον 346
 μνέω 388
 μνών 136, 356
 Μύρ(ρ)α 101, 128
 μωωπάζω 290, 405
 μώμος 351
 μωραίνω 401 f.
 μωρός 58—μωρό 152
 Μωωσής 86 f.

 ν: assimilation of ν in εν and ενν 104
 —insertion of ν 106
 -ν: movable -ν 113—"irrational"
 final ν 113, 129, 139, 161
 Ναζαρά (-ετ, -έθ) 107, 112, 149
 Ναζαρηνός and Ναζωραϊός 107, 150
 Ναϊμάν (Νεμάν), Ναϊν 84
 ναός 68, 71, 121
 Νάρκισσος 349
 ναυαγός 274—-έω 391
 ναύκληρος 274—ναυκληρομάχος 270
 ναύς 142, 333
 ναυίας 119, 340
 ναυισκοί 380
 Νεάπολις 278
 νεομηρία 91, 279
 νέος: does not contract 91
 νεόφυτος 279
 νεωκόρος 71, 121
 νεώς, νηός s.v. ναός
 νήθω 383
 νηλεής 126
 νήπιος 280—ιδίω 405
 Νηρεός 350

νήριτος 351
 νήστις 132, 162, 287, 374
 νηφάλιος 76, 157, 362
 νίζω 250
 νίκημα (for νίκη) 355
 νικο- cpds. 289 f.
 Νικομήδεια: scansion of 94
 νίκος and νίκη 126, 381
 νίπτω 214, 250, 403—-τήρ 368
 νομοθέτης 366
 -νος, -νη as suffixes 356
 νοσός (-ια, -ιον): Hellenistic form 92
 νοσάξω 405
 νοσφίζω 408
 νουνεχής 271—-εχός 163
 νοῦς 9 f., 121, 127, 142
 -ντ-: stems in 134
 Νύμφαν, Νυμφάν 58, 71, 118
 νυχθήμερον 269, 283
 -νώ: vbs. in, for -νυμι 202 ff.
 νῶτος: gender 124

 ξ: digraph 41, 45—advbs. in -ξ 376—
 nouns in -ξ 377, 380
 ξεροδοκῆς 391
 ξέστης 155
 ξιφίδιον 346
 ξυλάριον 346
 ξύρασθαι or -ασθαι 200, 250—-ασθω 199

 ο: sound 43—ο and α, ο and ω 73—
 ο(υ) represents a w sound 110
 ο- (see preverb ω) 294, 402
 όβολός from -ελός 71
 όγδουν (for -ουν) in papp. 91, 173
 όθγός 68, 71—-έω 389
 όδμή, όσμή 112, 352
 όδοιπόρος 271
 όδόν 332, 459
 όδοποιέω 389
 όδούς: flexion 134
 όδύνη 294, 368
 όδύρομαι, -ρός 294, 330, 350
 όδύνη 357—-όνιον 78, 343
 όγω 294
 οδα: flexion 10, 221
 οει 97
 οικείος 338
 οικερεία 339
 -οικέω: cpds. in 389
 οικήτωρ, -τήρ 365—-τήριον 342
 οικιακός 377
 οικοδοσότης 271
 οικοδομέω 250—-δομή 335
 οικουργός 274
 οικουρός 273
 οικτίρω 78, 250, 408
 οινάριον 347
 οϊνοπότης 367
 -οίος as suffix 338
 όκείλλω 243, 294, 330, 403
 όκταήμερος 176, 286

ὀλίγος: opda. of 284
 ὀλίγος for ὀλ- (with ὄχ) 98
 ὀλίγως 163
 -ὀλλυμι 251, 382
 ὀλοθρεύω, -της 71, 365, 399
 ὀλόκαυτος 276
 ὀλος: opda. of 284
 ὀλυθος 387
 ὀμείρωμαι 76, 100, 251, 294
 ὀμιλος 335—έω 386
 ὀμνυμι ἐν 464
 ὀμο- opda. 284
 ὀμοθυμαδόν 164
 ὀμοιος 58, 157
 ὀμολογέω ἐν 29, 463
 ὀμοῦ 328
 ὀναρίδιον 346
 ὀνειδος 294
 ὀνομα 354
 ὀπτιναδηποσοῦν 179
 ὀπιθεν, ὀπισθεν 311, 331
 ὀπίσω 331
 ὀπτάνομαι 214, 382
 ὀπώρα 279, 331
 ὀράω 189, 193, 251, 384
 ὀργα: accent 58
 ὀρέων 91, 139
 ὀρθοτομέω 274, 390
 ὀρθρίζω 407
 ὀρθρινός 358
 ὀρκίζω 407
 ὀρμητήριον 343
 ὀρσιξ 108, 130, 133, and ὀρσις 133
 -ορος as suffix 363
 -ος as suffix 324
 -οσαν: impf. and 2 aor. 9, 194, 209
 ὀσιος: flexion 157
 ὀσον ὀσον 270
 ὀστένω 91
 ὀστις: oblique cases rare in vernac.
 Κοινή 179
 ὀστούν: flexion 121
 -οσύνη as suffix 358
 ὀσφύς 141, 333
 ὀτι for rel. pron. 436—ὀτι recitativum
 469—for temp. particle 469
 ὀτρύνω 402
 ου: sound changes 87
 ὀ μή: force of, in NT 23
 ὀδέεις and ὀθέεις 111
 ὀθαμνός 359
 ὀσκουω, ὀσκοθω 60
 -ὀν not -ὀν infn. 82, 197
 ὀράνος 157
 ὀσθι 133
 ὀστω 112
 ὀχ for ὀκ 98, 100
 ὀφελον 191, 252
 ὀφθαλμοδουλος 271
 ὀφρῆς 141, 333
 ὀχυρός, ὀχύρωμα 71
 ὀψέ 331

ὀψηθε 218, 251
 ὀψιμος 353
 ὀψιος 336
 ὀψώνιον 341
 -ὀω: vbs. in 393 ff.
 π and φ 109
 πάθνη: Ionic for φάτνη 100
 παιδίον 345
 παιδίσκη 330
 παλαιός 337
 πάλιν 113—πάλιν inferential, Aramaic
 use of 446
 πανδοχεύς, -εῖον 108, 350
 πανήγυρις 279
 πανοικεί 163, 279
 πανοπλία 284
 πανούργος 271
 πανταχῶ 84
 πάντη 84, 163
 παντοκράτωρ 284, 365
 παρά 318—in opda. 319f.—subtractive
 use in numerals 173—in com-
 parison 467
 παραβάλλω 319
 παραβιάζομαι 319
 παραβολεύομαι 320, 400
 παραδειγματίζω 320
 παραθαλάσσιος 158, 320
 παραιτέομαι 319
 παρακαλέω 319 f.
 παρακίπτω 319
 παράλιος 157 f., 320, 336
 παραλυτικός 379
 παραμύθιον 341
 παραπλήσιον 331
 παρασκευάζω 319
 παραφρονέω 320
 παραχευμάζω, -ασία 319, 340
 παράβαλις 362
 παρεδρεύω 399
 παρ-εις- opda. 320
 παρεκτός 331
 παρελάβοσαν 9, 209
 παρεμβάλλω 320—βολή 307
 παρενεγκε ὀρ -και 70
 παρεπίδημος 26, 315, 320
 παρεκλουθηκότες ἄνωθεν 20
 παροιμία 320
 παρομοιάζω 320, 405
 παροτρύνω 320, 402
 παρουσία 320
 παροψίς 320, 375
 παρηρησία (-ιάζομαι) 101, 192, 404
 παρρώων 102
 πᾶς: Semitic use of πᾶς ὁ 22, 433 f.
 πατήρ 136, 368 f.
 πατριάρχης 124, 271
 πατρίς 376
 πατρολόγος 68, 83, 85, 119, 274
 πατροπαράδοτος 271
 πατριώσις 349

- πατρός 84, 338
 πεδινός 359
 πεζή 163—πεζός 336
 πειθαρχέω 290, 388
 πειθαίς or πειθαίος 78
 πειθῶ: flexion 143
 πειν for πειν 89 f.
 πεινάω 195 ff., 253
 πειράζω 387, 404
 πέμπειν διά 29, 462
 πένης 162
 πεποιθήσις 374
 πέρας 132, πέραν 331
 περί 321—in cpds. 321 f.
 περιαιρέω 321
 περιάπτω 321
 περιεργάζομαι 321
 περιέχω 321
 περίσταμαι 321
 περικεφαλαία 322
 περικρατής 322
 περικρύβω 245
 περίξ 322, 376
 περιούσιος 322
 περιποιούμαι 321
 περιραίνω 256
 περισσεύω 192, 399
 περισσός, -ότερος 167, 192, 321 f.
 περιψήμα 322, 354
 πέρπερος, -εύομαι 270, 400
 πέρσι 163, 279, 331
 πετεινός 357
 πηθάλιον 342
 πηλίκος 8, 24, 179, 379
 πηχύς 140 f.—πήχων uncontracted
 91, 141
 πιάζω 69, 254, 405
 πιέζω 69, 254, 311, 331
 πικραίνω 401 f.
 -πίμπλημι, -πίμπλημι: insertion of
 nasal 106
 πίμπρασθαι or -ᾶσθαι 60, 207, 254
 πινακίς 375—ίδιον 346
 πιστεύειν εἰς 463—π. ἐν 464
 πίστις 374—ικός 379
 πλανάω 384
 πλάνης 162
 πλάσσω 404
 πλέον 82—πλέον πλέον 270—πλεονάζω
 82, 405
 πλεονέκτης 82, 274
 πλέοντα for πνε- 103
 πλημύρης: spelling, 101—πλήμυρα
 274
 πλὴν 331
 πλήρης: flexion 162
 πληροφόρέω 275, 390
 πλησιον 331
 πλοῦς 121, 127, 142
 πλούτος 127
 ποδῆρης 275
 ποία (grass) 83
 ποιέω: princ. pts. and orthography
 255 f.—ποιέω: cpds. in 389
 ποίμνιον 342, 346
 ποιός (ποιός): cpds. in 386
 πόλεμος 352
 πόλι for -u in Ionic 89 f.
 πολιτάρχης 124, 289
 πολιτεύομαι 399
 πολλά: adverbial 446
 πολλάκις 164
 πολλαπλασιών 285
 πολυ- cpds. 285
 πόμα for πῶμα 354
 πορεύομαι 400
 πόρων or πορών 60
 πόρρω 163, 323
 πορφυρούς 347
 ποταμός 352
 ποταμοφόρητος 271
 ποταπός 112, 271, 375
 πότερος 181, 369
 Ποτιοιοί 76
 ποτός and πότος 254, 370
 Πούδης 134
 πούς 131, 333
 πραγματεύεσθαι or -σθε 70, 200
 πρᾶος 84
 πρασιαί πρασιαί 270, 439
 πράσσω 403
 πρεσβεία 339
 πρεσβευτής, -ύτης 86—-ύτις 131, 376
 πρεσβυτέριον 341
 πρηνής 68, 323
 προ 322—in cpds. 322 f.
 προαιρέομαι 322
 προαἶλιον 323, 341
 πρόβατον 323, 372—-ιον 345 f.
 προδότης 323
 πρόϊμος 73, 353
 προίσταμαι 322
 προπάτωρ, 277
 προπωλήτρια 349
 πρός 323—in cpds. 324—= *apud* 467
 προσάββατον 323
 προσαγορεύω 399
 προσαιτής 365
 προσαιχέειν 71
 προσευχή 324—προσευχῆ προσήξατε
 23, 444
 προσεύχομαι 324
 προσήλυτος 237, 370
 πρόσκαιρος 291
 προσκεφάλαιον 324, 337
 προσκυνέω 246, 382—-ητής 365
 προσοχθίζω 408
 προστίθημι: Hebr. use of 445
 προσφάγιον 341
 πρόσφατος 323, 370
 προσωπολήπτης (-πτέω, -ψία) 275, 366
 πρόσωπον 277, 324—in prep. phrases
 466
 πρόσσασις 323

προφητεία 339
 προφητεύω: augm. 189, 192, 256
 προφήτης 323, 366
 προφητικός 379
 προφήτις 131, 376
 προχειρίζομαι 323
 πρύμνα 118
 πρωτ 84—πρώιος 336
 πρωικός 73, 358
 πρῶρα 84
 πρώτος 167, 323
 πρωτότοκος, πρωτοτόκος, -τόκια 58, 279
 πρώτως 163
 πτερυγίων 78, 343
 πτώσ 388
 Πτολεμαῖς for -αῖς 81
 -πτω: vbs. in 403
 πνυγή 352
 πῦρ 138
 πυρ(ρ)ός and πυρ(ρ)ός 101, 405
 πυρώ 395

ρ 41, 45—variations between λ and ρ
 103

-ρρ- -ρ- 102, 192 f.
 -ρρ- -ρρ- 103 f.
 -ρα nouns in: flexion 118
 -ραίνω 100, 256
 ράκος 152, 387—ρακά 152
 ραντίζω 100, 256, 408
 ράσσω 71, 256 f., 403
 Ραχάβ and Ραδβ 109
 ρέθη 81, 155
 ρερ-, ρερ- 100, 192, 256
 ρηθῆναι 73, 235
 ρήσσω 71, 102, 214, 257, 403
 ρήτωρ: flexion 137
 ριπτέω, ριπτω 257, 386
 ρῖψαν: accent 57
 Ροβοάμ 109
 ροιζήδον 164
 -ρος, -ρα as suffixes 362
 ρύμη 352
 ρυπώω, -αίνω, -αρός, -αρεύομαι 395, 400 f.

σ 45—final -s movable 112—stems in
 -σ- 138, 381—-σσ- and -ττ- 104, 107
 σάββατον 128, 153
 Σαλαμίς 128, 136
 σάλπιγξ 108, 380—-πίζω 257, 409
 Σαμαρείτις 375
 Σαμοθράκη 84
 Σαμψών 103
 σάν or σαμπί 39, 168
 -σαν in 3 pl. impf. 194—aor. 209
 σανδάλιον 343, 387
 Σάπφειρα 118, 145
 σάρδιον 124
 σαρδόνις, σαρδόνις 90, 279
 σαρκικός, σάρκιος 378
 σαρών 395
 σάτων 153

σαυτών and αὐτών 180 f.
 σβέννυμι 106, 257
 σελήνη 357—-ιάζομαι 405 f.
 σεμίδαλις 362
 σεμνός: flexion 157
 Σεραπίς: spelling 65
 σημειῶ 396
 σήμερον 279
 σθενῶ 396
 -σθωσαν in imper. 199
 -σία as suffix 340
 σιδηροῦς: flexion 120
 σικάριος 347
 Σίλας, Σιλουανός, Σιλβανός 109 f., 146
 σιμικίνθιον 72
 -σιμος as suffix 353
 Σίμων 146
 σίναπι 68, 140
 σινιάζω 405
 -σιος as suffix 337
 σιρικός 72, 378
 σιρός or σειρός 78
 -σις as suffix 355, 373
 σιτομέτριον 341
 σίτος, 122, 372—-ιον 343
 σκάνδαλον 361
 σκέπτομαι 214, 258, 403
 σκευός: flexion 139
 σκληροκαρδία 279—σκληροτράχηλος 285
 σκοπέω 258, 386
 σκορπίζω 387, 407
 σκότος: gender 127—-εινός 126, 357
 σκύβαλον 275
 σκυθρωπός 285, 364
 σκύλον: accent 58
 -σμα as suffix 354
 -σμός as suffix 350
 Σολομών 146
 σουδάριον 347
 σπαράσσω 404
 σπᾶω 185, 258, 382
 σπείρα 117
 σπερμολόγος 275
 σπιλάς 360, 375
 σπίλιος 57, 360—-ώ 396
 σπυρίς: see σφ-
 -σσω: vbs. in 403
 -στα and στήθι 209
 στάδιον 122
 στάμνος: gender 124
 -στάνω 214
 στατήρ 368
 σταυρίσκω 383—-ρώ 396
 στείλω 214
 στείρα 118, 157
 στενάζω 405
 Στεφανῆς 119
 στήκω 220, 259—στήκετε or -ητε 73
 στηρίζω 259
 στιβάς (στοιβάς) 76, 375
 στοά: flexion 118
 στρατεία, -ιά: -ία 78

στρατεύομαι 400
 στρατηγός 68, 71, 274
 στρατοπέδαρχος 124
 στρήνος 127, 381—*-ιδώ* 385
 στυλος: accent 58
 συγγενής 131, 138 f., 142, 162, 325—
 -εῦσι 138, 350
 συγγενής 131, 375
 συγγνώμη 325
 συγχράομαι 325
 συκάμινος 153, 359
 συκομορέα 81
 συκοφαντέω 275
 συλλυπέομαι 325
 συμβαίνω 325, 427
 συμβιβάζει for LXX συμβιβᾶ 187
 συμβούλιον 341
 συμπόσιον 341—*συμπόσια* *συμπόσια*,
 270, 439
 συμφέρω 325
 σύν 324—in *opds.* 324 ff.—Hebraism
 in Aquila's use of, 17—assimilation
 of *v* in *syn-* 105
 συναγωγή 325
 συναλλάσσω 325
 συναυτή 335
 συνάξει 10
 συναρμολογέω 272
 συνέδριον 325, 341
 συνείδησις 325, 374
 συνέκδημος 311
 συνελαίνω 325
 συνεργέω 192
 συνερίζω 407
 συνευδοκέω 325
 συνευχοῦμαι 282
 συνέχεον 91, 265
 συνήχητος 365
 συνθλάω 240, 325, 382
 συνήμι 202 ff., 325—*συνίουσιν*, *-ούσιν*
 60
 συνιστάνω 325
 συνομορέω 284, 386
 συντέλεια 325
 συντετρίφθαι not *-τρίφθαι* 57
 συνπουργέω 389
 Συροφοινίκισσα 279, 349
 σύστασις 355
 συστατικός 325, 379
 σύστημα, *-εμα* 57, 355
 σφ- for σπ- 109
 σφάγιον 336, 341
 σφυδρόν 103, 112
 σφυρίς 109, 375
 σχεδόν 164
 σῆξω 84, 260, 407
 σῶμα 355: phrases with 440
 σωπᾶν for σω- 90
 σῶσις: *opds.* of 285
 Σωσικδσμος 291
 σωτήρ 137, 365—*-τήριος* 157, 336—
 -τήρια 336

τ and θ interchanged 100, 110
 ταλαίπωρος 282
 ταλανταῖος 337
 ταμείον 89 f., 344
 ταπεινός 357
 τάχειον (*τάχιον*) 164 f.
 τέθεικα, τέθηκα 72, 261
 τεθνάαι 240
 τείσω, θείσω 78, 261
 τεῖχος: flexion 139
 τέκνον c. gen.: Semitic use of 27, 441
 τέλειος 82
 τελειωτής 365
 τελεσφορέω 275, 390
 τέλλω 261
 τελώνιον 342
-τέος: verbals in 188, 224
τέρας: flexion 132
-τερος as suffix 369
 τεσσαράκοντα 66
 τεσσαρακονταετής 38, 91, 286
τέσσαρες: spelling 66—acc. 130, 170
 τεταρταῖος 176, 337
τετρα- *opds.* 286
 τετραάρχης 63, 91, 124, 276, 368
 τετράδιον 176, 343
 τέχνη 356
 τηλαυγής 283
 τηλικούτος 379
-τήρ, *-τωρ*, *-της*, *-τής* as suffixes 131 f.,
 365-369
-τήριον as suffix 342 f.
-τήριος as suffix 336
-τικός as suffix 379
τιμο- *opds.* 289 f.
 τιμωρός 273
 τοιόσδε 178
-τομέω: *opds.* in 390
 τοπάξιον 343
-τος: verbals in 188, 224, 370—abl.
 suffix 329
 τοῦ c. inf. 448 ff.
 τράχηλος 361
 τρεισκαίδεκα 78
τρι- *opds.* 286
-τρια as suffix 349
τρίβος: gender 124
τροπο- and *τροφοφορέω* 390
-τρος, *-τρα*, *-τρον* as suffixes 368
τροχός: accent 59
 τρύβλιον 342
 Τρωάς 84
-τρωων in imper. 10, 195 f.

v: itacism 78 f., 82—diphthongs with
 v 85 ff.—*v* not a diphthong 88 f.
βαλος (*βάλος*) 67, 124
βαμινός 359
ββρις 293
βγ(ε)ια 89, 90
βγίης 281—Att. acc. sg. *βγιᾶ* 139
βδωρ 133

-*ũa* participles in: flexion 118, 159
υῖος c. gen.: Semitic use 441
ὑμεῖς and *ἡμεῖς*: confusion of 73, 79
ὑμῶν αὐτῶν 181
-ύνω: vbs. in 402
ὑπακούω 327
ὑπανδρος 328
ὑπατος 167
ὑπεκπροφυγῶν 322
ὑπέρ 326—cpds. of 326
ὑπέρακμος 326, 352
ὑπεράνω 326, 331
ὑπερέκεινα 326, 331
ὑπερήφανος 326
ὑπερνικῶς 326
ὑπέρογκος 326
ὑπερφῶν, 84, 326, 338
ὑπηρέτης 30, 328, 366
ὑπό 327—cpds. of 327 f.
ὑπόδικος 328
ὑποθύγιον 328, 341
ὑποκάτω 328
ὑποκρίνομαι 327
ὑπολαμπάς 328
ὑπολήριον 328, 342
ὑποπόδιον 328, 342
ὑπόστασις 328
ὑπωπιάζω 75, 328, 405
-υρος as suffix 363
-ύρω: vbs. in 403
ὄς 142, 333
-ὄς for *-ύας* acc. pl. 142
ὄσσωπος 100, 124
ὄστερος 167, 293
ὄφαίνω 401
ὄψηλος 327, 361
ὄψιστος 165, 327

φ: sound 45—misplacement of aspirate 98—doubled aspirate 102—
 φ for π 109
φάγομαι 238
φάγος: accent 59
φάγη or *-ῆ* 60, 262
φαντάζω 387, 405
φαρμακεύς 349
φαύσκω and *φώσκω* 263
φαιδῶνης, *φαιδῶνης* 70, 81, 106, 155
φερνάριον 347
φήλιξ: accent 57
-φημέω: cpds. in 390
φημίζω 387, 407
φθινοπωρινός 279, 358
φιάλη 67
φιλάδελφος 290
Φιλιππησίος 337
φίλο- cpds. 289, 291
Φιλοκλέων 290
φίλοσπρωτεύω 399
φίλοτιμέομαι 391, 393
φλογίζω 408
φλόαρος 158, 363

φοβηθῆναι ἀπό 29, 460
φῶβηθρον 110, 364, 369
Φοινίκισσα, *-ρισσα* 349
φορέσωμεν 74
φῶρετρον 369
-φωρέω: cpds. in 390
φορτίον 342
φραγέλλιον 103— *-λλῶ* 396
φρέαρ: stem and flexion 133
φρεναπάτης 275, 367
φρήγης from *φρέαρ* in inscr. 91
-φρονέω: cpds. in 391
φρόνιμος 158, 353
φρυάσσω 404
Φύγελος 101
φυλακτήριον 342, 365
φυσιοῦσθε: subj. 9, 75, 200— *-σθε* or *-σθαι* 70
φυτεία 339
φωλεός 347
φῶς: stem and flexion 133—accent 133
φωσφόρος 271, 289

χ and κ 108—Semitic words with χ 108

χαίρω: form of fut. tense 264
χαλινός: flexion 122
χαλκεύς 85, 349
χαλκηδών 376
χαλκίον 343
χαλκολίβανος 280
χαλκοῦς 121, 347
Χανααία 109
χαράκτηρ 368
Χαράν 102
χάρις: flexion, 132—*χάριν* 331
χείλος: flexion 139— *-λέων* 91, 139
χειμαρρος (or *-ρρονς*) 121, 271
χείρ 137 f., 333
χειρόγραφον 271
χειροτονέω 275
χέω 195, 215, 382
χθών 134
χιλιάρχος 124
χιτών 100, 136
χιών 134, 333
χλιαρός 67, 363
χορηγός 71, 275— *-γέω* 68, 71, 389
χορτάζω 405
χορτάρρακον 270
χούς: flexion 127, 142
χρᾶσθαι or *χρηῆσθαι* 200, 265
χροοφειλέτης 73, 367
χρηζῶ 408
χρηματίζω 265, 408
χρήμομαι 195, 265
χρηστός 265, 370— *-εύομαι* 400
χρῆσμα 57
Χριστιανός 59, 72, 360
Χριστός 59, 371
χρυσοδακτύλιος 285

χρυσός 120 f., 347—*-έων* 91
 χρῶς 133
 -χρῶν 191, 195, 214 f., 265
 χωρήσειν 218, 219
 χωρίον 342
 χωρίς 331

ψ: digraph 41—nouns in *-ψ* 364
 ψακάδιον 349
 ψευδής: opds. of 280, 285
 ψήφος 364
 ψυχίον 345
 ψύχος 57—*-ψύχω* 266
 ψωμίον 345

ω: history 39—sound 40, 44—
 approximation of *ο* and *ω* sounds
 73 ff.—confusion between *ω* and *ου*
 75—*ω* and *α* 76—*ω* sound 191
ω- proverb 243, 293, 330

-ώδης: adjs. ending in 283, 376
ώδιν 135
-ωθέω 189, 266
ώκεανός 293, 330
-ωλός as suffix 361
-ων as suffix 356—Semitic names in
 146
ώνεομαι: augm. and redupl. 189
ώόν 84
-ως as suffix 338
ώρομαι 294, 330, 387, 398
-ως adverbial: extended use in Hellen-
 istic 163—in cpvse. and superl. 163
-ωσύνη: suffix 73, 358
-ώτερος in comparatives 73, 165
-ώτης as suffix 366
ώτιον 346
-ωτός as suffix 372
ώφελέω 294, 388—*-ία* 78, 348—*-ιμ*
 158, 353

(b) MODERN GREEK.

άγγαρευμένος 67
άδελφε, άδερφέ 58
άθρωπος 52—*άθρωπος τής πιστοσύνης*
 440

αισθάνομαι (pronounced *εσιάνομαι*) 45
ανάμεσα 64
άνεβα, -βάτε 210
ανεβοκατεβαίνω 270
άπό μνιά 462
άρκος 112
άς 210
άστός (αφτός), (ά)τός 87

γεναίκα τών γεναικών 443
γέροντας 145
για να μή 470
γυναικόπαιδα 270

δέκα έννιά, δεκαννιά 171
δέκα όχτώ, δεκοχτώ 171
δέστε, δέσετε 215
δυώ(τε) 170

είδα 231
είναι (= έστι) 203, 306
έναι 433
έπτά (εφτά)
έρμος 58
έρπίδα 130
έτοιμος 58
έφέτος 98

ήμαρτο 214
ήμισυ (δυό'μισυ, τρείς ήμισυ) 178

θεμελιώνω 395
θεο- superl. formations 166

καθημερνός 358
κάλλιον 164
κλέφτης 119, 145

λιοντάρι 347

μαχαιοπέρονα 270
μέ (for μετά) 93
μεγαλύτερος άπό 467
μέρα (ήμέρα) 130
μεσάνυχτα 73
μισός 178
μωρός 58

νά 470, 476

ξολοθρεύω 71

όκτώ (οχτιό) 45
όμοιος 58

παπās 145
πεγάδι 43
πέφτη 174
πέφτω 477
πιάνω 69, 254
πίο, πλιό 165
πιστι(s) 130
π(λ)εμότερος 166
πού 435
πρωύτερος 166

σαράντα 172
σκάβας τής σκαβιάς 443
σπέρνω 214

στάνω 202
 στέκω 43, 96, 259
 στόν 275
 συνέβη, συνέβηκε: constructions with
 428
 τέσσαρες, τεσσάρων 171, 175
 τί καλῶ 472

Τριάδα 176
 τριδικλος 176
 φαγάς, fem. φαγοῦ 59
 φελόνι 155
 φθάνω (fítano) 45
 χερότερος 166
 χιλιάδες 173

(c) HEBREW AND ARAMAIC.

[See pp. 143 ff., 152 ff., for Greek spelling and inflexion of Semitic words, also pp. 470-477 for retroversion of difficult readings into Aramaic or Hebrew.]

אֲרַמַיִם, אֲרַמַיִן Aramaic inferential conjunction 446	וְהָיָה = καὶ ἐγένετο 425 ff.
(Aram. אֲרַמַיִם אֲרַמַיִן 439	וְהָיָה אֲרַמַיִם 453
אֲרַמַיִם 357	וְהָיָה temp. use of 447
(אֲרַמַיִם אֲרַמַיִן) אֲרַמַיִם 437	וְהָיָה . . . וְהָיָה 438
אֲרַמַיִם אֲרַמַיִן 469	וְהָיָה וְהָיָה 471
אֲרַמַיִם אֲרַמַיִן 443	וְהָיָה . . . וְהָיָה 439
אֲרַמַיִם 468	וְהָיָה High. of 455
אֲרַמַיִם negandi 468	וְהָיָה High. of 455
אֲרַמַיִם 433	וְהָיָה יוֹם 439
אֲרַמַיִם 434	וְהָיָה 438
אֲרַמַיִם 453	וְהָיָה 425, 433, 438
וְהָיָה c. inf., temporal 427, 450, 485	וְהָיָה Aram. = פָּאֵן 5 437
וְהָיָה 468	וְהָיָה 476
וְהָיָה 430	וְהָיָה } predicative or re-
וְהָיָה קָטָן regular Targumic equiv. of Hebr. וְהָיָה	resultant 423, 462—
475	c. inf., gerundival
וְהָיָה Aram. vb. = seek, pray 475	448—jussive 450—
וְהָיָה 441	introduces new
וְהָיָה 467	subject 460
וְהָיָה sign of gen. in Aram. 431	וְהָיָה added to adj. to give force of superlative
וְהָיָה Aram. indecl. rel. = Hebr. וְהָיָה 434—= וְהָיָה or וְהָיָה 435-7, 469	442
וְהָיָה 471	וְהָיָה 454
וְהָיָה Aramaic = Hebr. וְהָיָה 470	וְהָיָה 467
וְהָיָה temp. use in Aram. 447	וְהָיָה 463
וְהָיָה . . . וְהָיָה 438	וְהָיָה 463
וְהָיָה c. inf. 445	וְהָיָה 463
וְהָיָה 444	וְהָיָה 15, 465
וְהָיָה consecutive 423, 425 —in apodosis 422	וְהָיָה 463
	וְהָיָה 443
	וְהָיָה Aram. temporal conj. 446
	וְהָיָה 443, 460
	וְהָיָה 28, 461
	וְהָיָה 475
	וְהָיָה Aram. = Hebr. וְהָיָה 475
	וְהָיָה 466

נש	433	קנש	קנשים	443
נשא	278	קנל		476
נתן	485	קעה		475
נדון	376	קאל		22
נל	439	קלה	קד	29, 462
נל	466	קרי		auxil. vb. in Aram.
נגה . . . וטפי	453			455
נשה	קד	קש		477
פיקסא	380	קש		446
ק	470			

III. INDEX OF SUBJECTS.

- N**—see *Sinaiticus*
N in transliteration 108 f.
A—see *Alexandrinus*
Ablaut—see *Vowel-gradation*
Accent 49, 51 f.—rules of accentuation
 53—recessive accent in vocatives
 54, 59—accent of 2 aor. imper. 55,
 57, 209—shortened penult of nouns
 in -μα 57, 354—distinguishing
 words 57—recession of accent in
 proper names 59—in *μῆτρῃ, θυγάτρῃ*
 368—accent of Latin and of Semitic
 words 59—differentiation by
 accent 60—in oblique cases of
 monosyllables 129—of 3rd decl.
 nouns in -ῆ 131—barytones in -is
 131—of contracted adjs. in -ος; 156
 —of *ἔρι*; 203—of nouns in -ιος 345
 —of nouns in τῆ; 367 f.—in τῆρ 368
 —of verbal adjs. in τος 371—of
 T.P. cpds. 392
Accusative: pl. in -es; 170—sg. in -ῶ
 140 ff.—3rd decl. in -ας 129—advl.
 use 332, 444 f., 459
Acts of Thomas 365, 478
Adjectives: declension of 156—sim-
 plicia with 2 terminations 157—
 cpds. with 3 terminations 158—
 comparison of 164
Adverbs: formation 163—comparison
 of 164—advl. numerals 175—
 Semitic substitutes for 443
 “Aeolic” forms 139, 216
Aeschylos 231, 275, 290, 292, 391 f.,
 398, 444—see also Index I (g) p. 512
Aktionart 263
Alcman papyrus 56
 “Alexandrian” variants 63
Alexandrinus, Codex 127, 129, 181,
 191, 198 f., 250, 258, 262, 428, 437,
 440, 442, 449, 465, 478.
Allegro utterance 62, 92, 99, 250
Alphabet 37—history of 38 ff.—
 numerical values 167
Ammonius (Grammaticus i/ii A.D.) 57
Analogy 91, 98 f., 106, 118, 126, 171,
 198 f., 218, 252 f., 261, 272, 274 f.,
 277, 282, 286, 308, 317, 337 f., 353,
 357 f., 363, 382 ff., 388 f., 393, 396,
 398, 400 f., 405
Anarthrous nouns: qualitative force
 431
Anatolia 109
Ancyra inscription 437
Anlaut 280, 303, 374
Anthology, Greek, 122, 163, 292, 366,
 394—see also Index I (g) p. 515
Antiatticista 132
Aorist: strong 186, 208 ff.—weak 186,
 214 ff.—mixed flexions 208 ff., 215
 —aor. for pres. 458
Apocalypse—see *Revelation*
Apocopated forms 172
Appian 457—see also Index I (g) p. 515
Aquila (ii/A.D.): Greek version of
 O.T. 17, 198
Aramaisms 14 ff., 416, 419 f., 430 f.,
 434 ff., 437 ff., 441, 445 ff., 451,
 455 ff., 459, 461, 463, 467 ff., 471 ff.
 —see also *Semitisms*
Aratus 263—see Index I (g) p. 513
Arcadian dialect 310
Arctaeus (Medicus ii/A.D.) 123, 365
Aristophanes 7, 122, 246, 270, 275,
 287, 290, 300, 346, 433—see also
 Index I (g) p. 512
**Aristophanes of Byzantium (Gram-
 maticus iii/B.C.)** 46, 48
Aristotle 48, 97, 122, 125, 127, 163,
 170, 246, 280, 290, 335, 378 f., 381,
 384, 390 ff., 395, 401, 407—see also
 Index I (g) p. 513
Arrian 288—see also Index I (g) p. 514
Artemidorus 379, 399—see also Index
 I (g) p. 515
 “Artemisia” papyrus 46
Article: declension 117—unusual in-
 sertion 430—omission 430—*ἐν τῷ*
 c. inf. 25, 450 f., 464—*τοῦ* c. inf.
 448 ff.
Aspiration 97 ff.—successive aspir-
 ates avoided 130, 262, 364, 369, 407
 —analogous aspiration 46—see
Breathings, Interaspiration, Psilosis
Assimilation of e to o 71—of *υ* to *ι*,
 of *ι* to *υ* 79—of *ν* in *ἐν* and *ὄν* 104

- Attic declension, 121, 156—"Attic" future 218—Attic dialect 3, 10, 43 f., 58, 67 ff., 70 f., 77 ff., 84, 88, 95 ff., 99, 103 f., 107 ff., 118 f., 124 f., 136 f., 139 ff., 160, 170, 189 f., 191, 196 f., 203, 209, 215, 218, 229, 233, 239, 242, 244, 255, 258, 272, 295, 303 f., 327 ff., 342 f., 350, 355, 355 f., 362, 365, 368, 445
- Atticism 2, 6, 127, 132, 138, 141, 217, 278 f., 313, 375
- Augment: *εὐ* or *ῥὺ* 86—with *ῆ* 188—double augm. 189—syllabic for temporal 189—dropped augm. 190—temp. augm. for reduplication 191—initial diphthongs 191—augm. in cpds. 192—vbs in *ρ* 193
- Avroman in Media: parchments from 13
- B—see *Vaticanus*
- Babylonian Talmud 451
- Bacchylides papyrus 46, 49, 56
- Back-formations 68, 220, 228, 230 f., 238, 241, 250 f., 335, 338, 356, 358, 363, 382, 384, 386, 394, 402, 404 f.
- Bahu-urishi* (B.V.): Possessive Cpds. 283, 393
- Barnabas, Epistle of 129—see also Index I (*d*) p. 503
- Barytones 118, 131, 142, 334, 367
- Belloo, Hiliare: bilingualism of 479
- Benedictus: Hebraic style of 482
- Bezae, Codex 31, 50 f., 56, 69, 75, 79, 98, 100, 102 f., 108, 110, 136, 145, 171, 194, 196, 208 f., 216, 240, 245, 262, 270, 301, 322, 348, 356, 364, 420, 423 f., 430, 432, 437, 441, 475
- Bilingualism in Galilee and Jerusalem 12 f.
- Boeotian 42 f., 77, 80, 82, 88, 95, 104, 107 f., 174, 304
- Breathings 40, 45, 49—in MSS 97 f.
- Bunyan, John: Biblical language of 8, 478
- Cappadocian—see *Pontic*
- Cardinals 169—Semitic use of 439
- Carpathos 107
- Cases: with prepositions 292—see under the several cases
- Casus pendens*: followed by resumptive pronoun 423
- Cato 360
- Causative force in composition of *ἀρά* 295—of *καρά* 316
- Chalcedon 376
- Charax, Joannes (vi/A.D.) 58
- Chios 107
- Chrysostom, 74, 282, 388, 443
- Cicero 360, 390
- Clement of Alexandria 441—Atticism of 2, 6—uses *γνώμη* subj. 211
- Clement of Rome—see Index I (*d*)
- Cleonae inscription 111
- Cobet, C. G. 122, 189—see p. xvii
- Combinations written as one word 63
- Comedy: Old 444—Middle 385—New 317, 381
- Common Greek 1, 4, 11, 13, 17, 62, 94 f., 130, 133—see also *Hellenistic Greek*, *Kourḥ passiv*
- Comparative particle after positive adj. or vb. 442
- Comparison of adjs. and advbs. 164—double comparison 166—Semitic substitutes for comparative 440
- Composita 293—328
- Compound verbs: no evidence of Greek culture 11—double cpds. a tendency in Hellenistic 389
- Compounds: Co-ordinatives (*Dvandva*) 269—Iteratives 270—Dependent Determinatives (T.P.) 271—5—Descriptive Determinatives (K.D.) 276 ff.—Possessive (B.V.) 283 ff.—Verbal 288 ff.—Based on Prepositional Phrases 291 f.—Prepositional Cpds. 294—328
- Conative force 311
- Confusion of Contracta 194 ff.
- Conglutinates: with *-cov* 346—in *-θμβς* 353—with *-αδ-*, *-ιδ-* 376
- Conjugation and tense stems of vbs. 183—conjug. classes of vbs. 184, 381 ff.
- Consonantal dissimilation 103, 106, 396
- Consonants: single and double 101—intrusive 103
- Construct state (Semitic) 25, 440
- Contract verbs 193—201—assimilation in 75, 195 ff.
- Contraction 89—reversion to uncontracted forms 90—contracted nouns 119, 127, 133—adjectives 120—of gen. plur. 139—contracted fut. of *-ίτω* vbs. 218
- Co-ordination of participle or infin. with finite verb 428
- Coptic influence 66, 87
- Crasis 55, 63
- Cretan dialect 296, 304, 329, 333—see *Gortyn*
- Cyril of Alexandria (iv/v A.D.) 74
- D—see Bezae
- Dative: Hebraic use of cognate dat. 443—dat. of agent 459—after *εὐνοχος* 460
- De-aspiration—see *Psilosis*
- Declensions: First 117—Second 120—Third 128—of Semitic names 143—of non-Semitic names 150

- Definition: gen. of 25, 27 f., 440, 485
 Delphic dialect 86, 194
 Demosthenes 343—see Index I (g)
 p. 513
 Dentals 110—dental stems 131—
 suffixes 364
 Dependent Determinatives (T.P.
 opds.) 271—see *Tatpuruṣa*
 Descriptive Determinatives (K.D.
 opds.) 276—see *Kharma-dhāraya*
 Deteriorative force of suffix *-ior* 344—
 of suffix *-laxos, -laxḥ* 380
 Diæresis 50
 Dialects in *Korñ* 95, 125 f., 131, 139,
 194, 196, 203, 210
 Dialects of ancient Greek 66 ff., 71, 77,
 119, 139, 170, 296, 304, 329 f., 365—
 see under *Attic, Doric, Ionic*, etc.
 Dialects: pronunciation 41 ff.
 Didymus of Alexandria (iv/A.D.) 74
 Differentiation by accent 60
 Digamma 39, 99, 110, 133, 135, 158 f.,
 167, 185, 189 f., 195, 215, 227 f.,
 263, 272 f., 280 f., 285 ff., 294, 296,
 300, 307, 314, 318, 330, 334, 338,
 342, 344, 348, 355, 357 f., 360, 362 f.,
 372, 382, 385 ff., 390, 398, 406, 408
 —see Index II under *F*
 Diminutives in *-ior* 344 ff.—in *-is* 375
 —in *-laxos, -laxḥ* 380
 Diphthongs 44—with *ι* 80—with *υ* 85
 Dio Cassius (ii/iii A.D.) 151, 391
 Dio Chrysostom (i/ii A.D.) 399
 Diodorus Siculus (i/B.C.) 193, 200 f.,
 379, 390, 392 f.
 Dionysius of Halicarnassus 389—see
 also Index I (g) p. 514
 Dioscorides (Medicus i/A.D.) 407
 Directive sense in composition of *éti*
 312, 314—of *ἄρως* 323 f.
 Dissimilation of vowels 79—of con-
 sonants 103, 106, 274, 364—of
 aspirates 130, 217, 262, 369—“pro-
 hibitive dissimilation” 401
 Distributives 175, 270, 437-440
 Dogma cause of solecism 154
 Doric 68 f., 70, 86, 98, 108, 119, 123,
 130, 178, 238, 254, 281, 303, 329,
 331, 367
 Double comparative and superlative
 166
Dvandva (Co-ordinative Compounds)
 269
Dvigu 276
 Egyptian inscriptions 87, 170, 330—
Korñ 170
 Elative 164 ff., 442
 Elian dialect 71
 Elision 61 f.
 Enclitics 54, 180, 203
 Epexegetic Infinitive 448
 Ephesians: Epistle to 22, 419
 Ephesus: inscriptions from 87, 330
 Epic language 58, 329, 407
 Epicharmus (Comicus v/B.C.) 305
 Epictetus 317, 374, 392, 395, 410, 437
 —see also Index I (g) p. 514
 Epiphanius (Bp. of Salamis iv/A.D.)
 74, 439
 Epsilon: origin of name 38
 Erasmus 154, 335
 Erythrae 330
 Etacism 95
 Ethnica 150, 350, 359, 366, 375, 378
 Etymon 112
 Euphemism 288
 Eupolis (Comicus v/B.C.) 407
 Euripides 52, 210, 292, 378—see also
 Index I (g) p. 512
 Eusebius of Caesarea (iv/A.D.) 126
 Eustathius, Abp. of Thessalonica
 (Grammaticus xii/A.D.) 390
 Eustathius, or Eumathius, Macrem-
 bolites (xii/A.D.) 365
 Ezra-Apocalypse (or 4 Ezra) 455, 480
 —see Index I (c) under 4 Ezra
 Faded diminutives 345, 380
 Fayyum 147—see also Index I (f)
 under P Fay, p. 507
 Final letters movable 112 f.
 Formative suffixes 333
 Fractions 174, 176
 Freer—see *Washington Codex*
 Frequentative verbs 385 f., 405
 Future tense 187, 218 f.—“Third
 Future” 187—future infin. obso-
 lescent 216 f., 219—“Attic” future
 218, 236—fut. subj. imaginary 218
 —fut. opt. obsolete 219—future for
 imperative 458
 Geminus 137
 Gender: fluctuations of 121 ff.—of
 proper names, 152
 Genitive plural in *-éov* or *-év* 139—
 “Doric” gen. 119—“Hebraic”
 gen. 27 f., 440—gen. of agent or
 cause 459—gen. of object 440
 Gentile names 144, 150, 337
 Gerundive in *-réos* 188, 224
 Gortyn Law (Crete v/B.C.) 315
 Gutturals 108—guttural stems 130—
 and dental stems: confusion of
 flexions 229, 257, 404, 407—suffixes
 376
 Haplogy: syllabic 68, 336, 365
 Harmonisation of Gospel texts 203
 Hebraisms 14-34, 416, 421 f., 425,
 429 f., 434, 438 f., 440 f., 442 f.,
 444 f., 446, 451, 459 f., 462, 464,
 468, 471—see also *Semitisms*

- Hebrews, Epistle to: Greek style of 6, 11, 24 f., 219, 221, 467
 Hecataeus Milesius (vi/v B.C.) 407
 Hegelochus, story of 52
 Hellenistic flexions 10
 Hellenistic Greek: pronunciation of 42 f.—accentuation 56 f.—see *Κουή*
 Herculanum 112 f.
 Hermas 129, 166, 192, 195, 199—see Index I (d) p. 503
 Herodian (grammarian ii/A.D.) 119, 140 f.
 Herodotus 103, 140, 151, 202, 204, 231, 295, 304, 310, 338, 378, 381, 386, 389, 417 f., 472—see also Index I (g) p. 512
 Hesiod 209, 286, 295, 338—see also Index I (g) p. 512
 Hesychius (Lexicographus v/A.D.) 297, 306, 396
 Heteroclisia 124, 128, 132 ff., 136, 138, 141 f., 350
 Hiatus 62, 91
 Hippocrates (Medicus v/B.C.) 163, 170, 189, 191, 201, 209, 231, 250, 261, 370, 393, 405, 408—see Index I (g) p. 512
 Hippolytus (iii/A.D.) 335
 Homer 131, 140, 234, 238, 263, 273, 292 f., 295 f., 303 f., 331, 337 f., 345, 350 f., 353, 359, 367, 369, 386, 391 f., 397, 405 f., 408, 429—see also Index I (g) p. 512
 Hyperbaton 424
 Hypocoristic nouns 344
 Hypotactic force of *kai* 420
 Imperative flexions 195–223
 Imperfect tense: flexions 194–206—rendering Aramaic participle 457
 Impersonal use of 3rd plur. act. 30, 447
 Indeclinable use of *πλήρης* 162—of *λέγων* (*λέγοντες*) 454—Indeclinables in -a 148
 Infinitive: Semitic uses of 448 ff.—Co-ordination of infin. with finite vb 430—*ἐν τῷ* c. inf. 25, 450 f., 464—*τοῦ* c. inf. 448 ff.
 Intensive force of *ἐξ* in composition 309
 Interaspiration 98
 Interchange of *n*- and *r*- 401
 Intransitive verb used in place of normal passive 448
 Intrusive consonants 103, 106, 137, 247, 366
 Inverse attraction of relative 424
 Ionic elements in *Κουή* 4, 43, 66 ff., 70 f., 88, 91 f., 95, 99 f., 104, 108, 118 f., 121, 125, 140, 174, 187, 195, 198 f., 202, 204, 221, 231 f., 234, 236, 275, 295, 303, 329 f., 355, 365, 374, 381, 387, 398, 407, 448
 Iota subscript 50, 96, 113, 197, 211, 260
 Irenaeus 251
 Isaacs (iv/B.C.) 378
 Isaiah 17—see also Index I (b) p. 501
 Isidore of Pelusium (v/A.D.) 279
 Isocrates 343, 378—see also Index I (g) p. 513
 Itacism 65 ff., 72, 74, 76 f., 80, 83, 88, 132, 190, 200, 205, 247, 339, 410—
 —and Syntax 74 f., 96
 Iterative Compounds 270—iterative force of present 265, 386
 James: Greek style of 10, 15, 26 f., 222
 Jerome (iv/v A.D.) 313
 John: Greek style of 13, 31 f., 162, 483
 Josephus 86, 119, 143, 147, 152, 170 f., 175, 190, 192, 356, 365, 375, 390, 408, 480—see also Index I (g) p. 514
 Jude: Greek style of 27
 Justin Martyr 202, 365, 390—see also Index I (d) p. 503
 Juvenal 279
 Kalidasa 268
 Karma-dhāraya (K.D.) Compounds, or Descriptive Determinatives 276, 367
 Καθαρεύουσα or Literary MGr. 465
 Κατήχησις, primitive 481
 Kidron: Greek popular etymology 149
 Klaros: inscriptions from 274
 Κουή: vowel system in 64–95, 139—rule of contraction 89—earlier and later *Κουή* 118, 122, 127 f., 130, 198—Eastern *Κουή* 94, 121—Achaean-Dorian 170—Egyptian 170
 Kretschmer's Law 56, 64, 92, 290
 Labials 109—labial stems 131—labial suffixes 364
 Laconian dialect 45, 353, 451
 Language conditions of Palestine 12 f.
 Latin: names 134, 155—loan words 103, 106, 128, 155, 347
 Latinism 103
 Lesbian dialect 119, 139, 318, 352, 357
 Lincoln, Abraham: Biblical language of 478
 Lingua cottidiana in LXX and NT 2—lingua franca 1, 12, 413
 Liquids 41, 45, 103—liquid stems 136—liquid suffixes 360
 Loan words 127 f., 375, 398—see also Latin
 Locative terminations: accent 53

- Logistic**: alphabet in Gr. logistic 169
Lucian 120, 135, 279, 365, 379—see also Index I (g) p. 515
Luke: style of 3, 7, 18-21, 138, 162, 216, 219, 222, 300, 357, 427, 432, 447 f., 451 f., 455, 473, 481, 483—Antiochene or Philippian? 19—unity of Lucan writings 7
Lycian inscription 202
Lysias 189—see also Index I (g) p. 513
Macedonian dialect 102, 290, 307, 320, 348 f.
Magdola 415
Magnesia, 77, 80, 82 f., 90, 94, 125, 139, 181, 195—see also Abbreviations, p. xxii, under *Nachmanson*
Magnificat: Hebraic style of 417—Harnack's judgment 482
Manuscripts of NT: orthography tested 88, 90, 92, 111—see *Alexandrinus*, *Bezae*, *Sinaiticus*, *Vaticanus*, *Washington*
Marcion (ii/A.D.) 74
Marcus Aurelius 400, 410—see Index I (g) p. 515
Mark: style of, 11, 13, 28, 30, 446, 481
Matthew: style of, 10, 29, 481
Medieval Greek 425, 431, 433 f., 435, 438 f., 442, 446, 451 f., 461 ff., 465, 467, 469, 476 f.—see Abbreviations, p. xxi, under *McKinlay*
Megarian dialect 331
Menander 61, 122—see also Index I (g) p. 514
Metaplasmas 119, 124, 147, 151
Metathesis of aspiration 100, 108, 110—of quantity 121—of consonants 106, 155
Middle voice 197 ff., 205 ff., 223 ff.—middle forms of *eipi* 203
Misplacement of h 98
Mistranslations of Semitic words and phrases 470 ff.
Mixture: of declensions 146, 151 (see *Metaplasmas*)—of conjugations 75, 194 ff., 202 ff., 265
Modern Greek 5, 14, 42 f., 51, 55 f., 59, 63 ff., 66 f., 76, 86, 92, 95, 101, 104, 107, 113, 120, 125 f., 160, 163 f., 170, 172 f., 175, 177, 183, 192, 194 f., 198, 202 f., 209 f., 214 f., 253, 316, 318, 346 f., 353, 379, 387, 417, 420 ff., 425, 428 f., 431, 435, 438 ff., 442, 446, 448, 452, 456, 461 f., 465, 467, 469 ff., 472, 476 f.—see also Index II (b) p. 533; Abbreviations, pp. xxi, xxiv, s.v. *McKinlay*, *Thumb*
Moeris (Grammaticus ii/A.D.) 57, 67, 90, 113, 123, 125, 132, 189, 192, 198, 206, 217 f., 221, 407—see Abbreviations, p. xxi
Mommsen 479
Movable letters -s, -r, -t 112
Multiplicative numeral adjs. 176—multipl. use of *επι* 173
Mutes 40, 44
Mysteries: *εμβαρτω* a technical term of 274
Nasals 41, 45, 103—nasal stems 134 ff.—nasal insertions in verbal stems 184—suffixes 350
Neuter nouns in -τω 340
Nomina actionis 289, 334, 341 f., 355, 373 f., 392
Nomina agentis 289, 334, 337, 341 f., 361, 364 ff., 368 f., 377, 385, 391 f., 402
Nominativus pendens 423 f., 447
Non-assimilation of ν 105
Nouns: declensions 117—word-composition 268—suffixes 332
Numerals 167—numerical signs 168—arrangement of 172—abstract numerals 176—multiplicative 176—"Semitic" use of 439 f.
Nymphodorus (Historicus ?/s.c.) 317
Onkelos: Targum of 453, 460
Onomatopoeia 388, 410
Optative 6 f., 53, 196, 200, 204, 207, 211, 213, 215 ff., 219
Orators: the Greek 295, 399
Ordinals 167, 173, 372
Origen 175, 313
Orthography 51 ff.
Orthotone words 54
Oxytone 53, 57, 59, 209, 328, 334, 359, 367
Palestine: language conditions of 12 f.
Pallias: Modern Greek version of NT 425, 429, 448, 470
Pamphylian dialect 323
Paragraphs 47
Parallelism 417 f.
Parataxis 414, 420 ff.
Paroxytone 53, 59, 371
Participle: Semitic uses of 451—co-ordination of participle with finite vb 34, 428 ff.—redundant use of 452
Patronymics 356, 375
Paul: Greek style of 2, 8 f., 21, 162, 221, 326
Pausanias (ii/A.D.) 151
Pentateuch: Greek of 17 f.—see Index I (b) p. 501
Penult shortened in many nouns in -ua 57, 354

- Perfect tense 187, 220 ff.
 Perfectivising force in composition of *ἀρά* 296, *ἀρά* 297, 393, *ἰδία* 301, *εἶ* 308 ff., *καρά* 298, 316, *ὄν* 324
 Pergamum 67 f., 72, 74, 77, 80, 82 f., 90, 94, 99, 104, 118, 139 f., 161, 171, 181, 191, 199, 200, 206—see Abbreviations, p. xxiii, under *Schwyzler*
 Periphrastic tenses 224, 239, 451
 Perispomenon 53 f., 117, 119, 146, 156
 Peter: First Ep. of 10, 13, 25 f.—Second Ep. of 5, 27 f., 420
 Philo 86, 292, 339, 365, 379, 391, 405—see also Index I (g) p. 514
 Philodemus (Philosophus i/v.o.) 288, 390
 Philostratus 94—see also Index I (g) p. 515
 Phocis 194
 Phonology and writing 37-114
 Photius (Lexicographus ix/A.D.) 55, 131, 390
 Phrygian influence 89, 102—Phrygian *Κοινή* 323—inscription 126
 Phrynichus of Bithynia (grammarian ii/A.D.) 6, 57 f., 67 f., 72, 76, 81, 91 f., 112 f., 123, 132, 141, 158, 166, 192, 195, 198 f., 221, 272, 279, 315, 351, 354, 358, 365, 371, 374, 379, 381, 383, 385, 390, 395 f., 398, 407, 410—see Abbreviations, pp. xx, xxiii, under *Lobeck*, *Rutherford*
 Pindar 277, 304, 326, 365—see also Index I (g) p. 512
 Pisidian inscription 177
 Place names 147
 Plato 163, 281, 310, 343, 378 f., 390, 395, 399—see also Index I (g) p. 513
 Plautus 106, 284
 Pleonastic use of *ἄρχομαι* 455 f.
 Pliny 292
 Plutarch 111, 157, 250, 292, 310, 347, 362, 365, 370, 379, 386, 390, 392, 399 f., 406, 442, 454—see Index I (g) p. 514
 Pollux (Grammaticus ii/A.D.) 346, 365
 Polybius 122 f., 151, 157, 171, 176, 190, 234, 274, 303, 305, 313, 339, 343, 347, 379, 384, 390, 392, 396, 399, 407 f., 417 f., 457, 464—see also Index I (g) p. 514
 Pompili 80, 94
 Pontic dialect of MGr 43, 58
 Position of vb in sentence 32, 416
 Positive of adj. for superlative 30, 441
 Possessive Compounds (B.V.) 283
 Praeverbia 293
 Prepositions 292-328—Improper Prepositions 328 ff.—elision 62—Semitic use of 460 ff.
 Present tense 193-207—Aramaizing use of historic present 456
 Proclitics 54
 Proclus (v/A.D.) 314
 Pronouns: Personal, flexions 179 f.—redundant use 431—unusual frequency of oblique cases 431—confusion of personal and demonstrative 432—Reflexive 180 f., 432—Indefinite 179—substitutes for 432—negative of 433—Relative 179—in Hebrew and Aramaic constructions 434 ff.—substitutes for 436—Distributive 437
 Pronunciation 41 ff.—of the vowels 93 ff.—and Textual Criticism 93
 Proparoxytone 53 f., 328, 337, 371
 Properispomenon 53 f.
 Prothesis 89, 363
 Psalms: Greek of 17 f.—see Index I (b) p. 501
 Psephism 86
 Pseudo-Anacreon 388
 Psilosis 46, 181, 273, 329
 Punctiliar force in root of *πέμνω* 253
 Punctuation 46 ff.
 "Q" 7, 11, 20, 28, 30, 133, 203, 313, 419, 442, 447, 472
 Quality of vowels: change in 94
 Quantity-levelling of vowels: its date 56, 93
 Quotations, Semitic 153
 Recessive accent 55, 59, 368
 Redundant verb: participle 453—auxil. vb 455
 Reduplication 100, 192—double, or "Attic" 193—irregular redupl. of cpd. vbs 288—of words to express relative force 270, 442
 Reflexive pronouns 180 f.
 Revelation, Book of 3, 16, 33, 490, 494
 Rhaga: transliteration of in Tobit 147
 Rhodes inscription 127
 Root determinatives 351, 364
 Root nouns 332
Sandhi (i.e. changes in initial and final sounds of words when used in a word-group or sentence) 130, 300, 304, 323
 Semantics, semasiology 267 f., 274, 305, 316
 Semitic colouring of NT Greek 12-34, 419—see *Semitisms*
 Semitic names: declension of 143 ff.
 Semitic quotations 153
 Semitic words: accent of 59—spelling of 102, 108—transliteration of 106 ff., 110, 143 ff.

- Semitisms 12-34: see 412—Semitism defined 14—classified 14 ff., 477—"nests" of Semitisms in Luke 483—Sem. of vocabulary 432, 481—"Secondary Semitisms" 15, 26, 414, 432, 437, 440, 451, 460, 470, 477, 481
- Septuagint 2, 8, 15, 17, 21 ff., 25 f., 28, 30, 34, 65, 67 ff., 71 ff., 83, 90, 99, 104, 118, 121 ff., 126, 129, 132, 143-150, 162, 177, 203, 212, 216, 248, 315, 322, 339, 362, 365 f., 384, 386, 388, 390, 392 ff., 399, 405, 415, 435, 438, 444, 447, 452 f., 458, 463, 465 ff., 469, 473, 482—see also Index I (b) p. 501
- Sextus Empiricus 124, 396—see also Index I (g) p. 515
- Shakespeare, 8, 468
- Sibilants, 45, 106
- Silco inscription 202, 425
- Sinaiticus, Codex (N) 47, 69 f., 75 f., 78, 103, 110, 113, 129, 170, 191 f., 194, 198, 216, 256, 262, 266, 321, 395, 434, 437, 465 f.
- Sophocles 276, 378—see also Index I (g) p. 512
- Sophon (Comicus v/b.c.) 103
- Sounds and writing 37-114—classification of sounds 40
- Spelling no longer phonetic 51
- Strabo 79, 85, 151, 278, 341—see also Index I (g) p. 514
- Strong Aorist stem 208
- Subjunctive: itacistic confusions with indic. 74—forms in contract vbs 196, 200
- Suffixes 332—primary and secondary 333 f.
- Šmidas (Lexicographus x/a.d.) 72, 128, 275, 305
- Superlative 164 ff., 372—Semitic substitutes for 442
- Suppletives 167, 235, 238, 252, 255, 258, 262
- Syllabic augment 189 f., 193
- Syllabification 60
- Symmachus: Greek version of OT 366
- Syncope 64, 92, 398
- Syraeusan Greek 58
- Syriac 433, 436, 443, 445, 449, 453, 457, 459, 461 f., 464, 467, 470, 473
- Syros: inscription from 86
- Talmud 451, 457
- Targums 450 f., 453, 457, 460, 469
- Tatpuruša (T.P.) Compounds 271, 367, 370, 390, 392
- Tautology 419
- Tense stems of vbs 185 ff.
- Tertullian 74, 175
- Testaments of Twelve Patriarchs 362—see Index I (c) p. 502
- Testimonia 419, 480
- Textus Receptus (T.R.) 193, 264, 303, 395, 399
- Thematic verbs 183 ff.—thematizing tendency in Hellenistic 183, 194, 212, 245, 251
- Theocritus 122, 273, 292—see Index I (g) p. 514
- Theodotion: Greek version of OT (Θ) 174, 366, 435, 452, 457, 465
- Theognis (Elegiacus vi/b.c.) 428
- Theophanes (chronicler viii/ix a.d.) 417 f.
- Theophrastus (iv/iii b.c.) 124, 153
- Theophylact (xi/xii a.d.) 282
- Thera 86, 124
- Thessalian dialect 108, 304
- Thomas Magister (Grammaticus xiii/xiv a.d.) 91, 113, 122, 132, 189, 326
- Thucydides 378, 387, 417 f.—see also Index I (g) p. 513
- Tobit 17—see also Index I (c) p. 502
- Towns in -a 147
- Transitive force in composition of $\acute{\alpha}\rho\acute{o}$ 298, of $\kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\alpha}$ 316 f.
- Transliteration of Semitic words 106 ff., 110, 143 ff.
- Uncontracted vowels 90, 120 f., 139
- Unthematic formations receding 183, 202
- Vaticanus, Codex (B) 15, 47, 56, 69, 71, 76, 78, 86, 103, 110, 113, 128, 130, 170, 197, 212, 216, 245, 262, 395, 434, 437, 458
- Verbals in - $\acute{\rho}\acute{o}\varsigma$ 188, 224—in - $\acute{\rho}\acute{o}\varsigma$ 188, 224, 370, 408
- Verbs: changes in Hellenistic 182 f.—Conjugation classes 186 f.—list of verbs with princ. pts. 224-266—verbal suffixes 381-410—verbs coined from prepositional phrases 408
- Vettius Valens (astrologer) 408—see also Index I (g) p. 515
- Vocative: recession of accent 54, 59—flexion 118 ff., 129, 134 ff., 137
- Vowels: 42 ff.—vowel system in Κοινή 64 f.—vowel-gradation 64 f., 128, 136, 138, 186, 220, 294, 324, 330, 369, 372—vowel suffixes 334—vowel assimilation 378—vowel-levelling 202: see *Itacism*
- W-sound in Greek 110
- Washington Codex 47 f., 61 f., 65 f., 83, 86 f., 97 f., 100, 103 f., 108, 118, 419, 181, 212, 234

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>Weak Aorists encroaching on Strong
 Aorist flexions 183—stem 214
 Wesley: John 2, 9, 478—Charles
 154
 Westcott-Hort 38, 48, 50, 58, 61, 69,
 73 f., 76, 78, 81, 87, 98 ff., 103 ff.,
 112 f., 129 f., 131, 143 ff., 146, 149,
 170, 177, 188 ff., 191, 197, 199 f.,
 205, 209, 211, 238, 256, 259, 261,
 265, 269, 273, 294, 315, 339, 348,
 357, 389, 476
 Western Text 31, 69, 107, 133, 211,
 315, 362, 475</p> | <p>Word-division 60
 Word-formation 267-410
 Xenophon 151, 158, 290, 339, 343,
 354, 378, 384, 389 ff., 395 f., 399 ff.,
 407 f., 417 f., 428, 454
 Zaconian (Laconian) dialect of MGr 451
 Zeugma 450
 Zonaras (Lexicographus i. v. c./
 i. a. d.) 57
 Zwaan, J. de: classification of Semit-
 isms 477</p> |
|--|--|

**A Grammar of
New Testament Greek
J. H. Moulton,
Volume III**

J. H. Moulton

T&T CLARK

**A GRAMMAR OF
NEW TESTAMENT GREEK**

This page intentionally left blank

A GRAMMAR OF
NEW TESTAMENT GREEK
J. H. MOULTON

VOLUME III

SYNTAX

NIGEL TURNER



T & T CLARK INTERNATIONAL
A Continuum imprint
LONDON • NEW YORK

T & T Clark
A Continuum Imprint

Continuum

The Tower Building
11 York Road
London SE1 7NX, UK

15 East 26th Street
New York 10010
USA

www.continuumbooks.com

Copyright © T&T Clark Ltd, 1963

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of T&T Clark Ltd.

First published 1963
Latest impression 1998
Reprinted 2003, 2005

ISBN 0 567 01013 9

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Printed and bound in Great Britain by Biddles Ltd, *www.biddles.co.uk*

PREFACE

THIS volume on Syntax has been doomed to be delayed. Perhaps providentially, for after the revolution in Biblical studies during the first half of this century the time is most opportune to make a detailed survey of New Testament idiom. It is now over fifty years since the first edition of the Prolegomena appeared, and Dr. Moulton had perished at sea before completing Volume II. His pupil, Dr. W. F. Howard, saw that volume through the press in parts, from 1919 to 1929, but before he had opportunity to lay many plans for Volume III he himself died in 1952; and then, on condition that he had the assistance of someone who would collect the necessary material, Dr. H. G. Meecham assumed responsibility for the Syntax. It was on Dr. G. D. Kilpatrick's suggestion that I was permitted to help at this point, and we had done no more than compile a provisional bibliography when Dr. Meecham died in 1955. By the kind invitation of the publishers I then worked alone and broke the spell by living to complete Volume III. It was a privilege for me, both to bring Dr. Moulton's task to fruition in a new age, and to be associated with the distinguished name of Messrs. T. and F. Clark.

My care has been lightened by the publishers' trust in me, their generosity and wise guidance; and I am grateful to the specialist printers who, faced with many typographical problems, so promptly achieved such excellent craftsmanship.

NIGEL TURNER.

Hitchin, *Corpus Christi*, 1962.

This page intentionally left blank

CHRONOLOGICAL BIBLIOGRAPHY

General works on syntax. See separate chapters for detailed bibliography.

1. G. Pasor, *Grammatica Graeca Sacra Novi Testamenti Domini nostri Jesu Christi*, Amsterdam 1655 (the first NT Grammar; wise use is made of the LXX).
2. G. B. Winer, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Sprachidioms?*, Leipzig 1867 (1st ed. 1822; the first scientific NT Grammar).
3. A. Buttmann, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Sprachgebrauchs*, Berlin 1859 (Eng. tr. by Thayer 1873). Good use of LXX.
4. W. Schmid, *Der Attizismus in seinen Hauptvertretern* (4 vols. and Index), Stuttgart 1887-97.
5. J. Viteau, *Étude sur le grec du NT. Le verbe: Syntaxe des propositions*, Paris 1893.
6. E. de W. Burton, *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in NT Greek*, Edinburgh 1894.
7. G. B. Winer, *Gramm. des nt. Spr.* (see 2): 8th ed. by P. W. Schmiedel, I.1894, II 1.1897, II 2.1898.
8. A. N. Jannaris, *An Historical Greek Grammar*, London 1897.
9. W. W. Goodwin, *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb*, London 1897.
10. J. Viteau, *Étude sur le grec du NT comparé avec celui des Septante. Sujet, complément et attribut*, Paris 1897.
11. R. Kühner, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*, I, 3rd ed. by F. Blass, Hannover 1890.
12. R. Kühner, *Ibid.*, II, vols. 1 and 2, 3rd ed. by B. Gerth, Hannover and Leipzig 1898-1904.
13. H. Reinhold, *De graecitate Patrum Apostolicorum librorumque apocryphorum Novi Test. quaestiones gramm.* (Diss.), Halle 1898.
14. B. L. Gildersleeve, *Syntax of Classical Greek from Homer to Demosthenes* (2 vols.), New York 1900, 1911.
15. K. Meisterhans, *Grammatik der att. Inschr.*, 3rd ed. by E. Schwyzer, Berlin 1900 (previous ed. referred to sometimes).

16. P. Giles, *A Short Manual of Comparative Philology*, London 1901.
17. T. Nägeli, *Der Wortschatz des Ap. Paulus*, Göttingen 1905.
18. F. E. Thompson, *A Syntax of Attic Greek*, London 1907.
19. J. M. Stahl, *Kritisch-historische Syntax des griechischen Verbums der klassischen Zeit*, Heidelberg 1907.
20. A. Boatti, *Grammatica del grec del Nuovo Testamento*² (2 vols.), Venice 1908–1910.
21. G. A. Deissmann, *Bible Studies* (Engl. tr., A. Grieve)², Edinburgh 1909.
22. H. St. J. Thackeray, *A Grammar of the OT in Greek according to the Septuagint*, I, Cambridge 1909.
23. W. Warning, *De Vettii Valentis sermone* (Diss.) Münster 1909.
24. M. Johannessohn, *Der Gebrauch der Kasus und der Präp. in der Septuaginta*, I Gebrauch der Kasus (Diss.) Berlin 1910.
25. A. Thumb, *Handbuch der neugriech. Volkssprache*², Strassburg 1910.
26. J. H. Moulton, *A Grammar of NT Greek: Prolegomena*, Edinburgh 1906.
27. J. H. Moulton, *Einleitung in die Sprache des NT*. Auf Grund der vom Verf. neu bearbeiteten 3 engl. Aufl. übersetzte deutsche Ausgabe, Heidelberg 1911. (This amounts to a 4th edition of the *Prolegomena*).
28. M. Arnim, *De Philonis Byzantii dicendi genere* (Diss.), Greifswald 1912.
29. H. B. Swete, *An Introduction to the OT in Greek*, rev. by R. R. Ottley, Cambridge 1914.
30. J. H. Moulton and W. F. Howard, *A Grammar of NT Greek*, vol. II, Edinburgh 1919–1929.
31. L. Radermacher, *Neutestamentliche Grammatik*², Tübingen 1925.
32. H. G. Liddell and R. Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 9th ed. rev. by H. S. Jones, Oxford 1925–1940.
33. M. Johannessohn, *Der Gebrauch der Präpositionen in der LXX*, Berlin 1926.
34. H. Ljungvik, *Studien zur Sprache der apokryphen Apostelgeschichten* (Diss.), Uppsala 1926.
35. E. Mayser, *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit*, II vol. 1, Berlin 1926; II vol. 2, 1934; II, vol. 3, 1934.

36. J. Wackernagel, *Vorlesungen über Syntax mit besonderer Berücksichtigung von Griechisch, Lateinisch und Deutsch*², I, Basel 1926; II, 1928.
37. P. F.-M. Abel, *Grammaire du grec biblique suivie d'un choix de papyrus*, Paris 1927.
38. H. Pernot, *Études sur la langue des Évangiles*, Paris 1927.
39. R. Helbing, *Die Kasussyntax der Verba bei den LXX*, Göttingen 1928.
40. G. Sacco, *La koinè del Nuovo Testamento e la trasmissione del sacro testo. Lezioni preliminari per lo studio del NT greco con introduzione e crestomazia*, Rome 1928.
41. A. A. Tzartanos, *Νεοελληνική σύνταξις ἤτοι Συντακτικὸν τῆς νέας ἑλληνικῆς γλώσσης . . .*, Athens 1928.
42. J. H. Moulton and G. Milligan, *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament*, London 1930.
43. J. Psichari, *Essai sur le grec de la Septante*, 1930.
44. A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek NT in the Light of Historical Research*⁵, New York 1931.
45. H. Ljungvik *Beiträge zur Syntax der spätgriechischen Volkssprache*, Uppsala 1932.
46. B. F. C. Atkinson, *The Greek Language*², Cambridge 1933.
47. G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum NT*, Stuttgart 1933—.
48. G. Bonnacorsi, *Primi saggi di philologia neotestamentaria*, I, Turin 1933.
49. M. Zerwick, *Untersuchungen zum Markus-Stil*, Rome 1937.
50. S. G. Kapsomenakis, *Voruntersuchungen zu einer Grammatik der Papyri der nachchristl. Zeit*, Munich 1938.
51. M. Soffray, *Recherches sur la syntaxe de Saint Jean Chrysostome*, Paris 1939.
52. J. Humbert, *Syntaxe grecque* (Collection de Philologie Classique), Paris 1945.
53. M. Black, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*, Oxford 1946, 2nd ed. 1954.
54. M.-J. Lagrange, *S. Matthieu*, Paris, 8th ed. 1948.
55. E. Schwyzer, *Griechische Grammatik*, vol. II, Munich 1950 (based on K. Brugmann).
56. C. F. D. Moule, *The Language of the NT* (inaug. lect.), Camb. 1952.
57. C. F. D. Moule, *An Idiom Book of NT Greek*, Cambridge 1953.

58. F. Blass and A. Debrunner, *Grammatik des nt. Griechisch*⁹, Göttingen 1954.
59. M. Zerwick, S.J., *Graecitas Biblica*³, Rome 1955
60. R. Morgenthaler, *Statistik des nt. Wortschatzes*, 1958.
61. W. Bauer, *Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des NT und der übrigen urchr. Literatur*⁵, Berlin 1958.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

BOOK ONE: BUILDING UP THE SENTENCE: ANALYTICAL

Chapter One

	PAGE
SUBSTITUTES FOR NOUNS IN SUBJECT, OBJECT OR PREDICATE	
§ 1. The Article with adjectives	13
§ 2. The Article with	
(1) attributive adverbs	14
(2) prepositional phrases	14
(3) genitives of nouns	16
§ 3. The Ellipse of <i>ὁδός, γῆ, χωρά, ἡμέρα, χεῖρ</i> , etc.	16

PART I.—WORD-MATERIAL FOR SENTENCE-BUILDING

Chapter Two

THE GENDER AND NUMBER OF NOUNS	
§ 1. Gender	21
§ 2. Number	22

Chapter Three

THE COMPARISON OF ADJECTIVES AND ADVERBS	
§ 1. Heightening of comparison	29
§ 2. Comparative for true superlative	29
§ 3. Comparative for elative superlative	30
§ 4. Comparative for positive	30
§ 5. Elative superlative	31
§ 6. Positive for superlative	31
§ 7. Positive for comparative	31
§ 8. Superlative for comparative	32

Chapter Four

VOCATIVES	
§ 1. The use of <i>ὦ</i>	33
§ 2. Nominative instead of vocative	34

Chapter Five

	PAGE
SUBSTANTIVAL ARTICLE AND PRONOUN	
§ 1. Substantival Article	
(a) ὁ μὲν . . . ὁ δέ	36
(b) ὁ δέ, ἡ δέ, οἱ δέ	37
(c) ὁ μὲν οὖν	37
§ 2. Substantival Pronoun	
(a) Personal	37
(b) Reflexive	41
(c) Reciprocal	43
(d) Demonstrative	44
(e) Relative	47
(f) Interrogative	48
(g) Interrogative pronoun as an exclamation	50

Chapter Six

THE VERB: VOICE	
§ 1. Absolute verbs	51
§ 2. Transitive and intransitive verbs	51
§ 3. The Active	53
§ 4. The Middle	53
§ 5. The Passive	57

Chapter Seven

THE VERB: ASPECT AND TENSE	
§ 1. Present indicative	60
§ 2. Imperfect	64
§ 3. Aorist indicative	68
§ 4. Moods of present and aorist in relation to <i>Aktionsart</i>	74
§ 5. Perfect indicative	81
§ 6. Other moods of perfect in relation to time	85
§ 7. Pluperfect	86
§ 8. Future	86
§ 9. Periphrastic tenses	87

Chapter Eight

THE VERB: MOODS: INDICATIVE AND SUBJUNCTIVE

§ 1. The Indicative	
1. Imperfect to express necessity: ἔδει, καθήκειν, ἀνῆκειν, ἐδύνατο, ὄφειλον, καλὸν ἦν, κρεῖττον ἦν	90
2. Imperfect to express regret: ὄφελον (ὄφελον), ἐβουλόμην, ἤθελον	91
3. "Unreal" indicative in conditional sentences	91
4. Augment-indicative with ἔν in an iterative sense	92

§ 2. The Subjunctive

A. MAIN CLAUSES		PAGE
1. A substitute for Imperative:		
a. Jussive		94
b. Prohibitions		94
c. Imperatival ἵνα		94
2. Emphatic denial and prohibition with οὐ μή		95
3. Cautious statement with μή		98
4. Deliberative subjunctive		98
B. SUBORDINATE CLAUSES		
1. Fearing (incl. μή ποτε, μή πως, etc.)		99
2. Purpose:		
a. ἵνα, ἵνα μή, μή		100
b. ὅπως (μή), ὥς, etc.		105
3. Relative clauses		106
4. Temporal clauses:		
a. ἄχρι, ἕως, μέχρι		110
b. ἕκταν, ὅταν, ὥς ἄν		112
c. πρίν		113
5. Conditional sentences:		
a. ἐάν c. pres. subj.		114
c. aor. subj.		114
b. εἰ c. fut. ind.		115
c. ἐάν c. pres. ind.		115
d. εἰ c. subj.		116
6. Indirect questions		116

Chapter Nine

THE VERB: MOODS: OPTATIVE

§ 1. Main Clauses		
a. Wish		120
b. Potential		122
§ 2. Dependent Clauses		
a. Iterative		124
b. Conditional		125
c. Final		128
d. Indirect statements		129
e. Indirect questions		130

Chapter Ten

THE VERB: NOUN FORMS: INFINITIVE

§ 1. With the Function of a Dative		
a. Final-consecutive		134
b. Imperatival (see p. 78)		136
§ 2. With various Case Functions		
a. Without the article		136
b. Articular infinitive		140
§ 3. Cases with the Infinitive		146

Chapter Eleven

	PAGE
THE VERB: ADJECTIVE-FORMS: PARTICIPLE	
§ 1. Substantival:	
a. Personal	150
b. Neuter	151
§ 2. Attributive	151
§ 3. Adverbial:	
a. Modal-temporal (incl. Pleonastic)	154
b. Causal	157
c. Concessive	157
d. Conditional	157
e. Final	157
§ 4. Predicative:	
a. Nominative	159
b. Oblique cases	160

PART II.—WORD-GROUPS DEFINING A NOUN OR
ADJECTIVE

Chapter Twelve

THE ADJECTIVAL AND PREDICATIVE DEFINITE ARTICLE

§ 1. Individual Article with Proper Nouns	
a. Names of persons	165
b. Geographical names	
1. Peoples	169
2. Lands and islands	170
3. Towns	171
4. Rivers and seas	172
c. Astronomical and natural phenomena	172
§ 2. Individual Article with Common Nouns	
a. Individual anaphoric use: Introduction	172
b. Articular use with certain nouns	
1. θεός κύριος	174
2. οὐρανός, γῆ, θάλασσα, κόσμος	174
3. θάνατος	175
4. πνεῦμα	175
5. γράμματα	176
6. ἐκκλησία	176
7. Abstract nouns	176
8. Numerals	178
c. Absence of article after prepositions	179
d. Absence before a noun governing a genitive	179
e. Generic article	180
f. Repetition with several nouns connected by καί	181
g. Article with quotations	182
h. Article with indirect interrogatives	182
§ 3. The definite article with a predicate	182

Chapter Thirteen

PAGE

ATTRIBUTIVE RELATIONSHIP: ADJECTIVES AND NUMERALS

§ 1. The adjectival attribute	185
§ 2. The definite article with several attributes	186
§ 3. Numerals	187

Chapter Fourteen

ATTRIBUTIVE RELATIONSHIP: PRONOUNS AND PRONOMINAL ADJECTIVES

§ 1. Attributive pronouns	
1. Possessive	
unemphatic	189
emphatic	190
possessive adjectives	191
ἴδιος as simple possessive pronoun	191
2. Demonstrative:	
ὅδε	192
οὗτος, ἐκεῖνος	192
τοιούτος, τοσοῦτος	193
αὐτός <i>self</i>	194
3. Indefinite:	
τις	195
εἷς	195
addition of -ουν or -ποτε	196
οὐ . . . πᾶς	196
§ 2. Attributive pronominal adjectives	
ἄλλος, ἕτερος	197
ἕκαστος	198
ἀμφοτέροι	198
ὅλος	199
ἅπας	199
πᾶς	199

Chapter Fifteen

ATTRIBUTIVE RELATIONSHIP: SUBSTANTIVES

§ 1. In the same case: Apposition	206
§ 2. In a different case:	
1. Adjectival genitive	
I. True genitive	
a. Possessive	207
b. Partitive	208
c. Objective	210
d. Of relationship	212
e. Of quality: Biblical Greek	212
f. Genitivus materiae, and epexegeticus	214
II. Ablatival Genitive	
a. With adjectives	215
b. Genitive of comparison	216
III. Position of attributive and partitive gen.	217
IV. Concatenation of different genitives	218

	PAGE
V. Genitives in Mark	219
2. Adjectival Dative:	
a. With nouns	219
b. With adjectives	220
c. Dative of respect	220
3. Adjectival Accusative	220
§ 3. Attributive prepositional phrases	221

PART III.—WORD-MATERIAL WHICH DEFINES A VERB

Chapter Sixteen

PREDICATIVE USE OF ADJECTIVES AND ADVERBS

§ 1. Adjectives	225
§ 2. Adverbs	226
§ 3. Adverbial Verbs (e. g. <i>λανθάνω</i>)	226
§ 4. Position of Adverb	227

Chapter Seventeen

CASE ADDITIONS TO THE VERB: WITHOUT A PREPOSITION

§ 1. Nominative:	
a. "Ad sensum"	230
b. Proper nouns without syntax	230
c. Parenthesis	230
d. Designations of time	231
§ 2. Genitive:	
a. True Genitive	
1. Possessive	231
2. With verbs and verbal adjectives	231
3. Local and temporal	235
b. Ablative Genitive: certain verbs	235
§ 3. Dative (waning in the Koine):	
a. As indirect object	236
b. Advantage and disadvantage	238
c. Reference	238
d. "Relationis"	238
e. Ethical	239
f. Credit or discredit	239
g. Possession	239
h. Occurrence	240
i. Agent	240
j. Instrument	240
k. "Sociativus" or "comitativus" (Associative)	240
l. Hebrew infinitive absolute (Biblical Greek)	241
m. Cause	242
n. With compound verbs	242
o. Locative	242
p. Temporal: point and duration of time	243

	PAGE
§ 4. Accusative (gaining ascendancy over dative in Koine):	
a. External object (verbs originally intransitive)	244
b. Content	245
c. Double accusative	246
d. With the passive	247
e. Adverbial	247

Chapter Eighteen

CASE ADDITIONS TO THE VERB: WITH A PREPOSITION

§ 1. Prepositions in the NT (prefatory)	249
§ 2. Prepositional periphrases for the simple cases	
a. For genitive: ἀπό of separation and alternation	251
b. For dative:	
διά c. gen. of instrument (or modal)	251
ἐνώπιον c. gen.	251
instrumental ἐν more common (as in Koine)	251
c. For nominative: εἰς (Semitic)	253
d. For accusative: εἰς	253
§ 3. Anomalous use of prepositions:	
a. ἀπό c. nom. (see p. 230)	254
b. εἰς for local ἐν	254
c. Interchange of εἰς and ἐν in metaphorical sense	255
d. εἰς for ἐπί and πρός	256
e. Confusion of διά τινος and τινα (see p. 267f)	257
f. Confusion of παρά τινος and τινη (see p. 273)	257
g. Use of ἐν for εἰς	257
§ 4. True prepositions	
I. With one case:	
a. Gen.: ἀντί, ἀπό, ἐκ, πρό	258
b. Dat.: ἐν, σύν	260
c. Accus.: ἀνά, εἰς	265
II. Two cases: διά, κατά, μετά, περί πρίν, ὑπέρ	267
III. Three cases: ἐπί, παρά, πρός, ὑπό	271
§ 5. Repetition or omission of the preposition	275
§ 6. Improper prepositions: ἀνεύ, ἕνεκα (-εν), ἕως, μέχρι (ἄχρι)	275
§ 7. Prepositional adverbs: ἀμα, ἐγγύς, ἔσω, ἔκτος, ἐναντιον, ἀντικρύς, ἐντός, ἐνώπιον, ἔξω, κυκλόθεν, λάθρα, μεταξύ, ὀπισθεν, ὀπίσω, ὄψε, πέραν, πλὴν, χάριν, χωρίς	276
§ 8. Proper prepositions combined with adverbs: ἔναντι, ἀπέναντι, κατέναντι ἔμπροσθεν, ἐπάνω, ὑποκάτω, ὑπεράνω	278
§ 9. Biblical circumlocutions: πρόσωπον, χεῖρ, στόμα	279

Chapter Nineteen

NEGATIVES

(especially the encroachment of MH upon the province of OY)

§ 1. General	281
§ 2. Main clauses	282
§ 3. Dependent clauses	283

	PAGE
§ 4. Participles	284
§ 5. Infinitive	285
§ 6. Double negatives	286
§ 7. <i>Yes</i> and <i>No</i>	286
§ 8. Position of negative	286

BOOK TWO: THE SENTENCE COMPLETE: SYNTHETIC SYNTAX

PART I.—THE ORDINARY SIMPLE SENTENCE

Chapter Twenty

SUBJECT AND PREDICATE: APPARENT ABSENCE OF SUBJECT

§ 1. Impersonal verbs	291
§ 2. Impersonal "they"	292
§ 3. Scil. "the Scripture"	293

Chapter Twenty-one

SUBJECT AND PREDICATE: ABSENCE OF THE VERB "TO BE"

§ 1. The Copula:	
a. In fixed phrases	295
b. In spontaneous phrases	296
c. Ellipse of other parts besides <i>ἔστιν</i>	297
§ 2. Stronger meanings of <i>εἶναι</i>	298
§ 3. Survey of individual writers	298

Chapter Twenty-two

CONGRUENCE OF GENDER AND NUMBER

§ 1. Incongruence in Gender	311
§ 2. "Constructio ad sensum"	311
a. Collective noun with plural verb	311
b. Collective noun (fem. or neut.) with masc. ptc. or pronoun	312
c. Neuter personal noun with masc. ptc.	312
d. <i>ἕκαστος</i> and plural verb	312
§ 3. The "Schema Atticum"	312
§ 4. Number of verb when there are several subjects	313
§ 5. Solecisms in the New Testament	314
a. In Revelation	314
b. In the rest of the NT	315

Chapter Twenty-three

THE SUBORDINATION OF CLAUSES

§ 1. Substantival	318
§ 2. Adjectival Clauses	318

	PAGE
§ 3. Adverbial Clauses	318
a. Causal: <i>ὅτι, διότι, ἐπει, καθότι, etc.</i>	318
b. Conditional	319
c. Comparative: <i>ὡς, καθὼς, καθάπερ</i>	319
d. Concessive: <i>εἰ καί, ἐὰν καί, κἄν</i>	321
e. Temporal: <i>ὅτε, ὅταν, ἐπὶ, ἐπει (δὴ), ἡνίκα, ὁπότε, ὡς</i>	321
f. Participle Absolute:	
accusative	322
genitive	322
g. Final	323
h. Consecutive	323

Chapter Twenty-four

INCONSISTENCIES BETWEEN MAIN AND DEPENDENT CLAUSES

§ 1. Attraction of the Relative Pronoun to its Antecedent	324
§ 2. Inverse Attraction of the Antecedent to the Relative	324
§ 3. Pleonastic Insertion of Personal Pronouns in Biblical Greek	325
§ 4. Prolepsis	325
§ 5. Anacoloutha after Relative Clauses	325
§ 6. Mingling of Direct and Indirect Speech: recitative <i>ὅτι</i>	325

PART II.—CONNECTIONS BETWEEN SENTENCES

Chapter Twenty-five

CO-ORDINATING PARTICLES

§ 1. Simple	329
§ 2. Compound	339
§ 3. Unconnected words and sentences: <i>Asyndeton</i>	340

Chapter Twenty-six

IRREGULARITY OF SUBORDINATION

§ 1. <i>Parataxis</i> instead of <i>hypotaxis</i>	342
§ 2. Interpolation of sentences: <i>Parenthesis</i>	342
§ 3. <i>Anacoloutha</i>	342

Chapter Twenty-seven

WORD ORDER

§ 1. Clause Order	
a. Position of dependent clauses	344
b. <i>Chiasmus</i>	345
§ 2. Word Order within the Clause	
a. <i>Idiosyncrasies</i> of Biblical Greek	
1. Particles as first word	347
2. Verb as near beginning as possible	357
3. Article and noun adhere closely together	348

	PAGE
4. Adjectives usually follow the noun	349
5. Genitive always immediately after its noun	349
6. Direct object personal pronoun follows verb	349
7. Demonstrative adjectives prefer to follow noun	349
8. Prepositional phrase always after its verb or noun	349
b. Effect of oratory on word-order	350
c. Stereotyped phrases	350

INDICES

Index of References	351
Index of Subjects	386
Index of Greek words	402

ABBREVIATIONS

(The numbers refer to the Bibliography)

Abel: 37

anarthr. : anarthrous

Beginnings: F. J. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake, *The Beginnings of Christianity*, London 1920-33

Bibl. Greek: Biblical Greek

Black AAGA²: 53

Blass-Debr.: 58

Burton: 6

class.: classical

Expos. T. and Exp. T. and E.T.: Expository Times

Gild. or Gildersleeve: 14

Goodwin: 9

Helbing DKVS: 39

Hell. Greek: Hellenistic Greek

Humbert: 52

ICC: International Critical Commentary

JBL: Journal of Biblical Literature

JThS: Journal of Theological Studies

Jannaris: 8

Johannessohn DGKPS: 24

Johannessohn DGPS: 33

K-Blass: 11

K-G: 12

Kittel WB: 47

LXX: Septuagint

Ljungvik BSSVS: 45

Ljungvik SSAA: 34

LS: 32

MGr: Modern Greek

MT: Massoretic Text

MM Vocab: 42

Mayser: 35

Meisterhans-Schwyzler: 15

Moulton Proleg.: 26

Moulton Einl.: 27

Moulton-Howard: 30

Moule: 57

NEB: New English Bible, Oxford and Cambridge 1961

NT: New Testament

NTS: New Testament Studies

- O': Septuagint
OT: Old Testament
pap.: papyri
Pernot *Études*: 38
Radermacher² or Rad.²: 31
RSV: Revised Standard Version, Nelson 1946
Schmid Attizismus: 4
Schwyzer: 55
Soffray: 51
Stahl: 19
Thackeray: *OT Gr.*: 22
Vet. Test.: Vetus Testamentum
Wackernagel: 36
Winer-Schmiedel: 7
Zerwick: 59
Zerwick *Untersuchungen*: 49

A GRAMMAR OF NEW TESTAMENT GREEK

VOLUME III

INTRODUCTION

DR. MOULTON'S own plan for the Grammar was that it should be not only a learned assessment of this field but also a practical guide to the student. I have designed volume III specially for three classes of reader: first, the teacher with an interest in exegesis, or the Bible translator either in Europe or among the young native churches who wishes to know the exact significance of every construction; then, the textual critic whom characteristic differences in the author's style may help to decide between variants; and also the student of comparative philology whose concern is the relationship of Biblical Greek to classical and Hellenistic.

The plan of this work follows a natural linguistic pattern: the building up of the sentence from its independent elements right to the complicated co-ordinations and subordinations of the period. The student who likes to have all his pronouns or all his prepositions dealt with together in one chapter must console himself by making good use of the index, for he will find that the various parts of speech are treated in the appropriate place as they contribute to the construction of the sentence. His compensation will be a better understanding of syntax in the true sense and not as a mere catalogue of parts of speech.

Space is very limited, and I wish I could have treated more fully (1) the syntax and style of Paul, (2) the study of word-order, and (3) the syntactic idiosyncrasies of the various authors, as I believe that all these are of great value for illuminating textual problems and difficult exegesis. During the course of the work those points have been constantly in mind, but their fuller treatment will yield ampler rewards. Some authors repeatedly confuse $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ and $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$, but others keep them carefully distinct. Knowledge of this kind brings deeper insight, as also does the study of Paul's use of the adnominal genitive, whether

it is largely subjective or largely objective. We will never be at home with the fourth evangelist until we observe his peculiar performance with tenses and make allowance for his love of the perfect and pluperfect. What C. H. Turner once commenced to do for Markan syntax needs completing and carrying out for other authors too. Light has been thrown on the Infancy narrative and even on the elusive Q from a careful study of Luke's characteristic style¹. Without a complete guide to his syntactical predilections, we will never know whether a writer is true to himself or whether he is going out of his way to impress.

I have tried to expose consistently the almost complete absence of classical standards in nearly every author. A tendency to use the active voice wherever possible in place of the declining middle², a tendency to give to certain transitive verbs like ἄγω and στρέφω an intransitive sense³, to give an object to some intransitive verbs (e.g. βασιλεύω, εὐαγγελίζω), and to use the present in reported speech referring to the past;⁴ the retreat of the Koine imperfect before the aorist and its confusion with the aorist;⁵ the disappearance of the perfect through its assumption of aoristic functions and aoristic "weak" endings;⁵ the even greater departure from classical standards in moods⁶, especially the optative and infinitive, where the infin. of purpose after verbs of motion and the articular infinitive are on the increase (in spite of the retreat of the infin. before ἵνα and ὅτι in other respects⁷); the less rigid connection between the mood and the conjunction, so that the subjunctive may stand more often without ἄν and conversely ἄν (including ἐάν and ὅταν) stands with the indicative; the articular neuter of the adjective for an abstract noun⁸ (τὸ ἅγιον, τὰ καλὰ); the non-classical use of the definite article generally; fluidity in the meaning and use of prepositions; weakening of the ἵνα-construction; indifference to the case after ἀκούω; lack of distinction between ἴδιος and αὐτοῦ, εἰς and ἐν, ὅστις and ὅς—these are well-known aberrations. More subtle, but as decisive for exegesis, is the infiltration of the comparative into the old preserves of the superlative, so that the

¹ NTS 2, 100-109; *Studia Evangelica*, Berlin 1959, 223-234.

² Ch. 6 § 4.

³ Ch. 6 § 2.

⁴ Ch. 7 § 1.

⁵ Ch. 7 § 3.

⁶ Ch. 8.

⁷ Ch. 10.

⁸ Ch. 1.

alert translator will not lose the opportunity of translating the one as the other, if necessary, and will not forget how philological study has made it essential to look at the superlative in the elative sense of *very*, and even to suspect the comparative in this way: πυκνότερον must be *very often* and ἀκριβέστερον *very accurately*. On the other hand, it is probably a unique feature of Bibl. Greek, under Hebraic influence, to put the positive for the superlative: e.g. *greatest* (not *great*) *in the kingdom of heaven*. So also the use of παρά and ὑπέρ with the positive, which is a Hebraic survival in Modern Greek; and since the general trend of the language was towards more emphatic comparison μάλλον is added to the normal comparative¹. The translator will avoid over-translating, because nearly all ancient distinctions are blurred. He will look askance at the "theology of prepositions" and will remember that Hellenistic writers much prefer to add prepositions, especially composite prepositions, to the simple case and also confuse the nice distinctions between prepositions and between the cases, so that the exegete must always look at the context². It is not that Biblical Greek has no standards at all, but pains must be taken to discover them outside the sphere of classical Greek, even outside secular Greek altogether, although the living Koine must be kept in mind always. Mark at least has simple rules which he carefully observes and, to a less extent, so have the others.

Biblical and Hellenistic Greek share the non-classical tendency to omit ὃ in the vocative. With the less cultured writers in post-Christian papyri the NT also shares the tendency to supply nominative forms for the vocative³. The popular love of emphatic speech demands a more extended use of pronouns of all kinds, both substantival and attributive⁴, in the NT and Koine. Αὐτός becomes simply *he*. Personal pronouns are inserted where they would be unnecessary in class. Greek, and the genitives follow their nouns with a consistency which points to the influence of the Hebrew suffix. Possibly on an Aramaic model, the evangelists use the proleptic pronoun followed by a resumptive noun. But it is a Hellenistic tendency to use the simple personal pronoun for a reflexive; and in the

¹ See ch. 3.

² See ch. 18.

³ See ch. 4.

⁴ See ch. 5 and 14.

LXX and illiterate papyri we find the 3rd. pers. reflexive used for all persons in the plural, as in the NT. Indirect pronouns are going out of use, and the direct interrogative pronouns like τίς find themselves serving in indirect questions; Hellenistic also is the confusion of relative and interrogative pronouns¹. The genitive of the pers. pronoun (μου, etc.) is preferred in the Koine to the possessive pronoun (ἐμός, etc.). Ἐγώ is a post-classical substitute for τις. Ἴδιος becomes no more than ἑαυτοῦ or even αὐτοῦ (simple possessive); and, in the Imperial period at any rate, the anarthrous demonstrative pronoun is not necessarily predicative². The nice distinctions between οὐ and μή in class. Greek have gone, and μή is encroaching³. Bibl. Greek shares with the Koine the tendency to misuse and extend the scope of the gen. absolute; ⁴ and, aided by Semitic precedent, to insert the personal pronoun pleonastically; ⁵ moreover, the popular tendency towards forceful expression is seen in the forming of new compound particles, and Semitic simplicity in the reduced number and use of particles⁶.

In view of the Appendix to volume II, I have not supplied a separate chapter on "Semitisms", which raise a vexed question bedevilled by the objection that nearly all of them appear in the papyri; but the discussion of the influence of the LXX and Semitic idiom arises in every chapter of the book. To some future work I leave discussion whether this influence supports the hypothesis of a spoken Jewish Greek. The present work does suggest that Bibl. Greek is a unique language with a unity and character of its own. It does not follow that if a construction occurs as frequently in the epistles as in the gospels it will be less likely to have a Semitic origin⁷, for direct translation is not the only possible medium of Semitic influence. When the LXX was established its idioms powerfully influenced free compositions of Biblical Greek⁸. The idiosyncrasies of Bibl.

¹ See ch. 5.

² See ch. 14 § 1.

³ See ch. 19.

⁴ See ch. 23 § 3f.

⁵ See ch. 24 § 3.

⁶ See ch. 25.

⁷ See *Exp. T.* LXVII, 247. As a contrast to what this writer found in the *Loeb Select Papyri*, vol. i, concerning the repetition of prepositions, attention should be drawn to Mayser's considered opinion on the Ptolemaic papyri which he had examined: "In der weitaus überwiegenden Mehrzahl der beobachteten Fälle, zumal im Stil privater Urkunden, wird bei καί, τε . . . καί, οὐ μόνον . . . ἀλλά usw. die Präposition nur einmal gesetzt." (II 2, 516).

⁸ Moulton-Howard 478.

Greek syntax are shared in varying degrees by almost all the NT writers, whether they were translating or not. There is a family likeness among these Biblical works, setting them apart from the papyri and from contemporary literary Greek, although the books with Semitic sources may have these features to an especial degree. This is so in the relation between the independent and attributive use of ἐκεῖνος, in which colloquial usage is entirely opposed to the Biblical; it is so with the position of ἔνεκα (-εν)¹, in the Bible the reverse of that of Polybius and the papyri; and with the three broad types of construction with πᾶς.

As to verbs, there was a Hellenistic tendency to use the historic present λέγει, etc., but its popularity in the NT is considerably helped by Aramaic precedent². The perfective aorist is Hebraic. Although development of the perfect tense in the NT has reached a stage closely corresponding with that in the vernacular, there are very important respects in which it is different, and the NT represents a new development. The number of resultative perfects is few indeed compared with secular literary and vernacular texts, and the use of this form is limited to a small number of verbs, except in the emphatic, solemnly strained style of the fourth evangelist. Moreover, although a few examples of εἶμι with the perfect ptc. as a periphrastic tense appear in the Ptolemaic pap., they cannot be compared with the galaxy which is apparent in the LXX and NT³. Mayser's exx. are very few. Even Chantraine will not dismiss the probability of Aramaic influence. The perfect tense in general is much rarer in the NT than in the popular language, and it preserves a good deal more of its old force. While the old intransitives have almost all disappeared in the Koine, ἕστηκα and γέγονα being the only living forms, in the NT we do still have a few, especially where they can be understood with a *present* meaning (e.g. the two above, and τέθνηκα, ἤγγικα, πέποιθα, ἀνέωγα). Some perfects are still true perfects, and not aorists, in spite of the universal confusion in the Ptolemaic and Imperial pap. Even in "colloquial" Mark, a significant distinction is sometimes made (15⁴⁴), and this is true of Paul (1 Co 15³). The oft repeated γέγραπται is correctly used, and other perfects retain their true present force.

¹ *Vet. Test.* 5, 1955, 208.

² See ch. 7 § 1.

³ See ch. 7 § 9.

The history of the optative mood in the literary and colloquial Greek of the post-classical period is first a gradual decay and subsequently a revival of this mood; in the first place, the revival was due to atticistic influence, but popular Greek followed the fashion in time. Now, the period in which this mood was least in favour in secular writers is the period of the NT and the later books of the LXX, which contrariwise display a comparative fondness for the mood. Is it the conservatism of religion? It might only be that atticizing scribes confused like-sounding endings. -But the old Volitive optative is admirably suited to the pious aspiration and longing of religious books. Volitive optatives could owe their preservation to their incidence in the solemn diction of Christian devotion and synagogue liturgy. They appear in the LXX, and that version became the Church's book. It is a form of speech well fitted for pious lips.

Some characteristically Biblical prepositions hardly occur at all in the papyri; e.g. *ὀπίσω* (over 300 times in LXX and 26 in NT), *ἀπέναντι* and *κατέναντι*. And *ἐμπροσθεν* is extremely rare outside Biblical Greek. The use of cases with prepositions is not that of the Koine, or the Biblical books show a more rapid tendency to drop one or more of the cases, e.g.

		LXX	NT	Polybius	Papyri	Herodotus
ἐπί	(g:d:a)	1·5:1:3·7	1·2:1:2	1·5:1:3	4·5:1:2·5	
παρά	(g:d:a)	2·5:1:1·5	1·6:1:1·2		22·5:1:2·5	1·8:1:3·5
πρός	(g:d:a)	·23:1:43	·16:1:116	·2:1:15	·02:1:4	2:1:6
μετά	(g:a)	3·8:1	3·6:1	1·2:1	1·6:1	

The wider use of *ἐν* is remarkable in Bibl. Greek, e.g.:

	LXX	NT	Papyri
<i>ἐν</i> : <i>παρά</i>	1 : ·06	1 : ·07	1 : ·43
<i>ἐν</i> : <i>περί</i>	1 : ·06	1 : ·12	1 : ·28

It is a peculiarity of Bibl. Greek, and not of the Koine, to use the feminine for neuter in certain expressions like *εἰς κρυπτήν*

and ἀπό μιᾶς, but the variations in the gender of λιμός are shared by the Koine ¹.

A distributive *singular*, in preference to the plural, is distinctly Biblical, like τὸ σῶμα ὑμῶν, although we have κατὰ γεωργόν once in the papyri. The plural *worlds* and *heaven* belongs to Bibl. Greek, and is normal Greek only poetically. The allusive plural is normal Greek, but late: of Herod it is said, *They are dead who sought the child's life*; and *the prophets* (Mt 2²³) is simply Hosea; while ὄχλοι πολλοί is one vast crowd ².

The use of *soul* for the reflexive pronoun must be uniquely Biblical. The use of αὐτός as a demonstrative (which has significance for exegesis) is doubtfully Koine and more likely to be due to Semitic influence; so also extra-Biblical examples of οὐ . . . πᾶς are rare ³. Biblical Greek uses παρά and ὑπέρ for comparison in place of ἦ or the genitive and is fond of the genitive of quality. The dative is beginning to decline in Hell. Greek but the popularity of ἐν in Bibl. Greek gives it a false appearance of life ⁴.

The NT is not in line with the Koine in the use of cases after certain verbs. It uses the dat. as well as the acc. after προσκινέω ⁵, and reverts to the Attic dat. after πειθαρχέω ⁶. The acc. is invariable in the LXX (except atticistic 4Km 2²⁴, Ep. Je 65), and in the NT after καταράομαι, against the dat. of secular style ⁷. The only two instances of acc. after ἐπηρεάζω which I can find, occur in NT, while secular Greek has the dative ⁸.

A partitive expression is often used in NT and LXX as subj. or obj. of the verb, e.g. θανατώσουσιν ἐξ ὑμῶν, without the help of τινος, in Lk 21¹⁶. This plays small part indeed in the non-Biblical language ⁹, and clearly reflects the Hebrew קָ. In partitive expressions the Ptolemaic papyri much prefer ἀπό to ἐκ ¹⁰, but NT writers prefer ἐκ and also often use ἐν in a partitive sense which is extremely rare in the papyri ¹¹.

¹ See ch. 2.

² See ch. 2.

³ Ch. 14 § 1.

⁴ Ch. 17.

⁵ Mayser II 2, 256; MMVocab.s.v. The dat. becomes increasingly common in LXX: Helbing DKVS 296-298.

⁶ Mayser II 2, 208. Ptolemaic pap. all gen.; dat. in A.D. 260 (MMVocab.s.v.).

⁷ Kittel WB I 449; Helbing DKVS 71; Bauer s.v.

⁸ Mayser II 2, 265.

⁹ See ch. 15 § 2, 1, I b; Mayser II 2, 351.

¹⁰ Mayser II 2, 352.

¹¹ Mayser II 2, 353.

The position of the attributive adjective (and participle) in relation to the noun and article is in the Ptolemaic pap. quite different from that in Bibl. Greek. There are three possible positions: I. ὁ ἀγαθὸς ἀνὴρ, II. ὁ ἀνὴρ ὁ ἀγαθός, III. ἀνὴρ ὁ ἀγαθός. The art. before the noun is often omitted in Hell. Greek and particularly in the papyri, but that is very rare in Bibl. Greek¹. I can find only one instance in the first twenty chapters of Genesis, and there are very few in the NT. As to the other two possible positions, if we take as a sample of iii/B.C. papyri the Hibeh Papyri nos. 27–120, there are twenty exx. of position I and ten exx. of the repeated article. The Tebtunis Papyri nos. 5–124 will serve for ii–i/B.C.: they have the first position with over 140 exx., but only four or five exx. with repetition of the article². This is not like the picture in Bibl. Greek. In the Pauline and General epistles³ (where direct rendering of a Hebrew text is ruled out) the proportion is: position I 24, position II 23, position III one only. Clearly the tendency in the papyri of the NT period is for the second position to be practically negligible (140:5), while Biblical writers are fond of the usage even when there is no emphasis. In LXX Ge 1–19 the proportion between positions I and II is 18:56, the very reverse of the proportion in iii/B.C. papyri. In 1 Km 1–6 the proportion is 1:16.

The construction ἐν τῷ with infin. occurs so often in Lk-Ac that to Dr. Howard it was "one more evidence of the great influence of the LXX on the style of Luke."⁴ It occurs in the papyri occasionally⁵, but this expression, like εἰς τό and τοῦ c.infin. (of which Paul and Luke are specially fond) belongs almost exclusively to Bibl. Greek through the influence of Hebrew⁶. Dr. Howard observed that the use of ἕνα "had already gained great flexibility in the Κοινή" (p. 470). If one cannot claim that its even greater flexibility of use in the NT⁷ was entirely due to Semitic influence, one must at least underline the difficulty of finding anywhere but in Biblical books such a

¹ See ch. 13 § 1.

² Mayser II 2, 25ff.

³ The first chapters of the following books have been read: Ro, 1 and 2 Co, Ga, Ph, Col, Phm, 1 and 2 Th, 1 and 2 Ti, Ti, Heb, Jas, 1 and 2 Pt, 1 Jn.

⁴ See the Appendix to vol. II of this Grammar, p. 451.

⁵ Mayser II 1, 328.

⁶ Mayser II 1, 321ff, 330; I 3, 43. See below ch. 10 § 2b.

⁷ See e.g. Radermacher² 193. See below ch. 8 § 2 B2.

wide variety in the use of ἵνα, imperatival, causal, consecutive, exegetical, within so small a space.

Other instances of the unique character of Bibl. Greek abound in peculiarities of word-order¹, in asyndeton² and parataxis³, in the use of proleptic pronouns⁴, and in the pleonastic insertion of personal pronouns⁵, as well as in many other smaller and less significant ways.

I do not wish to prove too much by these examples, but the strongly Semitic character of Bibl. Greek, and therefore its remarkable unity within itself, do seem to me to have contemporary significance at a time when many are finding their way back to the Bible as a living book and perhaps are pondering afresh the old question of a "Holy Ghost language". The lapse of half a century was needed to assess the discoveries of Deissmann and Moulton and put them in right perspective. We now have to concede that not only is the subject-matter of the Scriptures unique but so also is the language in which they came to be written or translated. This much is plain for all who can see, but the further question arises, whether such a Biblical language was the creature of an hour and the *ad hoc* instrument for a particular purpose, or whether it was a spoken language as well, something more than an over-literal rendering of Semitic idioms, a permanent influence and a significant development in the language. Students of Greek await the answer with interest.

¹ See ch. 27.

² See ch. 25 § 3.

³ See ch. 26 § 1.

⁴ See ch. 5 § 2 (a) 3; ch. 14 § 1. 2.

⁵ See ch. 24 § 3.

This page intentionally left blank

BOOK ONE

BUILDING UP THE SENTENCE: ANALYTICAL

The minimal form of the sentence is Subject and Predicate. The Subject is usually expressed by a noun and the Predicate by a verb; and this verb may need a direct or indirect Object. But often the Predicate too may be a noun or its substitute.

This page intentionally left blank

CHAPTER ONE

SUBSTITUTES FOR NOUNS IN SUBJECT, OBJECT OR PREDICATE

§ 1. The Article with Adjectives¹

A subject, object or predicate may be expressed without using a noun. The usual substitute for it in cultured speech is a non-substantival neuter expression, but sometimes also a masculine or feminine one. We find the article with a non-predicate adjective, and used in both (a) an individual and (b) a generic sense. By this method is represented a quality *par excellence*.

(a) Of God: Jn 5⁴⁴ ὁ μόνος BW, 1 Jn 5²⁰ ὁ ἀληθινός. Of Christ: Lk 4³⁴ ὁ ἅγιος, Ac 22¹⁴ ὁ δίκαιος. Of Satan: ὁ πονηρός. Also ἡ ἐρημος. *the desert*, Jas 2⁶ τὸν πτωχὸν *beggar*. Also ὁ σόφος.

(b) οἱ πλούσιοι and οἱ ἅγιοι. οἱ πολλοὶ either *the majority*, or *the many* previously indicated. 1 Pt 4¹⁸ ὁ δίκαιος, ὁ ἀσεβής. Mt 25⁴ αἱ φρόνιμοι. Also οἱ μαλακοί.

But the substantival expression is more usually neuter. In the pre-Christian papyri are τὸ ἅγιον, τὸ ἄξιον, τὸ δίκαιον, τὰ καλὰ, τὸ στρατιωτικόν *the army*, τὸ ἱππικόν, τὸ ναυτικόν, etc. (Mayser II 1, 1ff). Again we have (a) individual, (b) generic, more often; and (c), especially in Paul, the equivalent of an abstract noun; the latter is a class. idiom (Hdt. Thuc.) and higher contemporary Koine (Strabo, Joseph., I Cl.), as well as Biblical (LXX).² In the NT it is characteristic of Paul and Luke and not often in the Gospels. This abstract usage followed by the gen. does not appear in the papyri.

(a) Individual concrete expressions: 2 Co 8¹⁵ OT τὸ πολὺ, τὸ ὀλίγον, Philem¹⁴ τὸ ἀγαθόν *a good deed*, Ro 8³ τὸ ἀδυνατὸν *the one thing the Law could not do*. 1 Co 3¹⁰ θεμέλιον, sc. λίθον, 7⁵ ἐκ συμφώνου. Also τὸ

¹ K-G I 266ff., Gild. I § 36, Mayser II 1, 1ff. Ljungvik SSAA 24f. Schmid, Attizismus IV 608.

² Also Apost. Fathers, e.g. Mart. Petri 82²⁰ τὸ παράδοξον τοῦ θεάματος, and Pass. Andr. alt. 28^{14ff}.

καλόν. Never τὸ συνειδός for συνειδησις, but τὸ σωτήριον for ἡ σωτηρία (Lk 2³⁰ 3⁶, Ac 28²⁸, Eph 6¹⁷ all OT), and often τὸ μαρτύριον for ἡ μαρτυρία. Neut. sing. is also used collectively to denote persons: τὸ ἔλαττον . . . τοῦ κρείττονος = οἱ ἐλάττονες . . . τῶν κρειττόνων; also neut. pl. with a gen. 1 Co 12²¹ τὰ μωρὰ τοῦ κόσμου, etc, Papyri: τὸ δυνατόν, τὸ λοιπόν, τὰ Ἰδια, τὰ καλὰ, τὰ ὑπάρχοντα.

(b) Generic: Mt 6¹³ τοῦ πονηροῦ (but masc?), 12³⁵ = Lk 6⁴⁵ τὰ (B al om.) ἀγαθὰ . . . πονηρὰ, Lk 6⁴⁵ τὸ ἀγαθόν, Ro 3⁸ τὰ κακὰ, τὰ ἀγαθὰ 13⁸ τὸ ἀγαθόν *good works*, Gal 6¹⁰ same, Mt 13⁴⁸ τὰ καλὰ . . . τὰ σαπρά *fish*.

(c) Abstract ideas; usually with a following gen.: Ro 1¹⁹ τὸ γνωστὸν τοῦ θ. *knowledge concerning God* (Chrysost.) or *what is known* (or *can be known*) *about God* (Origen) or *God in his knowableness* (Kittel WB I 719), 1²⁰ τὰ ἀόρατα αὐτοῦ *he the Invisible* (ib.) 2⁴ τὸ χρηστὸν τοῦ θ. = *χρηστότης* (which precedes) or more definitely *God in his kindness* (ib.), 9²² τὸ δυνατόν αὐτοῦ *how powerful he is*, 1 Co 4⁵ τὰ κρυπτά τοῦ σκοτεινοῦ¹ *the darkness which hides*, 1²⁵ τὸ μῶρον τοῦ θ. = *μωρία* (which precedes) or *God seeming to be foolish*; τὸ ἀσθενές τοῦ θ. similarly. 7³⁵ τὸ εὐσχημον και εὐπάρεδρον τῶ κυρίῳ, 2 Co 4¹⁷ τὸ παραυτίκα ἐλαφρόν τῆς θλ. ἡμῶν, 8⁸ τὸ τῆς . . . γνήσιον *what is genuine with respect to . . .*, Ph 3⁸ τὸ ὑπερέχον τῆς = *ὑπεροχή*, 4⁵ τὸ ἐπιεικὲς ὑμῶν, Col 1¹⁶ τὰ ὁρατὰ και ἀόρατα (no gen.), Heb. 6¹⁷ τὸ ἀμετάθετον τῆς, 7¹⁸ τὸ αὐτῆς ἀσθενές και ἀνωφελές, 1 Pet 1⁷, Jas 1³ τὸ δοκιμεῖον = *something tested* (Deiss. BS 259ff. Mayser 1² 3, 52). Cp. Strabo's τὸ εὐμεταχειρίστον τῆς θήρας. LXX. 2 Mac 4⁴ τὸ χαλεπὸν τῆς, 3¹⁶ τὸ τῆς . . . παρηλλαγμένον, 2²¹ τὸ σύντομον τῆς . . . , τὸ ἐξεργαστικὸν τῆς, 4 Mac 6¹³ ἐν θαυμαστῶ τῆς, 18⁸ τὰ ἀγνὰ τῆς.

§ 2. The Article with (1) Attributive Adverbs

This is like the class. τὰ εἰς τὸν πόλεμον *things belonging to war*. Thus in pre-Christian papyri: πᾶν τὸ ἐξῆς *all other contributions*, τὸ ἐφαύριον, ἐν τῶ μεταξύ, ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν, ἕως . . . , μέχρι . . . , τὸ πρότερον, τὸ πρῶτ, τὰ ἄνω, τὰ ἐνταῦθα, τὰ ἐπάνω, εἰς τὰ μάλιστα, ἐκ τοῦ ὀπίσου (Mayser II, 1, 13). In the NT: εἰς τὸ μέσον, ἐν τῶ μέσῳ, ἐκ τοῦ μέσου (without art., if a gen. follows), Lk 16²⁶ οἱ (S*BD om.) ἐκείθεν, Mt 24²¹ ἕως τοῦ νῦν, 23²⁶ τὸ ἐντός, Jn 8²³, 1 Co 14¹⁶ τὸ ἀμήν, 2 Co 1²⁰ τὸ ναί, τὸ ἀμήν, Rev 3¹⁴ ὁ ἀμήν, Col 3¹¹ τὰ κάτω, τὰ ἄνω, 2 Co 1¹⁷ Jas 5¹² τὸ ναί, τὸ οὐ. Sometimes the noun so formed is used as an adverbial accusative: τὸ πρῶτ, τὸ ἐπτάκις Lk 17^{4D}, τὸ ἀνά δηνάριον Mt 20¹⁰ SCLNZ *everyone a penny*.

The Article with (2) prepositional phrases. Mayser II 1, 9-13: τὰ ἐκ τῆς γῆς *offspring or product*, hence Ro 12¹⁸ τὸ ἐξ ὑμῶν *so far as it originates from you*; papyri τὸ κατ' ἄνδρα distributive, hence pap. and NT τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν *daily*; but also in pap., Ac and Paul τὰ κατὰ τι expresses general relationship, so τὸ κατὰ σάρκα

¹ Cp. Ex Actis Andr. 45²⁸¹ τὸ κρυπτόμενον αὐτοῦ τῆς φύσεως.

Ro 9⁵ = *as far as the material side is concerned*; Ph 1¹² Col 4⁷ τὰ κατ' ἐμέ = *what concerns me*; but the same phrase Ac 25¹⁴ τὰ κατὰ Παῦλον is obviously *Paul's case* in the courts and this may be the correct interpretation in Ph and Col (*my lawsuit*); so Ac 16³⁹ D τὰ καθ' ὑμᾶς = *we acted amiss at your trial in court* (πρᾶγμα). But 2 Co 10⁷ τὰ κατὰ πρόσωπον = *what is in front of you* (spatial); Ro 12⁵ τὸ καθ' εἰς a stereotyped adv. Ac 28⁷ τὰ περὶ τὸν τόπον ἐκεῖνον (local), Herm V iii 3¹ τὰ περὶ τὸν πύργον. Local in the papyri, but sometimes of general relationship like κατὰ; hence probably *my circumstances* in Ph 2²³ τὰ περὶ ἐμέ, and not *my surroundings*. The gen. τὰ περὶ τινος is frequ. in pap. and in Luke and Paul, e.g. Lk 24²⁷ τὰ περὶ ἑαυτοῦ, Ac 18²⁵ τὰ περὶ τοῦ Ἰ. Mk 5²⁷ (but τὰ om. by S^cAC²DLW al) *things concerning* With παρά: Mk 5²⁶ δαπανήσασα τὰ παρ' (παρ' om. DW) ἑαυτῆς class., Lk 10⁷ πίνοντες τὰ παρ' αὐτῶν, Ph 4¹⁸ δεξάμενος . . . τὰ παρ' ὑμῶν. In the pap. τὸ παρά τινος (sing.) is a sum of money to be paid by someone, esp. taxes due (Mayser II 1, 12), but τὰ παρά τινος (pl.) is something sent, an answer, a mandate, an errand, an ordinance. With Ph 4¹⁸ cp. P. Alexandr. 4, 15 (iii/B.C.) εἴλεφεν τὰ παρὰ σοῦ = *he received what you sent*, but P. Teb. I 12, 23 (118 B.C.) ἀποδέχομαι τὰ παρὰ σοῦ = *your instructions*. Cp. Jos. BJ. 2, 124, Ant. 8, 175.

These were all neuter but we have masc. and fem. also with prepositional phrases: Mayser II 1, 14–20 ἀπό, διά g., ἐκ, εἰς, ἐν, ἐπί g., κατὰ acc., μετά g., παρά g. acc., περὶ acc., πρό, πρὸς dat., ὑπό acc. ἀπό: Heb 13²⁴ οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰτ. *Italians*. Inscr. 60 B.C. (Preis. Samm. 4980, 6) οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς πόλεως. Pap. i/B.C. (ib. 5216, 11) οἱ ἀπὸ Ἀλεξανδρείας, etc., very frequ. to represent a person's home or extraction. In the pap. also to denote a class: οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς τραπέζης are *bank officials* PSI IV 383, 8 (248 B.C.), like Ac 12¹ οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας *church folk*, 15⁵ οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς αἵρέσεως.

ἐκ: very frequ. in Paul as we use *-ists* of members of a sect or persuasion: Ro 3²⁶ οἱ ἐκ πίστεως Ἰ. *believers in J.*, 4^{14.16} οἱ ἐκ νόμου *who live by the Law*, ὁ ἐκ πίστεως Ἀ. *who shares A's faith* (a persuasion), Ac 6⁹ οἱ ἐκ τῆς συναγωγῆς (a sect). Class. use of a country: Isocr. 4⁸² οἱ ἐκ τῆς Ἀσίας *Asians*. Papyri of descendants, members of a family or class, residents (like ἀπό); members of a family in Ro 16¹¹ οἱ ἐκ τῶν Ναρκίσσου.

εἰς: Mk 13¹⁶ ὁ εἰς τὸν ἀγρόν. Ac 2³⁹ οἱ εἰς μακρὰν local.

ἐν: Mk 13¹⁴ οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἰ. local.

ἐπί: Mk 13¹⁵ ὁ ἐπὶ τοῦ δώματος local.

κατὰ: Ac 25²³ οἱ κατ' ἐξοχὴν *eminent men*. Eph 5³³ οἱ καθ' ἕνα *as individuals*.

παρά g.: in class. Gk. *those sent out by*. In pap. usually someone's *agent* or assistant, a *proxy*, but less often of relatives and friends (as Mk 3²¹) W. Chr. 10, 6 (130 B.C.) etc., esp. ἡ μήτηρ καὶ οἱ παρ' ἡμῶν πάντες in a private letter BGU VI 1300, 4 (iii-ii/B.C.), 1 Cl. 12⁴ *king's messengers*, 1 Esd 1¹⁵ 1 Mac 2¹⁵ a *king's proxy*, Mk 3²¹ (see J. Moulton in *ET* 20, 1909, 476) οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ but not DW and Lat. *his kinsfolk*, LXX Su³³ *her family and friends*, 1 Mac 9⁴⁴ v1⁵⁸ *his men*. Cf. Jos. Ant. 1, 193.

περί: Mk 4¹⁰ Lk 22⁴⁹ οἱ περὶ αὐτόν *his disciples*; *J. and his disciples* is impossible. Ac 13¹³ 21⁸TR οἱ περὶ (τὸν) Π. *Paul and his party* (class.); *the escorts alone* is impossible. Later than class. οἱ περὶ τινα was often a periphrasis for the person alone: Plu. Pyrrh. 20, 1 οἱ περὶ Φαβρίκιον = *Fabricius*; Tiber. Gracch. 2, 3 οἱ περὶ Δροῦσον = *Drusus*; so in Polyb. 4, 36; 6, 21; 11, 2; Diod. Sic. 1, 16; 1, 37; 19, 19; Ep. Arist. 51; Philo vi cont. 15; Jos. Ant. 13, 187; 15, 370; c. Ap. 1, 17. Probably we have this in NT: Jn 11¹⁹ τὰς περὶ Μ. καὶ Μ. = *Martha and Mary* only (p⁴⁵ AΘ al.). There is little if any support in the pap., unless P. Flind. Petr. I 29, 4 τὰ περὶ τὴν ἀναδενδράδα (Radermacher 2, 118).

The Article with (3) genitives of Nouns. In the pre-Christian papyri this neuter expression denotes (a) residence, possessions, property, house or home of the person in the genitive (Mayser II 1, 8); (b) with impers. genitive the phrase is largely periphrastic: τὰ τῆς γεωργίας = *field work*.

(a) *personal*: Lk 20²⁵ τὰ Καίσαρος, τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ *property of*, 1 Co. 1¹¹ ὑπὸ τῶν Χλόης (strictly ὑπὸ τῶν τῶν Χλόης *by them of Chloe's house*).

(b) *impersonal*. Nothing more subtle than periphrasis is involved: Mt 21²¹ τὸ τῆς συκῆς *the fig tree*, Ro 14¹⁹ τὰ τῆς εἰρήνης *peace*, Jas 4¹⁴ τὸ (τὰ Α) τῆς αὔριον *tomorrow*, 2 Pt 2²² τὸ τῆς ἀληθοῦς παροιμίας *the true proverb*.

§ 3. The Ellipse of Various Nouns

The absence of the noun (although its idea is quite necessary, in contrast to § 1 above) occurs in adjectival and other kinds of attributes (pronominal, participial, adverbial), and the context supplies its lack ¹.

Certain nouns are liable to ellipse in this way in NT and contemporary Greek. So ὁδός is to be supplied in the papyri as in Lk 3⁵ ΟΤ εἰς εὐθείας, 5¹⁹ ποίας, 19⁴ ἐκείνης, and also γῆ or χωρά very frequently: Mt 3⁵ etc. ἡ περιχωρος (Plut. LXX), 23¹⁵ ἡ ξηρά (Xen. LXX), Mk 15²⁹ ἐξ ἐναντίας (D substitutes ἐκεῖ and W omits), Lk 1³⁹. 65 ἡ ὀρεινή, ἡ ἐρημος, ἡ

¹ K-G I 265ff. Gild. I §§ 32-35. Mayser II 1, 20ff.

οἰκουμένη (*world*; class., pap., MGr.), 17²⁴ or better scil. μερίδος (T. Levi 184), Heb 11²⁰ D^cKLP διὰ ξηραῶς (but SAD*E p¹³ p⁴⁶ supply γῆς).

In dates in the pap. ἡμέρα is almost always omitted: Mt 11²³ etc. μέχρι τῆς σήμερον (elsewhere with ἡμέρα), Mt 27⁶² (Mk, Lk, Jn, Jas) τῇ (ἐπ) αὐριον like P. Hamb. I no. 27, 4 (250 B.C.) τῆι ἐφαύριον. Lk 13³² Ac 27¹⁹ τῇ τρίτῃ (elsewhere τῇ τρ. ἡμ.) like P. Eleph. 5, 17 (284 B.C.) τρίτῃ. Lk-Ac τῇ ἑξῆς. Lk 13³³ τῇ ἐχομένῃ, cp. P. Hal. 1, 30 (iii/B.C.) τῆι ἐπομένῃ, but in Ac 21²⁶ with no ellipse of ἡμ. Ac 16¹¹ 20¹⁵ 21¹⁸ τῇ ἐπιούσῃ, like P. Petr. III 56(b) 12 (260 B.C.), but no ellipse of ἡμ. in Ac 7²⁶. Ac 20⁷ etc. τῇ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων. Heb 4⁴ ἡ ἐβδόμη, but same verse has ἡμ. Herm. S. VI 5³ (Clem. Hom. IX.1) πρὸ μιᾶς. Possibly ἀφ' ἧς (Ac 24¹¹ 2 Pt 3⁴ 1 Mac 11¹: *since*)¹, is an ellipse of ἡμ. (or ὥρα in Lk 7⁴⁵). There is no ellipse of ἡμ. at Col 16.⁹ Herm. M. IV 4³, but the phrase is virtually a conjunction.

Χεῖρ is frequ. omitted in phrases like ἡ δεξιὰ, ἡ ἀριστερά Mt 6³ etc., ἐν δεξιᾷ Ro 8³⁴ etc. (unless we assume ἐνδέξια, class., in view of the fact that NT writers have ἐκ δεξιῶν, not ἐν δ.). Herm. S. IX 12⁸ has δεξιὰ and εὐώνυμα. MGr. also. Ptolemaic pap.: δεξιάν P. Petr. II 45 (248 B.C.), but χεῖρ is inserted also in pap.

It is probable that we should supply περίοδος with -μηνος and -ἡμερος ending adjectives. For νυχθήμερος see Blass-Debr. § 121. Hdt 2, 124 ἡ τρίμηνος. Polyb. VI 34⁸ ἡ δίμηνος, XXVII 7² ἡ ἑκμηνος. LXX Ez 39¹⁴ τὴν ἐπτάμηνον. 4 Mac 16⁷ ἐπτὰ δεκάμηνου. Jg 19^{2A} 20^{47A} τετράμηνον anarthrous. Ditt. Syll³ 410⁴. 24 (c 274 B.C.), 442³. 17 (c 250 B.C.). In pre-Christian papyri: Petr. III 78, 13 (iii/B.C.) etc. ἡ πενθήμερος. PSI IV 380, 6 (249 B.C.) ἡ δίμηνος. 408, 9 (iii/B.C.) ἡ τετράμηνος (Mayser II 1, 23). Jn 4³⁵ τετράμηνος anarthrous (-νον HW al). Heb 11²³ OT τρίμηνον (= Ex 2² μῆνας τρεῖς) (-ος p⁴⁶).

The ellipse of ὥρα is probable in other similar examples (e.g. PSI IV 391, 4 (241 B.C.) τῆι δευτέραί τῆς νυκτός): ἔξαιτης *at once*. Not class. are πρώτα and ὀψία in Mt Mk Jn Herm. Mk 11^{11B} ὀψίας οὐσης (other MSS either add τῆς ὥρας or substitute ὀψέ), with which cp. BU II 380³ (iii/A.D.) ὀψ(ε)λας τῆς ὥρας, P. Ox. III 475¹⁶ (A.D. 182) ὀψίας.

Other less frequ. noun-ellipses are the following:

*Ανεμος: Ac 27¹⁸ τῷ πνέοντι (Western).

*Αγαλμα: 19³⁵ τὸ διοπετές.

Αὔρα: 27⁴⁰ τῇ πνεοῦση (indicated by Arrian ep. ad Traj. 5 ταῖς αὔραις ταῖς . . . πνεούσαις). Lucian Herm. 28, Char. 3 τῷ πνέοντι.

Γλώσσα: Rev 9¹¹ ἐν τῇ ἐλληνικῇ (S ἐλληνιδι), or supply διάλεκτος or φωνή LXX.

Δραχμή: Ac 19¹⁹ ἀργυρίου (sc. δραχμῶν, but we would expect ἀργυρίων).

Ἰμάτιον: Mt 11⁸ ἐν μαλακοῖς. Jn 20¹² Herm. V. IV 2¹ ἐν λευκοῖς.

Rev 18¹². 16 βυσσίνου, πορφύρας etc. Pap. (Mayser II 1, 26).

Μέρος: not class. but pre-Chr. pap (τὸ τρίτον, τέταρτον *passim*) Rev: τὸ τρίτον, τέταρτον, δέκατον. Mk 16⁵? ἐν τοῖς δεξιοῖς.

¹ And in weak variants in Herm. S. VIII 1^{4A} (but read ἀφες with P. Mich. See below p. 94.) 6^{6A} (but read ἀφότε with P. Mich.).

Πληγή: Lk 12⁴⁷ δαρήσεται πολλάς . . . ὀλίγας. 2 Co 11²⁴ τεσσαράκοντα παρὰ μίαν.

Πύλη: Jn 5² but this could not be supplied by the general reader without local knowledge; it is suspect, being om. by Syrcur. *resh*.

Ῥάβδος: Heb 5⁷ ἱκετηρίας (or sc. ἐλαία). Büchsel in Kittel WB III 297f traces the origin to the olive branches of the suppliant, whence after Isocr. the adj. came to mean *earnest supplication*.

Ῥόδωρ: Mt 10⁴² ψυχροῦ. Jas 3¹¹ τὸ γλυκὺ καὶ τὸ πικρὸν. Aristoph. Nub. and pap: θερμόν (Gild. I § 38).

Ῥετόν: Jas 5⁷ προῖμον καὶ ὄψιμον (S)B.

Ῥελαία: Ro 11²⁴ ἡ ἀγριέλαιος, καλλιέλαιος. Ῥελαίον supplied in papyri (Mayser II 1, 24).

It remains only to notice under this head some stereotyped phrases where there is noun-ellipsis:

Ῥαπὸ μιᾶς: Lk 14¹⁸ sc. γνώμη or ὁρμή or φωνή, or more probably γλῶσσα in view of Philo V 170⁸ ἀπὸ μιᾶς καὶ τῆς αὐτῆς γνώμης = with one mind or voice. And some would supply φορὰ *impetus*. It may be Aramaism rather than ellipse (*min ch'dā*) = *at once*, but it occurs in secular PSI II 286²² (iii-iv/A.D.) = *at once*, and Wilcken. Chrest. 46, 15 (A.D. 338) μίαν ἐκ μιᾶς (sc. ἡμέρα), and in MGr. Lagrange (*S. Luc* 404) suggests that ὁδός or φωνή or preferably γνώμη be understood.

Κατὰ μόνας: There is no knowing what noun to supply. Mk 4¹⁰ Lk 9¹⁸, LXX Ge 32¹⁶ Ps 4⁹ Je 15¹⁷ 1 Mac 12³⁸. Thuc. I 32.5. Xen. Mem. 3.7.4. Menander. Polyb. 4.15.11. Diod. Sic. 4.51.16. Jos. BJ 6, 326; Ant. 17, 336, etc. Herm. M. XI 8. MGr καταμόναχο. BGU III 813, 15 (ii/A.D.).

Κατ' ἴδιον: Mt 14¹³, 23, 17¹, 19, 20¹⁷, 24³, Mk 4³⁴ 6³¹ 7³³ 9², 28 13³, Lk 9¹⁰ 10²³, Ac 23¹⁹, Ga 2². 2 Mac 4⁵ 14²¹. Ign Sm. 7². Hellenistic, not class.: Plut. 2, 120d. Polyb. 1, 71, 1; 4, 84, 8. Diod. Sic. 1, 21. Philo sacr. Abel. 136. Jos. BJ. 2, 199. Pap: P. Or. gr. 51, 9 (239 B.C.); 737, 7 (ii/B.C.). Insc: Dit. Syll³. 1157, 10, and see L.S. s.v. ἴδιος. Uncertain what noun to supply.

Ἰδίᾳ: the class. equivalent of the last. 1 Co 12¹¹ PSI IV 434¹² (261 B.C.).

Δημοσίᾳ: Ac 16³⁷ etc. = *openly*. Dit. Syll. 807⁹ (A.D. 138) = *publicly*. Vettius Valens p. 71²² *publicly*. Different meaning in class. Attic: *at the public expense* or *by public consent*.

PART I
WORD-MATERIAL FOR SENTENCE-BUILDING

This page intentionally left blank

CHAPTER TWO

THE GENDER AND NUMBER OF NOUNS

§ 1. The Gender of Nouns¹

As in class. Greek² the neuter gender may refer to a person (e.g. τὸ γεγεννημένον Jn 3⁶ 1 Jn 5⁴, cp. masc. 5¹), provided that the emphasis is less on the individual than on some outstanding general quality like *foolishness*; ³ πᾶν is often added to make this clear (1 Jn 5⁴, Jn 17² πᾶν ὁ like Heb. $\text{כָּל} \text{לֵב}$, 6³⁷ πᾶν ὁ resolves itself into τὸν ἐρχόμενον. Ga 3²² τὰ πάντα but τοὺς πάντας in Ro 11³². Jn 12³² πάντα S*D p⁶⁶ lat Aug; rest masc.)

Mt 12⁶ μείζον *something greater?* 12^{41f} πλείον. Lk 1³⁵ τὸ γεννώμενον (was τὸ τέκνον in mind?). Jn 17²⁴ the gift is depicted first in its unity = ὁ, then individually = κάκεινος. 1 Co 12^{7f} τὰ μῶρα . . . τὰ ἀσθενῆ . . . τὰ ἰσχυρά, pl. not to confuse with sing. in 12⁵. 2 Th 2⁶ neut. synonymous with ὁ κατέχων 2⁷. 1 Co 11⁵ she is one and the same as if (ἐν καὶ τὸ αὐτό). Heb 7⁷ τὸ ἕλαττον 9⁵ χερουβεὶν as neut. pl. (or sing. AP). See Bauer s.v. for discussion and bibliography. Neut. pl. used adverbially Ph 2⁶ τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ (ἴσα Thuc. III 14. Abel § 41a).

A direct Hebraism is fem. for neut.⁴: Mt 21⁴² LXX = Mk 12¹¹ = Ps 117 (118)²³ αὐτή = אִתָּה i.e. τοῦτο. LXX Ps 27³. 4 32⁶ 74¹⁸ 102¹⁹ 119⁵⁰. 56 αὐτή. 1 Km 4⁷ τοιαύτη. Etc.

Perhaps an Aramaism is Lk 11³³ εἰς κρυπτήν, where fem. pass. ptc. = a neuter, *hidden*; Bauer on the other hand takes the view = εἰς κρύπτῃν (see s.v.).

Note also the use of fem. to form adv. phrases: Lk 14¹⁸ ἀπὸ μιᾶς (see ch. 1). Mk 4¹⁰ κατὰ μόνας (ch. 1). LXX Jg 7⁵.

A masc. for a fem. is Mk 5¹⁵ λεγιῶν (because demon's name).

A fem. for a masc. is ἡ βία.

Note the variation in the gender of λιμός Lk 4²⁵; Lk 15¹⁴ Ac 11²⁸; same variation in a papyrus ii/B.C.

¹ K-Blass I 358ff. Schwyzer II 27-38. Mayser II 1, 28-34. R. Meister, "Genus bei den LXX" (Wien Stud. 34, 77ff). H. Roensch, *Itala und Vulgata*, 1869, 452.

² Examples in K-G I 14.

³ M. J. Lagrange, *S. Matthieu*, Paris 1948, 233, on Mt 12⁶.

⁴ P. Katz, *Philo's Bible*, Cambridge 1950, 25f. Swete Intr.³ 307.

Inscriptions give a parallel for ἡ θεός and ἡ θεά Ac 19²⁷. Also papyri: θεοὶ . . . πᾶσαι P. Eleph. 23¹³ (223 B.C.). SB 3444 (iii/B.C.). Or. gr. 132¹² (130 B.C.). θεὰς πάσας P. Grad. = SB 5680 (229 B.C.). Attic θεός was common gender, but later -α indicated a fem. deity ¹.

Sometimes a pl. masc. noun covers masc. and fem. subjects: Lk 2⁴¹ οἱ γονεῖς. To 10¹² B τοὺς πενθερούς. So οἱ ἀδελφοί, οἱ παῖδες. Thus οἱ κύριοι (Lk 19³³ Ac 16^{16, 19}) may cover a man and woman owner ².

The form πέτρος (Mt 16¹⁸ σὺ εἶ πέτρος καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρῃ) which is usually masc. (but in Hell. period also fem., probably in accordance with λίθος) means a *boulder*, a *stone*, and as a simplex it is restricted on the whole to poetic and elevated diction. On the other hand, the generally preferred πέτρα means chiefly *rock*; it is also a kind of collective or augmentative to πέτρος, and later it takes also the meaning a *fragment of rock*, a *stone*. The name of the apostle Πέτρος, if it actually means *rock* and corresponds to Aram. Κηφῶς, cannot be connected directly with πέτρος, since this was out of general use; it does not mean *rock* but is a masculinizing of πέτρα (Wackernagel op. cit. 14f).

§ 2. The Number of Nouns ³

SINGULAR: (1) In LXX and pre-Christian papyri, a generic sing. may appear with persons or races, and in the pap. with numbers (like our *six foot*). The usage is not unclass., especially in the historians, and dates from Homer (Schw. II 41): with ὁ Ἰουδαῖος Ro 3¹ (*the Jew as a Jew*) cp. ὁ Συρακόσιος and ὁ Ἀθηναῖος Thuc. 6, 78, 1, ὁ Χαλκιδεύς 6, 84, 3, ὁ Ἕλληγ Hdt 1, 69, and the proverb *Romanus sedendo vincit*, etc. With ὁ ἀγαθὸς ἄνθρωπος and ὁ πονηρὸς ἄ. Mt 12³⁵, ὁ ἀσθενῶν Ro 14¹, τὸ ἀγαθὸν ἔργον 13³, and ὁ δίκαιος and ὁ ἀσεβής 1 Pt 4¹⁸, cp. ὁ δικαστής Lycurg. 79. Generic also are the class. κέραμος Thuc. 2, 4, 2 and ἄμπελος 4, 90, 2. With class. ἡ ἵππος Hdt 1, 80, cp. LXX Ge 14¹¹ *cavalry*, Ex 8⁶ ἀνεβιβάσθη (ὁ) ἡ βάτραχος *frogs*. 1 Pt 2²⁴ LXX τῷ μῶλωπι ἰάθητε Rev. 11⁸ πτώμα αὐτῶν.

¹ Wackernagel II², 25.

² So Souter in *Expos.* VIII, 1914, 94f; IX, 1915, 94f.

³ K-G I, 13-20. Schwyzer II 38-46. Gild. I §§ 37, 42-59. Mayser II 1, 34-45. Wackernagel I 73-105. U. Holzmeister, "De 'plurali categoriae' in Novo Testamento et a Patribus adhibito," *Biblica* 14, 1933, 68-95.

It is not possible to classify here ὁ πρῶτος Jas 2⁶ or ὁ δίκαιος 5⁶; these refer to an individual example (e.g. 2²).

We demur also at 1 Co 6⁵ ἀνά μέσον τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ: it is less likely to be generic than a combined result of Semitic influence and abbreviation thereof (full: *between brother and brother*), because in LXX we find e.g. ἄ.μ. ὕδατος καὶ ὕδατος Ge 1⁶ and ἄ.μ. ποιμνης καὶ ποιμνης 32¹⁶. It is not a great step to omit the repeated noun.

(2) Contrary to normal Greek and Latin practice, the NT sometimes follows the Aram. and Heb. preference for a distributive sing. Something belonging to each person in a group of people is placed in the sing.: as τὸ σῶμα ὑμῶν 1 Co 6¹⁹, ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῶν Lk 1⁶⁶. On the other hand, NT does frequ. exhibit the pl., e.g. καρδίαι Mt 9⁴.

καρδία sing. of a group (Sem.)		Pl. of a group (normal)
Mt. Mk.	Mt 13 ¹⁵ LXX 15 ⁸ LXX = Mk 7 ⁶ . Mk 3 ⁵ 6 ⁵² 7 ²¹ 8 ¹⁷	Mt 9 ⁴ 18 ³⁵ (sing. Syr. Copt ^{bo}) Mk 2 ^{6,8} (sing. Syr ^{pe} . Copt ^{bo} 2MSS)
Lk. Ac	Lk 1 ^{51,66} 8 ^{12,15} 9 ⁴⁷ 12 ³⁴ 24 ^{32,38} Ac 2 ³⁷ 28 ²⁷ LXX bis	Lk 1 ¹⁷ 3 ¹⁵ 5 ²² 16 ¹⁵ 21 ^{14,34} Ac 7 ^{39,51} v ¹⁵⁴ 14 ¹⁷ 15 ⁹
Jn	12 ⁴⁰ LXX 14 ^{1,27} 16 ^{6,22}	
Paul	Ro 1 ²¹ 2 Co 3 ¹⁵ 6 ¹¹ LXX Eph 1 ¹⁸ 4 ¹⁸ 5 ¹⁹ 6 ⁵ Ph 1 ⁷ Col 3 ¹⁶ DcEKL	Ro 1 ²⁴ 2 ¹⁵ 5 ⁵ 16 ¹⁸ 2 Co 1 ²² 3 ² 4 ⁶ 7 ³ Ga 4 ⁶ Eph 3 ¹⁷ 6 ²² Ph 4 ⁷ Col 2 ² 3 ^{15,16} 4 ⁸ 1 Th ²⁴ LXX 3 ¹³ 2 Th 2 ¹⁷ 3 ⁵
Heb	8 ¹⁰ LXX vl.	3 ⁸ LXX 15 ^{LXX} 4 ⁷ LXX 8 ¹⁰ LXX vl. 10 ¹⁶ LXX 2 ²
Jas	3 ¹⁴	4 ⁸ 5 ^{5,8}
Jn. Epp	1 Jn 3 ¹⁹ vl. 20 ^{bis} 2 ¹	3 ¹⁹ S lat Syr ^h
Pet.		1 Pt 3 ¹⁵ 2 Pt 1 ¹⁹
Rev		17 ¹⁷

κεφαλή sing. of a group		Pl. as normal
Mt. Mk.	Mt 10 ³⁰ = Lk 12 ⁷	Mt 27 ²⁹ = Mk 15 ²⁹
Lk. Ac	Lk 12 ⁷ = Mt 10 ³⁰ Lk 21 ¹⁸ Ac 18 ⁶ 21 ²⁴	Lk 21 ²⁸
Rev		44 97. 17. 19 18 ¹⁹
LXX	Ps 21(22) ⁷ 37 ⁴ Je 14 ⁴ 18 ¹⁶ Ziegler La 2 ¹⁵ etc.	Ps 108(109) ²⁵ etc.

ὄσφρς sing. of a group		Pl. as normal
Lk. Ac		Lk 12 ³⁶
Paul	Eph 6 ¹⁴	
1 Pt		1 ¹³

σῶμα sing. of a group		Pl. as normal
Mt. Lk	6 ²⁵ = Lk 12 ²²	
Paul	Ro 8 ²³ 1 Co 6 ^{19. 20} 2 Co 4 ¹⁰	1 Co 6 ¹⁵ Eph 5 ²⁸
Jas	3 ³	

χείρ with preposition (metaph.) εἰς, ἐκ, ἐπί, διά		Plural
Mt. Mk		Mt 17 ²² = Mk 9 ³¹ = Lk 9 ⁴⁴ Mt 26 ⁴⁵ = Mk 14 ⁴¹ = Lk 24 ⁷
Lk. Ac	Lk 1 ^{71. 74} Ac 2 ²³ (but C ³ EP pl) 15 ²³	Ac 5 ¹² 14 ³ 24 ⁷ v1 28 ¹⁷
Jn	10 ³⁹	
Rev	13 ¹⁶ 20 ⁴	

In addition we find ἀπὸ προσώπου and similar Semitisms always sing.: Lk 2³¹ Ac 3^{18. 21} 7⁴⁵; κατὰ πρ. Lk 2³¹; διὰ στόματος Lk 1⁷⁰ Ac 3^{18. 21} Eph 4²⁹ Col 3⁸ Rev 11⁵. We find distrib. sing. τύπον 1 Th 1⁷ (see Milligan's note) 2 Th 3⁹; στολή λευκή Rev 6¹¹. Distrib. sing. also in papyri: κατὰ γεωργόν (Mayser II 1, 45 n. 6).

PLURAL: Exceptionally the pl. may be used in the NT for one person or thing in both a Semitic and a normal Greek manner¹.

(1) *Semitic*. אַלְמָנוּת is behind αἰῶνες², which means both *world* (Heb 1² 11³ 1 Ti 1^{17?} 1 Cl 35³ 55⁶ 61² To 13^{7. 11}) and *eternity* (Sext. Emp. phys. 1, 62. Orac. Sib. 3, 767. Barn 18² To 13² Si 18¹ Da 6²⁷ Lk 1³³ Ga 1⁵ Eph 2⁷ 3¹¹ Jude²⁵ Rev 14¹¹, and often), esp. in εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας (Ps 60⁵ 76⁸ 88⁶³ Mt 6¹³ v1 Lk 1³³ Ro 1²⁵ 9⁵ 11³⁶ 2 Co 11³¹ Heb 13⁸), εἰς πάντας . . . (To 13⁴ Da 3⁵² Enoch 9⁴ Or. Sib. 3⁵⁰ Jude²⁵), and εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων (Ps 83⁵ ZP 4, 1038, 22b 15, Ro 16²⁷ Ga 1⁵ Ph 4²⁰ 1 Ti 1¹⁷ 2 Ti 4¹⁸ Heb 13²¹ 1 Pt 4¹¹ 5¹¹ Rev 4^{9t} 10⁶ 15⁷ 19³ 20¹⁰ 22⁵, 1 Cl 20¹² 32⁴ 38⁴ 43⁶). Thus we have *end of the world* τὰ τέλη τῶν αἰώνων in 1 Co. 10¹¹, as in T. Levi 14¹, but it may be the normal pl. of αἰών: *the fulfilment of the ages or the frontiers of the ages* (i.e. the limits dividing one of the seven ages from the ensuing one); Or. Sib. 8³¹¹ τέλος αἰώνων *end of time*.

οὐρανοί is behind οὐρανοί: but here again, following a Jewish idea, the pl. of seven heavens may be intended, esp. in 2 Co 12² Eph 4¹⁰. In the material sense of *sky* the sing. predominates: the exceptional plurals are Mt 24³¹ (contrast Mk 13²⁷, LXX De 30⁴), 3^{16. 17} = Mk 1^{10. 11} (but Lk has sing.), Ac 7⁵⁶. In the less common figurative sense of *heaven* as God's abode the pl. predominates, as Mt 5^{16. 45} 6¹ etc.: the exceptional singulars (like ὁ μέγας ἐν οὐρανῷ Ζεὺς Plat. Phaed. 246E) are Lk 10^{20D} (rest pl) 11¹³ (exc. p⁴⁵) Eph 6^{8S} (rest pl) Col 4^{1S*} BAC (rest pl) 1 Pt 1^{4S} (rest pl), everywhere in Jn and Rev (exc. 12² LXX) Did 8². Taken as a whole, the sing. is more normal Greek, and scribes would correct to the sing. There is a significant variant at Mk 13²⁷: pl. is found in some MSS and some Old Latin, which is perhaps original in view of the tendency of scribes. In LXX the sing. is normal (Ge 1¹ 14^{19. 22} To 7¹⁷ BA Da Bel⁵ 1 Mac 2²⁷ al), with pl. in poetic passages (Jth 9¹², esp. Pss). For the LXX see P. Katz, *Philo's Bible* 141–146; H. Traub in Kittel WB V 510f.

(2) *Normal Greek but late*. Class. poetic sometimes: ἄρματα of one only (K-G I 18, n. 2). The allusive pl. is sometimes used when a class or variety rather than number is stressed. This is so in post-class. Greek and always the importance of the individual's action appears to be emphasized, not that of a group: Mt 2²⁰ τεθνήκασιν οἱ ζητοῦντες

¹ Kummerer. *Über den Gebrauch des Plur. statt des Sing. bei Soph. und Eur.*, 1869. Wackernagel I 97ff.

² H. Sasse in Kittel WB I 197–208 (αἰῶνες).

(Herod), Ostr. Berol. P. 10987 = SB 4631 (106 B.C.) τῶν οἴνων *the wine*, P. Hib. 54, 23 (245 B.C.) *send us the cheese* (τυρούς). P. Petr. II 20 col. 2, 5 πλήθη σίτου *a quantity of corn* (250 B.C.). PSI VI 584, 30 (iii/B.C.) γράφον μοι . . . ἀντίγραφα *an answer* (Mayser II 1, 34f, 39).

A difficult pl. which may be explained in this way is Mt 2²³ *prophets*: the reference is to one prophet only. Zerwick calls it *pluralis categoriae* (§ 4a) and he further suggests it as an explanation of Mt 27⁴⁴ (after Jerome, Aug., Ambrose): both robbers are said to reproach Jesus whereas it was only one, and we need not call in another tradition to help us out. Other difficulties are thus solved: Mt 14⁹ Mk 6²⁶ ὄρκους *oath* (Xen. Hell 5, 4, 54. 2 Mac 4³⁴ 7²⁴ 14³². Ep. Arist. 126. Jos. Ant. 3, 272; 7, 294; see J. Schneider in Kittel WB V 458-467). Mt 21⁷ ἐπεκάθισεν ἐπάνω αὐτῶν (scribes soften the harshness), 22⁷ *army*, Mk 4¹⁰ *parable*, 7³⁷ *deaf* . . . *dumb* (sing.), Lk 5²¹ βλασφημίας sing, Jn 6¹⁴ σημεῖα B al. Old Lat a boh, 6²⁶ σημεῖα 8²⁴ *sin*, 9¹⁶ *sign*, 10²¹ *blind man*. Zerwick (§ 4b) suggests that the women of Mt 28⁹ is a pl. of category referring only to Magdalene, in view of Jn 20¹⁴⁻¹⁸. Abel suggests (§ 41d) that this pl. of species is used in Ac 21²⁸ Ἕλληνας = only Trophimus! 19³⁸ ἀνθύπατοί εἰσιν too, because there was but one proconsul. Matthew uses the pl. of ὄχλος where we do not find the word at all in Mark: 5¹ 7²⁸ 9⁸. 33 12⁴⁶ 13³⁴. 36 14¹⁵. In this respect he is supported by Luke in Mt 11⁷ 12²³ 14¹³. In addition, Matthew has ὄχλοι πολλοί 4²⁵ 8¹. 18 v1 13² 15³⁰ 19². It seems that ὄχλοι πολλοί means no more than ὄχλος or ὄχλος πολὺς (or πλεῖστος) or πολὺ πλῆθος (Mk 3⁷), and is not intended to be understood of separate groups, in view of the Mk and Lk parallels. Therefore πολλοί must be taken in the unusual sense (as with χρόνοι) of *great* (= ἱκανοί or μεγάλοι). The usage is not quite confined to Mt (see Lk 5¹⁵ 14²⁵). But the motive for using the pl. of ὄχλος is not clear; it is confined to Mt Lk and Ac 1-17 (apart from a v1 in Mk and Jn, and Rev 17¹⁵ where more than one crowd is meant). Probably it betrays the influence of the later Greek meaning of the pl., i.e. *the masses*.

(3) *Classical*. The directions *north*, *south*, etc. are pl. Mt 21²⁴ 27 Lk 13²⁹ ἀπο ἀνατολῶν. Pl. also in Diod. Sic II 43, Dio Cass. 987. 32, Jos. c. Ap. 1, 77, Philo spec. leg. 3, 187, Lucian peregr. 39, 1 Cl. 10⁴, LXX Ge 13¹⁴ Nu 23⁷. But sometimes sing. in NT: Mt 2². 9 ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ (or is the sing. astronomical rather than geographical? See Bauer s.v. = *rising*). Rev 7², 16¹² ἀνατολῆς (-ῶν A). 21¹³ ἀνατολῆς (even alongside pl. δυσμῶν; but B^c ἀνατολῶν). Dit. Syll³ 1112, 25. Jos. Ant. 1, 37 al. Herm. V. I 4, 1.3. Also δυσμαί *west*, which is sing. in LXX, Enoch, Philo, Jos., Or. Sib., but generally pl. in Biblical Greek: BGU 1049, 8. LXX Ps 106³. T. Jud 5². Mt 8¹¹ 24²⁷ Lk 13²⁹ 12⁵⁴ Rev 21¹³. In MGr some place-names exist in the pl., referring to the region around; thus Ἀνατολάς = various parts of Asia Minor (Thumb Handbook³ 27f); it may be that here we have a clue to the pl. ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν Mt 2¹ (also LXX Ge 11²).

Right and *left* are pl., but also (as class.) sometimes sing: Ro 8³⁴ Eph 1²⁰ etc. *District* is pl. τὰ μέρη Mt 2²² etc., and *beyond* ἐπέκεινα Ac 7⁴³ LXX Am 5²⁷ probably (better v1 ἐπὶ τὰ μέρη D^{*}). Names of

festivals are formed on the class. principle, as in the papyri (Mayser II 1, 39): Mt 14⁶ Mk 6²¹ Jn 10²². *Sabbath* pl. for sing.: Zen. P. Cairo 762.6 (iii/B.C.), Plu. mor. 169c, Mt 12^{1.5} 28¹ Mk 12¹ Lk 4¹⁶ Ac 13¹⁴ 16¹⁸ Col 2¹⁶, LXX Ex 20¹⁰ Le 23³², Philo Abr. 28, Jos. Ant. 1, 33, Diog. 4, 3. That is unless we take *σάββατα* as a sing. (formed from *Πᾶσι* with *-α* added to make it easier Greek). Other pl. festivals: τὰ ἑξέμια Mt 26¹⁷ Lk 22¹ Ac 12³ etc. Mk 14¹ (D om); οἱ γάμοι *wedding* (feast) poet. class., frequent in papyri (where sing. = *wedlock*, as sing. in Heb 13⁴): Preisigke s.v. (ii/A.D.), P. Ox I 111 (iii/A.D.), BGU III 909.3 (A.D. 359); also Diog. L. 3.2; it is suggested that the pl. is a Latinism from *nuptiae*; Mt 22² 25¹⁰ etc., Est 2¹⁸ 9²². Sing.: Mt 22⁸ Jn 2^{1f} and LXX. To 6¹³ 8¹⁹ 1 Mac 9³⁷ 10⁶⁸. Τὰ πάσχα Mt 26^{18W} may be a mistake for τὸ πάσχα. Τὰ γενέσια (γενέθλια class. papyri; Mayser II 1, 39) Mt 14⁶ Mk 6²¹. Τὰ ἐγκαίνια LXX and Jn 10²².

Further class. plurals: πύλαι Mt 16¹⁸ only Wi 16¹³ (elsewhere sing. for one gate); θύραι in NT of one door in fixed idioms only, ἐπὶ θύραις Mt 24³³ = Mk 13²⁹, πρὸ τῶν θ. fig. Jas 5⁹, πρὸ τῆς θ. lit. Ac 12⁶, elsewhere several doors Jn 20¹⁹. 26 Ac 5¹⁹ 16²⁶ 21³⁰ (5²³ sing. or pl.?). κόλποι Hell. Lk 16²³ (sing.²²); αἵματα¹ shed blood of several persons, LXX Hab 2⁸ etc. Rev 16^{6S} (sing. BACP) 18^{24B} (sing. p⁴⁷ SACP), ancestral Jn 1¹³ (of husband and wife); ὕδατα Mt 14^{28f} Jn 3²³ Rev 1¹⁵ 14² 17^{1.15} etc.

Less usual in class. Greek: ἀργύρια Mt 26¹⁵ 27⁵ 28¹²; ὀφώνια Hell. LXX pap. (sing. and pl. iii/B.C.; Mayser II 1, 37) Lk 3¹⁴ Ro 6²³ etc., sing. 2 Co 11⁸; κέντρα². Hell. Ac 9⁵ TR 26¹⁴ (perhaps pl. because the goad was double-pointed); ἱμάτια *upper garment* Jn 13⁴ 19²³ Ac 18^{6.7} (but *clothes* pl. Mk 5³⁰ et al.); χιτῶνες Mk 14⁶³; τὰ ἄγια *temple*, or part of, LXX, e.g. 3 Km 8⁶ Jdt 4¹² 16²⁰ 1 Mac 3⁴³ etc. Or. Sib. 3³⁰⁸ Heb 8² 9^{2.3} 24^f 13¹¹ Philo Jos.; αἱ κριθαὶ Rev 6⁶ SACP (sing. B), sing. in post-cl. and LXX (Bauer s.v.; Mayser II 1, 35, several papyri iii/B.C.); αἱ διαθῆκαι Eph 2¹² Ro 9⁴ SCK (sing. p⁴⁶ BDE), sing. elsewhere in LXX NT; names of towns, Φίλιπποι, Ἀθήναι, Πάταρα, Ἱεροσόλυμα (P. Zen. 259 B.C.), To AB, 1 Esd A (see Abel § 41); αἱ ἐπιστολαὶ 1 Co 16^{3f}; ἡμέραι Mk 2²⁰ (and *one day* in same verse) but probably a Hebraism; καιροὶ *period* Rosetta stone 20 (196 B.C.) P. Petr. II 45 (246 B.C.) PSI IV 432, 5 (iii/B.C.), P. Par. 46, 7 (153 B.C.) etc. Mt 16³ this (*end-*) *period*, 21⁴¹ Lk 21²⁴ (T. Naphth. 7¹), Ac 1⁷ 17²⁶ *the allotted span*, Ac 3¹⁹ *Messianic period* (so 1 Th. 5¹ 1 Ti 4¹); χρόνοι Lk 8²⁷ TR (rest sing.) 20⁹ 23⁸ Ac 1⁷ Ro 16²⁵ 1 Th 5¹ 2 Ti 1⁹ Ti 1² 1 Pt 1²⁰ Jude¹⁸ Pol 1², not quite *years*, as in much later Greek, but advancing that way, certainly *period*, as in τῶν ἐπάνω χρόνων (*the earlier period*) P. Hib. 96, 6.23 (259 B.C.), Mayser II 1, 38, 2 Cl. 19⁴ οἱ νῦν χρ. = *the present period*, Herm. S. IX 20, 4 οἱ πρότεροι χρ. = *the earlier period*, M. Pol. XVI 2 οἱ καθ' ἑμᾶς χρ. = *our own period*.

Sometimes NT uses the Pluralis Poeticus for abstract subjects in a class. way³: e.g. φόνου P. Teb I 5, 5 (118 B.C.), μοιχεῖαι, πορνεῖαι,

¹ See Behm in Kittel WB I 172 n. 6.

² See K. L. Schmidt in Kittel WB III 664, 18ff.

³ E.g. θρόνοι μάχαραι σκῆπτρα in the tragedians: Menge, *De poetarum scaenic. Graec. sermone*, Göttingen 1905, 32ff.

κλοπαί Mt 15¹⁹ Mk 7^{21f}; ἔρεις, ζῆλοι (v1 in 2 Co 12²⁰) Ga 5^{20f}, with several other abstract nouns; ὑποκρίσεις 1 Pt 2¹ v1, with other abstracts, 4³, 1 Co 7² Jas 2¹ Jude¹³. These plurals may imply *cases of . . .* (Katz, op. cit. 112). In 2 Co 11²³ 2 Co 1¹⁰ (p⁴⁶ Syr) θάνατοι may imply ways of dying, i.e. *deadly perils*. Similar examples are μεθοδεΐαι Eph 6¹¹ *astuteness*; οἰκτιρμοί Ro 12¹ etc. (Hebrew), sing. Col 3¹² (K pl.); ἀναγκαί 2 Co 6⁴ 12¹⁰; θελήματα *that which (I) wish* Ac 13²² Eph 2³; μάχαι 2 Co 7⁵ Ti 3⁹; φόβοι 2 Co 7⁵ Xen. hier. 6, 5. Behind these plurals may be the thought of the diversity of words or expressions involved, although the Atticists resorted to the pl. to avoid hiatus.

The Pluralis Sociativus, or letter writer's plural (or *modestiae* or *auctoris*), is frequent in Paul especially with personal and possessive pronoun, but mainly where he seems to be writing on behalf of a group: Col 1³ (but sing. Eph 1^{15f}) Ro 1⁵. See also Mk 4³⁰ Heb 5¹¹ 6^{1.3.9.11} 13^{18f.22f} 1 Jn 1⁴. This is common enough in all periods of Greek from Homer onwards and does not call for much comment. One can safely judge only by the context what number the writer really intends, since sing. and pl. alternate as capriciously in Paul as in contemporary letters. In 1 Jn the writer seems to identify himself very closely with other members of the fellowship; hence *we*.¹

¹ On this subject see K. Dick, *Der schriftst. Pl. bei Paulus*, Halle 1900, Wackernagel I 98f, Stauffer in Kittel WB II 341A, 354f, Moule 118f.

CHAPTER THREE

THE COMPARISON OF ADJECTIVES AND ADVERBS

Comparison in Biblical Greek¹ is affected by the double influence of Semitic usages and the general trend of the Greek language. This resulted in more emphatic comparison, the positive adjective with παρά (= Heb. adj. and η), a levelling of comparative and superlative, and a moving down one stage in the use of each of the three degrees. The disappearance of the Dual number is in line with this popular inability to distinguish between comparative and superlative (Zerwick § 112).

§ 1. Heightening of Comparison

As in the papyri the genuine comparative is still in wide use but the opportunity is frequently taken to heighten comparison by the addition to the comparative of particles like ἔτι and adverbs like πολύ and πολλῶ and even accumulations like πολλῶ μᾶλλον much more than in class. Greek². Note also the comparative form of a comparative: 3 Jn⁴ and Archiv f. Pap. (Wilcken) iii 173 (iv/A.D.) μειζότεραν.

Πολύ or πολλῶ: PSI IV 435, 19 (258 B.C.), Ros. stone 31 (196 B.C.), Jn 4⁴¹ 2 Co 8²²; πολλῶ μᾶλλον P Par 26, 48 (163 B.C.) Ph 1²³ *much more better!*; μᾶλλον: 1 Cl 48⁶, Herm. S. IX 28⁴, 2 Co 7¹³; μᾶλλον περισσότερον Mk 7³⁶; πολύ μᾶλλον: P. Tor. VIII 65 (119 B.C.), inscr. Preiss. Samm. 5827, 17 (69 B.C.); ἔτι: P. Petr. II 13(18b)11 (255 B.C.), Ph 1⁹ *still more greatly*, Heb 7¹⁵ *still more manifest*.

§ 2. Comparative for True Superlative

Mt 8¹² τὸ σκότος τὸ ἐξώτερον, 11¹¹, 18¹. ὁ μείζων (or relative: *very*). In Apollodorus, of Odysseus tied under the *largest* ram: τῷ μείζονι (Radermacher² 68); μέγιστος is almost obsolete by this time, but appears

¹ K.-G I 20ff, II 301ff. Schwyzer II 183-185. Gild. §§ 28-39. Mayser II 1, 45-54. Jannaris 315-317. Radermacher² ch. VII. M. Zerwick S. J., *Græcitas Biblica*³, Rome 1955, §§ 107-116. Otto Schwab, *Historische Syntax der griechischen Comparison in der klassischen Litteratur* (Beitr. zur histor. Syntax der griech. Spr. herausg. v. M. Schanz. IV 1-3), 1893-95.

² Hesiod Erga 127 πολὺ χειρότερον.

in Atticistic 2 Peter. Mk 9³⁴ τίς μείζων, Lk 7²⁸ ὁ μικρότερος *the least*, 9⁴⁸ ὁ μικρότερος ἐν πᾶσιν ὑμῖν, 1 Co 12²³ Heb 8¹¹, LXX 1 Km 17^{13A} 14A Jg 6¹⁵, Barn 12² ὑψηλότερος πάντων *highest of all*.

§ 3. Comparative for Elative Superlative

In many instances where the comp. form indicates an unusually high degree of comparison in the NT and papyri (but not in Hermas), one may speak of an *elative* sense which normally belongs to the superlative. This is not class. usage and is characteristic of the inferior popular speech (Mayser II 1, 49f).

Add to Mayser's examples: P Teb. 33 (ii/B.C.) ἐν μίζονι ἀξιώματι, BU II 417, 28 (ii-iii/A.D.), 451, 11 (i-ii/A.D.), 615, 9.28 (ii/A.D.) ταχύτερον Ac 24²⁶ πυκνότερον *very often* or *so much the more often*, 2 Cl 17³ *as often as possible*, also Clem. Hom. ep. ad Jac 9, Ga 4¹³ τὸ πρότερον = τὸ πρῶτον *originally* (but the true compar. sense is possible: *the first time*), Ac 27¹³ ἄσσον *as near as possible* (or read θᾶσσον), 24²² ἀκριβέστερον *very accurately*, 18²⁶ 23^{15.20} same, P Petr. II 16.13 (iii/B.C.), PSI IV 444, 11 (iii/B.C.), Epict. I 24, 10, Herm. V. III 10¹⁰, Philo, Jos., BU II 388 II 41 (ii-iii/A.D.), Ac 25¹⁰ κάλλιον *very well* (or merely pos.), 2 Ti 1¹⁸ βέλτιον same (Ac 10^{28D}), Ac 4^{16D} φανερότερον *extremely obvious*, 17²² δεισιδαιμονεστέρους not class. *rather* but probably popular *elative extremely god-fearing* (strengthened by ὡς), 2 Co 8¹⁷ σπουδαιότερος *very zealous*, Ph 2²⁸ adv., Clem. Hom. 1¹⁴ τάχιον *as quickly as possible*, 11¹³ same (distinguish from 9²³). But in some instances these might well be comp. for pos.

§ 4. Comparative for Positive

Especially τάχιον *quickly*: Jn 13²⁷ (but could be elative) 1 Ti 3¹⁴ SKL 0142 (WH ἐν τάχει) 2 Ti 4⁹ I 33 (rest τάχεως or ἐν τάχει) Heb 13¹⁹ (but prob. a true comp.) 13²³ soon Herm. M.X 1, 6.

Other examples are νεώτερος and καινότερος, often positive however in class. Greek; so in NT πρεσβύτερος is simply a religious official; Ac 17²¹ καινότερον *something new* (but possibly an Atticistic refinement: *newer*), 25¹⁰ κάλλιον (but perhaps under § 3), Ro 15¹⁵ τολμηρότερον *boldly*; PSI V 484, 7 (258 B.C.) πρεσβύτεροι = no longer young, *old* (older than they used to be, not older than others); Mayser II 1, 47f; Or. gr. 48, 15 (iii/B.C.) οἱ νεώτεροι *the young*, P. Petr. I 21 (237 B.C.) μείζω more than normally *large*; very often in Ptolemaic papyri πλείονες = *many, more than one*: Lk 11⁵⁴ περὶ πλείονων (vulg. *de multis*), 1 Co 9¹⁹ 10⁵ 15⁶ Ac 19³² β-text 27¹² 2 Co 2⁶ 4¹⁵ 9² Ph 1¹⁴ Heb 7²³ (RSV *many in number*); Ac 2⁴⁰ ἑτέροις τε λόγοις πλείοσιν and M. Pol. 12¹ ταῦτα καὶ ἕτερα πλείονα exclude *majority* and *more* (it must be *many* or *several*);

P. Madg. 21, 6 (222 B.C.) τοῖς φυλακίταις καὶ ἄλλοις πλείοσιν *many others*. We suggest *many* for all the above NT examples of πλείονες, rather than the class. *more* or *the majority of*.

§ 5. Elative Superlative

Not so prominent in pre-Christian papyri as in NT and Christian texts: αἱ πλεῖσται Mt 11²⁰ *very numerous* Ac 19^{32D} *very many*; ὁ πλεῖστος ὄχλος Mt 21⁸ Mk 4¹ *very large*; σὺν ἄλλοις πλείστοις = *with very many others* P. Teb I 45, 17; 46, 14; 47, 11 (113 B.C.). Τιμιώτατος *most rare* Rev 18¹² 21¹¹ Jos. Ant. 17, 225. Κράτιστε *Most Excellent* Lk 1³ Ac 26²⁵ Dion. Hal. opusc. I 3, 6. Ἐλάχιστος *very small* Mt 5¹⁹ 25^{40.45} Lk 12²⁸ 16¹⁰ 19¹⁷ 1 Co 4³ Jas 3⁴. Ἠδίστα Ac 13^{8D}. Ἰαρωτέραι Herm. S. IX 10, 7. The elative superlative may be intensified by the addition of ὡς, ὅτι, ἦ, οἷος, and sometimes ἐν τοῖς (sc. δύνασθαι or οἷος ἦν): e.g. ὡς τάχιστα Ac 17¹⁵, culminating in MGr ὅσον τὸ (τὰ) μπορεῖς γληγορότερα *as quickly as you can*. On the other hand the true superlative, less frequent now but still active enough in the less uncultured papyri (Mayser II, 1, 51), is virtually dead in NT through Semitic influence. But see Ac 26⁵ ἀκριβεστάτην, Eph 3⁸ ἐλαχιστότερος (a compar. superlative: *less than least*). Mk 12²⁸ πρώτη πάντων. Mt 2⁶ 5¹⁹ 1 Co 6² 15⁹ ἐλάχιστος. 1 Co 14²⁷ τὸ πλεῖστον *at most*.

§ 6. Positive for Superlative

We have no NT example of repetition of the positive, as in pre-Christian papyri, but the positive itself is used in a superlative sense under Hebraic influence (although there are class. poet. examples with gen.: κακὰ κακῶν, K-G I 21, 339): Mt 22³⁶ μεγάλη *greatest* (not *the great one*; equivalent to πρώτη πάντων in the parallel Mk 12²⁸, 5¹⁹ Jn 2¹⁰ τὸν καλὸν οἶνον *best*, Lk 9⁴⁸ μέγας *greatest*, Lk 1⁴² εὐλογημένη σὺ ἐν γυναίξιν, LXX Ca 1⁸ ἡ καλὴ ἐν γυναίξιν, Heb 9^{2r} LXX τὰ ἅγια c. gen. *holiest*.

§ 7. Positive for Comparative

Mk 9⁴² καλὸν . . . μᾶλλον *better*. Lk 5⁸⁹ ὁ παλαιὸς χρηστός ἐστὶν *is better*. Then the frequent οἱ πολλοί which is class., the *majority*, even without of (as a vl) in Mk 6² 9²⁶. Then Mt 20^{28D} ἐτι κάτω = κατώτερον, cp. MGr κόμ (= ἐτι) καλός *better*. Where comparison is introduced by ἦ, μᾶλλον (ἦ), παρά or ὑπέρ (or ἀπό LXX) on the Semitic pattern, the adj. may be positive as well as comparative (although the adj. with μᾶλλον and μέλιστα had already occurred in Ionic prose and Attic poetry to a small extent): Ac 20⁸⁵ μακάριον . . . μᾶλλον . . . ἢ *happier than*, Ga 4²⁷ LXX πολλά . . . μᾶλλον ἢ *more than*, 1 Co 12²² πολλῶ μᾶλλον . . . ἀναγκαῖα *much more necessary*, Lk 13² ἁμαρτωλοὶ παρά *more sinful than*, 18¹⁴ SLB δεδικαιωμένος παρά (D adds μᾶλλον) (ἦ in W Θ, like LXX Ge 38²⁸ δεδικαιώται . . . ἦ ἔγω); Mt 18^{8r} Mk 9^{43.45.47} 1 Cl 51³ καλὸν ἢ *better than*; Mk 10²⁵ Clem. Alx. εὐκόλως . . . ἦ (it is suggested that this

is the true pre-MSS text which was amended to εὐκοπώτερον); Ap. Const. 4³ μακάριος ἦπερ; LXX Ge 49¹² λευκοὶ ἦ; Ex 18¹¹ μέγας παρά (Philostr. Ap. III 19), Nu 12³ πραῦς παρά, 1 Km 1⁸ Ec 2⁹ 9⁴ ἀγαθὸς ὑπέρ, Hag 2⁹ μέγας ὑπέρ. The pos. with παρά is also MGr: see Pernot *Études* 75, who sees in this the ultimate influence of Hebrew on MGr. Germane to this is the frequent reduction of μᾶλλον ἢ to simple ἢ or παρά: LXX Ps 45(44)⁸ ἔχρισεν . . . παρά, Lk 15⁷ χαρὰ ἔσται . . . ἢ; 1 Co 14¹⁹, Just. Ap. 15⁸, BU III 846¹⁵ (ii/A.D.), Epict. III 22 θέλω . . . ἢ; Lk 17² Το 3⁶ λυσιτελεῖ . . . ἢ; Mk 3⁴ ἐξέσθιν ἢ; LXX Nu 22⁶ ἰσχύει . . . ἢ; 2 Mac 14⁴² θέλω ἦπερ (but βούλομαι ἢ in Homer and often); it is a Semitism but there are some class. parallels: Andoc. I, 125 λυσιτελεῖν ἢ, Hdt 9, 26 δικαῖόν ἐστιν . . . ἦπερ (K-G II 303), Aesop 121 συμφέρει ἢ. Even without ἢ in Mt 5²⁹. ³⁰ συμφέρει σοι . . . καὶ μή.

§ 8. Superlative for Comparative

To complete the picture, πρῶτος and ἔσχατος must be mentioned here. Πρῶτος = πρότερος Aelian Anim. II 38; VIII 12, P. LPw (ii-iii/B.C.), Plut. Cat. min § 18, IG XII 5, 590, Kaibel Epigr. 642, 10 (iii-iv/A.D.), Mt 21²⁸. ³¹ elder, Jn 1¹⁵. ³⁰ superior to or before me, 15¹⁸ before us. Πρῶτος meaning former and ἔσχατος meaning latter occur in Mt 27⁶⁴. Thus πρῶτος in Ac 1¹ is ambiguous: either Luke is guilty of a popular Hellenistic mannerism or he intended to write three volumes. Similarly difficult is Lk 2² αὕτη ἡ ἀπογραφὴ πρώτη. It is the first census of a series (if class. Greek); or first of two (if Hellenistic). And if Hellenistic it could mean either *the first census of the two made by Quirinius*, or *the census before the (greater) census made by Quirinius*; see Lagrange *S. Luc* in loc.

With this popular Hellenistic failure to appreciate the significance of the Dual, we may compare the confusion of ἕλλος and ἕτερος, τίς and πότερος (Mt 9⁶ τί γάρ ἐστιν εὐκοπώτερον), and the use of ἀμφοτέροι for more than two. See below, ch. 14 § 2.

CHAPTER FOUR

VOCATIVES¹

§ 1. The use of ὦ

Whereas in class. Greek it was only exceptionally that ὦ was omitted, the reverse is now the case. Semitic and Koine influences once again united in their effect upon the NT, for in the Hell. period ὦ was reserved for emotional or stilted speech. "So erscheint ὦ bei Epiktet neben Eigennamen nur da, wo es sich um Grössen der Vergangenheit handelt" (Johann. DGKPS 13). In pre-Christian papyri it apparently occurs nowhere for certain except in an Artemis curse of iv/B.C. (Mayser II 1, 55). In Luke and Paul it occurs with only four out of seventeen vocatives. There will therefore be some special reason for each occurrence in the NT. Surprisingly we never find it used in prayer invoking the deity; but its use is confined to

(a) the beginning of a sentence where emotion is expressed: Mt 15²⁸ (not D) ὦ γύναι, μεγάλη σου ἡ πίστις (contrast γύναι alone: Lk 22⁵⁷ Jn 2⁴ 4²¹ etc.); Mt 17¹⁷ Mk 9¹⁹ ὦ γενεὰ ἀπιστος (great emotion); Lk 24²⁵ ὦ ἀνόητοι (exasperation); Ac 3¹⁰ ὦ πλήρης (indignation); Ga 3¹ ὦ ἀνόητοι Γάλαται (anger); 1 Ti 6²⁰ ὦ Τιμόθεε (affection). But there is no great emotion in: Ro 2¹. 3 9²⁰ Jas 2²⁰, and in fact simple ἄνθρωπε is found Lk 12¹⁴ 22⁵⁸. 60. Never ὦ πάτερ in NT, but in Josephus and Corpus Hermeticum. See Schrenk in Kittel WB V 985, n. 251;

(b) exclamations (= ὦ): Ro 11³³ ὦ βάθος;

(c) Acts, the only NT book where ὦ cannot be said to involve some emotion: 18¹⁴ ὦ Ἰουδαῖοι (not the first word, but correct position of the vocative in Attic style), 27²¹ ὦ ἄνδρες same. (Without ὦ: ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί 1⁶ 13²⁶ etc.; ἄνδ. Ἰσραηλεῖται 3¹²; ἄνδρες 7²⁶ etc.; ἄνδ. Ἰουδαῖοι 2¹⁴; βασιλεῦ 26⁷). There is no emotion, and everything that is classically correct, even to position after the first main verb, about ὦ Θεόφιλε 1¹; and yet Luke relapses into κράτιστε Θ. in Lk 1³, perhaps by a Latinism; cp. Dion. Hal. Orac. Vett. 1 ὦ κράτιστε Ἀμμαίε. See Schwyzer op. cit. on this subject. The only other Biblical book which has unemphatic or unemotional ὦ (i.e. not corresponding to Heb. exclam. וְיָי) is 4 Mac.; see Johanness. DGKPS 8-13.

¹ K-G I 47ff. Schwyzer II 59-64. Gild. I §§ 14-25. Humbert §§ 417-424. Wackernagel I 305-312. Mayser II 1, 55ff. Johannessohn DGKPS 7-15. Moulton Einl. 108ff. Abel § 42. Zerwick §§ 22-24.

§ 2. Nominative form instead of Vocative

Although there is no certain example in the pre-Christian papyri, yet in the less educated writers of the post-Christian papyri there is a tendency for nominative forms to usurp the vocative. In the NT generally, when adjectives are used alone, it is the nominative form: Ac 13¹⁰ ὁ πλήρης; Lk 12²⁰ 1 Co 15³⁶ ἄφρων (vl. ἄφρον). In class. Attic the articular nominative of a single noun sometimes accompanied rather harsh address to inferiors, somewhat impersonally and with particular definiteness (almost pointing): ὁ παῖς, ἀκολούθει Aristoph. Ra. 521.

There is no vocative of the article in Greek, and so if the article was required the nom. form was used, the noun taking the nom. ending, if this was different, in sympathy with the article: Ga 4²¹ οἱ ὑπὸ νόμου θέλοντες εἶναι, Col 3⁵ τὰ μέλη *members, mortify earthly things*, 3^{18f} αἱ γυναῖκες, . . . οἱ ἄνδρες, . . . τὰ τέκνα, etc., 4¹ οἱ κύριοι, Eph 5¹⁴ ὁ καθεύδων. Some NT examples owe themselves to Hebraic influence, the Semitic vocative being constituted by articular nominative; thus LXX Ps 21² Lk 18¹¹ ὁ θεός, cp. ὁ πατήρ, etc., Lk 8⁵⁴ ἡ παῖς, ἔγειρε, Mk 5⁴¹ τὸ κοράσιον (= Aramaic emphatic state **ܢܗܝܘܩܐ**), Mt 11²⁶ Mk 14³⁶ Ro 8¹⁵ Ga 4⁶ Ἀββᾶ, ὁ πατήρ (Aram.), Jn 17²¹ πατήρ (anarthr.), Jas 5¹ οἱ πλούσιοι, Jn 13¹³ ὁ διδάσκαλος καὶ ὁ κύριος, 20²⁸ ὁ κύριός μου καὶ ὁ θεός μου perhaps because the vocative form *κύριε* is lightly used in the Gospels as almost *sir*¹; hence the emphatic form here takes its place, *my Lord*; 19⁸ χαῖρε, ὁ βασιλεύς (S βασιλεῦ) (where Mt 27²⁹ BD Mk 15¹⁸ SBD have χαῖρε, βασιλεῦ . . .) said by Moulton to be due to "the writer's imperfect sensibility to the more delicate shades of Greek idiom"; actually it is an artist's stroke, the def. article pointing the finger of scorn; Rev 15³ ὁ βασιλεύς (S βασιλεῦ) τῶν ἐθνῶν (but Ac 26⁷ etc. βασιλεῦ, which, Moulton felt, admitted the royal prerogative whereas ὁ βασιλεύς in the mocking of Jesus does not); Lk 18¹¹ Heb 10⁷ OT etc. ὁ θεός (in Heb 1⁸ it is only just conceivable that ὁ θεός is nom. = *thy throne IS God*); Rev 11¹⁷ 15³ OT κύριε ὁ θεός (but Mt 27⁴⁶ θεέ μου, and seldom articular in LXX²), cp. Epict. II 16, 13 κύριε ὁ θεός which is from Jewish-Hellenistic magic; Rev 6¹⁰ ὁ Δεσπότης ὁ ἅγιος; Lk 12³² Mk 9²⁵ Rev 18⁴ ὁ λαός μου: Mt 9²⁷ 20³⁰. 31 (p⁴⁵ υἱέ) υἱός Δαυίδ, anarthr. because of Heb. construct state (but Mk 10⁴⁷ υἱέ Δαυίδ); Ac 7⁴² οἶκος Ἰσραὴλ anarthr. because of construct state (LXX

¹ Κύριε of Jesus: Mk 7²⁸ 10⁵¹; Mt 7^{21f} 8². 6. 8. 21. 25 14²⁸. 30 15²². 25. 27 16²² 17⁴. 15 18²¹ 20^{30f}. 33 25³⁷. 44 26²²; Lk 5⁸. 12 6⁴⁶ 7⁸ 9⁵⁴. 59 vl 61 10¹⁷. 40 11¹ 12⁴¹ 13²³. 25 14²² 17³⁷ 18⁴¹ 19⁸ 22³³. 38. 49; Jn 4¹¹. 15. 19. 49 5⁷ 6³⁴. 68 9³⁶. 38 11³. 12. 21. 27. 32. 34. 39 13⁶. 9. 25. 36. 37 14⁵. 8. 22 21¹⁵. 16. 17. 20. 21. Of others: Mt 11²⁵ 13²⁷ 21²⁹ 25¹¹. 20. 22. 24 27⁶³; Lk 10²¹ 13⁶. 25 14²¹ 19¹⁶. 20. 25; Jn 12²¹. 38 20¹⁵.

² Helbing DKVS 34. Thackeray OT Gr. § 10, 10. Katz, *Philo's Bible* 59f, 152f.

Am 5²⁵); Jn 17¹¹B 21BDW 24. 25AB πατήρ; Jn 12¹⁵ABDW OT Lk 8⁴⁸ BKLW Mt 9²² DGLW Mk 5³⁴ BDW LXX Ru 2²² ABL Jg 11³⁵ B, etc. θυγάτηρ anarthr. How are we to explain the anarthrous nominatives among the above? They probably never had the article, but scribes fell into the contemporary way of substituting nom. forms in the 3rd declen. for the special forms of the vocative. E.g. BGu II 423.11 (ii/A.D.) κύριέ μου πατήρ, P. Ross. Georg. III 2, vol. 27 (iii/A.D.) μήτηρ.

Moreover the nominative is common, as in class. Greek to a less extent, when additions other than an adjectival epithet, and especially participles, are made to the vocative, including a second or a third vocative: Mk 9¹⁹ D Lk 9⁴¹ D ὦ γενεά ἀπιστε (but other MSS and Mt 17¹⁷ ἀπιστος), Jn 17¹¹ πάτερ ἄγιε, Lk 11³⁹ ὑμεῖς οἱ Φαρισαῖοι, Mt 6⁹ πάτερ ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, Lk 6²⁵ ὑμῖν, οἱ ἐμπεπλησμένοι, Ac 13¹⁶ ἀνδ. Ἰσρ. καὶ οἱ φοβούμενοι τὸν θεόν; cp. Xen. Cyr. III 3, 20 ὦ Kῦρε καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι Πέρσαι, Ro 2¹. 3 ὦ ἄνθρωπε ὁ κρίνων, Rev 12¹² οὐρανοὶ καὶ οἱ ἐν αὐτοῖς σκηνοῦντες, 18²⁰ οὐρανὸς καὶ οἱ ἅγιοι καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι, 19⁵ αἰνετε . . . πάντες οἱ δοῦλοι αὐτοῦ, LXX Hag 2⁴ Sach 3⁸ Ἰησοῦ ὁ ἱερεὺς ὁ μέγας. Zerwick (§ 23) suggests that the speech of Elisabeth in Lk 1⁴⁵ becomes more intelligible if we understand ἡ πιστεύσασα as a vocative, as implied in the Vulgate's 2nd person: *Blessed are you because you have believed*. The difficulty is the αὐτῇ which soon follows, making the whole into 3rd person; of course, Vulg. alters this. Artemis pap. I (iv/B.C.) θεοὶ οἱ μετὰ Ὁσεράπιος καθήμενοι, P. Par. 51.39 (159 B.C.) εὐφράνεσθαι (= εὐφραίνεσθε), οἱ παρ' ἐμοῦ πάντες, J. Chrysostom *Hom. Stat.* 467, 17 (387 A.D.) ὁ θεός, ὁ μὴ θέλων τὸν θάνατον τοῦ ἁμαρτωλοῦ. "Cette construction devint fréquente à l'époque romaine, si bien que le nominatif avec l'article a fini par être l'équivalent du vocatif (σύ)."¹

¹ Soffray p. 1.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUBSTANTIVAL ARTICLE AND PRONOUN

§ 1. Substantival Article¹

The def. art. has always preserved its demonstrative force; this is apparent even in MGr. in τὸ καὶ τό, τὰ καὶ τὰ *this and that* and πρὸ τοῦ *previously*. In the beginning the def. art. grew out of the old demonstrative pronoun in Homer: *this one, he*. It separates some from others, individualizing something as this and not that. Considering the total use of the article, it is true that the higher the type of Greek above ordinary speech the less prolific is the use of the article, so that whereas Atticistic style keeps fairly close to the norm established by Attic prose popular speech uses the article freely. However this does not apply to the special use of the article considered in this section, the pronominal use, that is, the substantival use as opposed to the adjectival; this is much reduced in the NT. Only in Ac 17²⁸, a quotation, does τοῦ = τούτου, and there is no trace of καὶ τόν *and him*, τὸν καὶ τόν *such and such a one*, or πρὸ τοῦ *before this*. All we have is occasional occurrences of ὁ μὲν . . . ὁ δὲ *the one . . . the other* and indefinite *one . . . another*, and ὁ δὲ *but he*, and ὁ μὲν οὖν *now he*.

(a) ὁ μὲν . . . ὁ δὲ: Ptol. pap. very rare (Mayser II 1, 56f); 1 Co 77 (ὄς . . . ὄς p⁴⁷ S^oKL), Eph 4¹¹, Heb 7^{20f. 23f} 12¹⁰. Lk 8^{5f} ὁ μὲν . . . καὶ ἕτερος, Mt 13²³ ὁ μὲν . . . ὁ δὲ . . . ὁ δὲ (but accent ὁ neut., cp.⁸). Mt 22⁵ C² X, Mk 4⁴ W τὸ μὲν. Jn 7¹² οἱ μὲν . . . ἄλλοι δέ. Its place is usually taken by a non-class. use of the relative: Lk 23³⁸ ὃν μὲν . . . ὃν δέ, Mt 13⁴ ἀ μὲν . . . ἄλλα δέ (D ἀ δέ) 13⁸ 16¹⁴ οἱ μὲν . . . ἄλλοι δὲ . . . ἕτεροι δέ, 21³⁵ 22⁵ 25¹⁵, Mk 4⁴ 12⁵ Lk 8⁵ Ac 14⁴ 17¹⁸ (τινὲς . . . οἱ δέ) 27⁴⁴ 28²⁴, Ro 9²¹ 14² ὄς μὲν . . . ὁ (ὄς FG) δέ, 14⁵, 1 Co 11²¹ 12^{8. 23} 2 Co 2¹⁶ Ph 1⁶, 2 Ti 2²⁰, Jude 22^f. Papyri: P. Teb. I 61(b) 29 (118 B.C.) τὴν μὲν . . . ἦν δέ, P. Ox. IX 1189, 7 (c. A.D. 117) ἦν μὲν . . . ἦν δέ). There are also Semitic substitutes: ὁ εἷς . . . ὁ ἕτερος Mt 6²⁴ Lk 16¹³, εἷς . . . καὶ εἷς Mt 20²¹ 24^{40. 41} Mk 10³⁷. Even Luke has ὁ εἷς . . . ὁ ἕτερος.

¹ K-G I 583-588. Gild. II §§ 515ff. Schwyzer II 19-27. F. Völker, *Syntax d. griech. Papyri* I. Der Artikel, Münster 1903, § 1. Winer-Schmiedel § 17. Moulton Einl. 129.

(b) ὁ δέ, ἡ δέ, οἱ δέ. In class. Attic ὁ δέ rarely refers to the subject of the preceding sentence (Gild. II § 518). It occurs frequently in NT to continue a narrative, even in Jn where it occurs least often: 5¹¹ ὁ δέ ἀπεκριθῆ SC*GKL (δς δέ AB, as Mk 15²³ SD and P. Ryl. II 144, 14 (A.D. 38), P. Soc. It. IV 313, 8 (iii-iv/A.D.) δς δέ). Mt 26⁶⁷ 28¹⁷ οἱ δέ. It usually marks a change of subject for the new sentence, as in Attic (e.g. Mk 1⁴⁵ and throughout Mk). In Mk 10³² where οἱ δέ does not mark a change of subject the reading is probably to be rejected in favour of καί. On its rare appearances in papyri it is sometimes followed by a participle.

(c) ὁ μὲν οὖν. Acts only: 5⁴¹. With ptc. 1⁶ 2⁴¹ 8⁴ 11¹⁹ 15³. 30 23¹⁸ 28⁵.

There is no instance of the article as a relative pronoun in the NT.

§ 2. Substantival Pronouns¹

(a) *Personal*. These are very frequent in the NT.

1. The nominatives ἐγώ σύ ἡμεῖς ὑμεῖς were usually not employed in class. Greek except for emphasis or antithesis; this principle is not strictly observed in NT and papyri (Mayser II 1, 33), e.g. the stock phrases in letters ὡς ἐγὼ θέλω, ὡς ἐγὼ ἀκούω, etc., cp. Tit 1⁵ ὡς ἐγὼ σοι διαταξάμην. But in the following examples at least there is some sort of emphasis or antithesis:

ἐγὼ Mk 14²⁹ Lk 11¹⁹ Jn 10³⁰ Ro 7¹⁷ 1 Co 7¹² Eph 4¹ (but prob. simply to carry an apposition) 2 Ti 4⁶; if ἐγὼ occurs in the papyri it is usually emphatic. Σύ Mt 6¹⁷ 26⁶⁴ 27¹¹ Jn 2¹⁰ (cp. with πᾶς ἄνθρωπος) 4⁹ (but simply to carry a phrase in apposition, rather than emphatic: also 10³³ Lk 1⁷⁶ Ac 1²⁴ Ro 14⁴) 4¹⁰ 18³⁷ (*you have said it, not me*) 21²², Ac 10¹⁵ 11¹⁴, 2 Ti 4⁵ Jas 2³. Ἡμεῖς Mt 6¹² 17¹⁹ Ac 15¹⁰ Ga 2⁹. Ὑμεῖς Mk 6³⁷.

Without much emphasis are the following: Mk 13⁹ βλέπετε δὲ ὑμεῖς ἑαυτοῦς, ²³ ὑμεῖς δὲ βλέπετε, Lk 11⁸ ἐγὼ γάρ εἰμι πρεσβύτης, 9⁹ ἐγὼ, Jn 1³⁰ (c Syr^c om ἐγὼ), 18³⁸ superfluous ἐγὼ, 1 Co 2³ καὶ ἐγὼ, 11²³ ἐγὼ, Ph 4¹¹ ἐγὼ. Mt 11²³ σύ, 27¹¹ σύ, Jn 1⁴² σύ, 6³⁰ τί οὖν ποιεῖς σύ σημεῖον; 18³³ σὺ εἶ ὁ βασιλεὺς; Ro 2³ σύ. Ac 4⁷ τοῦτο ὑμεῖς are together stylistically but it is fanciful to suppose the meaning is *people like YOU doing a miracle like THIS*; the simple question was angry, not subtle. Jn 5³⁸. 39. 44 (some correctors have om. ὑμεῖς). Eph 5³² (it is straining things to say that ἐγὼ = *I as an apostle*; the corresponding phrase in

¹ K-G I 555f. Gild. I §§ 68ff. Schwyzer II 186-207. Wackernagel II 84-101. Mayser II 1, 62-73. Winer-Schmiedel § 22. Moulton Einl. 135. G. Dronke, "Beiträge zur Lehre vom griech. Pron. aus Apollonius Dyscolus," *Rh. M.* 9, 107ff.

1 Co 11² is simply λέγω δέ). Lk 10^{23f} (there cannot be any difference between ἀ βλέπετε and ἀ ὑμεῖς βλέπετε standing side by side). 2 Co 11²⁹ (the sudden insertion of ἐγώ is gratuitous and meaningless in τίς ἀσθενεῖ καὶ οὐκ ἀσθενῶ; τίς σκανδαλίζεται καὶ οὐκ ἐγώ πυροῦμαι;). Mt 10¹⁶ 11¹⁰ ἰδοὺ ἐγώ is the Heb. אני, but the Aram. *'anāh* is used unemphatically, especially with the participle. Thus there are no grounds for thinking that scribes have inserted the pronouns; we should retain them in the variant readings.

2. The difference between the enclitic and the accented forms of pers. pronouns in the oblique cases, like μου and ἐμοῦ, is once again the fact that the accented form tends to mark a contrast, as in class. Greek: P. Rein. 18, 5 (108 B.C.) γραψαμένου ἐμοῦ τε καὶ τῆς μητρός. But in Biblical Greek, and particularly the LXX (Johannesson DGPS 369ff) there is a large number of these accented and enclitic forms, especially in the genitive, occurring without emphasis; clearly this is due in some part to Semitic influence and the resultant tendency to attach pronouns like suffixes to substantival and verbal forms with a liberality and casualness which offends classical taste. So the redundancy in the NT also is obviously a Semitism (Lagrange, *S. Matth.* XCVI); Hebrew and Aramaic employ this pronoun so often in the form of a suffix that it would be surprising if Jewish writers did not carry the habit into their Greek. The MSS show many variants but we do well to prefer the reading which retains the superfluous αὐτοῦ, etc. The general tendency of the language was certainly in this direction, and unliturgical Gentiles indulge in the repetition of μου, σου, αὐτοῦ and the other oblique cases (Moulton-Howard 431f), but this will not explain the 34 instances of αὐτοῦ in Lk 1 where the Semitic background is so obvious, and the Semitic Matthew's usage is no more abundant than Mark's or Luke's. His extreme ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ εἶπεν αὐτῷ (25²⁶) is in line with the rest of NT. Of course, the writers vary in the degree to which they depart from the Greek norm of economy in this respect, some equipping every verb with a pronoun when it can be readily inferred from the context.

Very close to the Greek norm: Jn 8³⁸ παρὰ τῷ πατρὶ (SD add μου) and ὁ πατήρ often in Jn without pronoun, unless he means simply *the Father*. Mt 27²⁴ ἀπενίψατο τὰς χεῖρας, 15² τὰς χεῖρας (αὐτῶν add CDEF). Ac 7⁵⁸ τὰ ἱμάτια HPS (viii-xi/A.D. uncials; but rest have pro-

noun), 16¹⁵ παρεκάλεσεν λέγουσα, 13³ ἐπιθέντες τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῖς ἀπέλυσαν, Mk 6⁵ ἐπιθ. τ. χεῖρας. Ph 1⁶ ἐπιτελέσει (sc. αὐτό). Eph 5¹¹ (sc. αὐτά). 1 Ti 6² (sc. αὐτούς). Jn 10²⁹ (sc. αὐτούς). Lk 14⁴ (sc. αὐτόν).

Less Greek: Lk 24³¹ αὐτῶν δὲ διηγοίχθησαν οἱ ὀφθαλμοί, Herm. S.V 7, 3 αὐτοῦ γὰρ ἐστὶν πᾶσα ἐξουσία A, VIII 7, 1 ἄκουε καὶ περὶ αὐτῶν. Ac 7²¹ superfluous αὐτόν bis, as scribal activity indicates. Mt 6³ superfl. σου. Mt 8¹ v1 Mk 5² superfl. αὐτῶ; and same kind of repetition occurs in Mt 4¹⁶ OT 5⁴⁰ 8¹ 26⁷¹ Col 2¹³ Ph 1⁷ Jas 4¹⁷ Rev 6⁴. On the other hand, such repetition is not unknown in class. authors (K-G II 579, n. 2 and 3) where the first pronoun forms part of a preceding participial clause: eg. Mk 10¹⁶, ἐναγκαλισάμενος αὐτὰ κατευλόγει τιθεὶς τὰς χεῖρας ἐπ' αὐτά, and 9²⁸ Lk 1⁶² Ac 7²¹ 2 Pt 3¹⁶ and especially in Rev; see also Acta Thomae 198¹⁷ ἀνθρώποις ὑμῖν οὖσιν ὡσπερ τοῖς ἀλόγοις ζῴοις ἐπιτιθέασιν ὑμῖν φόρους (Ljungvik SSAA 27 gives further examples from apocryphal Acts). The question of rhythm may play some part in the repetition, e.g. Mt 22³⁷ (as in Engl. : *with all thy heart and with all thy soul and with all thy strength*); Rev 9²¹ οὐ . . . αὐτῶν οὔτε . . . αὐτῶν οὔτε . . . αὐτῶν. And there is insertion for emphasis, e.g. P. Oxy. VIII. 1162 (iv/A.D.) τὸν ἀδελφῶν ἡμῶν Ἀμμώνιον παραγιγόμενον πρὸς ὑμᾶς συνδέξασθαι (=σθε) αὐτόν ἐν ἱερῆνῃ; Passio Barth. 141³¹ τοῦτους πάντας τοὺς κατακειμένους ἐνθάδε ἀπὸ βαρέων νοσημάτων τίς ἐστὶν ὁ καταβλάπτων αὐτούς; Jn 18¹¹ τὸ ποτήριον . . . οὐ μὴ πῖω αὐτό; Mt 6⁴ ὁ πατήρ σου . . . ἀποδώσει σοι, 1 Pt 5¹⁰ PHL ὁ καλέσας ὑμᾶς . . . καταρτίσαι ὑμᾶς, Rev. 21⁶ 046 ἐγὼ τῶ διψῶντι δώσω αὐτῶ.

For accus. and infin. instead of plain infin., see pp. 147f.

For superfluous αὐτοῦ etc. after a relative, see p. 325.

See also Lk 12⁴⁸ Jn 6³⁹ 15².

It is usual to find that the accented forms of 1st p. sing. pronoun in oblique cases are used for special emphasis in the NT, especially after a preposition (with the notable exception of πρὸς: e.g. Mt 25³⁶ πρὸς με (S ἐμέ), Mk 9¹⁹ πρὸς με (p⁴⁵ S ἐμέ), Ac 22⁸ (S*AB ἐμέ)¹⁰, even emphatically Mt 3¹⁴ σὺ ἔρχῃ πρὸς με; however nearly all MSS read πρὸς ἐμέ in Jn 6³⁷ first time, and SE al the second time; inscr. from Magnesia 19¹⁰ πρὸς ἐμέ, 22⁵ πρὸς με, PSI IV 326, 4 πρὸς ἐμέ (261 B.C.), P. Hib. 63, 3 πρὸς με (265 B.C.)).

Quite in keeping with the animated style of Paul's letters is the usage of ἐγὼ and σύ (all cases) which is first found in the late class. Greek of Demosthenes and which is actually more a matter of rhetoric than syntax. Paul instances both himself and his reader in a vivid way to illustrate a point, not intending to apply what is said literally to himself or his reader: Ro 2¹⁷ 7^{7ff.} 9¹ 8²

11¹⁷ 14⁴ etc. 1 Co 10³⁰ Ga 2¹⁸. We must refer to Bauer s.v. ἐγώ (end); Stauffer in Kittel WB II 355ff.

Normal in secular Greek is the sense-construction with pronouns: Ac 8⁵ *Samaria* foll. by αὐτοῖς, similarly Mt 4²³ 9³⁵ 11¹ Lk 4¹⁵ Ac 16¹⁰ 20² 2 Co 2¹² Ga 2² 1 Th 1⁹ etc.; Jn 8⁴⁴ αὐτοῦ can only refer to a general conception like *falsehood* which has been no more than implied (it is unhelpful to translate *his father*; this needs at least a change of subject just before, as RV^{ms}, and the whole thing becomes confused at once; it might refer to a mythological *devil's father*, but even this author could scarcely be so credulous); Ro 2²⁸ αὐτοῦ has no expressed antecedent but again is vague in reference; Eph 5¹² αὐτῶν too has but a general reference which must be drawn from σκότος just before; Theodoret I 914 τοῦτο τῆς ἀποστολικῆς χάριτος ἰδίων αὐτοῖς γάρ (ἀποστόλοις must be inferred); 2 Co 5¹⁹ αὐτοῖς after κόσμος; Mt 1²¹ αὐτῶν after λαός; Jn 17² αὐτοῖς after πᾶν (but S*W correct to αὐτῶ); Mt 14¹⁴ Mk 6⁴⁵ αὐτοῖς after ὄχλος; 3 Jn⁹ αὐτῶν after ἐκακλησία; Mt 28¹⁹ Rev 19¹⁵ LXX Ex 23²⁷ Dt 4²⁷ 18¹⁴ al Ac 15¹⁷ OT ἔθνη foll. by αὐτούς; Ro 2¹⁴ by οὗτοι, Ac 16¹⁷ OT by οὗς; Lk 23^{50r} αὐτῶν of members of Council, inferred; LXX Jon 1⁸ εὔρε πλοῖον βαδίζον εἰς Θαρσίς . . . καὶ ἀνέβη εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦ πλεῦσαι μετ' αὐτῶν; Mt 8⁴ Mk 1⁴⁴ Lk 5¹⁴ αὐτοῖς after ἱερεῖς, unless it is a general ref., not to the priests but to the public; Mt 14¹¹ Mk 6²⁸ αὐτῆς after κοράσιον; Mk 5²³ αὐτῆ after θυγάτριον (p⁴⁵ AK correct to αὐτῶ); Lk 2²¹ αὐτόν after παιδίου: Col 2¹⁵ αὐτούς after ἀρχάς, ἐξουσίας; Rev 17¹⁸ after κέρατα, θηρίον. This is fairly common in class. Greek and very common in LXX: Dt 21⁸, 1 Km 14³⁴ Wis 16²⁰ αὐτοῖς after λαός; Jdt 5³ αὐτῶν after λαός; Wis 16³ αὐτοί after λαός, Si 16³ αὐτῶν after παροικίας.

3. In MGr αὐτός has become the pers. pronoun *he* (not *himself*). The beginnings of this development appear already in pre-Christian papyri (Mayser II 1, 64), in LXX (e.g. Ge 12¹²), and in NT especially in Luke; e.g. 1¹⁷ αὐτός προελευσεται αὐτοῦ,²² καὶ αὐτός, 2²⁸ καὶ αὐτός ἐδέξατο αὐτό,⁵⁰ καὶ αὐτοί,^{323, 415} καὶ αὐτός, 6³⁵ 7⁵, 9³⁶ καὶ αὐτοί, 11¹⁴ καὶ αὐτό, 16²³ 24²¹. It is possible to argue that the emphasis is still present even in the NT examples, but even here in place of αὐτός a class. Attic writer would use ἐκεῖνος. The LXX appear to use αὐτός without emphasis but not αὐτή or αὐτό; perhaps Lk 11¹⁴ shows αὐτό so used, if καὶ αὐτό ἦν is genuine; as to αὐτή, the editors of the NT text are divided in preference for αὐτή and αὐτη (Lk 2³⁷ 7¹² 8⁴² Heb 11¹¹). The text is uncertain in Lk 4¹⁵ καὶ αὐτός ἐδίδασκεν (Ae om. αὐτός), 5¹⁷ 19².

It is not easy to decide, but probably the pronoun has some emphasis in all the following: Mt 1²¹ Col 1¹⁷ *he* and no other, Mt 8¹⁷ (Isa 53⁴)

αὐτός . . . ἔλαβεν *he himself carried*, 12⁵⁰, Mk 1⁸, 2²⁵ *he/himself*, 5⁴⁰ αὐτός δέ (ὁ δὲ AMW), 14⁴⁴ αὐτός ἐστιν *he is the man*, Lk 5³⁷ 6⁴² 10¹ 18³⁹, Jn 4² 6⁶ 9²¹ 16²⁷, Ac 3¹⁰ αὐτός (BDEP οὗτος), 14¹² 18¹⁹ Ro 8²³ 16² καὶ γὰρ αὐτὴ *she herself*, 1 Co 3¹⁵, 1 Th 3¹¹ 4¹⁶ 5²³, 2 Th 2¹⁶ 3¹⁶, Col 1¹⁸ καὶ αὐτός ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλὴ . . . *he himself (alone)*.

The proleptic pronoun followed by resumptive noun is an Aramaic peculiarity¹: Mt 3⁴ αὐτός δὲ ὁ (ὁ om. D) Ἰωάννης *he, i.e. John*; Mk 2²¹ (see below under partitive ἀπό), 6¹⁷ αὐτός γὰρ ὁ (ὁ om. D) Ἡρ. *he, i.e. Herod*, 2²AC τῆς θυγατρὸς αὐτῆς τῆς Ἡρωδιάδος *her daughter, i.e. Herodias's*, Jn 9¹³ ἄγουσιν αὐτὸν πρὸς τοὺς Φαρισαίους, τὸν ποτε τυφλόν. Probably also: Mk 6¹⁷. 18. 22 12³⁶. 37. It appears particularly in codex Bezae²: Mt 12⁴⁵ D αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκείνου; Mk 5¹⁵¹ D καὶ θεωροῦσιν αὐτὸν τὸν δαιμονιζόμενον . . . διηγῆσαντο δὲ πῶς ἐγένετο αὐτῷ τῷ δαιμονιζομένῳ; 6¹⁸ D αὐτὴν γυναῖκα τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου. Ac 3² D (but mistake for παρὰ τῶν?). This hypothesis of Aramaic influence could explain the apparent use of αὐτός = οὗτος in a demonstrative sense: see p. 194.

(b) *Reflexive*. These pronouns do not share in the general increase in the use of pronouns in Hell. Greek. In the NT and pre-Christian papyri as in Hellenistic generally, even in the old colloquial Attic (but not class. Attic), the simple personal pronoun often serves as a reflexive; otherwise the regular reflexive is a formation of αὐτός like ἐμαυτοῦ, σεαυτοῦ, ἑαυτοῦ, αὐτοῦς ἡμᾶς (2 Th 1⁴), ὑμῶν αὐτῶν (e.g. Ac 20³⁰ 1 Co 5¹³ OT), ἑαυτῶν. In the NT sometimes αὐτον may be αὐτόν, but if so, it is difficult to see why this abbreviated form should be used instead of ἑαυτόν when it obviously causes confusion with αὐτόν. The contracted form is dying out in Hell. Greek (Blass-Debr. § 64.1) and in the NT period αὐτοῦ is virtually dead. It is therefore precarious to read αὐτοῦ where the uncials have ΑΥΤΟΥ, and so with αὐτόν and αὐτούς (Lk 23¹² Jn 2²⁴ Ac 14¹⁷ Ph 3²¹).

1. *Direct reflexives*. Used as a direct complement of the verb (Jn 14²¹ ἐμφανίσω αὐτῷ ἑμαυτόν) referring back to the subject, we have in the NT usually these compound -αὐτός

¹ C. F. Burney, *The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel*, Oxford 1922, 85ff. Moulton-Howard 431.

² M. Black, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*², Oxford 1953, 70-74.

forms, but sometimes the simple pronoun (e.g. Mt 6^{19f} θησαυρίζετε ὑμῖν (for ἑαυτοῖς) θησαυρούς; 17²⁷ ἀντὶ ἐμοῦ καὶ σοῦ (Aram. influence for ἑμαυτοῦ?): Ac 26⁹ ἔδοξα ἑμαυτῶ (= class. μοι), 1 Co 4⁴ ἑμαυτῶ σύνοιδα. Pre-Christian papyri exhibit examples of both emphatic and unemphatic reflexives formed from αὐτός (Mayser II 1, 66). But although personal pronouns have greatly increased in number in Biblical Greek, reflexive pronouns are retreating. The process is held up by the fact that the disappearance of ἐμός and σός often calls for the substitute of a refl. pronoun. In Luke ἑαυτοῦ is more frequent (60 times) than in Matthew (31). Note that Luke has altered Matthew's θησαυρίζετε ὑμῖν (6^{19f}) to ποιήσατε ἑαυτοῖς (12³³). Instead of the reflexive, Mt has ἔλεγξον . . . μεταξύ σοῦ καὶ αὐτοῦ (18¹⁵) and δὸς ἀντὶ ἐμοῦ καὶ σοῦ (17²⁷). But Luke uses the reflexive gen. without emphasis (ἑαυτοῦ 15²⁰, Ac 14¹⁴). The confusion has a Semitic explanation, in that Hebrew-Aramaic pronominal suffixes allow no distinction between personal and reflexive (Zerwick § 156).

Another development in the LXX, NT and illiterate papyri is the use of the 3rd person reflexive in place of 1st or 2nd person. In the plural we have e.g. for 2nd pers.: Jn 12⁸ μεθ' ἑαυτῶν, Lk 17³ προσέχετε ἑαυτοῖς, Ph 2¹², Heb 10²⁵ ἑαυτῶν, Mt 3⁹ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς, 23³¹ ἑαυτοῖς, Ac 13⁴⁶, Heb 3¹³ ἑαυτούς, Mt 25⁹ Ro 6¹³ 1 Jn 5²¹. 1st pers.: Ro 8²³ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς, 1 Co 11³¹ ἑαυτούς, 2 Co 1⁹ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς, Ac 23¹⁴ 2 Co 10¹² ἑαυτούς. In the sing. the substitution is even more commonly found; for 2nd pers.: Mt 23³⁷ Lk 14⁵ 13³⁴ Mk 12³¹ νῦν ὡς ἑαυτόν, Jn 18³⁴ ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ σὺ . . ., corr. to ἀπὸ σεαυτοῦ by SBC*L, Ro 13⁹ FGLP, Ga 5¹⁴ FGLN*P (OT) ὡς ἑαυτόν (but σεαυτόν, as in Mt 22³⁹ LXX, is prob. to be preferred), Ac 25²¹ αὐτόν for σεαυτόν. For 1st pers.: Herm. V IV 1⁵ ἠρξάμην λέγειν ἐν ἑαυτῶ S*a s (corr. to ἑμαυτῶ by S^c), Herm. S. II 1 τί σὺ ἐν ἑαυτῶ ζητεῖς, IX 2⁵, Clem. Hom. XIV 10, XVII 18 ἑαυτοῦ, BU 86 (ii/A.D.) ἑαυτοῦ.

Although after a preposition we find ἑαυτοῦ etc. (as Jn 8¹⁸ ἐγὼ εἶμι ὁ μαρτυρῶν περὶ ἑμαυτοῦ), yet often in NT and Koine a simple personal pronoun will be used, and this is certainly so in Mt: 5^{29f} 18^{8f} βάλε ἀπὸ σοῦ, 6² μὴ σαλπίσης ἔμπροσθέν σου, 11²⁹ take my yoke ἐφ' ὑμᾶς, 18¹⁶ παράλαβε μετὰ τοῦ BDIW (but σεαυτοῦ SKLM); and especially where two

pronouns are connected: 18¹⁵ μεταξύ σοῦ καὶ αὐτοῦ, 17²⁷ δὸς ἀντὶ ἐμοῦ καὶ σοῦ. But even Mt has the reflexive form too: 9³. 21 εἶπον ἐν ἑαυτοῖς, 12²⁵ *divided καθ' ἑαυτῆς*, 15³⁰ ἔχοντες μεθ' ἑαυτῶν. P. Petr. II 40(a) 27 (223 B.C.) περὶ ὑμῶν ἐντεινεσθε, PSI IV 443, 19 (iii/B.C.) ὑμᾶς παρεξόμεθα, etc. (Mayser II 1, 67). Ph 2²³ τὰ περὶ ἐμέ, Eph 2¹⁶ ἐν αὐτῷ either *by himself* or *by it* (the cross): similar ambiguity Col 1²⁰, 1 Jn 5¹⁰, Jas 5²⁰.

There is the Semitic periphrasis for reflexive pronoun ¹ by means of $\Psi\Delta\text{I}$, e.g. Lk 9²⁴ ἀπολέσῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ is the same as ²⁵ ἑαυτὸν δὲ ἀπολέσας ἢ ζημιωθείς, and cp. Mt 20²⁸ (Mk 10⁴⁵) with 1 Ti 2⁶. Mt 16^{25f} (Mk 8³⁵⁻³⁷) in this sense: at least, Luke seems to have understood it so, for he writes ἑαυτὸν δὲ ἀπολέσας 9²⁵. So also OT quotations: Mt 12¹⁸ ἡ ψυχὴ μου (= ἐγὼ αὐτός), Ac 2²⁷ Heb 10³⁸. But clearly the contexts intend us to feel the force of the double meaning of $\Psi\Delta\text{I}$ as *soul* and *life* which cannot be rendered so neatly in Greek.

2. *Indirect reflexives*. There are NT examples, though comparatively few, of the use of the reflexive pronoun where there is little or no dependence on the verb, because of the intervention of a noun or a phrase: Mt 12⁴⁵ πονηρότερα ἑαυτοῦ (DE*W αὐτου), Mk 5²⁶ τὰ παρ' ἑαυτῆς (ABL αὐτης), 8³⁵ τὴν ψυχὴν ἑαυτοῦ σῶσαι (first time) B Orig. D², (second time) C³ WXYΘ fam¹³ (the rest correct to αὐτοῦ), Lk 11²¹ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ αὐλήν, 13³⁴ τὴν ἑαυτῆς νοσσιάν. (D αὐτῆς), 14²⁶ τὸν πατέρα ἑαυτοῦ B, τὴν ψυχὴν ἑαυτοῦ, ³³τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ ὑπάρχουσιν (DW correct to αὐτοῦ), 16⁸ τὴν γενεάν τὴν ἑαυτῶν, 24²⁷ τὰ περὶ ἑαυτοῦ (DEL αὐτου); often in Paul, e.g. Ro 4¹⁹ 5⁸ 16⁴. 18, 1 Co 10²⁹ συνείδησιν δὲ λέγω οὐχὶ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ (emph. and contrast), ³³ τὸ ἑμαυτοῦ συμφέρον; Heb 10²⁵ τὴν ἐπισυναγωγὴν ἑαυτῶν (= ἡμῶν). This is quite common in the papyri (Mayser II 1, 67ff). The use of the simple pers. pronoun is more common in the NT.

(c) *Reciprocal pronouns*. As in the papyri and to some extent in earlier Greek, ἑαυτῶν serves for ἀλλήλων in NT.: P. Petr. II 45 (246 B.C.), P. Par. 46, 12 (153 B.C.), etc.; 1 Co 6⁷ having lawsuits μεθ' ἑαυτῶν, Eph 5¹⁹ speaking ἑαυτοῖς, Col 3¹⁶ admonishing ἑαυτούς, 1 Th 5¹³ be at peace ἐν ἑαυτοῖς (SD*FGP αὐτοις, clearly = αὐτοῖς); but Mk 9⁵⁰ εἶρ. ἐν ἀλλήλοις. Often side by side with ἀλλ. for variety: Lk 23¹² μετ' ἀλλήλων . . . πρὸς

¹ Schwyzer II 192 n. Huber 67. Mayser II 1, 65-72; II 2, 65-74. Winer-Schmiedel § 22, 18b. Lagrange, *S. Matth.* XCVII. Zerwick § 160.

ἑαυτοῦς (SBLT αὐτους, clearly = αὐτοῦς), Col 3¹³; Ph 2³ is precise: ἀλλήλους ἡγούμενοι ὑπερεχόντας ἑαυτῶν; so Mk 9⁵⁰ ἔχετε ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἄλλα καὶ εἰρηνεύετε ἐν ἀλλήλοις. Other alternatives for ἀλλ.: Ac 2¹² ἄλλος πρὸς ἄλλον (ἄλλος ἄλλον in Mayser II 1, § 26 n.2). For "Semitic" εἰς τὸν ἕνα. see p. 187.

(d) *Demonstrative pronouns.* On the article as demonstr. pronoun, see pp. 34, 36f. The usual pronouns are οὗτος, ἐκεῖνος, less often ὅδε.

1. "Ὁδε, fading rapidly in the Koine and lacking in the i/v.c. papyri (Mayser II 1, 73f), especially in its substantival use, in the NT it is almost confined to τάδε λέγει Ac 21¹¹ Rev 21. 8. 12. 18 31. 7. 14, P. Giss. I 36, 10 (135 B.C.), 37 II 11 (134 B.C.), etc. It is commoner in LXX, especially in the more literary parts (Thackeray OT Gr. 11). It tends to belong to official writing and not to living literature. See also Lk 10³⁹ καὶ τῆδε ἦν ἀδελφή not = ταύτη but *behold there was*, as LXX use τῆδε to render פִּהֵי Ge 25²⁴ = 38²⁷ καὶ τῆδε ἦν δίδυμα *behold there were*, 50¹⁸ οἶδε ἡμεῖς σοι οἰκέται *behold we are*, Ex 8²⁹⁽²⁵⁾ ὅδε ἐγὼ ἐξελεύσομαι *behold I go*, Je 3²² οἶδε ἡμεῖς ἐσόμεθα σοι *behold we shall be*.¹ See also, in this light, Lk 16²⁵ fam¹ Marc. ὅδε = *this man* (not *he . . . here*; it was misunderstood by very early scribes as Hellenistic for *here* and therefore corrected to ὧδε, in the same way as in LXX ὅδε is corrupted to ὧδε Ex 8²⁹⁽²⁵⁾ Le 10¹⁶ DaΘ 3⁹²⁽²⁵⁾, and οἶδε to ὧδε, ἴδε, etc. Num 14⁴⁰).

2. Οὗτος is very frequent in papyri and NT and as in earlier Greek refers to someone actually present (often contemptuously Lk 15³⁰ ὁ υἱός σου οὗτος, 18¹¹ οὗτος ὁ τελώνης; also Mt 26⁶¹. 71 Mk 27 Jn 6⁴² 9²⁴ 12³⁴ Ac 5²⁸ 7⁴⁰ 17¹⁸), not necessarily referring to the noun which is nearest, but to the noun which is most vividly in the writer's mind (deictic). Mt 3¹⁷ οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου, Ac 4¹¹ οὗτος Jesus (although *God* is the nearest noun), 8²⁶ αὕτη ἐστὶν ἔρημος the road (not Gaza, though *G.* is the nearer noun), Mt 3³ οὗτος (refers right back to 1), 1 Jn 5²⁰ (*God*, not *Christ*, is the true *God*). It often refers back to a previous description or introduction of a person (anaphoric): Mt 27^{57f}

¹ J. Ziegler's conclusion; the MSS nearest to this are Marchalianus and Venetus (ιδου οιδε). but the great uncials (SB) have a corrupted text (ιδου δουλοι) which bears no relation to הוּא הוּא הוּא. See *Beiträge zur Jeremias-Septuaginta*, Göttingen 1958, 38–39.

ἄνθρωπος . . . οὗτος προσελθών, etc., Lk 23^{50f} ἀνὴρ . . . οὗτος οὐκ ἦν, Ac 1^{16ff} Ἰουδα . . . οὗτος, Heb 7¹.

Indeed οὗτος in the apodosis referring back to the protasis is a favourite usage in various NT writers (but Luke often gets rid of it): Mt 10²² 24¹³ ὁ δὲ ὑπομείνας . . . οὗτος σωθήσεται = Mk 13¹³ (Lk alters), Mk 12⁴⁰ = Lk 20⁴⁷ κατέσθοντες τὰς οἰκίας . . . οὗτοι λήψονται, Jn 6⁴⁸ ὁ ὢν παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ οὗτος ἐώρακεν, 7¹⁸ ὁ δὲ ζητῶν τὴν δόξαν . . . οὗτος ἀληθὴς ἐστίν, 15⁵ ὁ μένων ἐν ἐμοί . . . οὗτος φέρει καρπόν, Mt 5¹⁹ ὃς δ' ἂν ποιήσῃ . . . οὗτος μέγας κληθήσεται, 2 Jn⁹ ὁ μένων . . . οὗτος . . . Mt 21⁴² = Mk 12¹⁰, Mt 13²⁰. ³⁸ 15¹¹ 18⁴ 26²³, Mk 3³⁵ 6¹⁶ Lk 9²⁴ Ro 7¹⁵ ὁ μισῶ τοῦτο ποιῶ, Jas 3² εἰ τις . . . οὗτος . . .

A characteristic usage in Paul and John is οὗτος in the preceding clause with ἵνα, ὅτι, or infin. or a noun to follow: Lk 1⁴³, Jn 3¹⁹ αὕτη . . . ὅτι, 8⁴⁷ etc. διὰ τοῦτο . . . ὅτι, 13³⁵, 1 Jn 2³ ἐν τούτῳ γινώσκομεν . . . ἐάν, 3¹¹, 5² ἐν τούτῳ ὅταν, 2 Jn⁶, 1 Co 7³⁷ τοῦτο κέκρικεν . . . infin., 2 Co 2¹ ἔκρινα ἐμαυτῷ τοῦτο, τὸ μὴ . . . ἐλθεῖν, 13⁹ τοῦτο καὶ εὐχόμεθα, τὴν ὑμῶν κατάρτισιν, 1 Ti 1⁹ εἰδὼς τοῦτο, ὅτι . . . , Heb 2¹⁵ ἀπαλλάξῃ τούτους, ὅσοι . . . (examples in Pernot *Études* 50f, 62, 119, 144f), P. Petr. II 13 (19) (252 B.C.) τοῦτο . . . ὅτι, P. Par. 63 (165 B.C.) τοῦτο . . . ὅτι, PSI V 495, 23 (258 B.C.) same. Antecedent of a relative: Mt 11¹⁰ οὗτος περὶ οὗ, Jn 7⁴⁹ Ac 7⁴⁰ οὗτος ὃς, Ph 2⁵ τοῦτο . . . ὅ. We find various adverbial usages: αὐτὸ τοῦτο = Pauline *just this* Ro 9¹⁷ OT 13⁶ Ph 1⁶ 2 Pt 1⁵; τοῦτο αὐτό = *just for this reason* 2 Co 2³. See Bauer s.v. αὐτός 1 h. In Attic and literary Koine there is τοῦτο μὲν . . . τοῦτο δέ *on the one hand . . . on the other* Heb 10³³. καὶ τοῦτο = *and indeed* Ro 13¹¹ 1 Co 6⁶. ⁸ Eph 2⁸; pl. class. Heb 11¹². τοῦτ' ἐστίν is formal and literary, mostly in Ac, Paul, Heb (besides Mt 27⁴⁶ Mk 7²).

3. Ἐκεῖνος, which in its substantive use is almost never found in pre-Christian papyri, refers to the remoter person or thing, and is rarer in NT than οὗτος (except in John), with which it is practically interchangeable; it very seldom marks an opposition to οὗτος, as it does in Herm. M. III 5: ἐκεῖνα (*the past*) . . . ταῦτα (*the present*), but there is Lk 18¹⁴ οὗτος . . . παρ' ἐκεῖνον, Jas 4¹⁵ τοῦτο ἢ ἐκεῖνο, Jn 5³⁸ ὃν ἀπέστειλεν ἐκεῖνος, τούτῳ However, in Jn 21²³ οὗτος and ἐκεῖνος are not so much for contrast as for variety. Ἐκεῖνος denotes persons in their absence deictically: ἐκεῖνοι opposed to ὑμεῖς Mt 13¹¹ Mk 4¹¹ Jn 5³⁹ Ac 3¹³

2 Co 8¹⁴; opposed to ἐγώ or ἡμεῖς Jn 3²⁸. 30 1 Co 9²⁵ 10¹¹ 15¹¹. As οὗτος was seen to represent the person nearest to the author's mind, so ἐκεῖνος represents the remoter person, e.g. Jn 1^{6ff}: οὗτος (John) ἦλθεν . . . ἵνα πάντες πιστεύσωσιν δι' αὐτοῦ; Jesus has now been mentioned and John becomes in thought the remoter person; hence οὐκ ἦν ἐκεῖνος τὸ φῶς. 7⁴⁵ the officers (who were away from the scene of action) came to the priests καὶ εἶπον αὐτοῖς ἐκεῖνοι. 13^{24f} νεύει τούτῳ (John) . . . περὶ οὗ λέγει (Jesus subject) . . . ἐκεῖνος (John, the remoter person, now Jesus has been introduced). Contemptuously like οὗτος: Jn 7¹¹ 9²⁸ 19²¹ *this fellow*. More often anaphorically, in the apodosis like οὗτος: Mk 7²⁰ τὸ . . . πορευόμενον, ἐκεῖνο κοινοῖ τὸν ἄνθρωπον, Jn 1³³ ὁ πέμψας . . . ἐκεῖνος, 5¹¹, 9³⁷ ὁ λαλῶν μετὰ σου ἐκεῖνός ἐστιν, 10¹ ὁ μὴ εἰσερχόμενος . . . ἐκεῖνος . . . , 14²¹ ὁ ἔχων . . . ἐκεῖνος . . . , Ro 14¹⁴ τῷ λογιζομένῳ . . . ἐκεῖνω κοινόν, 2 Co 10¹⁸ οὐ γὰρ ὁ ἑαυτὸν συνιστάνων, ἐκεῖνος . . . , Xen. Cyr. 6, 2, 33 ὁ . . . ἀκούων, ἐκεῖνος . . . , Herm. M. VII 5. It is dependent on the personal whim of the writer whether οὗτος or ἐκεῖνος is used in this anaphoric way, Matthew preferring οὗτος, John liking both. Ἐκεῖνος is even, like οὗτος, used in the protasis with resumptive ὅτι, relative pronoun, etc.: Mt 24⁴³ ἐκεῖνο δὲ γινώσκετε ὅτι, Jn 13²⁶ ἐκεῖνός ἐστιν ᾧ ἐγὼ βάρβω (Judas was not even absent, and by any rule we would expect οὗτος, as in Mt's parallel), Ro 14¹⁵ ἐκεῖνον . . . ὑπὲρ οὗ, Heb 11¹⁵ ἐκεῖνης ἀφ' ἧς. Thus, like οὗτος, its meaning is often weakened (especially in Jn) to *he* or *they*: Mk 16¹⁰. 13. 20 Jn 10⁶ *they* (S* om), 5³⁷ 8⁴⁴ 9⁹. 11. 25. 36 11²⁹ 12⁴⁸ 14²¹. 26 16¹⁴ etc. So it is inadvisable to build any theories of authorship on the notorious ἐκεῖνος (= *he*, the eye-witness) in Jn 19³⁵.

4. Τοιοῦτος and τοσοῦτος are several times used substantively in the pre-Christian papyri, especially with the article (Mayser II 1, 76), as also in the NT: τοιοῦτος Lk 9⁹ anarthr.; Mt 19¹⁴ Ac 19²⁵ Ro 13² 1 Co 7²⁸ 2 Co 10¹¹ etc. articular. Τοσοῦτος Ac 5⁸ Ga 3⁴ Heb 1⁴ etc. anarthr.; none articular. Articular τοιοῦτος may be weakened into a more indefinite term for οὗτος: 1 Co 5⁵ 2 Co 2⁶. 7 12². 3. 5. In correlative clauses we have Ac 26²⁹ τοιούτους . . . ὁποῖος *qualiscunque*; Heb 1⁴ τοσοῦτῳ . . . ὅσῳ.

Other less class. (more popular and Semitic) uses of correlatives include: Mk 9³ οἶος . . . οὕτως; 13¹⁹ οἷα . . . τοιαύτη; Rev 12⁹. 14 ὅπου . . . ἐκεῖ; 16¹⁸ οἶος . . . τηλικούτος; 17⁹ ὅπου . . . ἐπ' αὐτῶν. We can

best explain Ro 9⁶ (οὐχ οἶον δὲ ὅτι ἐκπέπτωκεν) as a mixture of οὐχ οἶον (Hell. for οὐ δήπου Phryn. 372) and οὐχ ὅτι (see p. 298).

(e) *Relative pronouns.* Already in the Koine the distinction between the relative pronoun of individual and definite reference (ὅς and ὅσος) and that of general and indeterminate reference (ὅστις and ὁπόσος) has become almost completely blurred. Indeed in general relative clauses ὅς is the rule, and although ὅστις is still used occasionally in its proper sense of *whoever*, it is nearly always misused, by Attic standards, of a definite and particular person (Mayser II 1, 76. Pernot *Études* 150–180). Moreover the use of ὅστις for ὅς is very old in Ionic Greek (e.g. Hdt II 99).

The same development proceeds in the NT. Complete indifference to the distinction is shown by Matthew who writes ἀνθρώπῳ βασιλεῖ ὅς in one place (18²³) and ἀνθρώπῳ βασιλεῖ ὅστις in another (22²) after exactly the same phrase; and by Luke who writes πόλιν Δαυιδ ἣτις καλεῖται Βηθλέεμ (2⁴) where to translate *utpote quae* (class.) is obviously wrong. Ὅστις is almost limited to the nominative in all writers, though least of all in John who uses ὅς (sing. and pl.) nom. 16, acc. 50, gen. 6; dat. 2 times. Ὅσος is restricted, except in Hebrews, to nom. and acc. In LXX ὅστις is confined to nom. and accus. In Luke the indef. forms are restricted to ἣτις οἵτινες αἵτινες; this may have been a general rule (perhaps to avoid confusion with the article) since we note the following interchange in Heb 9² ἐν ἣ . . . ἣτις,⁹ ἣτις . . . καθ' ἣν, 13⁷ οἵτινες . . . ὧν, Eph 5⁵ ὅς (ὁ vl) becoming in Col 3⁵ ἣτις, Ro 4¹⁶ ὅς ἐστὶν πατήρ becoming in Ga 4^{26f} ἣτις ἐστὶν μήτηρ. Heb 11³³ οἷ is the sole exception in that book. Cadbury¹ explains the few exceptions to this rule in Lucan writings as due in part to doubtful readings, in part to Luke having drawn some of his material from Mark (e.g. Lk 8¹³ = Mk 4¹⁶), and in part to euphonic considerations for avoiding a clash with a previous τινες (e.g. Lk 8² γυναῖκες τινες αἱ ἦσαν . . .). The rule is effective for Paul too, except that he has αἵτινα for αἵ: Ro 16^{3ff} is particularly revealing, viz. οἵτινες . . . οἷς . . . ὅς . . . ἣτις . . . οἵτινες . . . (οἷ in ⁷, but notice the vl ὅς p⁴⁶ and τοῖς DG) . . . ἣτις. It is effective for John, except that he has ὅ τι and αἵτινα; and except for ὅστις 8⁵³ (D ὅ τι),

¹ *JBL* 42 (1923) 150–157.

where however it might be excused by class. standards (Zerwick § 165). As to Matthew, in general relative clauses he observes the rule in respect of $\delta\varsigma$ in 10¹⁴ 23¹⁶. 18, but not in respect of $\delta\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$ in 5³⁹. 41 7¹⁵. 24 10³³ etc.¹, nor $\pi\tilde{\alpha}\varsigma$ $\delta\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$ 7²⁴ 10³² 19²⁹. He breaks the rule with $\pi\tilde{\alpha}\nu$ $\rho\eta\mu\alpha$ $\acute{\alpha}\rho\gamma\acute{\omicron}\nu$ δ 12³⁶, $\pi\tilde{\alpha}\sigma\alpha$ $\varphi\upsilon\tau\epsilon\iota\alpha$ $\eta\tilde{\nu}$ 15¹³. The Ptolemaic pap. follow the same rule, irrespective of general or individual reference. The conclusion is that we must not in exegesis read into $\delta\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$ any shade of meaning like *quippe qui* (*because*); e.g. Ac 17¹¹ they were not more noble *because* they received the message, but simply *who* received the message, whatever the context or theology may demand. Care must be taken also not to read in too much of consecutive (Mt 2⁶) or concessive (Lk 1²⁰) meaning.

* Ὅσπερ , which still flourishes a little in pre-Christian papyri (Mayser II 1, 77) has been abandoned in NT, except for Mk 15⁶ C ΘEFG , and Jn 10¹⁸ $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\pi\epsilon\rho$ p⁴⁵

* Ὅ ἐστιν = i.e. Mt 12³ 27³⁸ Mk 3¹⁷ 5⁴¹ 7¹¹. 34 12⁴² 15¹⁶. 42 Col 1²⁴ Heb 7² Rev 20². 12 21¹⁷; P. Petr II 13 (17) 4 (258 B.C.), W. Chr. 167, 21 (131 B.C.), P. Goodsp. 6, 5 (129 B.C.), P. Lond. III no. 879 (p. 9) 21 (123 B.C.).

(f) *Interrogative pronouns*². (The adjectival use is also, for convenience, discussed here.)

1. The direct interrog. pronouns $\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ $\pi\acute{\omicron}\iota\omicron\varsigma$ $\pi\acute{\omicron}\sigma\sigma\varsigma$ $\pi\omicron\tau\alpha\pi\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ now find themselves used in indirect questions, since the indirect pronouns are going out of use. The confusion was not unknown in class. Greek, but the interchange is much more freely employed in the Koine.

Indirect use: P. Hib. 29, 41 (265 B.C.) $\gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\varphi\omega\nu$ $\tau\iota$ $\delta\phi\epsilon\lambda\iota\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$, P. Eleph. 13, 7 (223 B.C.) $\gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\varphi\epsilon\iota\nu$ $\tau\acute{\iota}$. . . , PSI IV 425, 28 (iii/B.C.) $\epsilon\iota\delta\eta\sigma\omega\mu\epsilon\nu$ $\tau\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon\varsigma$ $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\kappa$ $\epsilon\iota\lambda\eta\varphi\alpha\sigma\iota\nu$, P. Par. 34, 9 (157 B.C.) $\eta\rho\acute{\omega}\tau\eta\sigma\acute{\alpha}\nu$ $\mu\epsilon$ $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ $\kappa\omicron\iota\omega$ $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\mu\alpha\chi\tau\iota$. . . (= $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ $\tau\acute{\iota}\nu\iota$), P. Par. 60, 4 (154 B.C.) $\acute{\alpha}\pi\acute{\omicron}\sigma\tau\iota\lambda\acute{\omicron}\nu$ $\mu\omicron\iota$ $\pi\acute{\omicron}\sigma\sigma\omega\nu$ $\acute{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\iota$ $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\acute{\omicron}$ $\pi\omicron\iota\omicron\upsilon$ $\chi\rho\acute{\nu}\omicron\nu$ (= $\tau\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\varsigma$). For $\pi\acute{\omicron}\iota\omicron\varsigma$ = $\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ cp. also Dit. Syll³ 344, 59 (303 B.C.) $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa$ $\pi\omicron\iota\alpha\varsigma$ $\pi\acute{\omicron}\lambda\epsilon\omega\varsigma$, Ac 23³⁴ $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\rho\omega\tau\eta\sigma\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa$ $\pi\omicron\iota\alpha\varsigma$ $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\alpha\rho\chi\epsilon\iota\alpha\varsigma$ (= $\tau\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\varsigma$), 1 Pt 1¹¹ $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha\upsilon\nu\acute{\omega}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\tau\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha$ η $\pi\omicron\iota\omicron\nu$ $\kappa\alpha\iota\rho\acute{\omicron}\nu$ (tautologous for emphasis), Lk 7³⁹ $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\acute{\iota}\nu\omega\sigma\kappa\epsilon\nu$ $\acute{\alpha}\nu$ $\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\pi\omicron\tau\alpha\pi\eta$ η $\gamma\upsilon\tilde{\nu}\eta$. . . , 2 Pt 3¹¹ $\pi\omicron\tau\alpha\pi\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ $\delta\epsilon\tilde{\iota}$. . . , P. Oxy. XIV 1678, 16 (iii/A.D.) $\gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\varphi\omega\nu$ $\mu\omicron\iota$ $\pi\omicron\tau\alpha\pi\acute{\omicron}\nu$ $\theta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\iota\varsigma$.

¹ In 7¹⁵ in fact the class. meaning *utpote qui* is quite appropriate ($\sigma\acute{\iota}\tau\iota\upsilon\epsilon\varsigma$ $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\chi\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\iota$. . . $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\delta\acute{\upsilon}\mu\alpha\sigma\iota$ $\pi\rho\acute{\omicron}\beta\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\nu$).

² K-G II 515ff, Schwyzer II 212ff. Wackernagel II 110-125. Mayser II 1, 78-80. Winer-Schm. § 25. W. Petersen, "Greek pronominal adjectives of the type $\pi\acute{\omicron}\iota\omicron\varsigma$," *Trans. and Proc. Amer. Philol. Assoc.* XLVI. 59.

2. Confusion of relative and interrogative pronouns is usual in Hellenistic Greek, although sometimes Luke appears to be correcting Matthew.

(α) In the same sentence both types of pronoun may occur: P. Par. 62, 2, 6 (ii/B.C.) ὅσα . . . ἔστιν καὶ τίνες . . . καὶ ὅσας, 1 Ti 1⁷ μήτε & . . . μήτε περὶ τίνων, 2 Cl 1² πόθεν . . . ὑπὸ τίνος . . . εἰς ὃν τόπον . . . ὅσα.

(β) The relative pronoun was used in indirect questions and after verbs of knowing, sometimes even in class. Greek (K-G II 438f), and frequently in the Koine: P. Goodsp. 3 (iii/B.C.) ὅπως εἰδῆς ὃν τρόπον οἱ θεοὶ σε οἰδαῖν, P. Petr. II 11 (1) (iii/B.C.) ἵνα εἰδῶμεν ἐν οἷς εἶ, etc. . . ., Mt 6⁸ οἶδεν . . . ὃν χρεῖαν ἔχετε (see Bauer s.v. οἶδα 1 f.g.). But ὅστις ἦτις δ, τι hardly ever occur in this way in the Koine or NT as they did in class. Greek: Jn 5²⁷ κρίσιν ποιεῖν δ, τι υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἔστιν *to judge what a man is* (? or read as ὅτι), Ac 9⁶ δ τι SBAC (but vl. τί), Herm. S. VIII 1, 4 δηλωθήσεται σοι δ, τι ἔστιν (A τό τί). We do however find ὁποῖος: 1 Co 3¹³ Ga 2⁶ 1Th 1⁹ Jas 1²⁴. Οἷος may occur: Lk 9⁵⁵ οἴου πνεύματος (but ποίου D 700 al; p⁴⁵ W al om the whole). *Ὅπως Lk 24²⁰.

(γ) Τίς = ὅστις or ὅς as a relative (perhaps as old as Sophocles) is Hellenistic: Athen. X 438 fin τινὶ ἢ τύχῃ δίδωσι, λαβέτω (saying of Ptolemy Euergetes); Ptol. pap.: five exx. in Mayser II 1, 80, a papyrus (Cnidus ii-i/B.C.) ὅτι τί θέλ(ε)ις πράξω *that I will do what you want*, BU III 822, 4 (iii/A.D.) εὔρον γεοργὸν τίς αὐτὰ ἐλύσῃ, LXX Le 21¹⁷, Mt 10¹⁹ δοθήσεται τί λαλήσητε (= διδάξει ὑμᾶς & δεῖ εἰπεῖν in Lk 12¹²), 15³² οὐκ ἔχουσιν τί φάγωσιν, 26⁶², Mk 2²⁵ οὐδέποτε ἀνέγνωτε τί ἐποίησεν Δαυὶδ (= Lk 6³ δ), 14³⁶ οὐ τί ἐγὼ θέλω, ἀλλὰ τί συ (D corrects to οὐχ ὅ . . . ἀλλ' ὅ . . .), ⁶⁰ οὐδὲν ἀποκρίνη τί (= δ) οὗτοι σου καταμαρτυροῦσιν (but this involves understanding πρὸς before οὐδέν; we must therefore divide into two sentences οὐδὲν ἀποκρίνη; τί οὗτοι . . .); Lk 17⁸ ἐτοίμασον τί δειπνήσω, Ac 13²⁵ τίνα με ὑπονοεῖτε εἶναι, οὐκ εἰμι ἐγὼ p⁴⁵; CD (τί ἐμέ SAB), Jas 3¹³ (but probably interrog.), Ign. Rom. 5³ τί μοι συμφέρει, ἐγὼ γινώσκω, BU III 948, 13 (iv-v/A.D.) οὐδὲν ἔχω τί ποιήσω σοι.

(δ) The confusion goes to extreme lengths in NT when we find ὅστις introducing *direct* questions, unless we are to understand δ, τι *why* as an abbreviation of τί (ἔστιν) ὅτι: Mt 16⁷ ὅτι ἄρτους οὐκ ἐλάβομεν, Mk 2¹⁸ ὅτι μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν . . . ἐσθίει; BL 33 (AC correct to τί ὅτι, and SDW harmonize with Mt and Lk διατί), 9¹¹ ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν λέγοντες ὅτι λέγουσιν οἱ γραμματεῖς . . . (W harm. with Mt τί οὖν); this could be ὅτι after λέγοντες, but the parallel Mt 17¹⁰ has the question τί οὖν; and the Lat. vns. have *quare* and *quia*; 9²³ ἐπηρώτων αὐτόν ὅτι ἡμεῖς οὐκ ἠδυνήθημεν (ADHP διατί, harm. with Mt); Jn 8²⁵ τὴν ἀρχὴν ὅτι καὶ λαλῶ ὑμῖν (Bodmer p⁶⁶ εἶπον ὑμῖν τὴν ἀρχὴν is simply an insertion to make things easier) *why do I speak to you at all?* (class. τὴν ἀρχὴν = δλωσ Hdt 4, 25; Dem. 23, 93; Lucian Eunuch. 6; P. Oxy. 472, 17 (A.D. 130); Philo spec. leg. 3, 121; Jos. Ant. 1, 100 etc.; Philostr. 1, 356, 17; Hom. Clem. 6¹¹ τί καὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν . . . διαλέγομαι, 19⁶ ἐπεὶ τί καὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν

ζητεῖ); LXX Ge 18¹³ A ὅτι (τί ὅτι DM), 2 Km 7⁷ B ὅτι (Luc. τί ὅτι), 12⁹, 4Km 8¹⁴ AB ὅτι *why* (rest τί), 1 Ch 17⁶ ὅτι *why*, Barn. 8⁵ ὅτι δέ (presumably same meaning as διατί δέ in 4. 6), 10¹ ὅτι δέ Μωϋσῆς εἶπεν Gr. Enoch 3¹ δι' ὅτι *why*?

It may not be too bold to go a step further and claim interrogative status¹ for ὅ in the notorious ἐταῖρε ἐφ' ὃ πάρει Mt 26⁵⁰ *what have you come for?* (vulg. *ad quid*). Certainly the gen. of ὅστις occurs in this way in eccles. Greek e.g. ἀνθ' ὅτου dir. question (Jannaris § 2038), and so also of ὅς, e.g. ὦν ἐνεκα Euseb. Praep. Ev. VI 7 p. 257d (Usener, *Der hl. Tychon*, 50); possibly Arr. Epict. IV 1, 120 ἦν δοκεῖς; the abbott Arsenius asks himself Ἄρσένιε, δι' ὃ ἐξήλθεας; (Migne PG 65, 105c. Zerwick § 169).

(g) *Interrogative pronouns used as exclamations.* Whereas class. Greek employs the relatives οἷος, ὅσος, ἡλικός, etc. in this way (K-G II 100f), as the NT also employs οἷος in 1 Th 1⁵ 2 Ti 3¹¹ and ἡλικός in Col 2¹ (possibly ὅσα in Ac 9¹⁶ 14²⁷)², yet in the NT the interrogatives are used as exclamations just as they are used in indirect questions (see p. 49):

Mt 27¹³ (B*ὅσα), Mk 15⁴ ἴδε πόσα . . . Ac 21²⁰, Ga 6¹¹ ἴδετε πηλίκους (p⁴⁶ B corr. to ἡλικούς), 2 Co 7¹¹ (direct), Heb 7⁴; Acta Phil 62⁹ σὺ ἀγαπητῆ τοῦ θεοῦ Ἰωάννη, πόσα αὐτοῖς διελέξω καὶ οὐχ ὑπηκούσθης, 59^{12.17}; Acta Thom. 235⁸; Acta Joh. 170^{12t}; Mart. Petri et Pauli 158^{17t} πόσων καλῶν πραγμάτων τε καὶ σημείων ὑπ' ἐμοῦ σοι δεικνυμένων θαυμάζω πῶς ἀμφισβητεῖς. The usage is not generally recognized as pre-Hellenistic, in spite of the contention of O. Lagercrantz, *Eranos* 18, 1918, 26–113.

On the whole then two points are notable in the NT and contemporary use of pronouns: 1. a great increase, to the extent of redundancy, and 2. "subtiliorum distinctionum abolitio" (Zerwick §§ 146, 161–169, who rightly insists that, for correct interpretation of the NT text, canons of classical and literary taste must be laid aside).

¹ Other interpretations, making ὃ a relative: (1) the ὃ refers to the kiss; paraphrase. "Friendly? You give me a kiss, for *which* I presume you have come here?" (2) Wellhausen has to supply too much, i.e. "By this kiss you are accomplishing the purpose for which you are here." (3) More simply, supply a verb, e.g. "Do that for which you are here." (E. C. E. Owen in *JThS* 29, 1928, 384–386; and Klostermann, *Zschr. f. nt. Wiss.* 29, 1930, 311, who adduces ἐγὼ δὲ ἐφ' ὃ πάρειμι, sc. ποιήσω). (4) Supply a ref. to the kiss: "Is *this* the reason why you are here?" (Radernacher² 78). (5) Emend to ἐταῖρε, αἶρε "Take what you have come for" (Blass).

² In Lk 5^{3D}, Heb 10⁸⁷, Philitas 7D, ὅσον ὅσον = ὀλίγον ὀλίγον (Hesychius) *very little or how little!*

CHAPTER SIX

THE VERB: VOICE¹

§ 1. Absolute Verbs (Mayser II 1, 80ff)

Many transitive verbs are used in an absolute sense, apparently as intransitive, the object understood from the context:

Mk 10¹⁹ μὴ ἀποστερήσης, P. Par. 26, 35 (163 B.C.) ἀποστεροῦσιν = *they deprive* a person, 1 Co 6⁸ ἀδικεῖτε καὶ ἀποστερεῖτε (MM Vocab. s.v.); Col 2¹⁵ ἐδειγμάτισεν (unless we take the previous object), cp. PSI IV 442, 18 (iii/B.C.) *arranged an inspection*, Mk 13¹⁷ ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχειν, P. Magd. 4, 6 (222 B.C.) ὄν λευκὴν ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχουσιν *be pregnant*; Mt 23^{16, 18} ὀφείλει: Semitic 𐤒𐤓𐤏 is not needed to explain this absol. use, as we have Rev L. 5, 1 (259 B.C.).

§ 2. Transitive and Intransitive Verbs (Mayser II 1, 82-87)

Transitive verbs have a noun-object either in the accus. or in an oblique case; in intransitive verbs the verbal idea is entirely realized in the subject itself.

(a) Hellenistic Greek extensively gives to trans. verbs an intrans. sense and substitutes a reflexive idea for the object. The most frequent instance of this in the Koine is ἄγω and βάλλω with their compounds, compounds of στρέφω, and less often ἀνακάμπτω, κλίνω, λύω- and ἔχω- compounds.

ἄγω: Mt 26⁴⁶ etc. ἄγωμεν *let us go*, class. phrase ἄγε *come!*; παράγω *pass by* Mt 9²⁷ 20³⁰ Mk 15²¹ etc., Polyb. V 18, 4, P. Tebt. I 17, 4 (114 B.C.); *disappear* 1 Co 7³¹; περιάγω *go about, traverse* (not cl.) Mt 4²³ Ac 13¹¹; ἐπιανάγω *return* Mt 21¹⁸ Xen. etc., P. Vat. A 15 (168 B.C.); in P. Par. 12, 20 (157 B.C.) = *return home*, but Lk 5^{3,4} *put out to sea* sc. boat; προάγω *go forward* 2 Jn⁹ vI, P. Lond. I no. 21 (p. 13) 15 (162 B.C.); *to go before* (τινα) Mt 2⁹ and *passim*, 1 Ti 1¹⁸ Heb 7¹⁸, P. Tor. I 8, 21 (116 B.C.); ptc. = *previous*; προσάγω *draw near* Ac 27²⁷ Xen. Hellenistic; συνάγε ἔτι ἄνω *move up* (but *assemble* in Or. gr. 130, 5 (146-116 B.C.) Mt 20²⁸ D; ὑπάγω Jn 3⁸ (and esp. often in Jn) = simplex as in MGr, especially in imperative, and only in pres. tense, P. Par. 15 (p. 225) 4 (121 B.C.) bis.

¹ K-G I 89-259. Gild. I 61-190. Schwyzer II 216ff. J. M. Stahl, *Kritisch-historische Syntax des griechischen Verbums der klassischen Zeit*, Heidelberg 1907. Jannaris 356-364. Wackernagel I 105-294. Mayser II 1, 80-130.

αἴρω: Ac 27¹³ *set sail*; μεταίρω *depart* Mt 13⁵³ 19¹, Aqu. Ge 12⁹.

βάλλω: Ac 27¹⁴ ἔβαλεν . . . ἄνεμος *rushed*; Mayser gives no parallels but there are Aesch., Eurip., Aeschin., and Enoch 18⁶, and βίπτω in the same sense (Radermacher², 23); Mk 4³⁷ class. ἐπιβάλλω *rush upon*; Lk 15¹², P. Lille 3, 64/5 (241 B.C.) τὸ ἐπιβάλλον μέρος; P. Grenf. I 33, 33 (103 B.C.) ἡ ἐπιβάλλουσα μέρος a fixed formula *belonging to* (Mayser II 1, 84); Mk 14⁷² ἐπιβαλὼν ἔκλειεν is controversial: *begin* is possible in later Greek (Migne PG 93, 1708) supported by DΘ 565 ἤρξατο κλαίειν, gloss of Theophylact and Euthymius ἀρξάμενος; Diog. Laert. VI 27 ἐπέβαλε *begin*; P. Tebt. I 50, 12 (112 B.C.) ἐπιβαλὼν συνέχωσεν, exx. in Mayser II 1, 84 meaning *set to work and*; but *consider* is also possible (Marc. Ant. X 30 ἐπιβάλλων τούτῳ sc. νοῦν *consider this*).

βρέχω: Mt 5⁴⁵ Jas 5¹⁷ = ὕει (class.) as in vernacular.

ἐγείρω: Lk 8⁵⁴ ἔγειρε (= ἐγέρθητι 7¹⁴) *be roused*.

ἔχω: Ac 21¹³ 2 Co 12¹⁴ etc. *to be in a certain condition* (class.), often in pap. letters with καλῶς *be well*, like Mk 16¹⁸; ἀπέχω *be distant* Lk 15²⁰ etc. (pp. 291, 336 for impers. use); ἐνέχω Mk 6⁴⁹ Lk 11⁵³ *hate, persecute*; ἐπέχω *tarry* Ac 19²², P. Rev. L. 4, 2; 17, 6 (259 B.C.); προσ- *listen to* Ac 8⁶ 16⁴ Heb 2¹ 2 Pt 1¹⁹ pap. (τὸν νοῦν no longer inserted, as in class. Attic); *stands written* 1 Pt 2⁶ περιέχει ἐν γραφῇ¹; Jos. Ant. 11, 104 ἐν αὐτῇ περιέχει; ὑπερ- *excel* Ro 13¹ 1 Pt 2¹³ Ph 2³ 3⁸ Wis 6⁶ (Johannessohn DGKPS 69: 2 Mac 11²² ἡ δὲ τοῦ βασιλέως ἐντολὴ περιεῖχεν οὕτως).

ἀνακάμπτω: *return* Mt 2¹² Lk 10⁶ Ac 18²¹ Heb 11¹⁵; often in papyri (Mayser and MM Vocab.).

κλίνω: *decline* Lk 9¹² 24²⁹, Hell., Polyb. P. Hib. 38, 8 (252 B.C.), MGr.; ἐκκλίνω *turn aside* Ro 16¹⁷ etc., P. Tor. I 2, 17 (116 B.C.).

προκόπτω: Ro 13¹² Hell.

ἀναλύω: *go home* Lk 12³⁶ Ph 1²³, P. Par. 22, 29 (165 B.C.) etc. See Bauer s.v. and Büchsel in Kittel WB IV 338.

ἀπορρίπτω: Ac 27⁴³, class. poet., Hell.

στρέφω: *turn intr.* Ac 3¹⁹ 7⁴²? 1 Pt 2²⁵ C (rest pass.), Jn 12⁴⁰ LXX WKLMX (rest pass.), Polyb.; ἐπιστρέφω *turn round*, P. Par. (Mayser II 1, 87), but the Bibl. context requires *be converted*; ἀναστρέφω *return* Ac 5²² 15¹⁶, P. Strass. II 111, 23 (iii/B.C.); ἀποστρέφω *return* Ac 3²⁶ P. Magd. 29, 9 (219 B.C.).

καταπαύω *take rest* Heb 4⁴. 10 LXX (Ge 2² Ex 31¹⁸ etc.), Com. Att. fragm. III no. 110⁸ p. 425 Kock (see Helbing DKVS 169f), but largely trans. in class.

ἐπιφαίνω: *show oneself* (of stars) Lk 1⁷⁹ Ac 27²⁰, Hell.

(b) Sometimes a causative sense is given to intrans. verbs, so that they may have an object. Thus in LXX βασιλεύω = *cause to reign*, ἐξαμαρτάνω = *cause to sin*, and some translators, esp. Lamentations, have gone very far in this direction², but the

¹ The reading of C corrects it and makes it transitive again: ἡ γραφή.

² Thackeray OT Gr. 24; J. Ziegler, *Beiträge zur Jeremias-Septuaginta*, Gött. 1958, 53.

process is advanced also in NT: ἀνατέλλω *cause to rise* Mt 5⁴⁵ (but intr. oft.) class. poet. Ionic, LXX Ge 3¹⁸ (Helbing DKVS 78) 1 Cl 2⁴, Diog. 12¹, Ev Naas.²; ἀναφαίνω *cause to appear* (a Hell. peculiarity) Ac 21³ SB*, Lucian dial. mar. X 1 ἀνάφηνον; εὐαγγελίζω Ac 16¹⁷ D* Rev 10⁷ 14⁶ (but p^{47S} have middle, as elsewhere in NT), Hell. (see Friedrich in Kittel WB II 708, 710); μαθητεύω *make a disciple of* (for *be a disc.*, as Mt 27⁵⁷, Plut.) Ac 14²¹; κατακληρονομέω Ac 13¹⁹ OT *cause to inherit*; θριαμβεύω *lead in triumph* (for *celebrate a triumph*; class. intr.) 2 Co 2¹⁴, Plut., MGr τονέ σπουδάζω *I make him study*, τονέ ζώ *I make him live*, με πέθανε *he has caused me to die* (see Psichari 185).

§ 3. The Active Voice (Mayser II 1, 89ff. Jannaris 356 ff. Abel § 52)

The intransitive active is used in a passive sense with παρά and υπό c. gen., e.g. ἀποθνήσκω υπό τῆς λύπης *died in grief* P. Par 23, 12 (165 B.C.). It was the rule in Attic Greek, and the pass. of ἀποκτείνω was τελευτάω or ἀποθνήσκω, as in NT, although we find the pass. form ἀπεκτάνθη in Mk 9³¹ etc. Hdt 6, 92 ἐτελεύτησαν ὑπ' Ἀθηναίων. The pass. of (εὖ, κακῶς) ποιέω was (εὖ, κακῶς) πάσχω, as in Ga 3⁵ ἐπάθετε εἰκῆ, and we find in Mt 17¹² an excellent example of act. and pass. together: ἐποίησαν ἐν αὐτῇ . . . μέλλει πάσχειν ὑπ' αὐτῶν (see P. Amh. 78, 4 βίαν πάσχων . . . ὑπὸ Ἐκύσεως). See Ac 27^{17. 28. 29} for ἐκπίπτω as pass. of ἐκβάλλω (in Ptolemaic papyri πίπτω as pass. of ἐπι-, προβάλλω; Mayser II 1, 90). The intr. ἕστηκα *I still stand* (= I have been placed), pass. in meaning though act. in form, is well established in class. Greek, as also ἕστην, intr. but active in form (*stand*). The simply conceived expressions ἐξεληλύθει Lk 8² (as pass. of ἐκβάλλω) and τὸν ἀναβάντα πρῶτον ἰχθύν Mt 17²⁷, may be due to Aramaic influence (Wellhausen Einl.² 19), but they are not foreign to Koine ways of speech either: e.g. P. Giss. I 39, 9 (130 B.C.) ἐὰν δέ τις ὄρκος ἢ τεκμήριον . . . ὑπὲρ τοῦ δικαίου πέσει (sc. εἰς σε) *be imposed (on you)*. The use of 3rd. p. pl. act. instead of pass. will be discussed pp. 292f.

§ 4. The Middle Voice (Mayser II 1, 91-116; Abel § 53)

MGr retains merely an active and a passive-deponent voice. The trend of the language in our period may have moved only

very slightly away from the class. norm but it was in this direction: where class. writers preferred the middle voice to express a somewhat loose connection between the subject and the action of the verb, in Hell. Greek the active voice is preferred. The forms of the middle and passive voices are tending to merge. The fut. and aor. tenses of the middle are declining; they alone anyway remained distinct from the passive in form even during the class. period. Now deponent verbs prefer passive forms, and ἀπεκρίθη in the NT is used (about 195 times) in place of ἀπεκρίνατο, while ἐγενήθημεν (*we were*, not *we were made*) displaces ἐγενόμεθα. Moreover, where there was formerly a fut. act. with a fut. mid. form, very often it conforms now with the active (e.g. ἀκούσω for ἀκούσομαι).

(a) The middle voice has sometimes been described as reflexive, and there are many instances of this in pre-Christian papyri (Mayser II 1, 94–105), but Hell. Greek will as soon use the active with a reflexive or personal pronoun in order to express a reflexive idea. Theoretically the middle involves the whole subject in the verb's action and expresses the subject in some special relationship to himself; e.g. 1 Co 6¹¹ ἀπελούσασθε *you were washed*, i.e. got yourselves washed. But in our period there is not always any significance in the writer's choice of middle or active, and the reflexive middle in the NT is relatively rare: Mt 6¹⁷ ἄλειψαί σου τὴν κεφαλὴν, 27⁵ ἀπήγγξατο, Mk 14⁵⁴ θερμαινόμενος, Jn 19²⁴ OT διαμερίσαντο . . . ἑαυτοῦς, 2 Pt 2²² ὅς λουσαμένη (Radermacher² 147). The reciprocal middle is even rarer: perhaps Mt 26⁴, Jn 12¹⁰ *took counsel with one another*.

(b) There is much confusion in the use of middle and active in NT. Of some verbs there is the middle form only, no active, both in Hell. and earlier Greek (e.g. αἰσθάνομαι); but of others the middle form is often used where we expect the active in spite of what has been noted as to the tendency of the language to allow the middle to disappear. There was enough deadening of linguistic sensitivity to make this possible. So much so that in the papyri and NT we can find even the active and middle of the same verb together in the same phrase; some distinction may have been intended, but none is apparent. E.g.:

1. αἰτέω and αἰτέομαι: an attempt was often made by exegetes to distinguish these in the NT, the active being described as a simple requesting and the middle an asking for what is due by contract. It is

true that the middle has a commercial or contractual flavour where the active serves for requests to God. "Commercial": Mt 27²⁰.⁵⁸ etc. (mid.), Mk 6²² (act., but mid. in SW),²³ (act.),²⁴ (mid.),²⁵ (mid.). Simple requests of a beggar or son: Mt 7^{9f} Ac 3² 16²⁹ (act.) 1 Co 1²² (act.). But, although in the pre-Christian papyri the middle prevails in the official style (Mayser II 1, 109f), there is often no principle either here or in the NT. For instance, prayer to God can be middle: Mt 18¹⁹ etc., Ac 13²¹ LXX 1 Km 8⁵. And yet "contractual" requests can be active or, rather, even vary in the same context: Mt 20²⁰ (act.),²² (mid.), Mk 10³⁵ (act.),³⁸ (mid.). No rule applies to that or the following: Jas 4^{2f} οὐκ ἔχετε διὰ τὸ μὴ αἰτεῖσθαι ἑμᾶς· αἰτεῖτε καὶ οὐ λαμβάνετε διότι κακῶς αἰτεῖσθε, 1 Jn 5^{14f} αἰτῶμεθα . . . ὃ ἐὰν αἰτῶμεθα, οἶδαμεν ὅτι ἔχομεν . . . ἃ ἤτήκαμεν. The change may have significance, but what? For the papyri see Mayser II 1, 109 n. 3, who quotes the ancient grammarian Ammonius to the effect that the active is used of requesting without reference to repayment, whereas the middle is to request with a view to using the thing requested and repaying it. But this hardly illuminates NT usage.

2. καρποφορέω and καρποφορέομαι: can there be significance in the contrast between the active in Col 1¹⁰ and middle καρποφορούμενον in 1⁶? The middle is rare, but there seems to be no difference (see Bauer s.v., but also Lightfoot in loc.).

3. *Some other verbs* appear in the middle where one expects active, since they have a transitive sense: the mid. of τίθημι in an act. sense has some class. precedent (e.g. Demosth. 56, 4 θέσθαι ἐν φυλακῇ like Ac 4³), 1 Co 12²⁸ οὐς μὲν ἔθετο, 1 Th 5⁹ ἔθετο ἡμᾶς; for pap. see Mayser II 1, 111; in view of Koine parallels, σπασάμενος in Mk 14⁴⁷ can easily be changed to act. in Mt 26⁵¹ ἀπέσπασεν; further the following appear in the NT in the middle with apparently the same meaning as the active: ἀμύνω *aid* (see Bauer), ἀπειλώ, ἐπιδεικνύω, ἀπεκδύομαι Col 2¹⁵ (ICC in loc.) *strip* or *spoil*, but *divesting oneself* is the more usual meaning for mid., συναλέομαι Lk 9¹ 15⁶ DF⁹ ADEGW 23¹³, Ac 10²⁴ 28¹⁷, ἐμβάπτομαι Mk 14²⁰ (Mt alters to act.), ἐπιδείκνυμαι *display* Ac 9³⁹, ἐπιτελέομαι *pay in full* 1 Pt 5⁹ P. Teb. 61 (b) 35 (118 B.C.) (ἐὰν μὴ ἐπιτελῶνται οἱ γεωργοὶ τὰ ἐκφόρια), ζηλόομαι Ga 4¹⁸ (or passive? Moule 25f), φανερόω Eph 5¹³ *that which illuminates*, or pass.?, φυλάσσομαι *observe* Mk 10²⁰ (parallels make it act.) LXX Ge 26⁵ Le 20⁸. Πληρώω is controversial: it appears in the act. Eph 4¹⁰ *fill*, but is this the same as the mid. in 1²³? AV and RV take it so, but some take it as pass., of Christ's being filled. Other words never appear in the act. in the NT but have an act. in the earlier Attic: προβλέπομαι Heb 11⁴⁰ *foresee*, περιβλέπομαι Mk 9⁸ etc. (mainly Mk, except for Lk 6¹⁰) *look around*, ἀρμόζομαι 2 Co 11² (no direct parallel, but see Moulton Pr. 160, MM Vocab. s.v.), ἐκδίδομαι Mt 21³³.⁴¹ Mk 12¹ Lk 20⁹ (here Mt retains Mk's mid.) frequ. in pap.: P. Giss. I 1 col. 1, 8 (173 B.C.), καταλαμβάνομαι Ac 4¹³ 10³⁴ 25²⁵ Eph 3¹⁸ *apprehend* mentally, Dion. Halic. etc., παρατηρέομαι *watch closely* Lk 6⁷ 14¹ Ac 9²⁴, *observe scrupulously* Ga 4¹⁰. Ἐκλέγομαι *choose* Mk 13²⁰ Lk 10⁴² (11 times in Lk-Ac) Jn 6⁷⁰ (4 times) Eph 1⁴ 1 Co 12⁷.²⁸ Jas 2⁵, P. Magd. 29, 4

(221 B.C.) ἐγλεξάμενος τὸν βέλτιστον τρόπον. The following middles are active with intrans. sense, and also have an active form in NT: ἀπορέομαι *be in doubt* Lk 24⁴ Jn 13²² Ac 25²⁰ Ga 4²⁰ 2 Co 4⁸; ὑστερέομαι *be inferior* 1 Co 12²⁴; ἐνεργέομαι Ro 7⁵ (8 times Paul) Jas 5¹⁶ *operate* (in act reserved for God or divine δυνάμεις in NT); see Lightfoot Gal. 204f., Milligan Thess. 28f., Mayor Jas. 177ff; but πολύ might be object in Jas 5¹⁶, thus making the verb trans. προέχομαι Ro 3⁹ (see Field Notes 152f., ICC in loc., Vaughan in loc.).

The evidence makes it difficult to claim, as Zerwick does (§ 178), that many of the above instances display a special use of the middle voice in which the subject is indicated as acting "ex se ipso", much less that ἔθετο in Ac 12⁴ indicates that Herod locked Peter up *very carefully*, i.e. for himself. The general lack of nice distinctions in use of the middle rules it out.

(c) On the other hand, some verbs appear in the active where we would expect the middle in class. Greek. The context supplies all that is required in the way of a reflexive idea. This is notably true of ποιέω with a verbal noun.

The middle of ποιέω is so rare in NT that its few (mainly Lucan) examples are worth studying (see Abel § 53 e): it is followed by ἀναβολήν, λόγον, μνειαν, πορείαν, σπουδήν; Lk 5³³ δεήσεις ποιούνται, 13²² πορείαν ποιούμενος, Ac 1¹ λόγον ἐποιησάμην (class., not same usage in pap.), 20²⁴ οὐδενός λόγον ποιῶμαι τὴν ψυχὴν, 25¹⁷ ἀναβολὴν μηδεμίαν ποιησάμενος, P. Amh. 34(e) 6 (157 B.C.), Ac 27¹⁸ ἐκβολὴν ἐποιοῦντο (techn.). The middle was the rule in class. Greek, and in some instances there is a variant correcting to the middle of ποιέω where the active appears in the stronger text: Mk 3⁶ συμβούλιον (mid. W), Jn 14²³ μονήν (mid. vl), Ac 8² κοπετόν (mid. EHP), 23¹³ ἩΡ συναμοσίαν (mid. vl). But the active, unchallenged, appears where we expect the middle: Mk 2²³ ὄδόν, 3⁶ συμβούλιον, Lk 1⁷² 10³⁷ ἔλεος (Hebraism; LXX Ge 24¹²), 18⁷. 8 ἐκδίκησιν, Ac 8² κοπετόν, 23¹² συστροφὴν, 25³ ἐνέδραν; Jn 5²⁷ Jude 1⁵ κρίσιν, Rev 11⁷ etc. πόλεμον.

This is true too of (κατα-)δουλόω: Ac 7⁶ OT 1 Co 9¹⁹ 2 Co 11²⁰ Ga 24 2 Pt 2¹⁹; and of εὐρίσκω *obtain* (where Attic prose had middle): Mt 10³⁹ 11²⁹ Lk 1³⁰ Ac 7⁴⁶ 2 Ti 1¹⁸ etc. Attic poets. See also Mt 26⁵¹ ἀπέσπασεν τὴν μάχαιραν (but correctly σπασάμενος Mk 14⁴⁷ Ac 16²⁷), 18²³⁽²⁴⁾ 25¹⁹ συναίρω λόγον (Moulton Pr. 160), 26⁶⁵ διέρρηξεν τὰ ἱμάτια, Ac 7³³ OT λῦσον (mid. LXX), 16¹⁶ παρεῖχεν ἐργασίαν (mid. C), 19²⁴ A* DE (mid. vl), 28² παρεῖχον φιλανθρωπίαν, 3 καθῆψεν (mid. C). See Deissmann NB 81ff; Moule 24-26. The middle is on its way out.

(d) Other verbs are passive in form but with middle or deponent meaning (middle-passive). These are also in the papyri: αἰσχύνομαι ἡσχυνήθην, γίνομαι ἐγενήθην, δύναμαι

ἡδυνήθην, ἀποκρίνομαι ἀπεκρίθην, ὀργίζομαι ὠργίσθην, φοβέομαι ἐφοβήθην, ἀνάγομαι ἀνήχθην, ἐνθυμέομαι ἐνεθυμήθην.

This is all part of the general Hellenistic tendency to substitute either the passive or active forms for the declining middle. The confusion of ἐβαπτίσθην and ἐβαπτισάμην has long puzzled expositors, but there is no mystery; both the middle and passive are now being used in the sense of *to allow oneself to be . . .*, and both voices become at times virtually an intransitive active: cp. ἀναστάς ἐβαπτίσθη Ac 9¹⁸. In the variant readings therefore there is no *prima facie* evidence either way: Lk 11³⁸ 1 Co 10². The development is fairly advanced in NT, where ἡγέρθη for instance is passive only in form and is used of the resurrection with a very active nuance: Mk 14²⁸ 16⁶ Mt 27⁶⁴ etc. There is simply no difference between this and ἀνέστη, where the action of the Father is assumed no more and no less (Zerwick § 175). No one *placed* the Pharisee in the Temple in Lk 18¹¹ or Paul on Mar's Hill in Ac 17²²; although σταθεῖς is used, they *stood* there. Translate *stand* also in Mt 18¹⁶ Ac 5²⁰ Ro 14⁴ Col. 4¹².

The following also are intrans. active in idea, rather than passive or middle: ἀπογράφομαι Lk 21^{3, 5} *register*; κείρασθαι, ξύρασθαι 1 Co 11⁶ *cut her hair*; ὀφελον καὶ ἀποκόψονται Ga 5¹² (MM Vocab. s.v.); ἀδικέομαι *submit to fraud*, ἀποστερέομαι *submit to loss* 1 Co 6⁷; δογματίζομαι Col 2²⁰ *submit to rules*; γαμίζομαι Mt 22³⁰ 1 Co 7³⁸ etc. *get married*; συσχηματίζομαι Ro 12² *conform*; ἐλάσθητι Lk 18¹³ *be merciful*; ἀγνισθῆναι Ac 21^{24, 26} *purify oneself*.

§ 5. The Passive Voice (Mayser II 1, 116-130; Abel § 54)

(a) In common with class. Attic, when NT authors transfer certain verbs with a genitive or dative object to the passive, the indirect object becomes the subject of the verb; there may also be an impersonal indirect object in the accusative, and this remains so. E.g.:

With dative: ἐγκαλέομαι *be accused* Ac 19⁴⁰ etc., P. Magd. 21, 6 (1 B.C.) τοὺς ἐγκεκλημένους, also 33, 11 (221 B.C.) etc. (Mayser II 1, 120); διακονέομαι *be served* Mt 20²⁸ Mk 10⁴⁵; μαρτυρέομαι *be well spoken of* Ac 6³ 1 Ti 5¹⁰ Heb 7⁸ etc. (Deissmann NB 93); but this construction is not followed in 3 Jn¹² Δημητρίῳ μεμαρτύρηται, Dion. Hal. de Thuc. 8); πιστεύομαι *be entrusted with* Ro 3² etc. Polyb. etc.; *find belief, be believed in* 1 Ti 3¹⁶ of Christ, 2 Th 1¹⁰ of his witness; χρηματίζομαι *be warned* Mt 21² etc. Lk 22⁶ D (different construction in the rest: ἦν αὐτῷ κεχρηματισμένον); εὐαρεστεύομαι *be pleased* Heb 13¹⁶, Diodor., Diog. Laert.; ἀρκέομαι Lk 3¹⁴

I Ti 6⁸ He 13⁵ I Cl 2¹, Ign. Pol. 5¹, P. Par. 22, 20 (165 B.C.), 38, 11 (160 B.C.), BGU VI 1247, 13 (149 B.C.) etc.; ἐπιτρέπομαι *be permitted* Ac 26¹ 28¹⁶ I Co 14³⁴, Thuc. 3, 22 (οἷς ἐτέτακτο παραβοηθεῖν), P. Magd. 27, 6 (220 B.C.), but here the verb becomes impersonal when it is passive and the object of the act. remains still in the dative.

With genitive: καταγινώσκω *stand condemned* Ga 2¹¹ (Field Notes 188f) Diodor., M. Aurel.; κατηγορέομαι *be accused* Mt 27¹² Ac 22³⁰ 25¹⁶; πληρόομαι Jn 18⁹.

(b) Many trans. deponent verbs may be used with passive sense (see K-G I 120, 4; Stahl 73, 3) in both class. and later Greek. In the Koine this extends to all tenses with certain verbs, like βιάζομαι, ἐργάζομαι, λογίζομαι, but the pres. tense is rare, as in class. and NT.

Aorist: these passives are easy to detect as the two voices differ in form in the aorist (and future). κατεργάσθην 2 Co 12¹² *be performed*, several pap. (Mayser II, 1, 121); ἐλογίσθην λογισθήσεται *be reckoned* Lk 22³⁷ Ac 19²⁷ Ro 2²⁶ 4³ etc., pap.; ἴσθην ἰαθήσεται Mt 8⁸ etc.; ἀπαρνηθήσεται Lk 12⁹; ἐχαρίσθην Ac 3¹⁴ etc.; ἐρρούσθην Lk 17⁴ etc.; ἐμνήσθην *be remembered* Ac 10³¹ Rev 16¹⁹ LXX, not class. or pap. See A. Prévot, *L'aoriste grec en -θην*, Paris 1935, 148-153.

Perfect: ἴσται Mk 5²⁹; ἐσμέν εὐηγγελισμένοι Heb 4²; ἐπήγγελται Ga 3¹⁹ I Cl 35⁴, LXX 2 Mac 4²⁷; ἐπιλελησμένον Lk 12⁶.

Present: rare in NT, class. λογίζομαι Ro 4⁴ 5. 24 9⁸; εὐαγγελίζομαι Mt 11⁵ Lk 7²² 16¹⁶; βιάζομαι Mt 11¹² (not Lk 16¹⁶), P. Tebt. I 6, 32 (140 B.C.), Stahl 73, 3; ἴσομαι Ac 5¹⁶ D Barn 8⁶.

(c) The passives of verbs like ὁράω ὁπτάνω φαίνω γινώσκω εὐρίσκω may attach the person concerned by means of the dative, rather than ὑπό c. gen., and then they have an intransitive meaning:

ὄφθῆναι c. dat. P. Cair. Zen. 28, 3 (255 B.C.), P. Par. 63, 11, 56 (165 B.C.), Mt 17³ Mk 9⁴ Lk 11¹ 22⁴³ etc.; ὁπτάνομαι Ac 1³, Eurip. Bacch. 914 (ὄφθητί μοι), P. Par. 49, 33 (160 B.C.); φαίνομαι Mt 27 Lk 9⁸ Ph 2¹⁵ Heb 11³ etc., frequ. in pap. (Mayser II 1, 122) *appear*; γινώσκομαι *become known* Ac 9²⁴ etc., Eurip. Cycl. 567, Xen. Cyr. 7, 1, 44 (but with ὑπό I Co 8³); εὐρίσκομαι¹ Ro 10²⁰ LXX (vl. ἐν), Ac 8⁴⁰ ε. εἰς "Ἀζωτον 2 Co 12²⁰ *come to* (Heb. infl.), LXX Est 1⁵, Herm S. IX 13, 2; = *in regnum dei venire* (vet. lat.); Acta Thom. 175^{2f}; also 116^{4f} πῶς νῦν εὐρέθης ὦδε; Acta Andr. et Matth. 90^{9f} πῶς εὐρέθης ἐνταῦθα; *what are you doing here? or how have you got in here?* (Wright II, p. 103); Gesta Pil. 12³; see de Boor's index to Theophanes: P. Ox. I 131 (vi-vii/A.D.); Acta Xanth. 76^{32ff} ἡ δὲ Πολυξένη ἐξελοῦσα τῆς πόλεως καὶ μὴ ἐπισταμένη διὰ ποίας ὁδεύση ὁδοῦ, εὐρέθη εἰς ἐρήμους τόπους ὁρέω (a striking parallel to Ac 8⁴⁰); Migne PG 65, 377c; MGr μοῦ εὐρέθη εἰς τὴν ἀνάγκην μου *he came to me in my need*; θεάομαι Mt 6¹ 23⁵ *appear*; σταθῆναι see Blass-Debr. §§ 97, 1; 191.

¹ See Sophocles Lexicon s.v. for its use in later Greek in this sense.

CHAPTER SEVEN

THE VERB: ASPECT AND TENSE¹

IN SOME places in the NT interpretation is affected by a consideration which is important for understanding the verb. Originally in Indo-Germanic speech the tense-stems of the verb were not intended to indicate kinds of *time*, e.g. present, past or future. That came later, and incidentally can usually be assumed in Greek; but essentially the tense in Greek expresses the kind of *action*, not time, which the speaker has in view and the *state* of the subject, or, as the Germans say, the *Aspekt*. In short, the tense-stems indicate the point of view from which the action or state is regarded. The word *Aktionsart* (kind of action) has been taken over in all countries to express this essential idea. The chief kinds of action are: (1) continuous, which grammarians call *linear*, and (2) instantaneous, which they call *punctiliar*. By their very meaning some verbs can express only either one or the other *Aktionsart*, but the majority may be used in both ways. The aorist stem expresses punctiliar, and the present expresses linear action. Sometimes however the aorist will not even express momentary or punctiliar action but will be non-committal; it regards the action as a whole without respect to its duration; time is irrelevant to it. Now the augment (ἐ-) is a different matter. It was this which in Greek indicated the time as distinct from the *Aktionsart*, and the augment was added to both present (which becomes imperfect) and aorist action-stems

¹ K-G I 129-200. Gild. I 79-143. Stahl 74-220. Schwyzer II 246-269. Wackernagel I 149-210. Jannaris 433-444. W. W. Goodwin, *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb*, Lond. 1897. E. W. Burton, *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek*⁴, Chicago 1909. A. Svensson, *Zum Gebrauch der erzählenden Tempora im Griech.* Lund 1930. J. Holt, *Études d'Aspect*, Copenhagen 1943 (a hist. of *Aspekt*-theories). J. W. Carpenter, *The Aktionsart of the Aorist in Acts* (Diss. of S. Baptist Theol. Sem.) 1943. Gildersleeve, *AJP* 23, 1902, 241-53. E. Purdie, "The Perfective *Aktionsart* in Polybius." *IF* 9, 1898, 63-153. Moulton Einl. 176-237. O. E. Johnson, *Tense Significance as the Time of Action*, Language Diss. no. 21, 1936. J. Humbert, "Verbal Aspect: Has it evolved from Ancient to Modern Greek?" *The Link*, Oxford 1938, 1, 21-28. Zerwick §§ 180-214a. Moulton Proleg. ch. VI.

to show that the time had passed, from the speaker's standpoint. If there is no augment to the stem we may assume that the speaker refers either to some contemporary action or else that he is not concerned with the time as such at all. Besides the augment, the future tense too indicates a temporal relationship with the speaker and considerations of *Aktionsart* do not often intrude.

§ 1. Present Indicative

It normally expresses linear action and, until the augment has transferred this tense to the imperfect, the linear action is understood as taking place at the same time as the speech. The equivalent in English might be the periphrastic present: *I am walking*. There is however a complication, because Greek has no present stem with a punctiliar root. In order to say *I walk* without reference to time, English can be unambiguous; not so Greek. It must use the indicative of the present, with all the disadvantages of ambiguity arising from its linear stem; if the aor. indic. were used it would but confuse still more by bringing in the augment which indicates past time. Thus in Greek one seldom knows apart from the context whether the pres. indic. means *I walk* or *I am walking*. In other moods than indic., of course, the problem does not arise, there being no complicating augment, and so the aorist stem is freely used to indicate punctiliar action in *present* time. One must always bear that in mind for exegesis.

(a) The *Historic Present* is common to cultured and unliterary speech, to class. Greek, the papyri, LXX, Josephus, and MGr., especially in vivid narrative where the speaker imagines himself present¹. In spite of the present being the tense of linear action, the hist. present is an instance where *Aktionsart* and tense-forms do not coincide; this present usually has punctiliar action. Mark and John are particularly fond of it, and their narrative is made vivid thereby. Mk has 151 exx. (72 verbs of speaking: λέγει and pl., and φησίν); Mt has 93 exx. (68 verbs of speaking); Lk only 9, and the Hellenistic 2 Maccabees only two (14¹⁶ συμμίσγει, 15⁵ φησίν). Luke markedly

¹ K. Eriksson, *Das Praesens Historicum in der nachclassischen griechischen Historiographie*, Diss. of Lund, 1943. Wackernagel I 162ff. Zerwick *Untersuchungen*, 49-57. Hawkins *Hor. Syn.*² 143f, 213ff.

tries to avoid it, as vulgar if used to excess. Were it not for the universal precedent in Greek we would be tempted to allege that the influence of the Aramaic participle accounts for this (see Moulton-Howard 456f). As Lagrange points out (*S. Matth.* XCII), it is Aramaic to use λέγει or pl. at the beginning without connecting particle: "en grec on dirait εφη, après un mot quelconque." In Daniel we have ענה ואמר, and this appears already in Pap. Eleph. 45 l. 16, but one also finds in these papyri the asyndetic אמר at the beginning. Mt has this λέγει 17 times: 8⁷ 16¹⁵ 17²⁵ 18²² 19⁸. 18. 20. 21 BΘ 20⁷. 21. 23 21³¹. 42 22⁴³ 26²⁵. 35. 64 27²². Jn extensively uses it and varies it with the aorist quite naturally, sometimes keeping the main events in the present and the incidentals in the aorist (e.g. 1²⁹⁻⁴³). In all speech, especially the least educated, forms like λέγει and φησίν appear in reports of conversation: Mt Mk Jn prefer the former, Lk the latter. Sometimes it indicates that an event took place simultaneously with, or immediately after, a point of time already given: e.g. Mt 2¹³ Mk 14¹⁷, Herm. V. I 1³, but the hist. pres. is so universal that it is impossible to theorize. We can only say that in post-class. Greek there is an increasing tendency to find it with λέγει and verbs of speaking, with verbs of seeing (this is frequent in the LXX Pent.), and with verbs of motion, especially coming and going (also frequ. in LXX later historical books). Thus there are 1145 pages in the eleven books of the Archaeology of Dionysius of Halicarnassus and 1000 historic presents—almost one each page (Eriksson op. cit. 39). And at its most frequent in Josephus we find: Ant. 5 (245/68 pp.), 6 (280/82 pp.), 18 (273/71 pp.), BJ 1 (379/140 pp.) (Eriksson op. cit. 76). The proportion in Arrian's *Anabasis* is 162/100 pp., as compared with Xenophon's *Anabasis* 165/100 pp. (Eriksson op. cit. 83). But doubtless the frequency of the picturesque participle in Heb. narrative, which tended to be translated by the present indic., contributed to its popularity in Biblical Greek.

It occurs about 337 times in LXX, of which 232 are in 1-4 Kms (Horae Synopticae², 213). Here, according to Thackeray (Schweich Lectures p. 21), it introduces a new scene in dramatic narrative, especially a new character or change of locality or a turning-point. "Even the colloquial λέγει . . . may be brought under the same head. It is the *loquitur* introducing a new speaker. It marks the exact point where *oratio recta* begins, the past tense being retained even in the verb immediately preceding; 'he answered and saith,' ἀποκριθεὶς λέγει in St. Mark,

ὕπολαβὼν λέγει in Job LXX. The main function is this, I maintain, to introduce a date, a new scene, a new character, occasionally a new speaker; in other words, a fresh paragraph in the narrative." In what Thackeray called Early Reigns "the clearest instance of the date-registering use is the present βασιλεύει, which, along with θάπτεται, is constant in the recurrent deace-and-accession formula" in 3 Kms. "With this mannerism of the Alexandrian translators we should contrast the later fourth book, where the formula consistently runs ἐκοιμήθη—ἐτάφη—ἐβασίλευσεν." Thackeray suggested that the presents in Mark (except λέγει) were used in a similar way for new scenes and characters (p. 22). "They generally coincide with chapter-openings in the capitulary system in Codex Alexandrinus." But the very fact that Thackeray's later translator does not observe this canon is overwhelming evidence that if there was such a rule it was not universally observed. At most, it may be a tendency.

Mayser divides the use of hist. pres. in the pre-Christian pap. into three: (a) the dramatic: and a typical example is given, showing the variation with the aorist, in the same way as in Mk and Jn: P. Par 23, 9ff (165 B.C.) (II 1, 131), (b) in reports of dreams, obviously for drama and vividness, and (c) in making records, especially on letters and documents.

(b) The *Perfective Present* is rare.

It occurs in NT with ἀδικέω Ac 25¹¹ (Mt 20¹³ is the usual sense of pres.) almost = *be worthy of death, be in the wrong*, P. Tebt. I 22, 11 (112 B.C.) γράψον ἡμῖν τίς ἀδικεῖ.—Ἦκω Lk 15²⁷ Jn 8⁴² etc. *be here*, Or. gr. 186, 6 (58 B.C.) ἤκω καὶ πεποίηκα τὸ προσκύνημα.—Ἀπέχω Mt 6² etc. (Deissmann L. v. 0⁴. 88) = ἀπειλήφα or ἐσχρηκα, v. frequ. in the Koine (Mayser II 1, 132f).—Ἀκούω Lk 9⁹ 1 Co 11¹⁸ 2 Th 3¹¹, class. Xen. Mem. 3, 5, 26, P. Hal. 1, 167, 177 (250 B.C.), P. Amh. II 37, 8 (ii/B.C.) etc. *have heard*.—Νικάω Ro 12²¹ Rev 2⁷ 15² etc., class. *be a conqueror*. Πάρεισιν Ac 17⁶ *have come* (Burton 10).—Πειθόμεθα Heb. 13¹⁸ (corr. to perf. in S^cC^cD^bc IK).—Κεῖται Mt 3¹⁰.—Πάρεστιν Jn 11²⁸.—Ἦττωνται 2 Pt 2²⁰.

(c) The Present which indicates the continuance of an action during the past and up to the moment of speaking is virtually the same as Perfective, the only difference being that the action is conceived as still in progress (Burton § 17). It is frequent in the NT: Lk 2⁴⁸ 13⁷ (ἰδοὺ τρία ἔτη ἀφ' οὗ ἔρχεται) 15²⁹ (τοσαῦτα ἔτη δουλεύω σοι, and I still do), Jn 5⁶ 8⁵⁸ (εἰμί) 14⁹ (μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμί) 15²⁷ (ἔστέ), Ac 15²¹ (Μ. γὰρ ἐκ γενεῶν ἀρχαίων κατὰ πόλιν τοὺς κηρύσσοντας αὐτὸν ἔχει, and still has) 26³¹ (πράσσει, his manner of life still continues), 2 Co 12¹⁹, 2 Ti 3¹⁵ (οἰδᾶς), 2 Pt 3⁴, 1 Jn 2⁹ 3⁸.

(d) Concerning the *Futuristic* use of the *Present*, Moulton¹ suggested that these presents differed from the future tense "mainly in the tone of assurance which is imparted"; they are confident assertions intended to arrest attention with a vivid and realistic tone or else with imminent fulfilment in mind, and they are mainly restricted to the vernacular. In English it would be *I am to . . .* or *I am about to . . .*. It is oracular sometimes in class. Greek (e.g. Hdt 8, 140) and so it is not surprising that it is used so much in the NT of the Coming One, with the verb ἔρχομαι: Mt 11³ ὁ ἐρχόμενος *the Messiah*, 17¹¹ Ἡλίας ἔρχεται, Jn 14³ ἔρχομαι (immediately foll. by a verb in the fut.), Lk 12^{54f} same, 1 Co 16^{5f} ἐλεύσομαι . . . διέρχομαι (*I am going through . . .*) . . . διαμενῶ; but in other languages too verbs of going employ a futuristic present (Wackernagel I 161).

In a prophetic or oracular sense other verbs too: Mk 9³¹ παραδίδοται (periphr. fut. in Mt-parallel) foll. by fut. καὶ ἀποκτενοῦσιν, Mt 26² παραδίδοται, 27⁶³ ἐγείρομαι, Jn 11⁴⁸ ἐλεύσονται καὶ αἰτοῦσιν p⁴⁵ (Θ ἔρουσιν; rest fut.), 20²³ ἀφίενται WΘ eschat. fut.? (J. Jeremias in Kittel WB III 753), Lk 13³² ἐκβάλλω . . . ἀποτελῶ . . . τελειοῦμαι, 1 Co 15³² OT ἀποθνήσκομεν. In other senses: Mt 2⁴ γενῶνται *is to be born* or *about to be born*, 24⁴³ Jn 4³⁵ ἔρχεται, Mt 26² γίνεται, P. Par. 51, 39 (159 B.C.) [ἀφ'εἰς μοι γίνεται ταχύ, Mt 20¹⁸ Jn 20¹⁷ ἀναβαίνομεν, P. Par. 47 (153 B.C.) ἀναβαίν(ει)αῦριον, O. P. 1157, 25f (iii/A.D.), largely rhetorical and poet. in class. Greek, Lk 14¹⁹ Jn 14^{2. 12}. Ac 20²² πορεύομαι. This use appears in the papyri; it is not always easy to decide whether there is futurity, e.g. in wills καταλείπω *I leave*, as in English (Mayser II 1, 134). See also: Mt 18¹² ζητεῖ (alongside a fut.), 26¹⁸ ποιῶ τὸ πασχα *I am about to celebrate*, Lk 3⁹ ἐκκόπτεται καὶ βάλλεται, 19⁸ δίδωμι καὶ ἀποδίδωμι, Jn 10¹⁵ τίθημι, 21²³ οὐκ ἀποθνήσκει, 1 Co 15²⁶ καταργεῖται, Rev 9⁶ φεύγει. See K-G I 137, 5. Stahl 88, 4. Wackernagel I 159, 161f.

(e) A *Conative Present*, having the same nuance as the imperfect, is conceivable where there is the notion of incompleteness and attempt: Jn 10³² *do they want to stone me?* 13⁶ *are you trying to wash . . . ?* Ro 2⁴ *try to lead or tend to lead*, Ga 5⁴ *try to be justified*, 6¹² *try to compel*, Jn 13²⁷ *what you want to do*, Ac 26²⁸ *you try to persuade me*, 2 Co 5¹¹ Ga 2¹⁴. Inchoative (*begin*): Mk 11²³ 4¹⁷.

(f) Burton (12) discusses a *Gnomic Present* used in generalizations or proverbs: Mt 7¹⁷ Jn 7⁵² 2 Co 9⁷ Jas 1¹³⁻¹⁵.

¹ *Einleitung*, 196.

(g) The *Aktionsart* is often difficult to determine in the present because of the lack of a punctiliar stem in the indic. which does not indicate past time. As already explained, the Greek pres. indic. must serve for *I walk* as well as *I am walking*. The following however are thought to be punctiliar actions taking place at the moment of speaking (Burton 9): Mt 5²². 28 etc. *I tell you*, 14⁸, 26⁶³, Mk 2⁵ Mt 9² *sins receive forgiveness* herewith, Lk 7⁸ *off he goes*, 12⁴⁴, Jn 5³⁴, 9²⁵, Ac 8²³, 9³⁴ ἰάται σε *he heals you* (not *is healing you*) or ἰάται perf.?, 16¹⁸ παραγγέλλω σοι herewith *I bid you*, 26¹ ἐπιτρέπεται almost = *herewith receive permission*.

(h) Present in reported speech referring to the past. Not only after verbs of speaking, but also perception and belief, the NT prefers the pres. tense in indirect discourse reported in the past; class. Greek has it only when the point of view of the original speaker (not the narrator) is adopted.

Mt 2²² ἀκούσας ὅτι Ἰ. βασιλεύει, 18²⁵ πάντα ὅσα ἔχει B Orig. (rest εἶχεν), 21⁴⁵ ὅτι περὶ αὐτῶν λέγει (but past in Mk-parallel 12¹²), Mk 8¹⁶ διελογίζοντο ὅτι ἄρτους οὐκ ἔχουσιν p⁴⁵ B (D corrects to εἶχαν), but rest make it orat. recta, Ac 22² ἀκούσαντες ὅτι προσφωνεῖ DEH (rest. corr. to προσεφώνει). Exceptions in NT, conforming to class. precedent: Mk 12¹² ἔγνωσαν ὅτι τὴν παραβολὴν εἶπεν (see Mt-parallel above), Jn 16¹⁹ ἔγνω ὅτι ἤθελον (vl. ἤμελλον) αὐτὸν ἐρωτᾶν.

§ 2. Imperfect

The contrast between the indicatives of the imperfect and aorist illustrates the difference between linear and punctiliar *Aktionsart* in its most acute form, for the imperfect is the tense of incomplete action, duration and continuity; the presence of the augment indicates that all this is in past time. Although imperfects are retreating before aorists in the Koine, they are still in wide use and the class. distinctions are still being observed. There is a certain interplay between the tenses; indeed we can find no difference between ἔλεγεν and εἶπεν in the NT. Although it is usual to distinguish various kinds of imperfect, and for convenience we preserve these divisions, the classification is not inelastic and the chief determining factor for translators will be the context itself.

1. Behind its use with verbs of asking, requesting, and commanding is the idea of incomplete action in the past. It is

close to the conative idea. Such verbs, in their very nature "imperfect", await a fulfilment in a further action by another agent: ἀξιόω, κελεύω, παρακελεύομαι, (ἐπ-)ερωτάω, πέμπω, ἀποστέλλω, πυνθάνομαι, etc.; and in the Koine also ἀπαιτέω, λέγω, προσημαρτυρέω, προσφέρομαι.

Mt 2⁴ ἐπυνθάνετο; so also Lk 15²⁶ 18³⁸ Ac 4⁷ 10¹⁸ (BC aor) 21³³ 23¹⁹. Mk 8⁵ ἠρώτα; so Ac 3³ 16³⁹. Mk 8²³. 27. 29 ἐπηρώτα. Mt 8² προσεκύνει = request; so 9¹⁸ 15²⁵ S*BDM, as distinct from the aorist which means *worship* (Mt 2¹¹ 14³³ etc.), but Mt 18²⁶ προσεκύνει could mean *prostrated*, and this is its usual meaning in NT. Lk 8²⁹ παρήγγελλεν the unclean spirit to come out (aor. is expected). Ac 15³⁸ ἤξιου requested *not to take with them*, cp. P. Tor. I 4, 73 (116 B.C.): it may mean that Paul's suggestion about Mark was only tentative at first. Ac 16²² ἐκέλευον to beat them (breaks the rule about unfulfilled action, as magistrates would be certain their command would be obeyed: vulg. *iusserunt*). Ac 27³³ παρεκάλει to take food (but Iterative?). Where the aorist is found the request is usually peremptory, demanding obedience (see Zerwick § 202 on the difference between Mk 5¹⁰: "rogatio vana est, ideo imperfectum": and 5¹² request successful and therefore aorist. Vulg. neglects the distinction): Ac 10⁴⁸ προσέταξεν to be baptized (essential), 23¹⁸ ἠρώτησεν (-αν) me to bring this young man to you (*demand*), Mt 8³⁴ παρεκάλεσαν to go away, 18² begged, 26⁵³ demanded, Mk 9¹⁶ (merely a dir. question, but by Jesus), Lk 8³⁷ insisted, Ac 8³¹ he made Ph. come up (not invited), 16¹⁵ insisted (παρεβιάσατο shows how insistent he was). In Jn 4⁵² ἐπόθετο is merely a question, but an urgent one, and the answer known.

2. A *Conative* or *Desiderative* imperfect¹, of incomplete or interrupted action, which sometimes softens the harshness of a remark or makes it more diffident, is discernible in NT but rare in the Koine. Mt 3¹⁴ Mk 9³⁸ (vl. aor.) Lk 9⁴⁹ p⁴⁵ SBL wished to hinder, Lk 15⁹ wished to name him Z. (Abel cites Xen.), Ac 7²⁶ tried to reconcile them, 25²² ἐβουλόμην . . . ἀκοῦσαι would like to listen, 26¹¹ ἠνάγκαζον tried to make them blaspheme (2 Mac 6¹⁸ ἠναγκάζετο the attempt was made to force him to eat), where to misinterpret this tense with AV is serious, 27⁴¹ ἐλύετο the surf seemed to be trying to break up the prow (or Incohative), Ro 9³ ἠύχομην γὰρ ἀνάθεμα εἶναι I could almost pray, Ga 4²⁰ ἤθελον . . . παρεῖναι, Phm¹³ ἐβουλόμην, Heb 11¹⁷ tried to offer, Mk 15²³ tried to give, Ac 18⁴ tried to persuade.

3. An impf. with a linear *Aktionsart* is used in descriptions in narrative to portray and set in relief the manner of the action ;

¹ K-G I 141. Stahl 100, 3. Mayser II 1, 135f. Burton § 23.

it is common in the Koine of the Imperial period, less so in the Ptolemaic (Gild. I 93; Mayser II 1, 136). It seems to represent a past event as still taking place at the time when an event in the aorist suddenly intervenes to cap it. In fact, the aorist advances the bare story and the imperfect supplies the picture's details, when the two tenses are woven together in narrative. On the other hand, sometimes the change of tense is prompted by no other motive than avoidance of monotony, as when Mt changes Mk's οὐχ ἠύρισκον into οὐχ εὖρον (Mt 26⁶⁰ Mk 14⁵⁵). There is a papyrus parallel to Mk's two imperfects: P. Hamb. no. 27, 4 (250 B.C.) ἐπεζήτηουν καὶ οὐχ ἠύρισκον, but by capping it with an aor. Mt is probably more stylistically correct: they were seeking a long time and in spite of that there was no sudden solution. So in Lk 7⁶ ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἐπορεύετο *he was going when* ἐπεμψεν *the centurion sent friends*. Correct too is Ac 21²⁰ ἐδόξαζον τὸν θεόν, εἰπόν τε, *they kept praising God and finally said*, 5²⁷ ἤγεν αὐτούς . . . ἀγαγόντες δὲ αὐτούς ἔστησαν; the impf. indicates action which proceeded until finally they were presented to the Sanhedrin, 21³ (we kept on our course to Syria [impf.] and finally landed at Tyre [aor.]), 21³⁰ they were in process of dragging P. out of the Temple (impf.) when suddenly the gates were shut (aor.), Mt 8²⁴ ἐκάθευδεν he kept on sleeping till finally ἤγειραν αὐτόν, 26⁶³ ἐσιώπα Jesus kept silent till the High Priest εἶπεν, 3⁴ John's dress (impf.), ⁵ his audience (impf.), ⁶ his baptizing (impf.): all contributes to a vivid picture against the background of which John utters his rebukes (7 aor.), Mk 5³² περιεβλέπετο Jesus was looking around him until the woman came ἦλθεν, 9²⁰ ἐκυλίετο he kept rolling about, and presumably they watched him awhile until Jesus spoke ἐπερώτησεν. There are many instances of descriptive impf., however, without a finalizing aorist to follow. These apparently are intended to make the narrative interesting and continuous until some action is expected in the aor. to give point to the whole description; but more often than not the description is left without climax: Mk 14³⁵ ἐπιπτεν καὶ προσηύχετο (vivid details of Gethsemane), Mt 7²⁸ ἐξεπλήσσαντο, 26⁵⁸ ἠκολούθει καὶ ἐκάθητο, Lk 24⁷ ἐξίσταντο, 16¹⁹ ἐνεδιδύσκετο, 15¹⁶ ἐπεθύμει . . . καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐδίδου, 17²⁷ describing Noah's times, 24¹⁴ ὠμίλουν, ²¹ ἠλπίζομεν Jn 11³⁶ ἐφίλει, 19³ ἤρχοντο, Ac 5⁴¹ ἐπορεύοντο, 15³ διήρχοντο . . . ἐποιοῦν, 14¹⁹ ἔσυρον, 18¹⁹ D διελέγετο (rest aor.), 21²⁹ ἐνόμιζον.

But how to account for Mt 4¹¹ ἄγγελοι προσῆλθον (aor.) καὶ διηκόνουν (impf.), 13⁸ the seed ἔπεσεν (aor.) and yet it ἐδίδου (impf.) καρπὸν, 25⁵ the maids ἐνύσταξαν (aor.) and yet ἐκάθευδον (impf.), 1 Co 10⁴ in the same verse and context ἔπιον and ἔπινον, 10^{6.11} in the same context ταῦτα τύποι ἡμῶν ἐγενήθησαν (aor.) and ταῦτα τυπικῶς συνέβαιναν (impf.)? Is it anything more subtle than a desire for variety? If the impfs. are descriptive, so must the aorists be, in these particular contexts. The most we can say is that the aor. records the action without stressing its execution, e.g. *angels, who had come, ministered to him; the seed, which had fallen, bore fruit.*

4. The *Iterative* or customary imperfect represents interrupted continuance or repetition, rather than an action that was done once and for all. In Mk 6⁴¹ Lk 9¹⁶ Jesus gives thanks and breaks the bread (punctiliar), but the next verb ἐδίδου reveals that the disciples kept returning to Jesus for more food (linear iterative).

Mk 1³¹ διηκόνει *began to wait on them*, 5¹³ ἐπνίγοντο, 7²⁶ ἡρώτα αὐτόν, 12⁴¹ ἐβαλλον (or Descriptive?), 15⁶ ἀπέλυεν, Lk 21³⁷ ἠύλιζετο *he used to spend the night*, 24¹ ἐπορεύοντο κατ' ἔτος, 8²⁹ ἐδεσμεύετο . . . ἤλαυνετο, Jn 4³¹ ἡρώτων, Ac 2⁴⁵ ἐπίπρασκον καὶ διεμέριζον (often but spasmodic), 4³⁴ ἔφερον . . . καὶ ἐτίθουν, 18⁸ ἐπίστευον καὶ ἐβαπτίζοντο. But the Markan use of this impf. is full of uncertainty. Mark keeps his aorists in proper use, but does he his imperfects? Very often he uses the periphrastic tense for the customary imperfect, and therefore in 1⁷ ἐκήρυσσεν λέγων the reference may be to some definite occasion and actual saying. 14^{60.61}, where ἐπήρωτα = ἐπηρώτησεν confirms this view.

5. The impf. often occurs where in English we would use the pluperfect: that is, to express past time relative to the time of the main action after verbs of perception and belief. Greek tenses do not so much express relative time, which emerges from the context, as indicate *Aktionsart*. If punctiliar action is intended, it will be aorist. Mk 6¹⁸ ἔλεγεν γὰρ ὁ Ἰωάννης *John had been saying*, 11³² *that John had been a prophet*, Lk 8²⁹ παρήγγελλεν *he had been commanding*, Jn 6²² *had been there*, 9¹⁸ *that he had been blind and made to see* (the latter aor., because punctiliar action), Mk 9⁶ Θ οὐ γὰρ ᾔδει τί ἐλάλει *what he had said*. Papyri: Mayser II 1, 137 (f).

6. Habit rather than logical principle appears to govern the choice of impf. or aor. with verbs of speaking. In the papyri

ἔλεγον I said is found in close conjunction with a series of verbs in the aorist, even εἶπα P. Par. 51, 9 and 17-21 (159 B.C.). In the NT ἔλεγεν occurs in Mk 4 21. 24. 26. 30 79. 20 Lk 5³⁶ 6⁵ 9²³ etc., in contexts where εἶπεν performs exactly the same function in Lk 6³⁹ 15¹¹ etc. MGr has this variation (Thumb *ThLZ* 1903, 422f; Schwyzer II 277f). - It is too much to claim any difference in *Aktionsart*, so that εἶπεν would be for simple reference to an utterance already made while ἔλεγεν introduced the detailed content of a speech. In Jn 11^{36f} there is no perceptible difference between ἔλεγον οὖν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι and τινὲς δὲ ἐξ αὐτῶν εἶπαν: each introduces speech in the same way, and indeed scribes have standardized the εἶπαν to ἔλεγον (AK II). The general practice too was to use λέγων, not εἰπών, after another verb of saying. For imperfect in conditional clauses see pp. 91f.

§ 3. Aorist Indicative

See previous section for the relationship between impf. and aorist.

(a) The "Aoristic Perfect" and the boundary between aorist and perfect. The choice between perfective aorist and perfect seems to have become a matter of the personal feeling of the writer, depending on whether, in a past action, its fulfilment in the present was to be more or less prominently expressed. In the Hellenistic period, as Chantraine demonstrates (see below, pp. 81f.), the perfect increasingly trespassed on the sphere of the aorist as a narrative tense (aoristic perfect), and thereby committed suicide. By listing together the instances where both tenses occur side by side Mayser (II 1, 139ff) shows for the uneducated Koine that the perfect at first represented an action or phenomenon with great emphasis on the fact that it was past and with clear reference to its fulfilment in the present; and yet at the same time he gives plenty of evidence that decadence soon set in and that both tenses were used "promiscuously". This is true especially of papyri in the Imperial period (Moulton *Prol.* 143). We have to ask whether NT usage is in line with the uncultured mass of the papyri rather than with the educated in this respect. The "promiscuous" use increased in the first three cc. A.D., and the aorist was used increasingly for the perfect, as well as vice versa, to such an extent that eventually in iv/A.D. the perfect as a distinct tense is altogether eclipsed. Its

doom had already been written in iv or iii/B.C. when the perfect left its first estate to become an active conjugation alongside that of the present and aorist, whereas it had originally been entirely intransitive. Such a climax led directly to its ruin, since it could not compete in the popular language with the pres. and aor. which now seemed to fulfil all its functions. Spoken language tends to eliminate superfluous elements, and having ceased to express *the state arrived at* and having assumed an active force as well it made itself redundant by sharing the meaning of the aorist. Its reduplicated stems had no chance against the simpler formations of the aorist. In MGr it has disappeared and a periphrasis takes its place. Although in Byzantine texts it is no longer distinguishable from the aorist in meaning, care must still be taken to ascertain whether the mingling in the NT is not by design, with the distinctions correctly observed. What is taken for "aoristic perfect" is often a true resultative perfect denoting a past action of which the results still vividly survive.

1. Mark is very careful when Pilate marvels that Jesus *is already dead* τέθνηκεν; Pilate then enquires when *he died* ἀπέθανεν (15^{44f}). So is Paul: 1 Co 15³ *Christ died* ἀπέθανεν *and was buried* ἐτάφη *and has risen again* ἐγήγερται. Mt 9²² *your faith has made you whole* σέσωκεν; *from that very hour received her wholeness* ἐσώθη. Mk 5¹⁹ *what the Lord has done* πεποίηκεν *and that he showed mercy* ἐλέησεν. Ac 21²⁸ *he brought in* εἰσήγαγεν *and has defiled* κεκοίνωκεν. There are many instances of such careful distinction in the pre-Christian papyri (Mayser II 1, 139f), e.g. *he did us no wrong* οὐθὲν ἡμῖν κακὸν ἐπύησεν, *but has always taken care of us* ἀλλ' ἐκ τῶν ἐναντίων ἐπιμεμέληται P. Grenf. II 36 (95 B.C.).

2. But undoubtedly there are exx. in NT where, either alone or in conjunction with another verb in the aorist, a verb in the perfect functions in a clearly aoristic sense in narrative; and often the perfect stem assumes aoristic endings in the papyri and NT—a disguise which helped it to survive a little longer:

(a) Narrative perfect with an aorist: Rev 5⁷ ἦλθεν καὶ εἰληφεν, (Dan O' 4^{30b} εἰληφα) 8⁵ εἰληφεν . . . καὶ ἐγέμισεν, 7¹⁴ εἰρηκα (B εἶπον) . . . καὶ εἶπεν (having no visible reduplication, the forms of εἰληφα and εἰρηκα may have appeared to the uneducated like aorists), 3³ εἰληφας καὶ ἤκουσας, 11¹⁷ εἰληφας . . . καὶ ἐβασίλευσας, Mt 25²⁰ ὁ τὰ πέντε

τάλαντα λαβών, and yet ²⁴ ὁ τὸ ἐν τάλαντον εἰληφώς, Jn 12⁴⁰ τετύφλωκεν . . . καὶ ἐπώρωσεν AB*[Ⓞ] fam¹³ (corr. to perf. by B[Ⓞ]Δ fam¹) or ἐπήρωσεν Bodm. pap. SW (LXX Isa 53⁵ ἐτραυματίσθη καὶ μεμαλάκισται, 57¹⁸ ἑώρακα καὶ ἰασάμην, 66⁸ ἤκουσεν . . . καὶ ἑώρακεν, Ex 52² ἐκάκωσας . . . ἀπέσταλκας, ²³ πεπόρευμαι . . . ἐκάκωσεν, 6⁴ παρωκῆκασιν . . . παρωκῆσαν (all in first part of Exodus), Col 1¹⁶ ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα . . . καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν ἔκτισται (any subtle distinction here is doubtful, but the exegete could hardly be blamed for suspecting it), P. Oxy. III 482, 1-2 (ii/A.D.) ἀπεγρῶψάμην καὶ πέπρακα (and see Moulton Prol. 143), Mt 13⁴⁶ πέπρακεν (perhaps because there is no aor. from the same root?) . . . καὶ ἠγόρασεν, Jn 1³ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἓν· ὃ γέγονεν, 2 Co 12¹⁷ ἀπέσταλκα . . . ἐπλεονέκτησα (DE corr. to ἐπεμψα, some cursives to ἀπέστειλα), 11²⁵ νυχθήμερον ἐν τῷ βυθῷ πεποίηκα, after a succession of aors., 1 Co 2⁸ ἔγνωκεν . . . ἔγνωσαν, Ac 7³⁵ κατέστησεν . . . ἀπέσταλκεν (CHP corr. to -στελεν), 22¹⁵ ἑώρακας καὶ ἤκουσας, Jn 3³² ὃ ἑώρακεν καὶ ἤκουσεν, 17² ἔδωκας . . . δέδωκας, 18^{20f} λελάληκα (corr. to aor. by C⁸DI⁷) . . . ἐδίδαξα . . . ἐλάλησα. 1 Jn 4^{10.14} ἀπέστειλεν . . . ἀπέσταλκεν, Justin M. Ap. I 22 πεποτηκέναι . . . ἀνεγεῖραι, also 32 ἐκάθισε καὶ εἰσελήλυθεν (Moulton Prol. 143).

(β) Isolated narrative perfects: the MSS show that there was a certain indeterminateness in the use of the two tenses which dates from an early period in textual transmission. Mk 11² κεκάθικεν A(W)XY ΠΦD (rest corr. to aor. like Lk 19³⁰), 14⁴⁴ δεδώκει (Mt. aor.), Rev 2²⁸ εἴληφα, 8⁵ εἴληφεν, 19³ εἴρηκαν (aor. termination), 2 Co 11²¹ ἠσθενήκαμεν p⁴⁶ SB (corr. to aor. by DGI^{vid}), 2¹³ ἔσχηκα, 7⁵ ἔσχηκεν (p⁴⁶ BFGK corr. to ἔσχευ), 1⁹, Ro 5² ἔσχήκαμεν (a true pf., as we still possess it?), Mk 5¹⁵ τὸν ἔσχηκότα τὸν λεγιῶνα, 3 Mac 5²⁰ ἔσχηκα, Lives Proph. Mal. 2 καλὸν βίον ἔσχηκε *he led a good life*. Moulton's view of ἔσχηκα was that it took the place of a constative aor. of ἔχω, which is lacking since ἔσχευ is almost exclusively the ingressive aor. = *got, received* (Prol. 145). It is also very like the aors. ἔθηκα and ἀφῆκα. For secular use of pres. ἔσχηκα see Schmid II 53; for Polybius see Schoy 75-77.

The pf. γέγονα is commonly in the Gospels = γίνομαι or ἐγενόμην. For aor.: Mt 12² 21⁴ (see Jn 19³⁶ ἐγένετο), 24²¹ BLWZ (but corr. to ἐγένετο by SD[Ⓞ] 700 e Geo¹ Eus Hipp², while the rest harm. with Mk), 26⁵⁶, Mk 5³³ 9²¹ 13¹⁹ οὕτω γέγονεν (corr. to aor. by D 299 565 184 b Old Lat. vulg. Aug Arm), 14⁴ (but om γέγονεν D 64 Old Lat (a ff i) Syr^s, to harm. with Mt 26⁸), Dan 12¹ Θ οὐ γέγονεν (O' οὐχ ἐγενήθη), Lives Proph. Jer. 13f, Dan 6, Nah. 2, Elisha 2 (pap. exx. in Moulton Prol. 146).

Lk 9³⁶ ἑώρακαν, Jn 13¹⁵ δέδωκα S fam¹ fam¹³ (rest aor.), 13³ 6³² δέδωκεν vl, 13¹ ἐλήλυθα EFG (vl. aor.), Ga 3¹⁸ κεχαρίσται ὁ θεός, 4²³ γεγέννηται, Heb 7⁶ δεδεκάτωκεν . . . εὐλόγηκεν, ⁹δεδεκάτωται, 8⁵ κεχηρημάτισται.

LXX evidence: Ge 16⁵ δέδωκα τὴν παιδίσκην, 24³⁰ οὕτως λελάληκέν μοι, 26²³ ἑώρακαμεν (sp. Lk 9³⁶ Jn 3³²), 29³⁴ A τέτοκα, 31¹ εἴληφεν, 38²³ ἀπέσταλκα, 41⁵⁵ ἐκέκραξεν, 42³⁰ λελάληκεν, and some dubious ones. Isai 3⁹ βεβούλευνται, 13⁴ ἐντέταλται, 20³ πεπόρευται, 22⁸ πέφευγασιν, 48¹⁰ πέπρακα, 17 δέδειχα, 48¹⁶ SAQΓ ἀπέσταλκεν (B aor.),

49⁶ δέδωκα, 51²² εἴληφα, 54⁶ κέκληκεν, 60¹ ἀνατέταλκεν, 61¹ ἀπέσταλκεν, 66⁹ δέδωκα, 1⁹ ἀκηράσιν . . . ἑώρακασιν. Dan O' (all corr. to aor. or impf. in Θ): 2⁸ ἑώρακατε, 31. 34. 41. 45 ἑώρακας.

Chantraine¹ argues that the pf. in Mt is puristic, but cp. ἡλικος οὐδείς πω γέγονεν Demosth. 1, 9, similarly Isocr. 15, 30.

In view of the evidence from the Koine and LXX we cannot claim that the confusion of aor. and pf. is due to Latin influence. We find it also to a small extent in Polyb. (3, 10, 1; 4, 1, 1: δεδηλώκαμεν and ἐδηλώσαμεν) and more so in Diodorus (16, 1, 6) and Strabo 2, 5 p. 133 γέγονε = ἦν) who are further from the class. model.

(b) The *Aktionsarten* of the aorist. The rules concerning this which we have already described (above, pp. 59f.) must be viewed with great caution; the rules appear to collapse with the "linear" aorists in Ac 1²¹ (συνελθόντων, εἰσῆλθεν καὶ ἐξῆλθεν) and with Lk 9³² διαγρηγορήσαντες, Mt 27⁸ ἐκλήθη . . . ἕως τῆς σήμερον (perhaps *praegnans*: *was called* [and kept the name] *until to-day*). Nevertheless, assuming as a working hypothesis the essential punctiliar and momentary meaning of the aorist stem, one will find various ways of using the indicative. They depend largely on the meaning of the verb itself and vary according to whether the preliminaries (Ingressive) or consequences (Perfective) of an action or state are chiefly in mind when the verb is used; or indeed whether the action is conceived on its own without reference to its progress and result (Constative). There are the following ways, and yet there is fundamentally but one kind of aorist action or aspect and that is punctiliar.

1. The *Ingressive* (Incohesive) aorist² or *Inceptive* aorist may be found with verbs expressing a state or condition; it indicates the point of entrance into such a state: βασιλεύω *became a king*, δουλεύω *became a slave*, πιστεύω *put his trust*, etc. The tense is to be distinguished from presents in -σκω, which indicate not so much the beginning of a state but are linear and indicate a gradual becoming, to become *more and more*; which is different from *began to be silent*, *a hush came upon it* (ἔσίγησεν Ac 15¹²), he ceased to be rich and *became poor* (ἐπτώχευσεν 2 Co 8⁹), *he sprang to life* (νεκρὸς ἦν καὶ ἐζήσεν Lk 15³²; the same translation in Ro 14⁹ Rev 2⁸ 13¹⁴ 20⁴), they did not cease to be ignorant or *begin to recognise* (οὐκ ἔγνωσαν Jn 11⁰ 16³), *he burst into*

¹ *Histoire du Parfait Grec*, Paris 1907, 235f.

² K-G I 155, 5. Stahl 137, 3. Goodwin 16. Moulton Einl. 177ff. Zerwick §§ 185f. M. W. Humphreys, "The Ingressive Second Aorist", *Transactions and Proceedings, Amer. Philol. Association*, 23, 62.

tears ἔκλαυσεν Lk 19⁴¹, ἔδάκρυσεν Jn 11³⁵), *they said no more* (ἔσίγησαν Lk 20²⁶, ἠσύχασαν Ac 11¹⁸). Sometimes this aor. will vitally distinguish the meanings of a word: ἁμαρτάνω *be a sinner*, but ἥμαρτον *commit a sin*, and so the apparent conflict between 1 Jn 2¹ and 3⁹ can be reasonably explained (Zerwick § 186), cp. Ro 6¹ with 6¹⁵.

Other exx. of Ingressive are probably: Mt 5¹⁶ λαμψάτω, 2¹⁶ ἐθυμώθη, 21¹ ἠγγισαν, 22⁷ ὠργίσθη, Mk 10²¹ ἠγάπησεν, Lk 6²² μισήσωσιν, 8²³ ἀφύπνωσεν, Jn 4⁵² κομψότερον ἔσχεν *started to mend*, Ac 7⁶⁰ ἐκοιμήθη *fell asleep*, 1 Co 4⁸ ἐβασιλεύσατε *become kings*, 2 Co 7⁹ ἐλυπήθητε, 8⁹ ἐπτώχευσεν *became poor*, πλουτήσητε, Heb 6¹⁸ κρατῆσαι (cp. pres. 4¹⁴), papyri Mayser II 1, 142. Possibly also: Mk 1¹¹ ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα *joy comes at thought of you* (but may be infl. of Heb. stative pf.), Lk 12³² *it was his happy inspiration to give you*, Mt 13²⁶ ἐποίησεν.

2. *Perfective* (or effective, or resultative) aorist (Stahl 128, 2), in which the emphasis is all on the conclusion or results of an action. Again the meaning of the verb makes this clear (e.g. shut, persuade, hide, fall, hinder, learn, save, escape). It is the reverse of the Conative impf. Mt 23² ἐπὶ τῆς Μ. καθέδρας ἐκάθισαν *they took their seat and still sit* (another explanation in Moulton-Howard 458) but it may be a Hebraism (perfective), 27²⁰ *they succeeded in persuading* (cp. the Conative pres. infin. in Ac 13⁴³ where Paul and Barn. could only *urge*, not succeed in persuading), Mt 27⁴⁶ Mk 15³⁴ (LXX Ps 21²) ἐγκατέλιπες, the present results of the action are much in mind, Mt 28¹⁵ διεφνημίσθη . . . μεχρὶ τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας, Ac 27⁴³ *succeeded in preventing*, 28¹⁴ *we were prevailed upon*.

3. *Constativ* (summary) or *Complexiv* aorist conceives the idea as a whole without reference to the beginning, progress, or end; it is a total yet punctiliar aspect, for it must not be supposed that punctiliar *Aktionsart* necessarily involves a brief space of time. The action is represented as complete, an assumption which must be made from the context, which indicates that no further action of the same kind is contemplated. E.g. Jn 7⁹ ἔμεινεν, Ac 14³ Ἰκάνον χρόνον διέτριψαν, 18¹¹ ἐκάθισεν, the limits of the action being defined by *eighteen months*, 28³⁰ ἐνέμεινεν *two whole years*, 10³⁸ διῆλθεν, Ro 15² ἤρσεν constantly, 2 Co 11²⁵ ἐραβδίσθη. Infin. Ac 11²⁶; imper. Mt 6³⁴.

4. The aorist in *Epistolary* style (as in Latin) is logical, since the action so described will be past at the time the letter

is read (Schwyzer II 281). Ac 23³⁰ etc. ἐπεμψα (ἀπέστειλα in the papyri, Mayser II 1, 144), Eph 6²² Ph 2²⁸ Col 4⁸ Phm¹². It is notable, however, that one never finds ἔγραψα (Koine) but always γράφω, and always ἀσπάζεται. 1 Co 5⁹ ἔγραψα probably refers to an earlier letter; 1 Co 5¹¹ Ro 15¹⁵ to an earlier place in the same letter. In Ga 6¹¹ it might be taken either way: if epistolary, the picture is of P. taking his pen and finishing the letter himself. Note that he does not use the epistolary aor. in 2 Co 13¹⁰ (γράφω). It may be epistolary in 2 Co 8^{17. 18. 22} 9^{3. 5}. In 1 Jn 2^{12. 14} γράφω occurs three times, then ἔγραψα three times (perhaps for the sake of variety; the author of Jn is fond of varying his tenses) which may refer back to some earlier writing.

5. *Gnomic aorist*¹ is a timeless and almost futuristic aorist, expressing axioms which avail for all time. The explanation may be that, the present stem in Greek being linear, it would not be suitable for expressing generalities; the timeless tense is therefore used, but the augment denoting past time cannot be jettisoned and has to go with it. We must look rather to the stem than the augment. This is more likely to be the correct assumption than that the writer had in mind a single specific instance after the manner of fables and parables ("a certain man went . . ."). It is true however that in the NT the Gnomic aorist is found almost only in conjunction with comparisons (perfect with similar meaning: Mt 13⁴⁶ Jas 1²⁴). Mt 13^{44. 46. 48} (but these could well be ordinary aorists; see Moule p. 13), 18¹⁵ (vulg. fut.), 5²⁸, Mk 11²⁴ ἐλάβετε SBCLW (AN pres.; D fut.), Lk 7³⁵ ἐδικαιώθη *wisdom is justified* (general statement), Jn 1⁵, 15⁶ ἐβλήθη ξίω . . . καὶ ἐξηράνθη (the latter aor. may suggest the immediacy of the result of excision),⁸ Ga 5⁴, 1 Pt 1²⁴ (LXX Isai 40⁷) ἐξηράνθη ὁ χόρτος, καὶ τὸ ἄνθος ἐξέπεσεν, Jas 1¹¹ ἀνέτειλεν γὰρ ὁ ἥλιος . . . καὶ ἐξήρανε τὸν χόρτον . . .; these may incidentally be Gnomic but they also would render the Heb. perfect too literally, unless we see in the aoristic punctiliar *Aktionsart* a graphic picture of the fading of the grass and flower; Moule includes also Jas 1²⁴ κατενόησεν . . . ἐπελάθετο *no sooner has he looked . . . than he has gone away and . . . forgotten* (p. 12) and aptly quotes Ign. Eph. 5³ ἑαυτὸν διέκρινεν forthwith

¹ K-G I 161. Schwyzer II 286. Zerwick § 191. H. C. Elmer, "A Note on the Origin and Force of the Gnomic Aorist", *Trans. and Proceedings, Amer. Philol. Association*, 25, 59-63 (1894). Wackernagel I 181.

excommunicatēs himself; Herm. V. III 12, 3; 13, 2; M. III 2; S. IX 26, 2; Epict. IV 10, 27 (aor. and pres. together: ὅταν θέλῃς, ἐξήλθες καὶ οὐ καπνίζῃ). See Jannaris § 1852 for MGr. The aorists in the Magnificat may be Gnostic (Lk 1⁵¹⁻⁵³); they possibly also help to explain the popularity of this kind of aorist in Biblical Greek—what God did in the past is evidence of what he will always do. Lk 16⁴ ἐγνων τί ποιήσω may be Gnostic, or merely an example of the way Greek more exactly interprets the *Aktionsart*: *the idea occurred to me, what to do*.

6. *Proleptic aorist* looks like a future, taking place after some actual or implied condition, e.g. Jn 15⁶ if a man will not abide in Christ ἐβλήθη ἔξω . . . καὶ ἐξηράνθη *he will be cut off and withered*, 15⁸ ἐδοξάσθη *he will be glorified if you bear fruit*. The timeless aor. is a suitable tense to express this projection of the future into the present as if some event had already occurred. Ga 5⁴ if you are going to be justified by the Law κατηργήθητε ἀπὸ Χριστοῦ *you will be severed from Christ*; see also 1 Co 7²⁸.

§ 4. Moods of Present and Aorist in relation to their Time and Aktionsarten.

(a) *Present and aorist Imperative and prohibitive Subjunctive*¹

The same distinction holds in the imperative as in the indicative; the present is durative or incomplete or iterative and the aorist punctiliar or constative. It affects commands in this way, that the aorist imper. is more or less restricted to precepts concerning conduct in specific cases; and this applies also to prohibitions, which in the aorist are subjunctive. Somewhat peremptory and categorical, they tend to be ingressive, giving either a command to commence some action or a prohibition against commencing it. On the other hand, present imperatives give a command to do something constantly, to

¹ K-G I 189C. Gild. I §§ 401-422. Stahl 148-152, 363. Schwyzer II 339-344. Mayser II 1, 145-150. Moulton Einl. 198ff, 271ff. Zerwick §§ 181-183, 189. Georges Cuendet, *L'impératif dans le texte grec et dans les versions gothique arménienne et vieux slave des Évangiles*, Paris 1924. E. Kieckers, *Zum Gebrauch des Imperativus Aoristi und Praesentis*, Idg. Forsch. XXIV, 1909, 10-16. F. W. Mozley, "Use of the Present and Aorist Imperative", *JThS* 4, 1903, 279ff. L. A. Post, "Dramatic Uses of the Greek Imperative", *AJP* 59, 1938, 31ff. W. Heidt, "Translating New Testament Imperatives", *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 13, 1951, 253ff.

continue to do it; or else a prohibition against its continuance, an interruption of an action already begun. But they are less pressing, less rude, less ruthless, than the aorist. Requests to the deity are regularly aorist, for they aim to gain a hearing for specific matters rather than to bind continually. These distinctions are broadly observed in all periods and even in MGr. On the other hand there are passages which do not conform: in 2 Co 13^{11, 12} after a chain of *present* imperatives we find the aor. ἀσπάσασθε without being aware of anything significant in the change. The problem of the *Aktionsarten* of the tenses is by no means solved as yet for the NT, and possibly John gives a clue when he seems to vary the tense according to the verb he is using. Why is the same prohibition, however, μὴ ὁμόσης in Mt 5³⁶ and μὴ ὁμύετε in Jas 5¹²?

1. Present Imperative:

(α) *Positive.* Mt 26³⁸ Mk 14³⁴ do not go away (aor.) but be on guard always (γρηγορεῖτε). Lk 22^{40, 46} Heb 13¹⁸ *keep praying* προσεύχεσθε. Pres. of περιπατέω and στοιχέω *go on walking*: 1 Co 7¹⁷ Ga 5^{16, 25} Eph 4¹⁷ 5^{2, 8} Ph 3¹⁶ Col 2⁶ 4⁵ 1 Th 4¹². See Lk 11⁹ αἰτεῖτε, ζητεῖτε, κρούετε: *petite perseveranter . . . quaerite indefesse . . . pulsate iterum atque iterum* (Zerwick § 181). But ἔρχου and ἐλθέ do not seem to conform, for the pres. = *start to come* Jn 14⁷ ἔρχου καὶ ἴδε, while the aor. ἐλθάτω = *continue to come* Mt 6¹⁰ (the Kingdom being present already as a grain of seed). In Mt 14²⁹ however ἐλθέ conforms: either ingressive *start to come!* or perfective *come here!* 1 Co 7³⁶ *let him go on doing what he wants* ποιεῖτω. But except for Jn 21¹⁰ ἐνέγκατε, we find always φέρε, φέρετε, whatever the context. Mt 5²⁴ *first be reconciled* (aor.) *and then come and offer as many gifts as you like* πρόσφερε (but 8⁴ προσένευχε τὸ δῶρον). Another exception is ἔγειρε, ὕπαγε, πορεύου and pl., which are used perhaps for politeness, as less peremptory, regardless of the *Aktionsart*: Ac 22¹⁰ πορεύου where the rule demands aor. Mt 2²⁰ 25⁹ Lk 5²⁴ also. But πορεύθητι correctly Mt 8⁹ *be off!* We usually find πιστεύω in the pres. also: Mk 1¹⁵ *persevere in repentance* μετανοεῖτε *and believe* πιστεύετε, 5³⁶ *stop being frightened* μὴ φοβοῦ, but *go on having faith* πίστευε (perhaps corrected in Lk 8⁵⁰: *start to have faith* πίστευσον). In Mk the command is to continue to have as much faith as before; in Lk,

it is to begin having faith, or to have a better faith than before the child died. Perhaps Luke felt the subtle difference.

(β) *Negative*. Mt 6¹⁹ *stop laying up* μὴ θησαυρίζετε,²⁵ *cease being anxious* μὴ μεριμνᾶτε (but ³⁴ *never be anxious* μὴ μεριμνήσητε). Mk 5³⁶ 6⁵⁰ etc. Lk 11³. 30 21⁰ 51⁰ 8⁵⁰ etc. *stop being frightened!* μὴ φοβοῦ and pl. Lk 8⁵² they were weeping, and he said *Weep not* (or *Stop weeping*) μὴ κλαίετε. Jn 2¹⁶ μὴ ποιεῖτε *stop making*, 5⁴⁵ μὴ δοκεῖτε *cease to imagine*, 19²¹ μὴ γράφε *stop writing*, i.e. *alter what you have written*, 20¹⁷ μὴ μου ἅπτου *stop touching me!* 6⁴³ μὴ γογγύζετε. Ro 6¹² μὴ βασιλευέτω *continue to reign*, ¹³ *do not continue yielding your members to sin* μὴ παριστάνετε, *but start yielding yourselves to God* παραστήσατε. 2 Co 6¹⁷ μὴ ἅπτεσθε (SAQ in LXX Isai 52¹¹, B aor.). Eph 4²⁶ μὴ ἁμαρτάνετε, 5¹⁸ μὴ μεθύσκεσθε, Col 3⁹ μὴ ψεύδεσθε. Jas 1⁷ *he must stop thinking* μὴ οἰέσθω, 5¹² μὴ ὀμνύετε (aor. Mt 5³⁶). 1 Pt 4¹⁵ *let none of you ever suffer* πασχέτω; the writer prefers pres. to aor. imper.; we might expect aor. at 11³. 15. 17. 22 22. 13. 17 31⁰. 11. 14. 15 4⁷ 5². 5. 6. 8. 9. See also Mt 6¹⁶ 1 Ti 4¹⁴ 5²². PSI IV 353, 16 (254 B.C.) μὴ ἐπιλανθάνου ἡμῶν *do not forget us in future*. P. Tebt. I 6, 43 (140 B.C.) μηθὲν ἐπιτρέπετε πράσσειν τι τῶν προοδηλωμένων *stop allowing anyone to do what we have ordered previously*.

2. Aorist imperative or Prohibitive subjunctive.

(α) *Positive*. Important for exegesis is the aor. imper. in 1 Co 7²¹ μᾶλλον χρῆσαι; the Corinthian Christians are urged to make use once and for all of the opportunity to be free; only with a pres. imper. ought the interpretation to be *use your present state* to the glory of God. Mt's χαίρετε in 5¹² is altered by Luke to aor. because he adds *in that day*. Mt 5⁴² δός of a definite occasion and person, where Lk 6³⁰ δίδου to *anyone* who asks. Mt 6²⁸ καταμάθετε is a command now, once and for all, to look at the lilies, probably during a walk in the fields, Lk. 9²³ ἀρνησάσθω ἑαυτὸν καὶ ἀράτω τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ (aor.) καὶ ἀκολουθεῖτω μοι (pres.); the self-denying is a decision, once and for all (om. the harmonizing vl. καθ' ἡμέραν), but the *following* is a continuous discipline. 12⁵⁸ δός ἐργασίαν. 19³⁰ λύσαντες αὐτὸν ἀγάγετε. 14²³ ἐξελθε. Jn 2¹⁹ λύσατε. 4¹⁶. 35. Ro 13¹³ *now let us walk περιπατήσωμεν*. Jas 4⁹ *start to be wretched and mourn and weep* ταλαιπωρήσατε πενήθησατε κλαύσατε, ¹⁰ *start to humble yourselves*

ταπεινώθητε, 5^{7.8} *be patient* (as a precept) μακροθυμήσατε. Mt 26⁴⁸ κρατήσατε *arrest him!* (but 2 Th 2¹⁵ κρατεῖτε *go on preserving*; Rev 2²⁵ aor. misused). Aorists for precepts until the coming of Christ: Mt 5³⁹ στρέψον, 6⁶, 1 Ti 6^{12.14.20}, 2 Ti 4^{2.5} 11⁴ 2^{2.3.15}. 1 Pt 1^{13.17.22} 2¹⁷ 5², 1 Jn 5²¹, 2 Cl 8⁶. Prayer: Mt 6¹⁰ δός (aor. because Mt adds *this day*) Lk 11³ δίδου *continue to give* because *day by day* is added (SD harm. with Mt); aor. in all petitions of Lord's Prayer (ἀγιασθήτω γεννηθήτω δός ἄφες), and in prayer in papyri (Mayser II 1, 145f). Greetings: ἀσπάσασθε, but also pres. in papyri, against NT usage.

(β) *Negative*. Mt 5¹⁷ μὴ νομίσητε *never think!* 6² μὴ σαλπίσσης *never sound!* Categorical prohibitions: Mt 7⁶ μὴ δῶτε, 6³⁴ μὴ μεριμνήσητε, Jn 3⁷ μὴ θαυμάσης. In 3rd. pers. prohibitions occur in aor. imper. and occasionally in the form μὴ τις with aor. subjunctive: 1 Co 16¹¹ 2 Co 11¹⁶ 2 Th 2³.

But there are exceptions to what seems a fairly definite principle: Jn 3⁷ has μὴ θαυμάσης, which sounds unnatural as *cease to marvel* (but perhaps like our *Never marvel!*). In Mt 1²⁰ 10²⁶ we expect *stop fearing* (pres.) instead of μὴ φοβηθῆς and pl. = *never fear*. We have some aorists too in prayer to the deity: Mt 6¹³ Lk 11⁴ μὴ εἰσενέγκης, Ac 7⁶⁰ μὴ στήσης, but a suggested reason has already been given. In general, some writers prefer the pres. (Paul) and others the aor. (1 Pt) imper.

3. Difference in *Aktionsart* is best seen when both tenses lie together.

Ac 12⁸ *put your cloak on* περιβαλοῦ (punctiliar) *and keep behind me* ἀκολουθεῖ (linear). Jn 5⁸ ἄρον (ingressive) . . . καὶ περιπάτει (linear), 9⁷ ὕπαγε (exclam. and invariable) καὶ νίψαι, 25⁻⁸ φέρετε alongside ποιήσατε γεμίσατε ἀντλήσατε (see above for invariable φέρετε), 21⁶ ἄρατε ταῦτα ἐντεῦθεν *get these things out of here!* μὴ ποιεῖτε *stop making* Ro 6¹³ *do not continue* παριστάνετε, *but once and for all* παραστήσατε. Mt 26³⁸ Mk 14³⁴ *do not go away* μείνατε ὧδε (constative), *but continue to watch* γρηγορεῖτε, Lk 10⁴ *cease carrying* μὴ βαστάζετε, *never salute* ἀσπάσησθε, 17⁸ ἐτοίμασον τί δειπνήσω *get something ready*, περιζωσάμενος διακόνει μοι *continue to wait*. P. Petr. II 40(a) 12 μὴ ὀλιγοψυχήσητε *stop being faint-hearted*, ἀλλ' ἀνδρίζεσθε *continue to be brave* (223 B.C.).

To Moulton the general agreement of Mt and Lk in the use of tense in their parallel passages showed "how delicately the

distinction of tenses was observed" ¹. That is not the only possible conclusion to be drawn, and Moulton seems to many today to be a little over confident in the rules of *Aktionsart* ². There is a case for Luke having known Mt and having followed his use of tenses. In any case the NT use of tenses is not so strikingly standardized or logical.

Before the prohibitive aor. subjunctive we often find in the NT *ὄρα ὄρατε βλέπετε*, which do not, however, affect the construction: Mt 8⁴ 18¹⁰ Mk 1⁴⁴ 1 Th 5¹⁵.

The prohibitive aor. imperative is later than the NT: Horn quotes the first as iii/A.D.

(b) *Infinitive of Present and Aorist* ³

In general the same distinction holds. When the infin. indicates a direct command, which is rare in the NT, though very frequent in the papyri (and *χρή* or *δεῖ* may perhaps be assumed), the tense is always present: ⁴ Lk 9³ *μηδὲν αἰρετε . . . μήτε ἂν δύο χιτῶνας ἔχειν* ⁵; Ac 15²³ 23²⁶ Jas 1¹ (*χαίρειν*, the wish-infin. of epistolary style), Ro 12¹⁵ (*χαίρειν, κλαίειν*), Ph 3¹⁶ (*στοίχειν*), 2 Ti 2¹⁴ (*μὴ λογομαχεῖν*, which may however depend on *διαμαρτυρόμενος*; AC* *λογομάχει*); aor. Ign. Eph. 11¹.

The consecutive, final and exegetical infin. maintains the same distinctions in the pap. and NT (Mayser II 1, 151f); *pres.*: Mk 3¹⁴ to proclaim continually, Ac 20²⁸ to shepherd continually; more often with *aor* (see below p. 136). In sentences with *πρὶν*, *πρὶν ἢ*, *πρὸ τοῦ* the infin. again indicates *Aktionsart* rather than time; *aor.* Mt 1¹⁸ *before ever they came together*, 26³⁴ *before the cock start to crow*. Kind of action rather than of time is also differentiated by the independent articular infin. The distinction holds after verbs of which the meaning requires punctiliar action in the dependent infin.; they are *θέλω, βούλομαι, αἰρέομαι, δοκεῖ, κρίνω, δύναμαι, δυνατός, κελύω* and verbs which concentrate on the fulfilment of the desired course. There are exceptions in the Koine: Jn 9²⁷ *pres.* with *θέλω*, Ac 16²² with *κελεύω*, in

¹ *Einleitung* 274.

² But the brilliant ch. VI of the Prolegomena is still vitally important for the student of tenses.

³ K-G I 192ff. Stahl 180ff. Mayser II 1, 150-168. Moulton Proleg. 204.

⁴ Unless, as seems likely, *κηρυχθῆναι* Lk 24⁴⁷ is imperatival.

⁵ An alternation of imperat. and infin. which is paralleled in the papyri, but always 3rd pers.: Mayser II 1, 303f.

pap. with βούλομαι (but proportion of 2:1 for aor.) and θέλω, κρίνω, δεῖ.

With μέλλω the fut. infin. was most frequent in class. Greek, but is restricted to Ac in NT; in the more official language as well as in the colloquial speech of the pap. there is the aor., and occasionally the fut. in official style, but in the less educated and in the NT the pres. prevails¹. NT has 3 fut., 5 aor., 84 pres. Aorist: Lk 20³⁶ D Marc., Ac 12⁶ AB, Ro 8¹⁸ Ga 3²³ Rev 3². 16 12⁴. Fut. infin. also for ἐλπίζω in NT, although class. fut. is found in papyri (Mayer II 1, 216). Note the subtle nuance in 1 Co 7⁹ κρεῖττον γάρ ἐστιν γαμεῖν ἢ πυροῦσθαι *to be in a married state (not to marry)*. Note also that when Barnabas wished to take Mark (παραλαβεῖν), all Paul may have objected to was παραλαμβάνειν (Mark's being with them throughout the journey) Ac 15^{37f}.

(c) Participle of Present and Aorist²

Like the infin., the ptc. had originally no temporal function but simply indicated the kind of action³. The *time* of action was inferred from the context. But eventually the aorist ptc. came to denote a time which was past in relation to the main verb, and the present ptc. time which was contemporaneous (Mayser II 1, 175f). The reason for this may have been the difficulty of thinking of an act as a simple event (aor. ptc.) without also conceiving of it as taking place in the (immediate) past. The pre-position or post-position of the ptc. has little to do with this: Mk 1³¹ ἤγειρεν αὐτὴν κρατήσας τῆς χειρὸς (relative past time in spite of post-position). Yet in spite of that development there are numerous examples of the aor. ptc. denoting coincident action⁴, where the time of the action is not antecedent to that of the main verb; there is the common phrase ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν which is the same as ἀπεκρίθη εἰπὼν,

¹ K-G I 177n. 4. Stahl 195. Moulton Einl. 184, 2. Mayser II 1, 166.

² K-G I 197. Stahl 209ff. Gild. I §§ 329ff. Mayser II 1, 168-176. Schwyzer II 385-409. Moulton Einl. 211ff. C. D. Chambers, "A Use of the Aorist Participle in some Hellenistic Writers," *JThS* 24, 1923, 183ff. A. T. Robertson, "The Aorist Participle for Purpose in the Κοινή," *JThS* 25, 1924, 286ff.

³ Zerwick § 184 goes so far as to distinguish ὁ ἀκούων (he who hears with lasting effect) from ὁ ἀκούσας (who hears ineffectively and momentarily): Lk 6⁴⁷⁻⁴⁹.

⁴ For the pre-Christian papyri, see Mayser II 1, 173f.

and also Ac 1²⁴ προσευζάμενοι εἶπαν and its reverse Mk 14³⁹ προσεύξατο . . . εἰπών. The meaning of the ptc. is not always that of the main verb: Mt 27⁴ ἡμαρτον παραδούς, Ac 10³³ καλῶς ἐποίησας παραγενόμενος, 18²⁷ προτρεψάμενοι οἱ ἀδελφοὶ ἐγραψαν, Lk 15²³ φαγόντες εὐφρανθῶμεν; Heb 2¹⁰ ἀγαγόντα is more suitably interpreted of coincident action (*by bringing in*). So 1 Ti 1¹² Heb 6¹³. Usually the main verb is aorist, but sometimes future: Lk 9²⁵ 3 Jn⁶; sometimes pres. and impf. Mk 8²⁹; sometimes perf. Ac 13³³.

Even time which is *future* to the main action seems to be denoted by the aor. ptc. ¹: Mt 10⁴ Judas who was to betray him ὁ καὶ παραδούς αὐτόν, Jn 11² Mary who was to anoint ἡ ἀλειψάσα, Ac 16⁶ διῆλθον . . . κωλυθέντες (= ἐκωλύθησαν δέ?), 25¹³ κατήντησαν . . . ἀσπασάμενοι = καταντήσαντες . . . ἡσπασάντο (vλ ἀσπασόμενοι to correct this anomaly) but we might by straining this make it an aor. of coincident action, the arrival and greeting being timed together! Wilcken Chr. 26 II³² (A.D. 156), LXX 1 Mac 15²⁸ ἀπέστειλε . . . ἓνα . . . κοινολογησάμενον (Lucianic; rest fut.).

Equally unexpected is the pres. ptc. expressing action relatively future in time. It is characteristic of Jn, e.g. 5⁴⁵ ἐστὶν ὁ κατηγορῶν ὑμῶν Μωϋσῆς (where the parallel κατηγορήσω just before makes it inevitable that this ptc. has future sense).

Ac 14^{21f} ὑπέστρεψαν . . . ἐπιστηρίζοντες *they returned . . . to strengthen*, 15²⁷ ἀπεστάλακαμεν ἀπαγγέλλοντας *we have sent . . . who will tell you*, 18²³ ἐξῆλθεν διερχόμενος τὴν Γαλατικὴν χωρὰν *he went from A. to go through*, 21¹⁶ συνῆλθον . . . ἄγοντες *went with us . . . in order to bring us*. Pre-Christian papyri, Mayser II 1, 170. Post-Christian also, e.g. P. Oxy. I 120 11 (iv/A.D.) ἀπόστειλον μοι τινα . . . παραμένοντά μοι.

It is debatable whether we may go so far as to see in the pres. ptc. an indication of time prior to the time of the main

¹ See Chambers, op. cit., for passages in support; also W. F. Howard ibid. 403-6; and *per contra* A. T. Robertson op. cit. For another explanation see Zerwick § 198: "fortasse potest intellegi de actione simpliciter subsequente (loco καὶ cum verbo coordinato; κατήντησαν καὶ ἡσπασάντο)." There may be analogous cases in Ac, which Z. admits to be doubtful, but we are in danger, according to some grammarians, of making nonsense of grammar if we see fut. action in the aor. ptc. Nevertheless Z. draws a good example of ἔλῶν of posterior action from Philostr. vit. Ap. I 22.

² Unless a previous anointing is referred to, viz. Lk 7³⁸, in which case Mary of Bethany is identified with the sinful woman from the street. The aor. ptc. is usually explained however of time *past* in relation not to the events described but to the time of writing.

verb¹. Mayser gives some possibilities from the papyri and there are instances in class. Greek. The prior action which is thus indicated is usually continued action, so that the ptc. amounts to an impf.:

Mt 2²⁰ *they who were seeking* 23¹³ *those who were entering* (trying to enter?) τοὺς εἰσερχομένους, 27⁴⁰ *you who were trying to destroy* ὁ καταλύων . . . and rebuild οἰκοδομῶν, Jn 9²⁵ *I was blind* τυφλὸς ὢν but now I see, 12¹⁷ *the crowd that was with him* ὁ ὢν, Ac 4³⁴ *they sold* πωλοῦντες, Ga 1²³ *who persecuted* ὁ διώκων, Eph 4²⁸ *who stole* ὁ κλέπτων, Rev 20¹⁰ *who deceived them* ὁ πλανῶν αὐτούς, 2 Jn 7 ἐξῆλθον . . . οἱ μὴ ὁμολογοῦντες. Pres. and aor. together: Lk 2⁴² ἀναβαίνόντων αὐτῶν . . . καὶ τελειωσάντων.

§ 5. Perfect Indicative²

The following are the significant trends of the Hellenistic period, as they are exemplified in the NT probably better than in any other single text of the time.

(1) By extending its sphere to cover the functions of the aorist, the perfect tends eventually to disappear and be confused with the aorist (see above under Aoristic Perfect). There is, particularly in the less cultured papyri, a tendency to emphasize the connection of a past action with the present, and in consequence to favour the perf. tense.

(2) The confusion is well illustrated by the introduction into the perf. system of the "weak" endings of the aorist.

(3) The perf. participle middle is developed and gradually assumes the strength of an adjective.

(4) A periphrastic conjugation becomes established.

In common with the Koine generally the NT and Ptolemaic papyri significantly extend their use of the perfect to a greater extent than do the literary writers of the period. They allow it to trespass seriously on the territory of the aorist. The *Aktionsart* belonging properly to the tense is either fulfilment in the present of a process begun in the past or else the contemplation of an event having taken place in the past with an interval

¹ H. G. Meecham, "The Present Participle of Antecedent Action. Some N.T. Instances." *Exp. T.* 64, June 1953, 285. Mayser II 1, 170f.

² K-G I 146-150. Stahl 107-119. Gild. I §§ 226-34. Schwyzer II 286-288. Mayser II 1, 176-207. P. Chantraine, *Histoire du Parfait Grec*, Paris 1907. Moulton Einl. 220ff. Zerwick §§ 209-212. J. E. Harry, "The Perfect Forms in later Greek from Aristotle to Justinian," *Proc., Amer. Philol. Association XXXVII* 53. H. J. Cadbury, "A Possible Perfect in Acts ix, 34," *JThS* 49, 1948, 57ff. M. S. Enslin, "Perfect Tense," *JBL* 55, 121-31.

intervening, whereas the English perfect is used when no interval intervenes. It is therefore a combining of the *Aktionsarten* of aorist and present. Originally it had no resultative force but simply expressed the subject's state; this had been arrived at by some previous activity, but the state arrived at was represented by the perfect as so permanent that the perfect can be said from long before the NT period to have present meaning¹. Several examples of this present perfect have survived in the Ptolemaic papyri (Mayser II 1, 177f) and NT: οἶδα, ἔστηκα, πέποιθα *trust*, κεῖμαι, μέμνημαι, τέθνηκα *be dead*, πέπεισμαι *be sure*, ἤλπικα *hope*, ἠγγημαι *believe* (cl.), κέκραγα, ὄλωλα, πέφρηνα, εἶωθα. They have in fact become independent presents, each one divorced from its own present stem. Among these ἀπόλωλα was disappearing (Mt has 2, Lk 5), the popular style of Mk being innocent of it and the "literary" Luke having most; it was giving way to ἀπολλῶ. Τέθνηκα is still *to be dead* but its distinction from ἀπέθανον is disappearing. Ἀνέωγα survives at Jn 1⁵¹ 1 Co 16⁹ 2 Co 6¹¹ but is already being displaced by ἀνέωγγμαι in cl. Attic, and Paul falls back on ἀνεωγμένης 2 Co 2¹². Πέποιθα Gospels: Mt has 2, Lk 3, Mk 10²⁴ τοὺς πεποιθότας ἐπὶ (τοῖς) χρήμασιν DA[⊕] fam¹ fam¹³ lat syr bo (but SBW *k sa om*), Paul. Ἐστηκα Gospels: Mt has 13, Lk 10, Jn 16, Mk ptc. only ἔστηκώς 9¹ 11⁵ (v1 ἐστώτων) 13¹⁴ (vll. ἐστός and στήκον), ἐστώς 3³¹ (v1 στήκοντες), and usually in NT, but a new pres. form is being coined from this perf. i.e. στήκω (8 times, and in variants for ἔστηκα). Οἶδα the old pres. pf., is preserved. Ἐγγήγορα is archaic, but a new verb γρηγορέω has been built on it. Ἡγγηκα *to be here* appears as well as ἐγγίζω Mk 11⁵ 14⁴² (SC aor.); conceivably it is a true pf. *to have drawn near*. Ἡκα Mk 8³ (v1 εἰσίν) Atticistic correction? Εἶωθα Mk 10¹ εἰώθει = impf.

But not all these intrans. perfects became independent presents. Some of them still survive with their resultative force in the Koine and Bibl. Greek: ἀκήκοα, κεκάθηκα, ἠκολούθηκα, κέκραγα, εἶωθα, διαμεμένηκα, συμβέβηκα, τετελεύτηκα, μεμαρτύρηκα, κεκοπίαια, πεπίστευκα, σέσηπα, πέπονθα, εἶληφα, τέτυχα.

Four books from LXX: Ge (παρ-) ἔστηκα 18²² 24¹³. 30. 31. 43 45¹; γέγονα 3²² 18¹² 44²⁸ 47⁹; κεκόπιαια 8⁷. 8. 11; προβέβηκα 18¹¹ 24¹; γεγήρακα 18¹³ 27²; συνώκηκα 20³; προσώθηκα 27⁴⁶A; παρεμβέβηκα 32¹; ἐκπεπόρευκα 38²⁴; ἦκα 42⁷ 45¹⁶ 47⁸; συμβέβηκα 42²⁹ AD; ἡμάρτηκα 43⁹; ἐκλέλοιπα 47¹⁵. 18; τέθνηκα 50¹⁵.

¹ For ἔσχηκα, πέπονθα, and πεποίηκα in a present sense in Polyb., see A. Schoy, *De perfecti usu Polybiano*, Bonn 1913, 75f.

Ex (παρ-) (συν-) ἔστηκα 3⁵ 7¹⁹ 17^{6. 9} 24¹⁰ 33^{8. 10} 9³¹ 18^{13. 14} 20²¹ 24¹³; οἶδα 37^{. 19} 5² 10²⁶ 32^{1. 22. 23} 33^{12. 17} 23⁹; τέθνηκα 4¹⁹ 14³⁰ 21³⁵; κέκραγα 5⁸; γέγονα 8¹⁵ 9^{18. 24} 10^{6. 14} 11⁶ 32^{1. 28} 34¹⁰; ἡμάρτηκα 9²⁷ 10¹⁶; πέφευγα 14⁵; καταβέβηκα 19¹⁸; τετέλευκα 21³⁴ 22¹; πέπτωκα 23⁵; κεχρόνικα 32¹.

Isa (συν-)πέπτωκα 3⁸ 9¹⁰ 21⁹ 23¹³; (ἀφ-) (παρ-) ἔστηκα 6² 5²⁹ 17⁵ 59^{11. 14}; πέπτωκα 9¹⁰ 21⁹ 23¹³; πέφευγα 22³; γέγονα 23²; ἀπόλωλα 23¹⁴; πέποιθα 30^{15. 32} 33² 36⁷ 37¹⁰ 50¹⁰ 59⁴; κεκόπικακα 47¹³ ἡγγικα 56¹; ἀνατέταλκα 60¹; ἦκα 60⁴; παραβέβηκα 66²⁴.

Dan Ο' ἔστηκα and compounds 2³¹ 3³¹ 7¹⁰ 8^{3. 6} 10¹³ 11² 12^{1. 5}; ἡγγόηκα 9¹⁵.

Thus the old intrans. perfect was giving way before the active, transitive and resultative pf. The resultative was already popular in the Attic orators and continued to be so in the literary texts of the Hellenistic period, and subsequently in Atticistic texts. Many *new* perfects of a resultative kind appear. The vernacular shows the same tendency, and by iii/B.C. the verbal balance between the intrans. and resultative is reached. The decline of the resultative perfect did eventually set in (see above, pp. 68f.) and by i/A.D. as revealed by the NT the number of such perfects has shrunk, except in the literary traditions; its form is limited to only a few verbs (cp. the variety in the LXX books just examined) and its meaning is difficult to distinguish from the aorist. There is an instructive exception: in the Johannine writings, by contrast especially to the Synoptists and Paul, the resultative pf. is frequent. There are 77 examples; Mk has only 8, Lk 14, and Mt 7. The intrans. perfects are not less frequent: there are still 100 in the Joh. writings. We may ascribe this to the peculiar style of the Fourth Gospel, its love of emphasis and solemnity, its stress on the abiding significance of everything. Generally, however, the NT writers use only a perfect which is already well established by tradition, the same verbs being employed repeatedly. Let us take Mk as an example: 5¹⁵ ἐσχηκότα (om D 17* 27 Old Lat. vulg^{p1} syr^s bo), 5³⁴ 10⁵² σέσωκεν, 14⁴⁴ δεδώκει, δέδωκεν Θ (aor. in D *ackr*¹ vulg¹: scribes did not like the "Latin" plupf. in Greek), 15¹⁰ παραδεδώκεισαν (aor. DWΘ fam¹³ fam¹ 700 *a c* vulg¹), 5¹⁹ πεποίηκεν (aor. DKΦ fam¹ 517 565 700), 7³⁷ πεποίηκεν, 11¹⁷ πεποιήκατε BLΔΨ 892 1342 orig (aor. rest), 15⁷ pf. or plupf., 5³³ διὸ πεποιήκει λάθρα DΘ28 565 700 *a ff* geo arm (but neither διὸ nor λάθρα is Marcan!). In Mt εἶρηκα occurs twice, but the following only

once: ἔγνωκα, ἠτοίμακα, εἴληφα, πέπρακα, σέσωκα. Lk (who is more flexible) has: δέδωκα, συνήρτακα, συνείληφα, σέσωκα once; ἀπέσταλκα, κέκληκα, ἑώρακα, πεποίηκα 2. 1 Co κέκρικα, εἴληφα, μεμέρικα, ἑώρακα once, κέκληκα 2, ἔγνωκα 3. The resultative pf. is however often used with what seems to be aoristic force. So the MSS show many variations with the aorist. Although the resultative pf. is so frequent in Jn the same verb occurs over and over again: ἤντηλα, βέβληκα, βέβρωκα, ἐλήλακα, τεθέμαι, πεπλήρωκα, τετύφλωκα, πεφίληκα once; ἀκήκοα, γέγραφα, μεμίσηκα twice; ἀπέσταλκα, εὔρηκα, τετήρηκα 3; ἔγνωκα, πεποίηκα 4; εἴρηκα, μεμαρτύρηκα 5; λελάληκα 10; δέδωκα 14; ἑώρακα 17.

To a slightly less degree, as we have seen, there is the same limitation in the LXX. Thus, Ge κεκότακα 3; δέδωκα (NT) 5; τέθεικα, πέπρακα (NT), ἀνένηοχα, ἐκπετόρνευκα, ἐκλέλοιπα, σέσωκα (NT), λελάληκα (NT) once; εἴληφα (NT) 3; πεποίηκα (NT) 5; (ἐπ-) ἀκήκοα 4; τέτοκα 3; ἑώρακα (NT) 4; εἴρηκα (NT) 3; ἀπέσταλκα (NT) 3; εὔρηκα 3. Ex καταλέλοιπα, ἐμπέταιχα, συνκέλεικα, λελάληκα (NT), ἠγάπηκα, κέκραξα, προσκεκύνηκα, ἦσαν πεποικηότες once; (εἰς-) ἀκήκοα 3; ἑώρακα (NT) 5; ἀπέσταλκα (NT) 5; δέδωκα (NT) 2; εἴρηκα (NT) 4; παράκηκα 2; πεποίηκα (NT) 2; ἡμάρτηκα 3; εὔρηκα 4. Isa συνῆκα, ἀποβέβληκα, πεπότικα, ἔσπαρκα, ἐζωγράφηκα, εἴληφα (NT), κέκληκα (NT), πεποίηκα (NT), ἐγκαταλέλοιπα, ἀκήκοα, κέκληκα once; ἀπέσταλκα (NT) 3; λελάληκα (NT) 2; ἀπολώλεκα 2; ἑώρακα (NT) 2; δέδωκα (NT) 4, πέπρακα (NT) 2. Dan ἑώρακα (NT) 8; εὔρηκα, σέσωκα (NT), εἴρηκα (NT) once. This is enough to show that the resultative pf. was becoming lifeless, fossilized in a few verbs only. Comparing the situation, for instance, in Thucydides book II we find only εἴρηκα and δέδωκα among the resultatives which are so common in LXX and NT, and hardly any of the resultatives in that book are repetitions of the same verb. By iii and iv/A.D. the perfect has greatly declined, and in the collection of Christian papyri of this date by G. Ghedini¹ we find only εὔρηκα, ἐνῆοχα, (παρα-)δέδωκα, ἐπέσταλκα, προστέθεικα, ἠπάντηκα, εἴρηκα.

We may glance at some exegetically interesting examples of the perfect in the NT. It expresses a present state in πέπεισμαι *I am persuaded*, but it may not be simply a pres. pf., as the processes involved are important, as well as the resultant state; and the same is true of ἤλπικα. But truly present are τέθηκα and ἤγημαι. Illustrative of a tense which expresses action begun in the past but fulfilled in the present is the series of resultative perfects in 2 Ti 4⁷: *I have fought ἠγώνισμαι, I have*

¹ *Lettere cristiane dai papiri greci del III e IV secolo*, Milan 1923.

finished τετέλεκα, *I have kept* τετήρηκα, i.e. until now. It is remarkable that ἐώρακα occurs so often in the NT and ἀκήκοα comparatively seldom; but to explain the aor. of the latter side by side with the perf. of the former by the theory that to have seen the Lord was a more abiding experience than merely to have heard him, is utterly fantastic (Jn 3³² Ac 22¹⁵ Clem. Hom. 1⁹). Of the two perfects used by Pilate (Jn 19²² ὁ γέγραφα γέγραφα) the first must be simply for euphony, as it is aoristic.

Although a very large number of perfects in the NT cannot fairly be distinguished from aorists, there are still some which retain true resultative, and some a present, meaning.

§ 6. Other Moods of the Perfect in relation to Time¹

(a) Of perfects with present meaning there are in NT and Koine the *imperatives* ἔρωσο, ἔρωσθε (Ac 15²⁹ 23³⁰ SELHP) and the periphrasis with ἴσθι. In Eph 5⁶ τοῦτο ἴστε γινώσκοντες may be a Hebraism (cp. γινώσκων οἶδεν LXX 1 Km 20³, and ἴστε γινώσκοντες Sym Je 49(42)²²). In Jas 1¹⁹ ἴστε may be imper. or indic. (S* ἴστω); so also Heb 12¹⁷. In Mk 4³⁹ (as opposed to φημίθητι in DW, and 1²⁵ Lk 4³⁵) πεφίμωσο is probably a solemn stereotyped phrase used in adjurations.

(b) On the other hand, the *infinitive* is fairly common. In indirect speech (antecedent action): Lk 10³⁶ 22³⁴, Jn 12¹⁸. 29, Ac 12¹⁴ 14¹⁹ 16²⁷ 25²⁵ 27¹³, Ro 15⁸, Col 2¹, 1 Ti 6¹⁷ 2 Ti 2¹⁸, Heb 11³. Subject or object (its time is coincident with the main verb): Lk 12⁵⁸ Ac 19³⁶ Ro 15¹⁹ Ac 26³² 2 Co 5¹¹, 1 Pt 4³ 2 Pt 2²¹. With prepositions διά εἰς μετά (antecedent action): Mk 5⁴ Lk 6⁴⁸ Ac 8¹¹ 13² 27⁹ Eph 1¹⁸ Heb 10⁹. 15 11³ (Mayser II 1, 186ff).

(c) The *participle* also is fairly common, and its time is relative to that of the main verb, either antecedent or coincident. E.g. coincident: Jn 4⁶ 19³³ Ro 15¹⁴. Antecedent: Mt 26⁷⁵ Lk 16¹⁸ Jn 11⁴⁴ 18¹⁸ (Mayser II 1, 192ff). It is here, as well as in the indicative, that a difference from class. Greek is apparent: there was a distinct tendency in the Hellenistic period to connect very closely a past action with its present consequences. Hence Mt 5¹⁰ οἱ δεδιωγμένοι. It was preferable to say "who has been here a week" than to say "who came here a week ago." Aquila came from Italy recently (Ac 18²), but in Hellenistic they thought, "he has been here since coming from Italy recently." Hence the perfect where class. Greek would have aorist. Thus there can be no difference between preaching Christ ἐσταυρωμένον (as he has been since Good Friday) and preaching Christ σταυρωθέντα (as he was on Good Friday): the one is rather more classical than the other.

¹ K-G I 192β. Stahl 152f. Gild. I §§ 406-409. Mayser II 1, 185-207. Moulton Einl. 277.

§ 7. Pluperfect¹

The tense was never very frequent in the class. period—much less so than in Latin or English—and in the Ptolemaic papyri it shrank to an inconsiderable number of verbs, and was restricted largely to epistolary style. It still appears in NT, but many of the plupfs. of the Latin Bible translate the aorist: e.g. Ac 14²⁷. When it occurs it is simply the perfect placed in past time, relative to the time of speaking: Lk 16²⁰ *he lay* (we might use the impf. *he was lying*), Jn 9³² *the Jews have agreed* put into the past, 11⁴⁴ past of *his face is swathed in a towel*.

§ 8. Future²

(a) *Indicative*. This is the one tense which does not express the *Aktionsart*, but simply states the time of action relative to the speaker. However, it is usually punctiliar, the periphrastic future being used when it is required to indicate linear action (Moulton Proleg. 149f), but the question is really a matter of opinion (Moule p. 10).

The future expresses a command, both in secular (Mayser II 1, 212f) and Biblical Greek. In the Mosaic Law this is particularly so, and prohibitions are formed by the addition of οὐ. All from the OT are: Mt 5²¹. 43. 48 1 Pt 1¹⁶. Otherwise it occurs: Mt 6⁵ οὐκ ἔσεσθε, 20²⁶ οὐχ οὕτως ἔσται, 21³ ἔρεϊτε, 13 κληθήσεται, 27⁴ σὺ ὀψῆ (Latin?), 24 ὑμεῖς ὄψεσθε (Latin?), Ac 18¹⁵ ὄψεσθε αὐτοί (Latin?); also Mk 9³⁵ Lk 1³¹; 1 Cl 60² καθαρεῖς, Herm V. II 2, 6 ἐρεῖς; several times in Barn. 19^{2ff}, Herm. M. XII 3, 1, Did. 11⁷. But Jesus' own commands are imperative: Mt 5⁴⁴ ἀγαπάτε, 10¹⁸ ἐλθάτω ἡ εἰρήνη ὑμῶν ἐπ' αὐτήν (D fut). The MSS often vary between fut. ind. and imper. (Cuendet op. cit. 124), e.g.: Mt 20²⁷ Lk 17⁴.

Entirely due to Semitic influence is Rev 4^{9f} καὶ ὅταν δώσουσιν τὰ ζῶα δόξαν . . . πεσοῦνται . . . καὶ προσκυνήσουσιν . . . καὶ βαλοῦσιν *when they gave glory . . . they fell . . . worshipped . . . threw*; we suspect literal rendering of the Heb. impf. which can be future under some circumstances.

Apparently Gnomic are: Ro 5⁷ *will die* = *is willing to*, 7³ χρηματίσει almost imper. *let her be called*. Deliberative: Mt 11¹⁶ *am I to compare*.

(b) *Infinitive*. It expresses time which is future in relation to the main verb; it has died out in colloquial speech, for the pap. examples are nearly all very early (Mayser II 1, 216), but it is still found in Ac and Heb: Jn 21²⁵ SBC (rest aor.) οἶμαι, Ac 11²⁸ 24¹⁵ 27¹⁰ (μέλλω), 23³⁰ (μηνύω), 26⁷ B (rest aor.) ἐλπίζω, Heb 3¹⁸ (δμνουμι).

(c) *Participle*. The same applies. Independent use: Lk 22⁴⁹ τὸ ἐσόμενον (D γενόμενον), Jn 6⁶⁴ παραδώσω (D pres., S μέλλων), Ac 20²² τὰ συνανηθῆσόντά μοι, Ro 8³⁴ ὁ κατακρινῶν? 1 Co 15³⁷ τὸ σῶμα τὸ

¹ K-G I 151ff. Stahl 119-123. Gild. I §§ 235-237, Mayser II 1, 207-211. Moulton Einl. 232ff.

² K-G I 170ff. Stahl 140ff. Gild. I §§ 265-284. Mayser II 1, 211ff. Keith. "The Future in Greek," *Class. Q.*, 1912, 6, 121.

γενησόμενον, 1 Pt 3¹³ τις ὁ κακῶσων ὁμᾶς, 2 Pt 2¹³ κοιμούμενοι (S* B arm ἀδικούμενοι), Heb 3⁵ τῶν λαληθησομένων. Dependent: very rare, the pres. ptc. or infin. or a clause taking its place: Mt 27⁴⁹ ἔρχεται σώσων (W σώζων, S* σώσαι, D καὶ σώσει), Mk 11¹³ vl ὡς εὐρήσων, Ac 8²⁷ ἐληλύθει προσκυνήσων, 22⁵ ἐπορεύομην ἀξων, 24¹¹ ἀνέβην προσκυνήσων, ¹⁷ ποιήσων . . . παρεγενόμην, Heb 13¹⁷ ὡς λόγον ἀποδώσοντας (probably genuine only in Ac and Heb). Instead, perhaps under Heb. or Aram. influence, we have the pres. ptc. for fut., e.g. Ἰούδας ὁ παραδιδούς (Mt 26²⁵), ἀποδημῶν (25¹⁴), περὶ τῶν πιστευόντων (Jn 17²⁰); also Mt 20²⁰ 22¹⁶, Lk 1³⁵ 2³⁴ 14³¹ 22^{19f}, Ac 21^{2f} 26¹⁷. In all these, translate as a final clause or a future (Zerwick §§ 208, 208^a).

§ 9. Periphrastic Tenses ¹

As Lagrange notes, it is a "construction très usitée en araméen, connue des Grecs mais surtout avec le participe au parfait." (*S. Matth.* XCI.)

(a) *Present and Imperfect* ². For this εἰμί serves (but never γίνομαι in Ptol. pap. and rarely in NT) with pres. ptc. In NT it is rarely the pres. ind. of εἰμί but usually ἦν ἔσομαι εἶναι or ἴσθι. Scribes of a later age did not like the periphr. tense and altered it at e.g. Mk 1³⁹ 2⁴ 3¹ 5¹¹. 40 9⁴ 13²⁵ 14⁴ 15²⁶. But the development is not far advanced in Hell. Greek, not even in the popular style of the papyri (Mayser II 1, 223f). Due acknowledgement must therefore be given to the influence of Semitic speech ³ for the popularity of the usage in NT: so many of the examples occur in Mt, Lk, and the first part of Ac. In Jn the ἦν cannot always be considered independently, even with a little straining: 1⁹. 28 2⁶ 3²³ 18³⁰ ἦν κακὸν ποιῶν (vl κακοποιός). What possible distinction can there be between ἐβάπτιζεν and ἦν βαπτίζων in Jn 3²². 23, or between ἐν τῷ εἶναι αὐτὸν προσευχόμενον and ἐν τῷ προσεῦχέσθαι αὐτὸν in Lk 9¹⁸. 29? Björck (op. cit. 68f) argues against Semitic influence and (op. cit. 53f) urges that sometimes the instances are only apparently periphrastic, the ptc. being adjectival. Indeed it is probably a supplementary predicate in Mk 1⁴ ἐγένετο Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτίζων ἐν τῇ

¹ K-G I 38n. 3. Gild. I § 191. 285-290. 291. 293. Stahl 144-147. Schwyzer II 407 (ζ). Mayser II 1, 223ff. Moulton Einl. 357ff. Radermacher², 102. Bauer s.v. εἰμί 4. P. F. Regarde, *La Phrase Nominale dans la Langue du NT*, Paris 1919, 111-185.

² G. Björck, Ἦν διδάσκων. *Die periphr. Konstruktionem im Griech.*, Uppsala 1940.

³ Aramaic in particular; de Zwaan in *Beginnings* II 62 mentions the Aram. imperfect.

ἐρήμω κηρύσσων . . . (= ἐγένετο καὶ ἐκήρυσσεν), 93. 7, Mt 5²⁵, Lk 1²⁰, Ac 9⁹. No doubt in some instances the copula really means *there is* or *there are*, but not in the vast majority.

Present: Mt 1²³ 7²⁹ 19²² 27³³ etc., Mk 5⁴¹ 15²². 34 Lk 6⁴⁸ 8³² SBD, Jn 1⁴² 5², Ac 1¹² 4³⁶ 14¹⁵ 25¹⁰, Ro 13⁶ 15⁴, 1 Co 8⁵, 2 Co 2¹⁷ 9¹² 10¹¹, Ga 1¹⁰. 22¹ 4²⁴, Col 1⁶ 25. 23 3¹, Eph 5⁵ DEKL, 1 Ti 5²⁴, Jas 1¹⁷ 3¹⁵, 2 Pt 3⁷, Rev 1¹⁸ 3¹⁷. Πρέπον ἐστὶν Mt 3¹⁵ 1 Co 11¹³. Δέον ἐστὶν Ac 19³⁶ 1 Cl 34². Ἐξόν (sc. ἐστὶν) Ac 2²⁹ 2 Co 12⁴. Συμφέρον (sc. ἐστὶν) 2 Co 12¹ p⁴⁶ SBFGP (συμφέρει DEKL).

Imperfect: in Mk there is abundance of periph. tenses (29): 1⁶. 13. 22. 33. 39 24. 6. 18. 31 4³⁸ 5⁵. 11. 40 6⁵² 9⁴ 10²². 32bis 14⁴. 40. 49. 54 15⁷. 26. 40. 43; Mt 7²⁹ 12⁴ 14²⁴ SCE (B differs) 17³ 19²² 24³⁸ 27⁵⁵. 61 Lk 1¹⁰. 21. 22 28. 33. 51 32³ 42⁰. 31. 33. 38. 44 51⁶. 17. 29 61² 83² SBD (ACEFG diff) 40 93⁰. 53 111⁴ 131⁰. 11 14¹ 15¹ 194⁷ 21³⁷ 23⁸. 51 24¹³. 32. 53; Jn 1²⁸ 2⁶ 3²³ 5⁵ 10⁴⁰ 13²³ 18¹⁸. 25. 30 19⁴¹ ἦν τεθειμένος SB (AD₁ ἐτέθη); Ac 1¹⁰. 13. 14 22. 5. 42 81. 13. 28 99. 28 102⁴. 30 11⁵ 12⁵. 6. 12. 20 14⁷ 16⁹. 12 18⁷ 19¹⁴ 21³. 9 22¹⁹. 20; 2 Co 5¹⁹; Ga 1²². 23¹ 21¹; Ph 2²⁶; Eph 2¹²; Ti 3³; 1 Pt 2²⁵; Rev 1¹⁶ 10² 17⁴ 21¹¹. 14.

(b) *Perfect and Pluperfect*. We have an illustration of the principle that when a grammatical form tends to disappear, having lost its characteristic force, the language will find a substitute; often that substitute is a periphrasis. Class. Greek furnishes numerous examples of periphrastic optative and subjunctive, and the periphrasis began to extend to other parts so that εἰμί with perf. ptc. is very common in NT. No real difference can be detected between ἐπεγράπτο Ac 17²³ and ἦν γεγραμμένον Jn 19¹⁹. Even in the same book within a few lines we find γεγραμμένα ἐστὶν Jn 20³⁰ and ταῦτα δὲ γέγραπται 20³¹. Cp. 1 Jn 4¹² τετελειωμένη ἐστὶν, 2⁵ τετελείωται; Herm. S. IX 4 ὑποδεδυκῆναι ἦσαν alongside ὑποδεδύκεισαν. Although it may be possible occasionally to trace the presence of the class. force of *insistence*¹, as when Paul separates ἐστώς (a pres. pf.) from εἰμί with great emphasis, referring to his position as a suitor for Imperial justice (Ac 25¹⁰), yet usually there is no emphasis and the question of Semitic background is immediately raised. The same construction occurs in the early part of Acts, where there are grounds for supposing Semitic influence (5²⁵ εἰσὶν . . . ἐστῶτες). Mayser does not give many exx. from secular Greek. Nevertheless, whatever its origin, the periphrastic

¹ Thucydides book II: 4³. 5 6² 10³ 12² 49³ 78³ (often with expressive force).

perfect persisted in the mainstream of the language and is in regular use at the present day with the force of the Latin and English perfect.

LXX. Ge 27³³ 30³³ 40⁶ 41³⁶ 43⁹ 44³². Ex 12⁶. 34 17¹² 21²³. 36 32¹⁵ 33¹³ 34³⁰ 39²³. Isa 1¹¹ 8¹⁴. 17 9¹⁹ 10²⁰ 11⁵ bis 12² 13³. 15 17⁷. 8. 9 20⁵. 6 22³. 14. 24 27¹⁰ 28⁷ 30¹² 33¹² 36⁴. 5 42²⁰ 54¹¹ 58¹⁴. Dan. 2²⁰. 42 35². 53. 54. 56 63 82⁶ 10⁹ 12⁹.

Pre-Christian papyri: 5 in iii/b.c., 11 in ii/b.c. (Mayser II 1, 224f).

NT: Mt 1²³ 9³⁶ 10³⁰ 18²⁰ 26⁴³; Mk 1⁶. 33 6⁵² 14²¹ D 15⁷. 26. 46; Lk 1⁷ 2²⁶ 4¹⁶. 17 5¹. 17. 18 8². 3 9⁴⁵ 12². 6 15²⁴. 32 18³² 20⁶ 23¹⁵. 51. 53. 56 24³⁸; Jn 1²⁴ 2¹⁷ 3²¹. 24. 28 6³¹. 45 10³⁴ 12¹⁴. 16 13⁵ 18¹⁸. 25 19¹¹. 19. 20 20³⁰; Ac 1¹⁷ 2¹³ 4³¹ 8¹⁶ 9³³ 12⁸. 12 13⁴⁸ 14²⁶ 16⁹ 17²³ 18²⁵ 19³² 20⁸. 13 21²⁹. 33 22²⁰. 29 25¹⁰. 14 26²⁶; Ro 7¹⁴ 13¹ 15¹⁴; 1 Co 1¹⁰ 5² 7²⁹ 14⁸ 15¹⁹; 2 Co 1⁹ 4³; Ga 2¹¹ 4³; Eph 2⁶. 8. 12; Col 2¹⁰; Heb 4² 7²⁰. 23 10¹⁰; Jas 5¹⁵; 2 Pt 3⁵. 7; 1 Jn 4¹²; Rev 7⁵ 17⁴ 21¹⁹.

(c) Future Perfect periphrasis is very rare too (Mayser II 1, 225): Mt 16¹⁹ 18¹⁸ Lk 12⁵² Heb 2¹³ (Isa 8¹⁷); but it takes the place of the normal fut. pf.

(d) Periphr. Future, normally linear in *Aktionsart*, is expressed by θέλω and μέλλω with infin. or by the fut. of εἶμι with the ptc. Mt 10²² 24⁹ Mk 13¹³, Lk 21¹⁷ ἔσσεσθε μισοῦμενοι, 21²⁴. Mk 13²⁵ (corr. by Mt 24²⁹) Lk 5¹⁰ 12⁵² 22⁶⁹ Ac 6⁴ D 13¹¹ 1 Co 14⁹ Jude 18; Lk 1²⁰ ἔση σιωπῶν. Μέλλω Mk 13⁴ Lk 7² 22²³ Jn 12⁴ Ac 18¹⁴ 20³ 28⁶.

(e) Periphrasis with aorist ptc. (= plupf.): Lk 23¹⁹ B ἦν βληθείς (Engl. impf. or plupf.?) vl. perf., Jn 18³⁰ S*, 2 Co 5¹⁹ ἦν θέμενος. No more in NT, but in post-Christian Greek (K-G I 38f. Gild. I 125f. Radermacher², 102).

(f). Periphrasis with verbal adjectives in -τος: Lk 4²⁴ δεκτός ἐστιν (= δέχεται), Ac 11¹⁷ ἤμην δυνατός, 28²² γνωστόν ἐστιν, Jn 18¹⁵ ἦν γνωστός, 6⁴⁵ ἔσσονται διδασκοί, Ro 1²⁵ ἐστιν εὐλογητός.

(g) Periphrasis with γίνομαι: Mk 9³ (9⁷), 2 Co 6¹⁴ Col 1¹⁸, Heb 5¹², Rev 1¹⁸ 3² 16¹⁰, Did 3⁸, LXX Isa 30¹².

(h) Other periphrases: pres. subjunctive Eph 4¹⁴ Jas 1⁴. Perf. subj. Lk 14⁸ Jn 3²⁷ 6⁴⁵ 16²⁴ 17¹⁹. 23 1 Co 1¹⁰ Ph 1¹⁰ 2 Co 1⁹ 9³ Jas 5¹⁵ 1 Jn 1⁴, LXX Isa 8¹⁴ 10²⁰ 17⁸ 20⁵. 6. Pf. imper. Lk 12³⁵. Pf. ptc. Eph 4¹⁸ Col 1²¹. Infin. Lk 9¹⁸ = 11¹. Imper. Mt 5²⁵ Lk 19¹⁷ Hom. Clem. ep. ad Jac³, Mart. Pelag. 26¹⁵. Eph 5⁵?

It is well to note that in true periphrastic tenses the copula keeps very close to the participle; there are hardly more than four exceptions to this rule in Mark.

CHAPTER EIGHT

THE VERB: MOODS: INDICATIVE AND SUBJUNCTIVE

IN THE use of moods Hellenistic Greek moves further away from class. Greek than in its use of tenses. The optative mood is less used, although there is a considerable survival in the LXX and NT. The infinitive has retreated on some flanks and advanced on others.

§ 1. The Indicative¹

1. The imperfect indicative (without ἄν), in main clauses, to express necessity really concerns only ἔδει, since *χρή* is not Hellenistic². The time is either *past* (*it would have been necessary*, but did not happen) or else *present* (*it were necessary*, but is not happening); in English *ought* serves for both and we make the second verb carry the time-indication.

(a) *Past*: Lk 24²⁶ *would it not have been necessary* οὐχὶ ταῦτα ἔδει παθεῖν τὸν Χριστόν, Heb 9²⁶ *it would then have been necessary* ἔδει αὐτὸν πολλάκις παθεῖν. Mt 18³³ *ought you not to have pitied*, 23²³ Lk 11⁴² *ought you not to have done*, Mt 25²⁷, Lk 13¹⁶. Ptol. papyri (dates): 266, iim, 258, 258, 258, 258, 165, 107.

(b) *Present*: Ac 24¹⁹ *they ought to be here* οὐς ἔδει ἐπὶ σου παρεῖναι. P. Hib. 46, 13 (258 B.C.) ἔδει πάλαι τὰ ἐνέχυρα αὐτῶν ὧδε εἶναι καὶ πεπραῖσθαι, also iim.

Other imperfects are used in a similar sense for the pres. in NT, but not the papyri: καθῆκεν Ac 22²² (D² καθῆκον), ἀνῆκεν Eph 5⁴ (DE τὰ οὐκ ἀνήκοντα) Col 3¹⁸, ἐδύνατο Mt 26⁹ Jn 9³³ Ac 26³², ὄφειλον 2 Co 12¹¹, καλὸν ἦν Mt 26²⁴, κρεῖττον ἦν 2 Pt 2²¹. It is not suggested that the past obligation was not lived up to; it is simply a present obligation expressed for some reason in the imperfect. The reason may be the same as that which

¹ K-G I 202-216. Stahl 351ff. Gild. I §§ 361-368. Schwyzer II 301-309. Mayser II 1, 226-229. R. Law, "Imperfect of Obligation in the NT", *Exp. T.* 30, 330ff. For fut. ind. as a command, see above.

² In NT only Jas 3¹⁰; in LXX only Pr 25²⁷ 4 Mac 8²⁵ A. There are two uncertain examples in the Ptol. pap.: Mayser II 1, 226.

prompts the English past tense *ought* instead of present *owe*: simply because the obligation logically conceived is anterior to the implied fulfilment of the obligation. What we do not find in NT are: ἐξῆν *it were possible*, ἦν with the verbal adj. in -τέος, ὀλίγον with aor. ind. for something that nearly happened, and προσήκει.

2. In the same way an unfulfilled or impossible wish can be expressed by ὄφελον or ἐβουλόμην, etc., as a regret. 1 Co 4⁸ ὄφελον (ὄφελον D^cEL) ἐβασιλεύσατε, 2 Co 11¹ ὄφελον (ὄφ. D^cEFGKL) fut. ind., Rev 3¹⁵ ὄφελον (ὄφ. BP) ψυχρὸς ἦς ἡ ζεστός, Ign. Sm. 12¹, LXX and Epict. have ὄφελον (and ὄφ.) with indic., Gr. Enoch 10⁶⁻¹⁰ ὄφελον subj. Nothing in papyri. In class. Greek a wish relating to the past which can no longer be fulfilled is expressed by εἶθε with ind.; a wish which cannot be fulfilled, relating to past or present, by ὄφελον or εἶθε (εἰ γάρ) ὄφελον, with inf. But the pap. and NT have no instance of εἶθε and εἰ γάρ used in this way.

By omitting the apodosis, a protasis with εἰ may become a wish clause (Lk 19⁴² Ac 23⁹).

Ac 26²⁹ S^cAB εὐξαίμην ἔν (class.), Ro 9³ ἠὲ βουλόμην ἀνάθεμα εἶναι. Ἐβουλόμην: Arist. Ran 866, P. Flor. I 6, 7 (A.D. 210) Ac 25²² Phm¹³. Ἡθελον: Soph. Ajax 1400, Epict. (= *I must*), Ga 4²⁰, Clem. Hom. 1⁹, BU IV 1078⁸ (A.D. 39), P. Lond III 897²⁰ (p. 207) (A.D. 84), MGr ἤθελα.

In cl. Attic the aor. (rarely the impf.) was used with ἔν to denote what would have happened at a past time if the attempt had been made, and therefore what *might*, *could*, or *should* have taken place. Thus ἠβουλόμην ἔν = *I should (could) have wished* (under other circumstances), Lat. *vellem*. But already in Attic orators the ἔν is dispensed with (K-G I 205; Stahl 358).

3. The "unreal" indicative (impf. for what *should be* now; aor. for what *should have been*) is found in conditional sentences; the ἔν which is the characteristic of "unreal" usage may not even be present. The tenses maintain their proper *Aktionsarten* (NB. plupf. Ac 26³² 1 Jn 2¹⁹).

(a) Apodosis with ἔν¹: Mt 11²¹ εἰ . . . ἐγένοντο (*had been*

¹ Whether Mt 15⁵ Mk 7¹¹ comes here is debatable. It might be an apodosis, with a protasis to be supplied like "if it had not been δῶρον." Thus translate, Δῶρον *is the benefit which you would have received from me*. But ἐάν is not elsewhere used for ἔν in "unreal" use (hence D's correction to ἔν).

done) . . . ἄν . . . μετενόησαν (*would have repented*), Jn 18³⁰ εἰ μὴ ἦν . . . , οὐκ (syr^{1ew} οὐδ') ἄν σοι παρεδώκαμεν *if he were not . . . we would not have*, 18³⁶ (see below). Ptol. pap: iii/B.C. (6), ii/B.C. (1) We have pres. indic. in the protasis in P. Par. 47 (153 B.C.) ἰ μὴ μικρόν τι ἐντρέπομαι, οὐκ ἄν με ἴδες τὸ π(ο)ρσωπὸν μου πόποτε, which is parallel to Lk 17⁶ εἰ ἔχετε πίστιν . . . , ἐλέγετε ἄν *if you have faith, you would say* (the "real" condition, pres. indic., may be due to politeness, for the disciples had claimed to have *some* faith, when they asked for it to be increased. *If you had faith* would seem to deny this too bluntly.)

The position of ἄν: it goes back as far as possible, and often there is οὐκ ἄν; note the following: Lk 19²³ κἀγὼ ἐλθὼν σὺν τόκῳ ἄν αὐτὸ ἐπραξα, Jn 18³⁶ οἱ ὑπηρέται ἄν οἱ ἐμοὶ ἠγωνίζοντο (B*om ἄν; SB^{ms} LWX have ἠγωνίζοντο ἄν), 8¹⁹ εἰ ἐμὲ ἤδειτε καὶ τὸν πατέρα μου ἄν ἤδειτε BLW (ἤδειτε ἄν LΓΔ), Ga 1¹⁰ χρ.δοῦλος οὐκ ἄν ἤμην, Heb 10² ἐπεὶ (*otherwise*) οὐκ ἄν ἐπαύσαντο.

(b) Apodosis without ἄν: Mk 9⁴² Lk 17² DW καλὸν ἐστὶν αὐτῷ μᾶλλον εἰ περιέκειτο (vl. περιέκειται) μύλος ονικὸς . . . καὶ ἐβλήθη (vl. βέβληται), but the "real" indic. of the other MSS may have some point: "If such a man as that is drowned, it is just as well!" So also Ga 5¹¹ εἰ . . . ἐπι κηρύσσω, τί ἐπι διώκομαι. Mt 26²⁴ Mk 14²¹ καλὸν (ἦν) αὐτῷ εἰ οὐκ ἐγενήθη. Jn 9³³ εἰ μὴ ἦν . . . οὐκ ἠδύνατο, 15²⁴ εἰ τὰ ἔργα εἰ οὐκ ἐποίησα . . . ἁμαρτιᾶν οὐκ εἴχουσαν, 19¹¹ οὐκ εἶχες B (ἔχεις SA) ἐξουσίαν . . . εἰ μὴ ἦν . . . , 8³⁹ εἰ τέκνα . . . ἐστε, τὰ ἔργα . . . ἐποιεῖτε SB² DΓWΘ fam¹⁸ (+ ἄν S^cKL) (ποιεῖτε p⁶⁶ B*700 Old Lat syr^s), Ac 26³² ἀπολελεύσθαι ἐδύνατο . . . εἰ μὴ ἐπεκέκλητο Καίσαρα, Ro 7⁷, Ga 4¹⁵ (S^cD^cEKLP add ἄν), 2 Cl 20⁴, Gosp. Petr. 2⁵, LXX 2 Mac 5¹⁸, 3 Mac 5³². Ptol. pap. (dates): 141 116 2.

4. The augment-indicative with ἄν stands in dependent clauses in an iterative sense (= class. optative). It is certainly found in class. Greek in *main* clauses to denote a customary past action¹. But in NT and simple Koine it never occurs in main clauses; in temporal and conditional relative clauses it may be a remnant of the class. usage² in main clauses. The class. ὅς ἄν (ὅταν) βούλοιο ἐδύνατο becomes in later Greek ὅς ἄν (ὅταν) ἐβούλετο ἐδύνατο.

¹ *He would often do it, he used to do it*; Goodwin § 162. The only exception seems to be Soph. Ph. 442ff. ὅς οὐκ ἄν εἴλετο (Schwyzer II 350).

² Burton § 26.

Again *ἄν* stands early, as near as possible (if not actually joined) to the conjunction or relative: Mk 3¹¹ τὰ πνεύματα, *ὅταν αὐτὸν θεώρουν, προσέπιπτον*, 6⁵⁶ *ὅπου ἂν (ἄν) εἰσπορεύετο . . . ἐν ταῖς ἀγοραῖς ἐτίθεσαν . . .*, 15⁶ *ὅν ἂν ἤτοῦντο* DG rightly, Ac 2⁴⁵ 4³⁵, 1 Co 12² *ὡς ἂν ἤγασθε*; LXX Ge 38⁹, Ex 33⁸ *ἦνικα δ' ἄν εἰσπορεύετο*, Ps 119 (120)⁷ *ὅταν ἐλάλουν αὐτοῖς ἐπολέμου με δωρέαν each time I spoke to them*, 1 Mac 13²⁰, Nu 21⁹ (A aor.): see Ottley, *Introduction to OT in Greek*, 1914, 306. Polybius 4, 32, 5 *ὅταν . . . ἐν πειρασμοῖς ἦσαν*, Herm S. IX 6, 4.

The aor. is found, as well as impf. Mk 6⁵⁶ *ὅσοι ἂν (SΔ om) ἤψαντο SBDΛW (ἤπτοντο ANXHΓΠ) αὐτοῦ, ἐσώζοντο*: von Soden accepts impf., the more normal construction, but aor. is not without precedent. Mk 11¹⁹ *ὅταν SBCKL (ὅτε AD) ὀψέ ἐγένετο, ἐξεπορεύετο ἔξω τῆς πόλεως = whenever it was evening, every evening*, not as some translators take it *when it was evening* (of that day); by class. standards it is what Field called a "solecism" (Notes 35), but not by Hellenistic, in which it is normal iterative indic. with *ἄν*. Ac 3² *ὅν ἐτίθουν καθ' ἡμέραν πρὸς τὴν θύραν τοῦ Ἱεροῦ*. It would suggest, in Rev 8¹ (*ὅταν ἤνοιξεν*), that the Lamb's breaking of the seals was a repetitive performance, in spite of the aor. Aor. elsewhere: Polyb. 4, 32, 6 *ὅταν . . . ἐτρέπησαν*, 13, 7, 8, 10. LXX Ge 30⁴² vl, Ez 10¹¹. Herm. S. IX 4, 5; 17, 3. Barn 12². P.Lond.IV1394 (A.D. 709) *ἀπόστειλον πρὸς ἡμᾶς εἴ τι δ' ἂν συνῆξας χρυσίου ἀπὸ τῶν αὐτῶν δημοσίων* For *ὅταν* with indic. however in a non-iterative meaning see pp. 112f. For pres. and fut. indic. with *ἄν* see p. 110.

§ 2. The Subjunctive¹

(A). MAIN CLAUSES

1. A substitute for the Imperative

The difference in meaning between pres. and aor. imper. has already been discussed (pp. 74-78); for the perfect imper. see pp. 85, 89. All that remain are the substitutionary forms of the imperative, of which we have already discussed the pres. and aor. infinitive and fut. indic. (pp. 78, 86). There remains the subjunctive, both positive and negative.

¹ K-G I 217-225. Gild. I §§ 369-386. Stahl 228, 364ff. Schwyzer II 309ff. Wackernagel I 230ff. F. Slotty, *Der Gebrauch des Konjunktiv und Optativ in den griechischen Dialekten*, I. 1915.

(a) *The Jussive.* This use of 2nd and 3rd p. subjunctive in positive sentences was never acceptable to Ionic and Attic writers (K-G I 220) and probably does not appear in NT¹ although there are examples from inscriptions of v-iii/B.C. (Slotty op. cit. 22ff) and post-Christian Greek². They are all aor. and so could be confused with fut. through the phonetic resemblance of -σαι and -ση, -σομεν and -σωμεν, etc. Moreover, confusion was already apparent in Attic Greek poetry between the subjunctive and optative for wishes (K-G I 225), and all the time the opt. was generally losing ground; thus the way was prepared for the jussive use of the subjunctive in the popular Koine (exx. in Slotty op. cit. 34, Mayser II 1, 230), while the analogy of the prohibitive subjunctive was ever at hand to suggest this development.

The hortative subj. in 1st p. does however occur in NT (as in class. Greek); Jn 14³¹ Ga 5²⁶ 1 Co 11³⁴ διατάζωμαι ADEFG (-ξομαι p⁴⁶ SBC). Also, where cl. Greek used ἄγε, φέρε or δεῦρο, Hellenistic has ἄφες (ἄς with 1st and 3rd p. subj. in MGr as an imper.) and δεῦρο with 1st p.: Mt 7⁴ 27⁴⁹ Mk 15³⁶ SDV 12⁷ Lk 6⁴² Ac 7³⁴ OT Rev 17¹ 21⁹, Lk 21⁵ διέλθωμεν δῆ, Epict. 1, 9, 15 ἄφες δειξωμεν, P. Oxy. III 413, 184 (ii/A.D.).

(b) *Negative.* In prohibitions, as have seen (pp. 74-78), it depends on the *Aktionsart* of the verb whether the pres. imper. or aor. subj. with μή is used; never probably the pres. subj. in NT³ but Herm. S. IV 5 (A pap^{mich}) οὐδὲν διαμάρτης. In neg. hortatory sentences, e.g. 1 Co 16¹¹ μή τις . . . ἐξουθενήσῃ *let no one despise*, 2 Co 11¹⁶ 2 Th 2³.

Ὅπως (ἄν) and ὅπως μή with subj. or fut. ind. occur in the Ptol. pap. like the class. ὅπως and fut. ind., but not the NT.

(c) *Imperatival ἴνα.* However the NT does display exx. of ἴνα with subj. in 2nd and 3rd p. 4 Mt 20³³ κύριε, ἴνα ἀνοιγῶσιν,

¹ Possible exceptions at 1 Co 7³⁹ FG γαμηθῆ (3rd p), 11³³ ἐκδέχησθε (2nd p).

² Reinhold, *Apost. Väter* 104; Ign. Pol 8³ διαμείνητε; Barn. 19¹ σπεύσῃ; Ljungvik BSSV 71 (ἐν νόῳ ἐχρῆς ὅτι BGV II 5, ii-iii/A.D.).

³ Possibly except Col 3⁹ p⁴⁶ μή ψευδῆσθε.

⁴ Schwyzer II 318. Horn 120ff. Radermacher² 170. Pernot *Études* 63, 97ff, 123, 148f. Moulton Einl. 281. C. J. Cadoux, "The Imperatival Use of ἴνα in NT," *JThS* 42, 1941, 165ff. H. G. Meecham, *ibid.* 43, 1942, 179f. A. R. George, *ibid.* 45, 1944, 56ff. (criticism of Cadoux and Meecham). H. G. Meecham *Exp. T.* 52, Aug. 1941, 437. Mayser II 1, 231f. Ljungvik SSAA 38.

Mk 5²³ ἵνα . . . ἐπιθῆς (or it depends on παρακαλεῖ), 10⁵¹ 'Ραββουεὶ ἵνα ἀναλέψω. Lk 18⁴¹. Jn 6³⁹ ἵνα . . . μὴ ἀπολέσω, 9³ ἵνα φανερωθῆ, 13¹⁸ ἵνα ἡ γραφὴ πληρωθῆ, 15²⁵. 1 Co 5² ἵνα ἀρθῆ ἐκ μέσου ὑμῶν ὁ τὸ ἔργον τοῦτο πράξας usually taken as final, but only imperat. ἵνα will make good sense, as RSV (but not quite NEB), 7²⁹ ἵνα . . . ὦσιν, 2 Co 8⁷ ἵνα περισσεύητε, 9⁴ ἵνα μὴ λέγωμεν (p⁴⁶ C*DG it λέγω) *not to say*, Col 4¹⁸ ἵνα . . . ἀναγνωσθῆ *see that it is read*, Ga 2¹⁰ ἵνα μνημονεύωμεν *we must remember*, Phm¹⁹, Eph 5³³ ἡ δὲ γυνὴ ἵνα φοβῆται τὸν ἄνδρα. 1 Ti 1³ ἵνα παραγγείλης (or depends on παρεκάλεσα), 1 Jn 2¹⁹ (final in RV, NEB) ἵνα φανερωθῶσιν *they must be manifest*. Doubtful in Jn 1⁸ *he must bear witness*, 14³¹ *the world must learn*, 18^{9.32} 19²⁴, Mk 14⁴⁹ *the Scripture must be fulfilled*, 1 Co 7^{5.10.29} 2 Co 8^{7.13} 9⁴ Col 2⁴. None in Ac, Past, Heb, Jas, 1, 2 Pt, Rev. The use is popular (Slotty 35), although it is found also in LXX 2 Mac 1⁹ ἵνα ἄγρητε τὰς ἡμέρας τῆς σκηνοπηγίας. Note νά with 2nd and 3rd p. subj. as imper. in MGr. Ptol. pap.: pos. iii/B.C. (2), neg. iii/B.C. (1).

LXX displays a great many exx. because of the influence of its Semitic background: Ge 18²¹ ἵνα γινῶ *I must know*, 30^{8?} ἵνα εὐρη ὁ παῖς σου χάριν, 44³⁴ ἵνα μὴ ἴδω *let me not see*, 47¹⁹ *let me not die before you*. Ex. Le none. Nu 11¹⁵ *let me not see my wretchedness*, 21²⁷ *let the city be built*. Dt 5¹⁴ *your servant must rest*. Josh 22²⁴ *let not our children say*. Jg Ru Km none. 1 Ch 21³ ἵνα μὴ γένηται εἰς ἁμαρτίαν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ *let him not be accused of sin*. 1 Esd. none. 2 Es Ne. To S none. To B 8¹² ἵνα θάψωμεν αὐτὸν καὶ μηδεὶς γινῶ (B ὅπως). Est. Jdt. none. Ps 38⁵ ἵνα γινῶ *let me know*. Pr Eccl Ca Wi Si Isa Je Ba. none. Ezk 37²³ *they must no longer be defiled* pres. subj. Dan O' none. 2 Mac 1⁹ ἵνα ἄγρητε *see that ye keep*. 3 4 Mac none. Jb 32¹³ (cp. Eph 5³³ Mk 5²³) 1 Mac 1^{9?} Acta Petri et Pauli 209¹⁴ ἵνα γινῶς, βασιλεῦ, Acta Phil. 39^{1ff} ἵνα λαλῶσιν ὁμοίότητα ἄνθρωπον (following an imperat.), 86^{21ff} μὴ καλυψάτω με . . . ἀλλ' ἵνα διαπεράσω . . . Before an imperat.: Acta Thom. 253^{6ff} ἵνα . . . πέμψη . . . καὶ εὐφρανέσθωσαν . . . , 253^{10f} ἵνα μὴ ἀπόληται ἡ πεποιθήσις μου καὶ ἡ ἐλπίς μου ἡ ἐν σοὶ μὴ καταισχυνοθῆ, 254^{6ff}.

In view of this wealth and the secular poverty of examples, we may claim the imperatival ἵνα as virtually a Semitism, illustrating the homogeneity of Biblical Greek and its distinction from the Koine.

2. *Emphatic Denial and Prohibition with οὐ μὴ*

Besides the imperatival use of the subj. in main clauses, we have the following:

The use of οὐ μὴ¹ to express emphatic denial or a strong

¹ Which also occurs as *nonne* in questions expecting answer yes (see below ch. 19 § 2).

prohibition¹, not so strongly as in class. Greek², is in NT almost restricted to quotations from LXX, to sayings of Jesus, and to Rev. The fut. ind. is also used in NT but not in Ptol. pap. The subj. is very strongly attested in the papyri, and this seems to rule out an exclusively Semitic influence. For theories on the origin of the οὐ μή construction, see Moulton Proleg. 188ff, Goodwin 389ff, Thompson *Syntax* 431-438. It was probably οὐ (no!): μή (*it is not*), then punctuated οὐ μή.

(a) In Denials

1. *Aorist*. Aor. subj. occurs in class. Greek. L.S. (s.v. οὐ μή) gives exx from Aesch. Soph. Eurip. Hdt. Thucyd. Aristoph. Plato, Xen. Demosth. Post-cl.: Aelius Aristides (ii/A.D.), Diogenes; Epict. III 22, 33 οὐ μὴ ἀποθάνωσιν; Ep. Barn. 17² οὐ μὴ νοήσητε *you will not understand*; Ep. Clem. 27⁵ καὶ οὐδὲν μὴ παρέλθῃ τῶν δεδογματισμένων ὑπ' αὐτοῦ. Ptol. Pap.: many exx., esp. Zen. P. 59084. 9 (257 B.C.) οὐ μὴ κινήθῶ *that will certainly make no impression on me*; 59396. 4 (iii/B.C.) πρὸς δέ σε οὐθὲν μὴ διενεχθῶμεν *we will certainly not quarrel with you*. Imperial: P. Oxy. 119 (ii-iii/A.D.) οὐ μὴ φάγω, οὐ μὴ πίνω. LXX: (Ge οὐ μὴ 15 times in 337 negs; Ex 13 in 302; Dt 33 in 499) Ge 6³ οὐ μὴ καταμείνη τὸ πνεῦμά μου etc. (9), Ex (6), Le (6) Nu (11), Dt (33), Isa (88), Je α (28) β (50); also, e, g, Jb 7⁹, Wi 1⁸. SA 3¹ 6²² 12¹⁰; Ps. Sol. I 5; Vit. Proph. Jer. 14. NT:—Mt 5¹⁸. 20. 26, 15⁶ οὐ μὴ τιμήσῃ E*FGK (rest fut.), 16²⁸ οἴτινες οὐ μὴ γεύσονται θανάτου, 21¹⁹, 24². 34. 35 οὐ μὴ παρελθῶσιν (Mk 13³¹ ACD^o a harmonization), 21 οὐδὲ οὐ μὴ γένηται, 26²⁹. 35 οὐ μὴ σε ἀπαρνήσωμαι AEGK (rest fut.), Mk 9¹. 41, 13² οὐ μὴ ἀφεθῇ ὧδε λίθος ἐπὶ λίθον ὃς οὐ μὴ καταλυθῇ, 19. 30, 14²⁵. 31 (-σωμαι SEFGK), 16¹⁸, Lk 9²⁷ 12⁵⁹ ο.μ. ἐξελεθῆς, 13²⁵ ο.μ. ἔδῃτε. 1¹⁵ ο.μ. πῆρ, 6^{37a.b}, 8¹⁷ ο.μ. γνωσθῇ . . ., 18⁷ οὐ μὴ ποιήσῃ; 17. 29^f οὐχὶ μὴ ἀπολάβῃ, 21¹⁸. 32 22¹⁶ οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ, 18. 67. 68, Jn 4⁴⁸ 6³⁵ (vl. fut. ind.), 8¹² (vl. fut. ind.) 51. 52. (vl. fut. ind.), 10²⁸, 11²⁶. 56, 13⁸ οὐ μὴ νίψῃς (D fut. ind.), 18¹¹ οὐ μὴ πῖω αὐτό; Ac 13⁴¹ (LXX Hab1⁵), Ga 4³⁰ οὐ μὴ (p⁴⁶ FG om) κληρονομήσῃ ACFG (rest fut.), Ro 4⁸ (Ps 31²) οὐ μὴ λογισθῆται, 1 Co 8¹³ Heb 8¹² (Je 38³⁴), 13⁵ οὐ μὴ σε ἄνω οὐδὲ p⁴⁶ (rest οὐδ' οὐ) μὴ σε ἐγκαταλίπω D (rest-λείπω) very emph., Rev 2¹¹

¹ K-G I 176f, II 221-223. Jannaris § 1827. Slotty *Konj. und Opt.* 42 § 90. Gild. *AJP* 3, 1882, 202-205. C. D. Chambers, *Cl. Rev.* 10, 1896. 150-153; 11, 1897, 109-111; Wharton *ibid.* 10, 1896, 239; R. Whitelaw *ibid.* 239-244; A. Y. Cambell *ibid.* 57, 1943, 58-61. Mayser II 1, 233. R. Ludwig, *D. prophet. Wort* 31, 1937, 272-279. Moulton Proleg. 187-192.

² Very rare indeed in Hell. Greek. I read the following books without finding a single οὐ μή among 1370 negatives: Aratus *Phaenomena* (iv-iii/B.C.), Callimachus *Hymns* and *Epigrams* (iii/B.C.), Lycophron *Alexandra* (iii/B.C.), Aelian *Letters of Farmers* ii-iii/A.D.), Philostratus *Love Letters* (ii-iii/A.D.), Alciphron *Fishermen, Farmers, Parasites, Courtesans* (iv/A.D.). But in *Didache* (ii/A.D.), there were 2 out of 124 negs., and in Ep. Clem. (i/A.D.) 1 out of 95 negs.; in Eps. Ign. 1 out of 217.

οὐ μὴ ἀδικηθῆ, 3¹², 7¹⁶, 15⁴ τίς οὐ μὴ φοβηθῆ; 18^{21. 23} etc. 1 Pt 2⁶ (Isa 28¹⁶).

2. *Present*. Classical: Xen. Plato, Soph. Is. Ptol. Pap: comparatively rare, e.g. Zen. P. 59610. 21 οὐ μὴ βούλωνται φυλάσσειν (iii/v.c.), Mich. Zen. 77. 13 οὐ μὴ ξηγίς αὐτῶι ἐγκαλέσαι (iii/v.c.). No true ex. occurs in NT, a vl. only Heb 13⁵ p⁴⁶. LXX, e.g. Ge 28¹⁵ Dt 15¹¹ AF, Isa 10²⁰ οὐκέτι μὴ πεποιθότες ὦσιν, 11⁹ οὐ μὴ κακοποιήσουσιν οὐδὲ μὴ δύνωνται, 16¹² οὐ μὴ δύνηται ἐξελεῖσθαι αὐτόν, 24²⁰ οὐ μὴ δύνηται ἵναστῆναι 36¹⁴ οὐ μὴ δύνηται ῥύσασθαι ὑμᾶς, Je 1⁹ 15²⁰ 29¹¹ 30¹² 43⁵.

3. *Future*. Class.: Aesch. Soph. Aristoph. Xen. Aeschin. NT:— Mt 15⁶, 26³⁵, 16²² οὐ μὴ ἔσται σοι τοῦτο, Lk 21³³ οἱ δὲ λόγοι μου οὐ μὴ παρελεύσονται apparently a conflation of Mt-Mk: Mt 24³⁵ οὐ μὴ παρέλθωσιν, Mk 13³¹ οὐ παρελεύσονται. (ACD^c harmonize Lk with Mt; such details make it likely that Luke knew Mt.¹), Lk 10¹⁸ οὐδὲν οὐ μὴ ὑμᾶς ἀδικήσει.

Jn 4¹⁴ οὐ μὴ διψήσει, 6³⁷ οὐ μὴ ἐκβαλῶ ἔξω, 10⁵ οὐ μὴ ἀκολουθήσουσιν (vl. aor. subj.), Mk 14³¹ οὐ μὴ σε ἀπαρνήσομαι, Jn 20²⁸ οὐ μὴ πιστεύσω, Ga 4³⁰ οὐ γὰρ μὴ κληρονομήσει (Ge 21¹⁰), Heb 10¹⁷, Rev 9⁶ οὐ μὴ εὐρήσουσιν, 18¹⁴ οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ εὐρήσουσιν Herm. M. IX 2; IX 5; S. I 5. Barn 11¹ πῶς τὸ βάπτισμα . . . οὐ μὴ προσδέξονται, 19⁷ μήποτε οὐ μὴ φοβηθήσονται (cp. Did. 4¹⁰). LXX:— e.g. Ge 21¹⁰ A οὐ γὰρ μὴ κληρονομήσει ὁ υἱός . . . (D om μὴ), Nu 35²³ A (rest οὐ), Dt 4³¹ οὐκ ἔνκαταλείψει σε οὐδὲ μὴ ἐκτρέψει σε, 28³⁰ AF οὐ μὴ τρυγήσεις αὐτόν (B om μὴ). Isa (12), Je α (9), β (4). Enoch 98¹² 99¹⁰.

(b) In Prohibitions ²

1. *Fut. Ind.* In class. Greek "interrogative": Soph. Tr. 978, Eurip. Supp. 1066, Andr. 757, El. 982, Hipp. 213, Aristoph. Ach. 166, Nu. 367, V. 397. Editors and MSS vary between fut. ind. and aor. subj. Probably both were allowed, but subj. may have been commoner in denials and fut. ind. in prohibitions. LXX: Le 11⁴³ οὐ μὴ κοιμηθήσεται ὁ μισθὸς τοῦ μισθωτοῦ . . . Dt 1⁴² οὐκ ἀναβήσεσθε οὐδὲ μὴ πολεμήσετε (F aor. subj.), 6¹⁴ AF οὐ μὴ πορεύσεσθε (B om μὴ), 7¹⁶ AF οὐ μὴ λατρεύσεις τοῖς θεοῖς (B om μὴ), 2 Km 24¹⁴ οὐ μὴ ἐμπέσω *let me not fall*, Je 11²¹ οὐ μὴ προφητεύσεις . . . (-σης A). Mt 16²² οὐ μὴ ἔσται σοι τοῦτο. Barn 10⁴ οὐ μὴ, φησίν, κολληθήσῃ οὐδὲ ὁμοιωθήσῃ, 5.

2. *Aor. Subj.* LXX:—Ge 3¹ οὐ μὴ φάγητε, ³ οὐδὲ μὴ ἀψησθε, 21¹⁶ οὐ μὴ ἴδω τὸν θάνατον τοῦ παιδίου μου, Ex (7), Le (1), Nu (3), Dt (13). NT:—Mt 13¹⁴ Ac 28²⁶ (LXX Isa 6⁹) Jn 13⁸ οὐ μὴ νίψῃς μου τοὺς πόδας. Ep. Barn. 10⁶ οὐ μὴ γένη παιδοφθόρος οὐδὲ ὁμοιωθήσῃ, ^{7. 8} οὐ μὴ, φησίν, γεννηθῆς τοιοῦτος, 19² οὐ μὴ ἐγκαταλίπῃς ἐντολάς κυρίου (cp. Did. 4¹³), ⁴ οὐ μὴ σου ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ ἐξέλθῃ ἐν ἀκαθαρσίᾳ τινῶν, ⁵ οὐ μὴ διψυχήσῃς, ⁵ οὐ μὴ ἄρῃς τὴν χεῖρά σου ἀπὸ τοῦ υἱοῦ σου, ⁶ οὐ μὴ γένη

¹ See *Studia Evangelica* (Texte und Untersuchungen, LXXIII) 1959, pp. 223-234.

² W. W. Goodwin, *Trans. American Philol. Assn.* 1869-70, 52. Sloty op. cit. 43. Mayser II 1, 233 (very rare in papyri, and never prs. subj. or fut. ind.).

ἐπιθυμῶν τὰ τοῦ πλησίον σου . . . οὐ μὴ γένη πλεονέκτης,⁷ οὐ μὴ ἐπιτάξῃς δούλῳ σου (contrast Did. 4¹⁰).

3. *A Cautious Statement.*

Μή with subjunctive to express a cautious statement in a main clause¹ is rare in NT: Mt 25⁹ μήποτε οὐκ ἀρκέσῃ ΣΑΛΣ (μήποτε οὐ μὴ ἀρκ. BWC; D ἀρκέσει), 1 Th 5¹⁵ ὄρατε μή τις ἀποδοῖ ἀλλὰ . . . διώκετε, 2 Ti 2²⁵ μήποτε δῶ αὐτοῖς ὁ θεός *perhaps God will give*. Fairly frequ. in Platonic dialogue, e.g. *it would be rude* μὴ ἀγροικότερον ἤ, *it would not be right* μὴ οὐ θεμιτόν ἤ. Only rarely in Ptol. pap. (e.g. P. Par. 32, 162 B.C.) μὴ οὐκ ἀποδώσοι. It is similar to the prospective or future subj.² without μή.

Foreign to class. Attic, this substitute for fut. ind. emerges in later Greek (K-G I 218). It was understandable that the like-soundings -ης and -ει should be confused in fut. and aor., but ἀφεθῆ αὐτοῦς ἡ ἀμαρτία (LXX Isa 33²⁴) and εἶπω σοι (for ἐρῶ σοι)³ go beyond that. So also Ptol. pap. UPZ 31, 7 (162 B.C.) εὐδοκῶ . . . ἐπέλω. Exx. from post-Christian pap. in Moulton Einl. 292, 2. LXX Isa 10¹⁶ S ἀποστείλῃ. Hom. Clem. 11³ δυνηθῆ.

4. *Deliberative Subjunctive*⁴.

The dubitative subj., the interrogative form of the hortatory, occurs in class. Greek (K-G. I 174, 233; Slotty 51) sometimes in 3rd p., but generally 1st p., negated by μή and introduced immediately by βούλει, βούλεσθε, etc. Incidentally the fut. ind. (see above p. 86) is found sometimes in class. Greek (Plato *Crito* 50B) and NT: Lk 16^{11f} τίς πιστεύσει; τίς δώσει; Mt 16²⁶ τί δώσει (for Mk 8³⁷ τί δοῖ, which p⁴⁵ ACDW harm. with Mt), Lk 22⁴⁹ εἰ πατάξομεν (-ωμεν GH), Mk 6³⁷ ἀγοράσωμεν . . . καὶ δώσομεν p⁴⁵ AB (-σωμεν SD fam¹³ 28 565; δῶμεν WΘ fam¹), Ro 3⁵ 4¹ etc. τί ἐροῦμεν. Sometimes even pres. ind. in NT: Jn 11⁴⁷ Herm. S. IX 9, 1 τί ποιῶμεν, 1 Jn 3¹⁷ μένει (or μενεῖ) fut.). Plato *Symp.* 214A πῶς ποιῶμεν.

¹ K-G I 224, 7. Stahl 366, 3. Gild. I § 385. Moulton Einl. 303ff. Slotty §§ 84-86, 318, 331. Schmid Attic. III 90. Mayser I 1, 234.

² Schwyzer II 313f. Slotty § 130. Mayser II 1, 234-5. Moulton Einl. 292, 2. Reinhold 101-103. Sophocles Lexicon p. 45.

³ P. Würthle, *Die Monodie des Michael Psellos auf den Einsturz der Hagia Sophia*, 1917, 22f.; Mayser II 1, 235.

⁴ Mayser II 1, 235. Schwyzer II 318. A. W. McWhorter, "A Study of the so-called Deliberative Type of Question (τι ποιήσω;)" *Trans. and Proc., Amer. Philol. Association*, 41, 1910, 157ff.

Subjunctive: Mt 6²⁵ φάγητε, etc. 23³³ πῶς φύγητε: 26⁵⁴ πῶς . . . πληρωθῶσιν; Mk 12¹⁴ δῶμεν ἢ μὴ δῶμεν; Lk 11⁵ ἔξει . . . πορεύεται . . . καὶ εἴπη (AD a fut.), ⁷ κάκεινος εἴπη (D ἐρεῖ), 23³¹ ἐν τῷ ξηρῷ τί γένηται (DK fut.); γένηται also in Epict. IV 1, 97; 100. Ro 10^{14f} ἐπικαλέσωνται (p⁴⁶ KLP-σονται), πιστεύσωσιν (vl. -σουσιν), ἀκούσωσιν S^cA²B (L -σουσιν, S*D -σονται, p⁴⁶ -σωνται), κηρύξωσιν (vl. -ουσιν), Hom. Clem. 19² πῶς . . . στήκη (from Mt 12²⁶), Herm. S. V 7, 3 πῶς σωθῆ A (P. Mich. -θήσεται), Pass. Perp. et Felic. 1¹ διὰ τί μὴ . . . γραφῆ παραδοθῆ LXX 2 Km 23³ πῶς κραταιώσητε. In Ptol. pap. only in dependent clauses, e.g. οὐκ εἶχομεν ὅθεν αὐτῶι δῶμεν, (dates): 254 247 248 iim (3) 257; once infin. (251); see Mayser II 1, 235f. Introduced by θέλεις, βούλεσθε etc. as in class. Greek (K-G I 221f): Mt 13²⁸ Lk 9⁵⁴ 18⁴¹ Jn 18³⁹.

(B) SUBORDINATE CLAUSES.

1. *Fearing.*

The subj. appears as in class. Greek after expressions of anxiety with μὴ or μήποτε or μήπως, e.g. P. Magd. 9, 3 (iii/B.C.) φοβουμένη μὴ συμπέση, MGr φοβοῦμαι μήπως. It occurs after φοβοῦμαι in Luke, Paul and Heb. as a semi-literary feature, rather than popular. Pres. subj.:—Heb 4¹ μήποτε δοκῆ, 12¹⁵ μὴ τις ἐνοχλῆ (after ἐπισκοπέω). Fut. ind.:—Ro 11^{20f} φοβοῦ . . . μήπως οὐδὲ σοῦ φείσεται p⁴⁶ DFG (φείσεται in minusc. only; SABCP om μήπως). Aor. subj.:—Ac 23¹⁰ φ. (or εὐλαβηθεῖς HLP) μὴ διασπασθῆ, 27^{17. 29} μήπως. 2 Co 11³ 12²⁰. Past indic.:—Ga 4¹¹ μήπως εἰκῆ κεκοπίακα (p⁴⁶ 1739 ἐκοπίασα).

After other words than φοβοῦμαι:—Lk 12⁵⁸ δὸς ἐργασίαν . . . μήποτε κατασύρη σε . . . καὶ παραδώσει (note change to fut. ind.), 14^{8f} do not sit . . . μήποτε . . . ἢ κεκλημένος (D ἤξει), Ac 5³⁹ we cannot kill them μήποτε καὶ θεομάχοι εὐρεθῆτε. 2 Ti 2²⁵. Perhaps Mt 25⁹ go and buy . . . μήποτε . . . PSI V 495, 8 εὐλαβεῖσθε μήποτε (subj.?) (258 B.C.). P. Tebt. 43, 22 προορώμενοι μήποτε . . . συκοφαντηθῶμεν (118 B.C.). P. Par. 45 προσέχων μὴ εὕρη (153 B.C.). Μὴ alone (Lat. ne): Mk 13³⁶ Col 2⁸ μὴ τις ἔσται (final?). Μήπως 2 Co 9⁴. Like cl. Greek, NT Greek distinguished between fear of an uncertain thing in the future (subj.) and fear regarding a present inevitable reality (indic.). Note the difference even in the same verse: Ga 2² I laid before them the Gospel μήπως εἰς κενὸν τρέχω ἢ ἔδραμον. 1 Th 3⁵ I have sent . . . μήπως ἐπέπρασεν ὑμᾶς ὁ πειράζων καὶ εἰς κενὸν γένηται ὁ κόπος ἡμῶν.

2. Purpose

(a) *Use of* ἵνα, ἵνα μή, and μή¹.

The purpose clause has increased its modes of expression in Hell. Greek. Here we are simply concerned with ἵνα. Its mood was always subjunctive in class. Greek (or oblique optative), and it is generally so in the Koine, even after a secondary tense. The alleged opt. δῶν Eph 1¹⁷ is probably a subj. Hell. Greek also has fut. ind., and we have this in NT, especially in Rev and Paul, quite profusely but always with evidence that scribes have corrected to aor. subj. The addition of καὶν in two instances (Mk 6⁵⁶ Ac 5¹⁵) supplies a modifying or conditional element: *so that even if*.

Fut. indic.

Mt 12¹⁰ ἵνα κατηγορήσουσιν SWX (rest corr. to -σωσιν). Lk 14¹⁰ ἵνα . . . ἐρεῖ (ADW corr. to εἰρη), 20¹⁰ ἵνα δώσουσιν (CDW δῶσιν). Jn 7³ ἵνα θεωρήσουσιν (B³ X -σῶσιν). 17² ἵνα δώσει (var. corr.: δώση S^{CG}; δῶσω S^{*}; δῶς W; ἐχη D). Ac 5¹⁵, 21²⁴ ἵνα ξυρήσονται SB^{*}D^{*E}. 1 Co 9¹⁵ ἵνα τις κενώσει, 18 ἵνα θήσω, 21, 13³ ἵνα καυθήσομαι (CK -σωμαι; p⁴⁶ SAB καυχήσωμαι), Ga 2⁴ ἵνα καταδουλώσουσιν SAB^{*}CDE (vl. subj.), Eph 6³, Ph 2¹¹ ἵνα κάμψη . . . ἐξομολογήσονται (ACDG -σεται). 1 Th 5¹⁰ ἵνα ζήσομεν A (D^{*E} corr. to ζῶμεν; S to ζήσομεν). 1 Pt 3¹ ἵνα . . . κερδηθήσονται. Rev 3⁹ ἵνα ἤξουσιν (B -ωσιν) καὶ προσκυνήσουσιν (B -ωσιν), 6⁴ ἵνα σφάξουσιν, 11 ἵνα ἀναπαύσονται AP 046 I (SC -σωνται), 8³ ἵνα δώσει (BP -ση), 9⁴ ἵνα ἀδικήσουσιν (SP 046 I -σωσιν), 5 ἵνα βασανισθῶσονται (vl -σθῶσιν), 9²⁰ 13¹² ἵνα (μή) προσκυνήσουσιν (vl -σῶσιν), 14¹³ ἵνα ἀναπαήσονται (P -παυσῶνται) (δτι p⁴⁷), 13¹⁶ ἵνα δώσει ΔΩΣ I, 22¹⁴ ἵνα ἔσται . . . καὶ εἰσέλθωσιν (causal ἵνα, like 14^{13?}). On causal ἵνα see below p. 102. There are instances also where, after ἵνα, ὅπως, or μή, with subj., there follows καὶ with fut. ind. to indicate further result: Mt 5²⁵, 13¹⁵ OT, 20²⁸ D μήποτε . . . ἐπέλθῃ . . . καὶ κατασχυθήσῃ, Mk 5²⁸ A, Lk 22³⁰ (many vl), 12⁵⁸, Jn 12⁴⁰ OT, 15⁸ ἵνα καρπὸν . . . φέρητε καὶ γενήσεσθε (BDL corr. to γένησθε), Ac 21²⁴ (see above), Ro 3⁴ OT SADE, Eph 6³ OT, Barn 4³ S, Herm. M. VI 2¹⁰; S. IX 7⁶, 28⁵, LXX Je 29¹¹ DaSu²⁸. (Other exx. in Radermacher² p. 216).

Pres. ind.

Jn 5²⁰ ἵνα θαυμάζετε SL, 17²⁴ ἵνα θεωροῦσιν W (rest subj.), Ga 6¹² ἵνα . . . μή διώκονται p⁴⁶ ACGKL (subj. BSD), Eph 1¹⁸ FG ἵνα

¹ K-G II § 553. Mayser II 1, 240ff. Schwyzer II 671ff. W. B. Curry, *The Nature and Use of the ἵνα-clause in the NT* (Diss. of S-W Bapt. Sem., 1949). E. Stauffer in Kittel WB III, 327ff (NT in general); in *Theol. Stud. u. Kri.* 102, 1930, 232-257 (purpose-ἵνα in Paul). H. Diel, *De enuntiationis finalibus apud Graecarum rerum scriptoribus posterioris aetatis*, Munich 1896.

οἶδατε, Ti 2⁴ ἵνα σωφρονίζουσιν S*AGF, Rev 16¹⁵ ἵνα βλέπουσιν p⁴⁷, Ign Eph 4² ἵνα . . . ἔδετε . . . μετέχετε. Very rare in Ptol. pap.: P. Par. 23, 23 εἶνα διακονεῖ (165 B.C.), Or. gr. 139, 21 ἵνα . . . ὑπάρχει (146–116 B.C.); even these are doubtfully indicative and may be bad spelling for subj. (Mayser II 1, 244); later BU IV 1081³ (ii–iii/A.D.) ἐχάρην ἵνα σε ἀσπάζομαι (causal ἵνα?).

Pres. subj.

Mt none.—Mk 39. 14. 14 4¹² 6⁴¹ 8⁶.—Lk 5¹⁴ 8¹⁶ 9⁴⁰ aor.? 11³³ 18⁵. 15 22³⁰.—Jn 3¹⁵. 16 4³⁶ 5²⁰. 23. 40 6²⁸. 38 (8⁶) 9³⁹ 10¹⁰. 38 13¹⁵. 19 14³. 16 15². 11. 16 16⁴. 24 33 17¹¹. 13. 19. 22. 23. 23. 24. 26 20³¹.—Ac 8¹⁹ 24⁴.—Ro 9¹¹ 11²⁵ 15⁴. 6. 20.—1 Co 12⁷. 27 5⁷ 7³⁴ 14³¹ 15²⁸.—2 Co 19. 17 4⁷ 5¹². 15 9³. 8 12⁷ 13⁷.—Ga 1⁶ 4¹⁷ 6¹².—Eph 4¹⁴. 28 5²⁷.—Ph 110. 26. 27 2¹⁹.—Col 2⁴ 3²¹.—1 Th 4¹². 13.—1 Ti 2² 4¹⁵ 5⁷. 20 6¹.—2 Ti 3¹⁷.—Tt 1⁹. 13 2⁴. 5. 10 3¹³. 14.—Heb 5¹ 6¹⁸ 9²⁵ 13¹⁷.—Jas 1⁴.—1 Pt 4¹¹.—1 Jn 13. 4 2¹ 4¹⁷.—Phm 13. 14. 15.—Rev 3¹⁸ 7¹ 11⁶ 12¹⁴ 16¹⁵ (Total: = 111).

LXX Ge 6¹⁹ 21³⁰ 42² 43⁸.—Ex 11⁹ 20²⁰ 26¹³ 27²⁰ 36²⁹ 38¹⁶. 27.—Dt 5¹⁶. 29 10¹³ 16²⁰ 29⁹ 30⁶.—Jos 1⁷ 3⁴ 4⁶. 24 22²⁵. 27 23⁶.—Jg 5¹⁵ A.—2 Esd 6¹⁰ 7²⁵.—To 1⁹ B^bA.—Est 4¹⁷.—Pr 3⁸. 23 5⁹ 6⁵. 22 26⁵ 27¹¹. 26. 26.—Wi 9² 12²² 13⁹ 14¹⁷ 16³.—Si 8⁴. 15 17⁹ 22¹³ 30²⁸. 36 35².—Isa 40²⁰ 44¹⁵.—Je 39¹⁴.—Ezk 14¹¹.—1 Mac 12³⁶.—2 Mac 1¹⁸ 6¹⁵ 11³⁶.—3 Mac 2³⁰.—Jb 2⁸ 33³⁰ (Total:—62). Ptol. pap. (dates): 223 251 241 iii 255 iii 240 iii 258 241 iii 250 223 261 250 222 255 241 iii 241 258 iii 240 260 253 251 258 261 248; 153 99 163 154 113 57 165 118 ii 161 131 110 103 152 95 168 5 2 166 153 164 118 114 ii 168 115 76 117 (Total:—57).

Aor. Subj.

Mt 1²² 2¹⁵ 4¹⁴ 5²⁹. 30 7¹ 9⁶ 12¹⁰ (fut. ind.) 17 14¹⁵ 17²⁷ 18¹⁶ 19¹³. 16 21⁴ 23²⁶ 26⁵. 56 27²⁶.—Mk 1³⁸ 2¹⁰ 3². 10 4¹² (see below) 21. 22 5¹². 23 6³⁶. 56 (ἵνα κἀν) 7⁹ 9²² 10¹³. 17 11²⁵ 12³. 13. 15 14⁴⁹ 15¹¹. 15. 20. 32 16¹.—Lk 1⁴ 5²⁴ 6⁷. 34 8¹² 9¹² 11⁵⁰. 54 12³⁶ 14²³. 29 15²⁹ 16⁴. 9. 24. 28 19⁴. 15 20¹⁰. 14. 20 22⁸.—Ac 2²⁵ 4¹⁷ 5¹⁵ ἵνα . . . κἀν 9²¹ 16³⁰ 22⁵. 24 23²⁴.—Jn 17. 8. 19. 22. 31 3¹⁷. 21 4⁸ 5³⁴. 36 6⁵. 15. 30. 50 7³² 8⁵⁹ 9³⁶ 10¹⁰. 17. 31. 38 11⁴. 11. 15. 16. 19. 31. 42. 52. 55 12⁹. 20. 36. 38. 47. 47 14¹³. 39. 31 15¹⁶ 17¹. 13 18⁹. 28. 32. 37 19⁴. 16. 24. 28; negative: 3¹⁶. 20 4¹⁵ 5¹⁴ 6¹². 50 7²³ 12³⁵. 40. 42. 46 16¹ 18²⁸. 36 19³¹.—Ro 11¹. 13 3⁸ 5²⁰. 21 6¹. 4. 6 7⁴. 13 8⁴. 17 11¹¹. 19. 31. 32 14⁹ 15¹⁶.—1 Co 1²⁸ 2¹² 3¹⁸ 4⁵. 8 5² (imperative?) 6 7⁵. 35 9¹⁵. 19. 20. 20. 22. 23. 24. 25 10³³ 11¹⁹ 14⁵. 19 16⁶. 11; neg.: 1¹⁵. 17 8¹³ 9¹² 11³².—2 Co 1¹¹. 15 2⁴. 9 4¹⁰. 11. 15 5⁴. 10. 21 7⁹ 8⁹. 14 11⁷. 12. 16. 16 12⁹ 13⁷; neg.: 2³. 5. 11 6³ 9³. 4 10⁹ 13¹⁰.—Ga 2⁵. 9. 16. 19 3¹⁴. 22. 24 4⁵ 6¹³.—Eph 2⁷. 10. 15 3¹⁰. 18. 19 4¹⁰. 29 5²⁶. 37 6³. 13. 22; neg.: 2⁹.—Col 1¹⁸. 38 2² 4⁴. 8.—Ph 2¹⁰. 15. 28. 30 3⁸; neg.: 2²⁷.—1 Th 2¹⁶ 5¹⁰.—2 Th 2¹² 3⁹. 14.—1 Ti 1¹⁶. 20 3¹⁵ 5¹⁶ 6¹⁹.—2 Ti 1⁴ 2⁴. 10 4¹⁷.—Ti 1⁵ 2⁸. 14 3⁷; neg.: 1 Ti 3⁶. 7.—Heb 2¹⁴. 17 4¹⁶ 10⁹. 36 11³⁵ 12²⁷ 13¹². 19 neg.: 3¹³ 4¹¹ 6¹² 11²⁸. 40 12³. 13.—Jas 5⁹. 12 4³.—1 Pt 1⁷ 2². 12. 21. 24 3¹. 9. 16. 18 4⁶. 13 5⁶.—2 Pt 1⁴.—1 Jn 2²⁸ 3¹. 5. 8 4⁹ 5¹³.—Rev 2¹⁰ 3¹¹. 18 6² 8¹² 9¹⁵ 12⁴. 6. 15 13¹⁵ 16¹² 19¹⁵. 18 21¹⁵; neg.: 3¹⁸ 8¹² 18⁴ 20³. (Total:—322).

LXX Ge 26, Ex 37, Le 7, Nu 4, Dt 43, Jos 4, Jg Ru 3, Km 8, Chr 3, 1 Esd 1, 2 Esd-Ne 2. To S 2, To B 5, Jdt 6, Est 1, Ps 6, Pr 35, Ecol. 5, Wi 23, Si 25, Jb 16, Isa 26, Je 9, Ba 2, La 1, Ezk 3, DaO' 7, Θ 4, 1 Mac 3, 2 Mac 3, 3 Mac 1, 4 Mac 2. (Total:—112).

It is difficult to decide between telic and ecbatic force for *ἵνα* in the formula with *πληρῶ, ἀναπληρῶ, τελειῶ*. It is probably telic, since *ὅπως* is occasionally substituted for *ἵνα* in the formula, and especially in view of the Jewish theology probably lying behind it. But in Lk 9⁴⁵ *ἵνα μὴ αἰσθῶνται αὐτό* is probably consecutive rather than final. In Col 2⁴ *ἵνα* may be final: *I say this in order that . . .*, but equally possible is an imperatival sense: *Let no one . . .* 2 Co 1¹⁷ is similarly controversial. The *ἵνα* in Jn 9² (*τίς ἤμαρτεν . . . ἵνα*) is consecutive, but the weak variant *ὅτι* indicates that scribes took it for causal *ἵνα*. It is like Epict. III 1, 12 *τί εἶδεν ἐν ἐμοὶ ὁ Ἐπικτήτης, ἵνα . . . περιίδη*; So also the *ἵνα* in Mk 15³² *καταβάτω ἵνα ἴδωμεν καὶ πιστεύσωμεν* is obviously consecutive. For instances of ecbatic *ἵνα* elsewhere, see Jannaris §§ 1758, 1951; Radermacher² 191f.

The question of causal sense for some instances of *ἵνα* in NT has also been raised¹. In Rev 22¹⁴ it is claimed that *μακάριοι . . . ἵνα* is parallel with *μακάριοι ὅτι* in Mt 5^{3ff}; but the possibility of telic force cannot be ruled out. In Rev 14¹³ the question of imperatival *ἵνα* arises: *They shall rest!* The *ἵνα* of Mk 4¹² = Lk 8¹⁰ is transformed into causal *ὅτι* in the Mt-parallel, but this would not prove identity of meaning. In 1 Pt 4⁶ (*ἵνα κρηθῶσιν . . . καὶ ζῶσιν*) it would be possible to assume that *ἵνα* is causal and that a second *ἵνα* (telic) has fallen out before *ζῶσιν*—or that we are to take *ἵνα* first as causal and then as telic. The causal as well as final use of *ἵνα* was acknowledged by the grammarian Apollonius Dyscolus (ii/A.D.) and no doubt this was so in NT. The causal makes excellent sense in Jn 8⁵⁶ (Abraham rejoiced *because . . .*). The real crux is Mk 4¹². The consecutive of NEB is not so good as final (OT background) or causal (good precedent and excellent sense). Lohmeyer in

¹ On causal *ἵνα* see Jannaris § 1714; Pernot *Études* 90–95; H. Wind-sich, "Die Verstockungsidee in Mk 4.12 und das kausale *ἵνα* der späteren Koine," in *ZNW* 26, 1927, 203ff; A. T. Robertson, "The Causal Use of *ἵνα*," *Studies in Early Christianity* 1927, 49ff; C. H. Dodd, in *JThS* 23, 1922, 62f; U. Holzmeister, in *Biblica* 17, 1936, 512ff; LS s.v.; Bauer s.v. (II2).

his commentary (Göttingen 1937, in loc) states truly "ἵνα bedeutet in der Koine . . . auch, wengleich seltener, 'weil'".

"ἵνα instead of almost any infinitive¹, for epexegetic infinitive, in demands after verbs of willing and the like, and also in an ecclastic sense, marks the beginning of a process which ended in the disappearance of the infinitive and substitution of *νά* with subj. in MGr.

Subjunctive:

Mt 4⁸ εἶπέ ἵνα . . . γένωνται, 16²⁰ ἐπετίμησεν B*D (διστείλατο SCΘ) ἵνα . . . εἴπωσιν.—Mk 5¹⁰ παρεκάλει . . . ἵνα μὴ . . . ἀποστείλῃ, 3⁹ εἶπεν . . . ἵνα . . . προσκαρτερῇ. 6²⁵ θέλω ἵνα . . . δῶς, 9³⁰ ἤθελεν ἵνα τις γνοῖ, 10³⁵ θέλομεν ἵνα . . . ποιήσης, 51. Mk. command: 3^{9.12} 543 68.12 736 830 9⁹ 1048 12¹⁹ 1334 1621; grant 10³⁷ 11^{16.28}; beseech 510.18 656 726.32 822 918 14^{35.38} 1318.—Mt 7¹² θέλητε ἵνα ποιῶσιν, 18¹⁴ θέλημα . . . ἵνα ἀπόληται, 20²¹ εἶπέ ἵνα καθίσωσιν, 31 ἐπετίμησεν . . . ἵνα σιωπήσωσιν, 27³² ἠγγάρουσιν ἵνα ἄρῃ, 28¹⁰ ἀπαγγεῖλατε . . . ἵνα ἀπέλωσιν, 12¹⁶ ἐπετίμησεν . . . ἵνα μὴ . . . ποιήσωσιν, 14³⁶ παρεκάλουν . . . ἵνα aor. subj., 24²⁰ 26⁴¹ προσεύχεσθε . . . ἵνα aor. subj., 27²⁰ ἐπεισαν . . . ἵνα aor. subj.—Lk 6³¹ θέλετε ἵνα ποιῶσιν, 14⁸ whence is this to me ἵνα ἔλθῃ; command: 4³ εἶπέ . . . ἵνα, 10⁴⁰ εἶπὸν ἵνα, 18³⁹ ἐπετίμων . . . ἵνα 20²⁸ ἔγραψεν . . . ἵνα; request: 7³⁶ ἠρώτα . . . ἵνα, 8³² παρεκάλεσεν . . . ἵνα, 8³¹ παρεκάλουν . . . ἵνα, 9⁴⁰ ἐδεήθην . . . ἵνα, 16²⁷ ἐρωτῶ . . . ἵνα, 21³⁶ δεόμενοι . . . ἵνα, 22³² ἐδεήθην . . . ἵνα, 46 προσεύχεσθε . . . ἵνα; completing verbal idea 7⁶ ἵκανος . . . ἵνα, 17² better for him ἵνα; Ac. command: 16³⁶ ἀπέσταλκαν . . . ἵνα ἀπολυθῆτε, 17¹⁵ λαβόντες ἐντολὴν . . . ἵνα, 19⁴ λέγων . . . ἵνα, plot: 27⁴² βουλή ἐγένετο ἵνα. Jn, will: 6⁴⁰ θέλημα . . . ἵνα . . . ἔχῃ, 17²⁴ θέλω ἵνα . . . ὧσιν, command: 11⁵⁷ δεδώκισαν . . . ἐντολὰς ἵνα, 13²⁹, 34 ἐντολὴν καινὴν δίδωμι ἵνα, 15¹² ἡ ἐντελὴ ἡ ἐμὴ ἵνα, 17 ἐντέλλομαι . . . ἵνα, 17⁴ τὸ ἔργον . . . δὲ δέδοκάς μοι ἵνα ποιήσω, beseech: 4⁴⁷ ἠρώτα ἵνα καταβῆ, 17^{15.21} ἐρωτῶ ἵνα, 19³¹ ἠρώτησαν ἵνα, agree: 9²² συνετέθειντο . . . ἵνα, 11⁵³ 12¹⁰ ἐβουλεύσαντο ἵνα, allow: 12⁷ ἀφες . . . ἵνα, epexegetic: 6²⁹ τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ ἔργον τ. θεοῦ ἵνα πιστεύητε, 8⁵⁶, 12²³ 13¹ 16^{2.32} ἡ ὥρα ἵνα, 15⁸ ἐν τούτῳ ἐδοξάσθη . . . ἵνα καρπὸν πολὺν φέρητε, 13 greater love . . . ἵνα (= i.e.), 17³ this is eternal life ἵνα, 18³⁹ there is a custom ἵνα; consecutive: 9² τίς ἤμαρτεν . . . ἵνα τυφλὸς γεννηθῆ; completing verbal action 12⁷ ἄξιός ἵνα, 22⁵ χρειὰν εἶχεν ἵνα, 4³⁴ ἐμὸν βρῶμά ἐστιν ἵνα, 5⁷ ἀνθρωπον οὐκ ἔχω ἵνα, 6⁷ οὐκ ἀρκοῦσιν αὐτοῖς ἵνα ἕκαστος βραχὺ λάβῃ, 11⁵⁰ 16⁷ συμφέροι ὑμῖν ἵνα, 13² put it in the heart ἵνα, 16³⁰ οὐ χρειὰν ἔχεις ἵνα; after ποιέω 11³⁷.—Ro command 16²; pray 15^{31.32}.—1 Co 16¹⁰ βλέπετε ἵνα; seek 14^{1.12}; say 7²⁹; epex. 4³; a small thing ἵνα 9¹⁸ (fut. ind.); beseech 11⁰ 14¹³ 16^{12.16}; it is required 4²; 14⁵ θέλω . . . λαλεῖν . . . ἵνα προφητεύητε,

¹ Even subject infinitive, e.g. Jn 16⁷ συμφέροι ὑμῖν ἵνα ἐγὼ ἀπέλω, and 1 Co 9¹⁸.

16¹² θέλημα ἵνα νῦν ἔλθῃ.—2 Co beseech 12⁸ παρακάλεσα ἵνα; exhort 8⁶ 9⁵.—Ga consecutive 5¹⁷.—Eph pray 1¹⁷ 3¹⁶ 6¹⁹. 20 δεήσει ἵνα.—Ph pray 1⁹ επεχ. 2² *namely* ἵνα.—Col pray 1⁹ αἰτούμενοι ἵνα 4^{3,12}; βλέπε ἵνα 4¹⁷; after ποιῶ 4¹⁶.—Th beseech 1 Th 4^{1.1} 2 Th 3¹² παρακαλέομαι; pray 2 Th 1¹¹ 3^{1.2}; consec. 1 Th 5⁴.—1 Ti exhort 1^{3.18} 5²¹ Ti 2¹² 3⁸.—2 Pt 3¹⁷ φυλάσσομαι.—Joh epp. command 1 Jn 3²³ 4²¹ 5¹⁶ 2 Jn 5. 6; επεχ. 1 Jn 1⁹ (cp. Heb 6¹⁰) faithful and just ἵνα; 2²⁷ χρεῖαν ἔχω ἵνα, 3¹¹ the message ἵνα, 5³ love of God ἵνα; 2 Jn 6 love ἵνα; 3 Jn 4 joy ἵνα; 2 Jn 8 βλέπετε ἵνα.—Rev command 6¹¹ 9⁴ ἔρρέθη ἵνα (fut. ind.); 9⁵ ἐδόθη αὐταῖς . . . ἵνα 19⁸; 14¹³ καὶ λέγει τὸ πνεῦμα ἵνα (fut. ind.); completing verbal action 2²¹ χρόνος ἵνα; 8⁶ prepare ἵνα; 21²³ οὐ χρεῖαν ἔχει . . . ἵνα; επεχ. (or consec?) 9²⁰ repented ἵνα (fut. ind.); 13¹³ ἵνα = i.e.; after ποιῶ (cp. Mt 24²⁴ ὥστε) 3⁹ 13¹² (fut. ind.) 15. 16. 17.

LXX: Ge 22¹⁴ consec., 24⁸ ἐξόρκισε σε κύριον . . . ἵνα μὴ λάβῃς.—Ex 6¹¹ λαλέω.—Dt command 6² ὅσα ἐνετείλατο ἵνα φοβῆσθε κύριον; swear 4²¹.—3 Km 6² (5¹⁷) command ἐνετείλατο ἵνα B^{ab}.—1 Ch 21¹⁸ command εἰπεῖν . . . ἵνα.—2 Ch 18¹⁵ adjure ὀρκίζω σε ἵνα μὴ λαλήσῃς (A fut. ind.).—1 Esd command 4⁴⁷ ἔγραψεν . . . ἵνα προπέμψωσιν, 5⁰ ἔγραψεν . . . ἵνα . . . ἀφίουσι (B pres. ind., A pres. subj.), 6³¹ προστάξαι ἵνα, 8¹⁹ προσέταξα . . . ἵνα . . . διδώσιν pr. ind.; beseech 4⁴⁶ δέομαι . . . ἵνα ποιήσῃς τὴν εὐχὴν; care 6²⁷ ἀτενίσαι ἵνα συνποιῶσιν.—Ne 7⁶⁵ εἶπεν . . . ἵνα μὴ φάγωσιν.—To S command 14⁹ ἐνυποταγήσεται . . . ἵνα ὦσιν . . . ; beseech 6¹⁸ δεήθητε . . . ἵνα ἔλεος γένηται (not B); completing verbal idea 3¹⁵ *he has no other child* ἵνα κληρονομήσῃ αὐτόν (not B), 5⁷ χρεῖαν . . . ἔχω ἵνα βαδίσῃς (not B), 9 πιστός . . . ἵνα πορευθῇ μετὰ σοῦ (B τοῦ and inf.), 6¹⁵ *they have no other son* ἵνα θάψῃ αὐτούς (not B).—To B beseech 8⁴ προσευξάμεθα ἵνα ἡμᾶς ἐλεήσῃ ὁ κύριος (S ὅπως).—Jdt 7²⁸ μαρτυρόμεθα ὑμῖν . . . ἵνα μὴ ποιήσῃ.—Mal 1⁹ beseech δεήθητε . . . ἵνα ἐλεήσῃ ὑμᾶς S^{ca}.—Ps allow 38¹⁴ ἄνεσ μοι ἵνα ἀνυψώξω.—Ca beseech 5¹ αἰτεῖται . . . ἵνα καταβῇ S.—Wi consec. 14⁴.—Si beseech 37¹⁵ δεήθητι . . . ἵνα εὐθύνῃ, 38¹⁴ δεηθήσονται ἵνα εὐοδώσῃ; promise 44¹⁸ διαθήκαι αἰῶνος ἐτέθεσαν . . . ἵνα μὴ ἐξαλειφθῇ, 45²⁴ ἐστάθη . . . διαθήκη . . . ἵνα . . . ᾤ.—Isa command 36¹²; βουλεύομαι 42²¹.—Ba pray 1¹¹ προσεύξασθαι . . . ἵνα ὦσιν.—Ezk after ποιῶ 36²⁷ ἵνα . . . πορευῆσθε.—Da O' command 3¹⁰ προσέταξας καὶ ἔκρινας ἵνα πᾶς . . . προσκυνήσῃ (Th. μὴ and aor. subj.), 3⁹ κρίνω ἵνα . . . διαμελισθήσεται fut. ind. (no ἵνα in Th), 6¹² οὐχ ὀρισμὸν ὠρίσω ἵνα πᾶς ἄνθρωπος μὴ εὐξῆται εὐχὴν (Th ὅπως), adjure 6¹² ὀρκίζομέν σε . . . ἵνα μὴ ἀλλιώσῃς . . . καὶ . . . ἐλαττώσῃς (Th om); fear 1¹⁰ ἵνα μὴ ἴδῃ (Th μήποτε); request 1⁸ ἤξιωσεν . . . ἵνα μὴ συμμολυνθῇ (Th ὡς οὐ μή), 2¹⁶ ἤξιωσεν ἵνα δοθῇ (Th ὅπως), 2⁴⁹ ἤξιωσεν . . . κατασταθῶσιν (co-ord. in Th).—Da ☉ be ready 3¹⁵ (LXX infin).—Jb command 37⁶ A.—1 Mac command 4⁵⁹ ἔστησεν . . . ἵνα ἄγωνται, 11⁴¹ ἀπέστειλεν . . . ἵνα ἐκβάλλῃ; write 15¹⁹ γράψαι . . . ἵνα μὴ συμμαχώσιν.—2 Mac command 2² ἐνετείλατο . . . ἵνα μὴ ἐπιλάθωνται; beseech 2⁸ ἤξιωσεν ἵνα . . . καταγιασθῇ.—4 Mac beseech 16¹² οὐδ' ἵνα μὴ ἀποθάνωσιν ἐπέτρεπεν . . .

In the Greek Bible the books which use ἵνα in a non-final sense at least equally as often as in a final sense are: Ch, 1 Esd, To S, Dan O', 1 Mac, Mt, Mk.

As to order of clauses, the *ἵνα*-clause generally follows the governing main clause, except where a second clause depends on the main verb; the exceptions in pre-Christian papyri are (dates): iii 244 iii 164 152 (all pre-positive).

(b) *Use of ὅπως (μή), ὡς, etc.*¹

In NT *ὅπως* is rather strictly confined to final sentences and to its use after *beseech* (e.g. *παρακαλέω*). In class. Attic it was also used with fut. ind. after *strive, take care*, but that is restricted to *ἵνα* in NT. In both NT and Koine² *ἵνα* and *ὅπως* alternate for the sake of variety: Jn 11⁵⁷, 1 Co 12⁹ *ἵνα . . . καταργήσῃ, ὅπως μὴ καυχῆσῃται* 2 Co 8¹⁴ *ἵνα γένηται . . . ὅπως γένηται*; 2 Th 1¹². John restricts himself almost entirely to *ἵνα*, in spite of the return of *ὅπως* in Hell. Greek; in the Ptol. papyri it is almost as frequent as *ἵνα* (302:260), although most exx. of *ὅπως* occur in official writing (Mayser II 1, 247-52, 256, 261). The figures of R. C. Horn (p. 31) corroborate Mayser:

Period	<i>ἵνα</i>	<i>ὅπως</i>	Proportion
Ptolemaic	222	200	same
Imperial	436	88	5 : 1
Byzantine	153	41	4 : 1

For class. Greek, see the figures in Goodwin, appendix III.

"Ὅπως has largely lost its *ἔν* in NT, in spite of many instances in the early papyri and older inscriptions, especially in official writings (Mayser II 1, 254-57; II 3, 50; Meisterhans 254; Horn 31); exceptions in the NT are Lk 2³⁵ Ac 3²⁰ 9¹² 15¹⁷ OT (Am 9¹² where no *ἔν*), Ro 3⁴ (Ps 50 (51)⁶), 9¹⁷ (Ex 9¹⁶ where our text has no *ἔν*).

The only place in NT where final *ὡς* occurs is Ac 20²⁴ (v.l. *ὅπως*). It is rare also in the Koine. R. C. Horn gives only P. Tebt. 56, 11ff (ii/B.C.), P. Prk. 5232, 35 (A.D. 14), P. Path 1 (99 B.C.), P. Prk 5357, 9 (prob. Byz.).

Other ways of expressing purpose in the later Koine are: *ὕπερ τοῦ* c. inf. (P. Giess. ii/A.D.), *πρὸς τό* c. inf. (P.B.M. A.D. 187,

¹ K-G II 375, 2; 385, 5. Schmid Attic. IV 621. Mayser II 1, 254-8.

² Mayser II 1, 245; Diogen. of On. I 8 οὐχ *ἵνα* . . . ἀλλ' *ὅπως* . . . Cp. in 1 Clem *ὅπως* and *εἰς τό*.

P. Flor. A.D. 514, O.P. A.D. 335, P.B.M. A.D. 345). εἰς τό c. inf. (O.P. A.D. 190, O.P. A.D. 427), ὥστε c. inf. (P. Flor. iii/A.D. bis). See pp. 135f., 141-144. In Hellenistic colloquial speech there was much overlapping in the use of ἵνα (or ὅπως) and ὥστε (or ὡς); so much so that ἵνα (ὅπως) are even used with the inf. and ὥστε with subj., with their final and consecutive rôles respectively reversed (see Ljungvik BSSVS 46f).

Certain writers like Aristophanes, Plato and the orators, favoured ἵνα, but Homer, Thucydides, Xenophon, Herodotus, and Attic inscriptions of v-iv/B.C. favoured ὅπως. Polybius always chooses ἵνα and this development is reflected in NT and inscriptions and papyri of i/A.D., until the Atticistic revival of ὅπως set in about iii-iv/A.D.

	ἵνα	ὅπως
Homer	9	145
Thuc. (whole)	53	156
Xen. (i-iii)	32	52
Herodotus	17	107

	ἵνα	ὅπως
Polybius (i-v)	62	0
NT	746	58
Test. Sol.	16	10
Ep. Arist.	28	17
Pap. i/A.D.	2	0
ii/A.D.	17	3
iii-v	21	3

* From P. Bouriant, P. Lug. Bat. 1, 2, 3, P. Oslo 1, 2, 3.

Ac is the only NT book with much stylistic pretence in this respect (as with τε). Where there is a variant, except in Ac, we should probably accept ἵνα, e.g. Mt 6¹⁸D. However, ὅπως seems to be preferred with verbs of *beseeking*: Mt 8³⁴ παρεκάλεσαν, 9³⁸ δεῖσθαι, Lk 7³ ἔρωτᾶν, Ac 8¹⁵ προσεύχεσθαι, Jas 5¹⁶ εὔχεσθαι.

3. Relative clauses¹

A futuristic subjunctive (neg. μή) in relative clauses introduces an element of uncertainty and supposition. Sometimes

¹ K-G II § 559. Stahl 521ff. Meisterhans-Schw. 236f. Moulton Einl. 259ff. Mayser II 1, 261-267. M. L. Earle, "Subjunctive of Purpose in Relative Clauses in Attic Greek," *Trans. & Proc. American Philol. Assoc.*, 23, 17; J. E. Harry, "The Use of οἷος, ποῖος, and ὁποῖος," *ibid.* 38, 18. A. W. Argyle, "The Causal Use of the Relative Pronouns in the Greek N.T.," *Bible Translator* 6, 1955, 165-169 (repetition is not a Semitism). H. J. Cadbury, "Relative Pronouns," *JBL* 42, 150-7.

the clause is the equivalent of a condition ($\delta\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\nu = \acute{\epsilon}\acute{\alpha}\nu$ τις); sometimes of a final clause. The main verb is usually future or an imperative, but the general idea may be timeless. These general relative clauses almost invariably contain the particle $\acute{\alpha}\nu$ (even if the verb is in the indic. mood¹), and it stands as near to the rel. pronoun as possible, though $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$, $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$, etc., may intervene. Its presence was virtually essential in classical prose and is only very rarely omitted in NT and Egyptian Koine. Of course, the conditional particle $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\alpha}\nu$ is gaining on $\acute{\alpha}\nu$ from iii/B.C. In the papyri it becomes more frequent at the end of ii/B.C. and during i/B.C. ($\acute{\alpha}\nu$:—iii 130; ii-i 78. $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\alpha}\nu$:—iii 4; ii-i 16). The use of pres. or aor. subj. bears little or no relation to the *Aktionsart*. In the papyri, the difference appears to be that the pres. indicates that the time of the subordinate clause is coincident with that of the main (or durative action, if relatively past), while the aor. indicates a relatively past time. To take the half-dozen instances of pres. tense in Mt: in 7¹² the main verb is *do so to them* and the rel. clause is *what you wish them to do to you*, i.e. at the time when you are doing it to them; 11²⁷ the Father is known only to that man *to whom the Son has been willing* (from time to time, durative) *to reveal him* $\acute{\omega}\delta \acute{\epsilon}\acute{\alpha}\nu$ βούληται; 16²⁵ 20²⁶. 27 *that man will lose his life who is desirous* (at that moment) *to save it* (whereas also in 16²⁵ is the aor., meaning *who by that time has already lost it, he will save it*); 20⁴ *I will pay you whatever* (at that time) *is the right payment* $\delta \acute{\epsilon}\acute{\alpha}\nu$ η δίκαιον. By way of contrast, we discover from the more abundant aorists in Mt that the relative action is always antecedent to the main action: 5¹⁹ *he will be called least, who* (by that time shall have) *relaxed*; 3² *he makes his wife an adulteress who divorces* (i.e. has already divorced) *her*.

1. Pres. subj.

(a) with $\acute{\alpha}\nu$: (x) coincident time, e.g., LXX Ge 39⁸, Mk 9³⁷ $\delta\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\nu$ $\acute{\epsilon}\mu\acute{\epsilon}$ δέχεται BL 892; Jn 2⁵ δ τι $\acute{\alpha}\nu$ λέγει *whatever he will be saying to you*: do it at the time he is saying it (for a different explanation, making it equivalent to universal $\acute{\alpha}\nu$ c. subj. in conditional clauses, see Zerwick

¹ It is a feature of Hell. Greek that the connection between the mood and the conjunction (e.g. subj. after $\acute{\alpha}\nu$) is becoming less determined, and so we have $\epsilon\iota$ with subj., $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\alpha}\nu$ with indic., $\delta\tau\epsilon$ with subj., $\delta\tau\alpha\upsilon$ with indic., etc. In MGr only the fuller conjunctions $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\alpha}\nu$ and $\delta\tau\alpha\upsilon$ remain; and they have both indic. (real) and subj. (probable).

§ 235: *whatsoever at any time he says to you.*) (β) antecedent continuous or iterative time, e.g. Mt 20²⁷ Mk 10^{43f} δς ἂν θέλῃ . . . ἔσται ὑμῶν (δοῦλος).

(b) with ἐάν: (α) coincident, e.g. LXX Ge 6¹⁷ ὅσα ἐάν ᾤ, 20¹⁵, 21²² (durative), 30³³, 44¹; Mt 7¹² ὅσα ἐάν θέλητε (or continuous), 11²⁷ ᾗ ἐάν βούληται, 20⁴ δ' ἐάν ᾤ δικαίον, Mk 6²² αἰτήσόν με δ' ἐάν θέλῃς. (β) antecedent cont. or iterat., e.g. Mt 16²⁵ 20²⁶ Mk 8³⁵ δς . . . ἐάν θέλῃ.

(c) without ἂν or ἐάν, e.g. Mt 10³³ ὅστις δὲ ἀρνήσεται BLW (rest ἂν).

2. Aor. subj.

(a) with ἂν: LXX Ge 21⁷ 3⁵ 11⁶ 12¹ 21⁶ 22² 24¹⁴. 43 26² 42³⁸ 44⁹. 10 48⁶ AB. Mt 5¹⁹ δς δ' ἂν ποιήσῃ, ²¹ φονεύσῃ, ²² 15⁵ εἴπῃ, 53¹ 19⁹ δς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ (OT Dt 24¹), 10¹¹ εἰς ἣν ἂν πόλιν . . . εἰσέλθῃτε, ¹⁴ δς ἂν μὴ δέξῃται, ³³ ὅστις δ' ἂν ἀρνήσεται vl., 12⁵⁰ ὅστις . . . ἂν ποιήσῃ, 16²⁵ δς δ' ἂν ἀπολέσῃ, 18⁶ δς δ' ἂν σκανδαλίσῃ, 19⁹ δς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ, (21⁴⁴ ἐφ' οὗ ἂν πέσῃ), 23¹⁶. 18 δς ἂν ὁμόσῃ, 26⁴⁸ ὃν ἂν φιλήσω. Mk 3³⁵ δς ἂν ποιήσῃ, 3²⁸ ὅσα ἂν βλασφημῆσωσιν SD (ὅσας ἂν AFΦ fam¹ 22 28 157 700), 3²⁹ δς δ' ἂν βλασφημῆσῃ, 6¹¹ δς ἂν (τόπος) μὴ δέξῃται, 9³⁷ δς ἂν . . . δέξῃται DWΔΘ (corr. to ἐάν by 565 579 700), 4¹ δς γὰρ ἂν ποτίσῃ (S ἐάν; HΓΔ Ψ 28 ποτίσει), 4² δς ἂν σκανδαλίσῃ (ACX ἐάν), 10¹¹ δς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ (ANX 700 ἐάν), 1⁵ δς ἂν μὴ δέξῃται (ANX 700 ἐάν), 11²³ δς ἂν εἴπῃ. 14⁴⁴ ὃν ἂν φιλήσω (LNDΨ ἐάν).

(b) with ἐάν: LXX Ge 15¹⁴ 20¹³ 21¹² 28¹⁵. 22 31³² 34¹¹ 41⁵⁵ 42³⁸ 48⁶ (Rahlfs). Mt 5¹⁹ δς ἐάν . . . λύσῃ, ³² δς ἐάν . . . γαμήσῃ, 10⁴² δς ἐάν (vl) ποτίσῃ, 11⁶ δς ἐάν (vl) μὴ σκανδαλισθῇ, 12³² ἐάν (vl) εἴπῃ. 14⁷ δ' ἐάν αἰτήσεται (an apparent exception: she had not asked anything yet, but would have done so before he was able to make the gift), 15⁵ ὠφεληθῆς, WHT (rest aor. ind.), 16¹⁹ δήσῃς, 18⁵ δέξῃται, 1⁹ οὗ ἐάν αἰτήσονται 1⁸ ὅσα ἐάν δήσῃτε, 21²² ἐάν (vl) αἰτήσῃτε, 22⁹ ὅσους ἐάν εὖρητε, 23³ πάντα . . . ὅσα ἐάν εἴπωσιν.—Mk 3²⁸ ὅσα ἐάν βλασφημῆσωσιν BΔΘ, ὅσας ἐάν βλ. CFE 33 565 892 1071, 6²⁸ ὅτι ἐάν με αἰτήσῃς BΔ p⁴⁵ 118 124 435, ὅτι δ' ἐάν μ.α. SAC Θ fam¹⁸ 33, 7¹¹ δ' ἐάν ἐξ ἐμοῦ ὠφεληθῆς (DW 28 ἂν), 8³⁸ δς γὰρ ἐάν ἐπαυχυνθῇ SBC Θ p⁴⁵ (ἂν GHKSUWΠΦ fam¹. 18 22 543 28 33 700 Cl. Alx D), 9³⁷ δς ἐάν ἐμὲ δέξῃται ACNXΓΣΦ, 10³⁵ δ' ἐάν αἰτήσωμεν (ἂν DW 6369 C*; αἰτήσομεν S^cA), 13¹¹ δ' ἐάν δοθῇ (ἂν ADW 229 1342).

(c) neither ἂν nor ἐάν: Mt 10³³ BLW ὅστις δὲ ἀρνήσεται.

3. Pres. and Aor. side by side

Mt 16²⁵ δς . . . ἐάν θέλῃ — δς δ' ἂν ἀπολέσῃ.

Thus in Mt the situation is different from that in pre-Christian papyri, and precisely the same as in LXX Ge (Rahlfs' text).

PAPYRI

MATTHEW

Present			Aorist			Present			Aorist		
ἔν	ἔάν	neither	ἔν	ἔάν	neither	ἔν	ἔάν	neither	ἔν	ἔάν	neither
118	12	3	85	8	2	1	5	—	18	14	1

LXX GE

MARK

Present			Aorist			Present			Aorist		
ἔν	ἔάν	neither	ἔν	ἔάν	neither	ἔν	ἔάν	neither	ἔν	ἔάν	neither
1	5	—	13	10	—	2	2	—	12	7	—

Also in contradistinction to the papyri¹, the NT sometimes employs the subj. in relative clauses, in a final sense, where class. Greek used the fut. ind. : Mk 14¹⁴ Lk 22¹¹ ποῦ ἔστιν τὸ κατάλυμα ὅπου φάγω (D corr. to fut.), Lk 11⁶ ὁ παραθήσω αὐτῷ *something to set before him*, 9⁵⁸ οὐκ ἔχει ποῦ τὴν κεφαλὴν κλίνῃ *nowhere to lay*, Ac 21¹⁶ ἄγοντες παρ' ᾧ ξενισθῶμεν Μνάσωνι. LXX Je 11⁶ ἐπικατάρατος ὁ ἄνθρωπος, ὅς . . . ἔχει . . . καὶ στηρίσει . . . καὶ . . . ἀποστῆ.

In the papyri too, qualitative-consecutive relative sentences employ the indicative, not the subjunctive. Like Latin, NT sometimes uses subj. : Heb 8³ ἔχειν τι . . . ὁ προσενέγκῃ *something to offer* (but also Isocr. IV 44 ἔχειν ἐφ' οἷς φιλοτιμηθῶσιν), 1 Clem 38² ἔδωκεν δι' οὗ ἀναπληρωθῆ.

The difference between indic. and subj. in these general relative clauses is ideally and approximately that between εἰ c. indic. and ἔάν c. subj. in true conditional clauses. The former indicates an assumption which is actual and realized, while the latter points to future probabilities which may not actually be realized. But in the papyri which concern official decrees and statutes, as Mayser remarks, the distinction is often effaced and in fact the two moods can be used quite promiscuously (II 1, 266). This applies equally to the NT :

¹ Mayser II 1, 214, 267. But not necessarily to Hellenistic Greek generally. See examples in Radermacher² 170.

Mt 13¹² ὅστις γὰρ ἔχει (ind.), Mk 4²⁵ ὅς γὰρ ἔχει AE²G ὅς ἂν ἐχῆ (subj.) DE*F ὅς ἂν ἔχει (ind.), 4²⁵ ὅς οὐκ ἔχει (ind.), E*G ὅς οὐκ ἔχη (subj.), Lk 8¹⁸ ὅς γὰρ ἂν ἐχη (subj.), δοθήσεται αὐτῷ, καὶ ὅς ἂν μὴ ἐχη (subj.), καὶ ὁ δοκεῖ (ind.) ἔχειν, ἀρθήσεται ἀπ' αὐτοῦ.—Mt 10³² ὅστις ὁμολογήσει (ind.), ³³ ὅστις δ' [ἂν] ἀρνήσεται (subj.).—Lk 12⁸ πᾶς ὅς ἂν ὁμολογήσῃ (subj.) p⁴⁵ SΘ (B*D Mcion. harm. with Mt 10³²). Thus the moods fluctuate for no good reason, and only the context can really decide whether the rel. clause is definite or indefinite.

Very occasionally the indic. occurs with ἂν in NT and LXX (see pp. 91, 92f): Future Mk 3²⁸ ὅσας ἐὰν βλασφημήσουσιν L, 8³⁵ SBCD² ἀπολέσει (ALW -ση), Lk 12⁸ ὁμολογήσει AB*DR, 17³³ SAL (BDEW -ση), Ac 7⁷ δουλεύσουσιν ACD. LXX Le 27¹² καθότι ἂν τιμηθήσεται. Barn 11⁸ SC ὁ ἐὰν ἐξελεύσεται. Present Mt 11²⁷ LW ζῆ ἐὰν βούλεται, Rev 14⁴ ὅπου ἂν ὑπάγει.

There are a few exx. of subj. without ἂν (ἐάν) in the papyri—five, all told, in Mayser—but all the NT exx. are textually suspect: Mt 10³³ BWL, Ga 6¹⁶ p⁴⁶ ὅσοι στοιχήσωσιν, Jas 2¹⁰ SBC ὅστις . . . τηρήσῃ, 2¹⁰ SABC πταισῃ, Herm. S. II 3 bis.

4. Temporal Clauses ¹

A special kind of relative clause, they follow the same construction with regard to relative time in the use of subj. with ἂν. As with the relative conjunction, ἂν stands as near as possible to the temporal conjunction. It is only with ἕως, and then largely in the aor., that ἂν can be omitted. In post-Christian papyri these particles have a final sense (Ljungvik BSSVS 43-46).

(a) Clauses with ἄχρι, ἕως and μέχρι.

Pres. subj. = *as long as*, of indefinite continuance in either past or future.

With ἂν: none in NT. Ptol. pap. (dates): 237 285.

Without ἂν: none in NT. Ptol. pap.: 140.

Pres. indic.: Mt 5²⁵ ἕως ὅτου εἶ *while*. Jn 9⁴ ἕως ἡμέρας ἐστίν. Ptol. pap. (dates): 223 iii 164.

We may note ἕως with pres. indic. in a futuristic sense: Mk 6⁴⁵ SBL ἕως αὐτὸς ἀπολύει (vī. ἀπολύσῃ, -σει, D αὐτὸς δὲ

¹ K-G II § 567. Stahl 444ff. Mayser II 1, 268ff. Meisterhans-Schwyzler 242, 9; 247, 1; 251b. Schwyzler II 648ff. A. Tschuschke, *De prōn particulae apud scriptores aetatis Augustae prosaicos usu* (Diss. of Breslau), 1913.

ἀπολύει), Jn 21^{22, 23} ἕως ἔρχομαι *until I come*, also 1 Ti 4¹³. This can hardly mean *as long as*, any more than in Herm. S. IX 11, 1 ἕως ἔρχεται, V 2, 2; IX 10, 5. 6. The papyri have ἕως with pres. subj. on two occasions with possible meaning *until*, but never pres. ind., or even fut. ind. like Lk 13³⁵ vl.

Aor. subj. (ἕως and μέχρι) = *until*, of a punctiliarly conceived future event preceded in time by the action of the main clause:

with ἄν: Mt 21³ ἕως ἄν εἶπω, 51⁸ 24³⁴ ἕως ἄν πάντα γένηται, 52⁶ ἕως ἄν ἀποδῶς, 10¹¹ ἕως ἄν ἐξέλθῃτε, 12²⁰ ἕως ἄν ἐκβάλλῃ (Isa 42³), 16²⁸ ἕως ἄν ἴδωσιν, 22⁴⁴ ἕως ἄν θῶ (Ps 110¹), 23³⁹ ἕως ἄν εἶπητε.—Mk 6¹⁰ ἕως ἄν ἐξέλθῃτε, 9¹ ἕως ἄν ἴδωσιν, 12³⁶ ἕως ἄν θῶ.—Lk 9²⁷ ἕως ἄν ἴδωσιν, 20⁴³ ἕως ἄν θῶ (Ps 110¹), 21³² ἕως ἄν πάντα γένηται.—Ac 2³⁵ (Ps 110¹).—1 Co 4⁵ ἕως ἄν ἔλθῃ.—Ga 3¹⁹ ἄχρις ἄν ἔλθῃ (vl. ἄχρις οὗ).—Heb 1³ (Ps 110¹).—Μέχρις ἄν none.

without ἄν: Mt 10²³ ἕως ἔλθῃ, 14²² ἕως ἄν ἀπολύσῃ (-σει ΚΓ), 17⁹ ἕως οὗ ἐγερθῇ, 18³⁰ ἕως ἀποδῶ, 34 ἕως οὗ ἀποδῶ, 26³⁶ ἕως οὗ . . . προσεύξωμαι *while, as long as* (fut. subj.?).—Mk 13³⁰ μέχρις οὗ . . . γένηται (B μέχρις οὗ; S μέχρι; W ἕως; D ἕως οὗ), 14³² (-ζομαι D).—Lk 12⁵⁰ ἕως οὗ τελεσθῇ, 59 ἕως ἀποδῶς 13⁸ ἕως οὗ σκάψω, 35 ἕως εἶπητε (vl.), 15⁴ ἕως εὗρῃ, 8 ἕως οὗ εὗρῃ, 17⁸ ἕως (+ ἄν AK) φάγω καὶ πῖω *while, as long as*, 21²⁴ ἄχρι (οὗ) πληρωθῶσιν, 22¹⁶ ἕως οὗ πληρωθῇ, 18 ἕως οὗ . . . ἔλθῃ, 34 ἕως . . . ἀπαρνήσῃ, 24⁴⁹ ἕως οὗ ἐνδύσῃσθε.—Jn 13³⁸ ἕως οὗ ἀρνήσῃ.—Ac 23¹² ἕως οὗ ἀποκτείνωσιν, 14 -ωμεν (final, as in later papyri), 21 ἕως οὗ ἀνέλωσιν, 25²¹ ἕως οὗ ἀναπέμψω.—Ro 11²⁵ ἄχρι οὗ . . . εἰσέλθῃ.—1 Co 11²⁶ ἄχρι οὗ ἔλθῃ, 15²⁵ ἄχρι οὗ θῇ (Ps 110¹).—2 Th 2⁷ ἕως (+ ἄν FG) . . . γένηται.—Heb 10¹³ ἕως τεθῶσιν.—Jas 5⁷ ἕως λάβῃ.—2 Pt 1¹⁹ ἕως οὗ . . . διαυγάσῃ.—Rev 6¹¹ ἕως πληρωθῶσιν, 7³ ἄχρι σφραγίσωμεν, 15⁸ ἄχρι τελεσθῶσιν, 17¹⁷ B ἄχρι τελεσθῶσιν (vl τελεσθῆσονται), 20^{3, 5} ἄχρι τελεσθῇ.—Ga 4¹⁹ μέχρις οὗ μορφωθῇ.—Eph 4¹³ μέχρι καταστήσωμεν.

	Present subjunctive			Aorist subjunctive					
	ἕως	ἕως ἄν	μέχρι ἄν	ἕως	ἕως ἄν	μέχρι	μέχρι ἄν	ἄχρι	ἄχρις ἄν
Ptol.									
pap.	1	4	1	7	44	—	3	—	—
NT	—	—	—	28	18	3	—	9	1

In the earlier papyri ἕως ἄν predominates, but in the Imperial period ἕως is preferred.

(b) *Clauses with ἐπάν, ὅταν, ὡς ἄν.*

With pres. subj.

(1) Usually of an iterative action, indefinite, in the past or future. By far the most frequent, in secular and Biblical Greek, is ὅταν. The main clause has most often the present or future, but also the aorist. *Whenever.* See pp. 92f.

Ὅταν:—Mt 6² ὅταν οὖν ποιῆς ἐλεημοσύνην, ⁵ ὅταν προσεύχησθε, 6. 16, 10²³ 15².—Mk 11²⁵ ὅταν στήκητε BWG (ACD -κετε; S στήτε) 13^{4. 11} 14^{7. 26}.—Lk 11² (AWCH προσεύχεσθε), 21. 34 12¹¹ 14^{12. 13} 21⁷.—Jn 7²⁷ (SHXA* ἔρχεται) 8⁴⁴ 9⁵ 16²¹.—Ro 21⁴.—1 Co 3⁴ 14²⁶.—2 Co 12¹⁰ 13⁹.—1 Th 5³.—1 Jn 5².—Rev 4⁹ SQ δώσωσιν (v.l. δώσουσιν 10⁷).
Ἡνίκα:—2 Co 3¹⁵ ἕως σήμερον ἡνίκα ἂν ἀναγινώσκῃται Μωϋσῆς.

(2) Of a definite action occurring in the future: *when.*

Ὅταν:—Mt 26²⁹.—1 Co 15²⁴.—Rev 18⁹.—Pap (A.D. 270).

Ὅς ἄν:—Ro 15²⁴ πορεύομαι εἰς τὴν Σπανίαν. Only in Ptol. pap., not in later Koine (Horn 133). Its use in Paul (so also 1 Co 11³⁴, Ph 2²³) might be due to his familiarity with LXX; more probably he is using the spoken language of his day (Horn 136): P. Fay. I 111 16 (A.D. 95) ὡς ἂν βλέπῃς.

Ἐπὶ ἄν:—Lk 11³⁴ ἐπὶ ἄν δὲ πονηρὸς ἦ (D ὅταν).

Ὅτε c. subj. is late (Jannaris § 1988), but see Lk 13³⁵ AD ὅτε εἰπητε.

With aor. subj.

(1) Most commonly of a definite action taking place in the future but concluded before the action of the main verb. Thus the main verb is usually fut. ind., but it may be imper. The particles are ὡς ἄν, ὅταν, and ἐπὶ ἄν.

Ἐπὶ ἄν:—Mt 2⁸ ἐπὶ ἄν δὲ εὗρητε ἀπαγγεिलाτέ μοι (D ὅταν).—Lk 11²² κήσῃ (D ἔάν), ³⁴ ἦ (D ὅταν). BU 523, 17 ἐπὶ ἄν ἀναβῆς *after you have been.*

Ὅταν:—Mt 5¹¹, 9¹⁵ ἐλεύσονται ἡμέραι ὅταν ἀπαρθῇ, 10¹⁹ 12⁴³ 13³² 19²⁸ 21⁴⁰ 23¹⁵ 24^{15. 32. 33} 25³¹.—Mk 2²⁰ 4^{15. 16. 20. 31. 32} 8³⁸ 9⁹ 12^{23. 25} 13⁷ ὅταν ἀκούσῃτε (v.l. ἀκούετε), 14. 28. 29.—Lk 5³⁵ ὅταν ἀπαρθῇ, 6²⁶ 8¹³ 9²⁶ 13²⁸ S ἴδῃτε (B*DX ὄψεσθε; ABeorr W -ῆσθε), 16^{4. 9} 17¹⁰ 21^{9. 20} 23⁴².—Jn 4²⁵ 5⁷ 7³¹ 8²⁸ 10⁴ 14²⁹ 15²⁶ 16^{4. 18. 21} 21¹⁸.—Ac 23³⁵ 24²².—Ro 11²⁷.—1 Co 13¹⁰ 15^{24. 24. 27. 28. 54} 16^{2. 3. 5. 12}.—2 Co 10⁶.—Col 3⁴ 4¹⁶.—2 Th 1¹⁰.—1 Ti 5¹¹.—Ti 3¹².—Heb 1⁶.—Jas 1².—Rev 11⁷ 12⁴ 17¹⁰ 20⁷.

Ὅς ἄν:—1 Co 11³⁴ τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ ὡς ἂν ἔλθω διατάξομαι.—Ph 2²³ ὡς ἂν ἀφίδω:—LXX Ge 12¹² ὡς ἂν ἴδωσίν σε . . . ἐροῦσι.—P. Hib. I 59, 2 (247 B.C.), UPZ I 7I, 18 (152 B.C.); Horn 133, Mayser II 1, 271f, 274f.

(2). Much rarer are the instances where the action is indefinite or iterative:

Ἐπάν:—(= **בבכל עת אשא**) LXX Est 5¹⁸ S¹ ἐπάν ἴδω Μαρδ. *all the while that*, Da O' Bel¹² ἐπάν κλεισθῆ *after it has been*.

Ὅταν:—Lk 6²² 11²⁴ 12⁵⁴ 14^{8, 10} 21^{30, 31}.—Jn 2¹⁰.—Rev 9⁵.

Ἦνικά:—LXX Ex 1¹⁰ καὶ ἦνικά ἀν συμβῆ ἡμῖν πόλεμος *each time*.—Dt 7¹².—2 Co 3¹⁶ (Ex 34³⁴) ἦνικά δὲ ἐάν ἐπιστρέψῃ.

For ὅτε, ὅταν, and ἐπάν with indic., see pp. 92f.

	Pres. subj.		Aor. subj.				
	ὅταν	ὡς ἂν	ὅταν	ὡς ἂν	ἐπάν	ἐπειδάν	ὀπηνίκε' ἂν
Ptol. pap.	20	10	19	49	3	2	3
NT	33	1	82	2	1	—	—

(c) *Clauses with πρίν.*

Neither πρίν nor πρίν ἂν occur with subj. in the Ptol. pap., but πρίν c. subj. occurs in papyri from ii-v/A.D. (Horn 128). Πρίν was possible without ἂν in class. Greek and it so occurs in LXX and NT. Lk 2²⁶ πρίν ἢ ἂν ἴδῃ (S* ἕως ἂν ἴδῃ; B om ἢ; ADW om ἂν), 22³⁴ πρίν ἢ ἀπαρνήσῃ AWT (SBL ἕως; K ἕως οὐ; D ἕως ὄτου). With optative Ac 25¹⁶ (see next ch.). LXX Si 11⁷ πρίν (+ ἢ SA) ἐξετάσῃς; Sym. Ps 57 (58)¹⁰ πρίν ἢ (LXX πρὸ τοῦ c. inf.); Sym. Je 40 (47)⁵ πρίν ἢ ἀπαλλάγω ἐγώ.—Herm. S. V 7, 3 πρίν ἀκουσθῶσι τὰ ῥήματα.

5. *Conditional Sentences*¹

The subjunctive occurs in the hypothetical protasis which is introduced by ἐάν. This is often written εἰάν and sometimes ἦν in the papyri, never in NT. Moreover, we find ἂν for ἐάν, as there was interchange at this time between the two particles; and this occurs six times in Jn especially in connection with τις (cp. ἂν τις ὑμῶν κακῶς ἐρεῖ in a very badly written papyrus from the Fayum, SB 5627, 11).

¹ K-G I § 399, 2; II § 575. Meisterhans-Schwyzler § 89. Stahl 390. Schwyzler II 682-688. Mayser II 1, 275-288. Moulton Einl. 292ff. E. B. Clapp, "Conditional Sentences in the Greek Tragedies," (*Trans. and Proc. Amer. Philol. Assn.* 22, 81). J. Sterenberg, *The Use of Conditional Sentences in the Alexandrian Version of the Pentateuch*. (Diss. of Munich, 1908.)

Parallel with relative and temporal clauses, the aor. subj. denotes a single event taking place in the future, and the pres. subj. a general or iterative occurrence which may or may not be expected to take place at any time. The pres. denotes also coincident action with the main verb, whereas the aor. is like the Latin future, and is fut. perf. in its relation with the main clause.

(a) *Ἐάν* with pres. and aor. subjunctive.

(1) *Present*: very common in Koine. In a general and iterative sense, as "condicio universalis" (Zerwick § 227c), the pres. subj. denotes a hypothesis which can occur over and over again (present *Aktionsart*). The most common example of this condition in the Ptol. pap. is stereotyped phrases in decrees and punishments, having a continual validity. In the main clause is a pres. ind. (or even optative), mainly an imperative or jussive of some kind.

Mt 5²³ ἐάν οὖν προσφέρῃς *as often as you*, 6^{22. 23}, 8² ἐάν θέλῃς, δύνασαι (how tentative, cp. with Peter's εἰ θέλεις 174!), 10^{13. 13} 15¹⁴ 17²⁰ 21²¹.—Mk 1⁴⁰ 9^{45. 47} 14³¹ ἐάν δέῃ . . . οὐ μὴ σε ἀπαρνήσομαι (S -σωμαι).—Lk 5¹² 6³³ 10⁶ 13³ ἐάν μὴ μετανοῆτε is not distinguishable from ⁵ ἐάν μὴ μετανοήσητε (as scribes realized, correcting to μετανοήτε), 19³¹.—Jn 3^{2. 27} 5³¹ 6^{62. 65} 7¹⁷ 8^{16. 31} 9³¹ 11^{9.10} 12^{26. 26} 13^{17. 35} 14^{15. 23} 15^{4. 4. 7. 14} 21²² ἐάν αὐτὸν θέλω μένειν . . . τί πρὸς σέ; (difficult because so definite; class. would be εἰ), ²³.—Ac 5³⁸ (see Zerwick §§ 219–220: Gamaliel seems strangely biased. He says doubtfully *If it should be of men* (ἐάν ᾗ) but confidently *If (as it seems) it is of God* (εἰ . . . ἐστίν), the one hypothetical, the other "real". Luke has composed the speech and is giving his own conviction, not Gamaliel's), 13⁴¹ 26⁵.—Ro 2^{25. 25. 26} 9²⁷ 11^{22. 23} 12^{20. 20} 13⁴ 14^{8. 8. 8.}—1 Co 4¹⁵ 5¹¹ 6⁴ 7³⁶ 9^{16. 16} vl. 11^{14. 15} 13^{1. 2} 14^{14. 24. 28} 16⁴.—Col. 3¹³.—1 Th 2⁸.—1 Ti 1⁸ 3¹⁵.—2 Ti 2⁵.—Jas 2^{14. 15. 17} 4¹⁵ (vl. aor. subj.).—1 Pt 3¹³.—1 Jn 1^{7. 9} 2³ γινώσκωμεν . . . ἐάν . . . τηρῶμεν (S* φυλάξωμεν), 15 3^{20. 21} 4¹².—Heb 6³ ἐάνπερ.

(2) *Aorist*: This represents a definite event as occurring only once in the future, and conceived as taking place before the time of the action of the main verb. It is expectation, but not fulfilment as yet. It is very near the meaning of ὅταν, and is often more than mere probability (see LXX Isa 24¹³ *when*; Am 7²). In the apodosis occurs fut. and pres. indic., or imper. or jussive.

Mt 4⁹ 5^{13. 20. 46. 47} 6^{14. 15} 9²¹ 12^{11. 29} 16²⁸ 18^{3. 12. 13. 15. 16. 17. 19} ἐάν συμφωνήσωσιν (SD fut. ind.) . . . γενήσεται FGKMW, ³⁵, 21^{3. 21. 25. 26}

22²⁴ 24²³. 26. 48 26⁴² 28¹⁴.—Mk 3²⁴. 25. 27 5²⁸ 7⁸. 4. 11 8² 9⁴³. 50 10¹². 30 11³. 31 12¹⁹ OT 13²¹.—Lk 4⁷ 6³⁴ 12³⁸. 45 14³⁴ 15⁸ 16³⁰. 31 17³. 3. 4 19⁴⁰ ἐάν οὗτοι σιωπήσωσιν (SBALWR fut. ind.; D σιγήσουσιν) κράξουσιν ΓΔΘ 20⁵. 6. 28 22⁶⁷. 68.—Jn 3⁵. 5. 12 5⁴³ 6⁵¹ 7³⁷ 8³⁶. 51. 52. 54. 55 9²² 10⁹ 11⁴⁰. 48 12²⁴. 24. 32. 47 13⁸ 14³. 14 (vl. pres. subj.), 15¹⁰ 16⁷. 7 19¹² 4⁴⁸ 6⁴⁴. 53 7⁵¹ 8²⁴ 20²⁵.—Ac 15¹ 27³¹.—Ro 7². 3. 3 10⁹. 15 14²³ 15²⁴.—1 Co 4¹⁹ 7⁸. 11. 28. 39. 40 8⁸. 10 9¹⁶ (vl. pres. subj.) 10²⁸ 12¹⁵. 16 13³. 3 (vl. fut. ind.), 14⁶. 6. 7. 9. 11. 16. 23. 30 15³⁶ 16⁷. 10 (see Allo in loc., but this type of condition does not express mere probability: Zerwick § 226).—2 Co 5¹ 10⁸ ἐάν . . . καυχώσωμαι (SLP fut. ind.) . . . οὐκ αἰσχυνθήσομαι p⁴⁶ BGH 33, 12⁶, 13².—Ga 1⁸ 5³.—Col 4¹⁰.—2 Th 2³.—1 Ti 2¹⁵.—2 Ti 2⁵. 21.—Heb 3⁶. 7 OT 4⁷ 10³⁸ OT.—Jas 2² 5¹⁹.—1 Jn 1⁶. 8. 10 2¹ ἐάν τις ἀμάρτην . . . ἔχομεν 2²⁴. 28. 29. 3² 4²⁰ 5¹⁶.—Rev 2⁵ 3³. 20 22¹⁸. 19.—Heb 3¹⁴ ἐάνπερ.

(b) *Ei with fut. indic.*

This sometimes conveys the same idea but occurs very seldom in Ptol. pap. The feeling of definiteness and actual realization accompanies it. It is almost causal. Mt 26³³ Mk 14²⁹ εἰ (καί) πάντες σκανδαλισθήσονται (i.e. granting the assumption: *let us suppose that all will actually be offended*).—Lk 11⁸ εἰ καὶ οὐ δώσει *although*.—1 Co 9¹¹ μέγα εἰ ἡμεῖς . . . θερίζομεν (i.e. we are in fact doing it).—1 Pt 2²⁰. 20 εἰ ὑπομενεῖτε. The difficulty about this view is 2 Ti 2¹² εἰ ἀπαρνησόμεθα, where the condition was surely conceived as no more than hypothetical.

With pres. indic.

Si igitur. Mt 5²⁹ εἰ ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου σκανδαλίζει σε (altered from ἐάν c. subj. in Mk 9⁴³⁻⁴⁷), 6³⁰ εἰ . . . ὁ θεὸς οὕτως ἀμφιένυσσιν *since he clothes*, 17⁴ (a foregone conclusion for Peter). Lk 22⁴² εἰ βούλει.—Mt 19¹⁰.—Lk 6³², Jn 7⁴ εἰ ταῦτα ποιεῖς, Jn 11^{12D} εἰ κοιμᾶται.—Ac 5^{38f}.—Ro 21^{7f} 7¹⁶. 20 8¹¹ 11¹⁷.—1 Co 7³⁶ εἰ δέ τις . . . νομίζει (Paul knows this is actually happening).—Ga 1⁹ 2¹⁸.—Heb 7¹⁵.

(c) *Ἐάν with pres. ind.*

This calls for some comment; it is an abnormal use in the Ptol. pap., confined to ἐάν δεῖ and ἐάν φαίνεται, for other exx. are of doubtful reading or capable of different explanation (Mayser II 1, 284f). But Horn quotes BGU 597 (A.D. 75). From ii/A.D. the construction makes more frequent appearance, as εἰ and ἐάν are beginning to be confused (we have exx. in ii/A.D., iii/A.D., and late Imp. period), and increases in Byzantine Greek. It seems to bear a causal sense: 1 Co 4¹⁵ ἐάν . . . ἔχετε

(perhaps a half-way-house of actuality between *ἐάν ἔχητε* you may have and *εἰ ἔχετε* since you have), 13² *ἐάν ἔχω . . . καὶ εἰδῶ?*, Jn 5³¹ *ἐάν . . . μαρτυρῶ?*, 1 Jn 5¹⁵ *ἐάν οἶδαμεν* (S corr. to *ἴδωμεν*).—1 Th 3⁸ *ἐάν . . . στήκετε* (S*DE corr. to *-ητε*).—Mk 11¹³ D (*εἰδεν εαν τι εστιν*).

Fut. indic. too: Ac 8³¹ *πῶς γὰρ ἂν δυναίμην ἐάν μή τις ὀδηγήσει με* SB*GE, Rev 2²² SA.—Herm. M. V 1, 2; IV 3, 7.

Apparent use of *ἐάν* with impf. (*ἦν, ἦσθα, ἦσαν*) in papyri and LXX (also p⁴⁶ 1 Co 7³⁶ 14²⁸) is probably an illusion, since these forms are intended as subjunctive (see Debrunner *Glotta* 11, 1920, 25f).

	ἐάν		εἰ	ἐάν
	Pres. subj.	Aor. subj.	Fut. ind.	Indic.
Ptol. pap.	246	218	9	5 ?
NT	88	159	8	6 ?

(d) *Ei with subjunctive.*

It appears to encroach on the province of *ἐάν*. This is unusual in Ptolemaic times (there are two exx. from iii/B.C.) but it becomes increasingly common in papyri from ii/A.D. onwards (see confusion mentioned in previous section): BGU (c. A.D. 100), P. Giess. (ii/A.D.), P. Ryl. (ii/A.D.), P. Lips. (A.D. 240), P. Grenf. (late iii/A.D.), P. Rein. (iv/A.D.), PSI (iv-v/A.D.), OP (v/A.D.), PR (v-vi/A.D.), OP (v-vi/A.D.), OP (A.D. 583), P. Cair. (Byz.), etc.¹

There is therefore nothing surprising in Rev 11⁵ *καὶ εἴ τις θελήσῃ* SA (p⁴⁷ *θελήσει*; C *θέλει*; καὶ η in S* = *κἄν?*), Lk 11¹⁸ *εἰ μερισθῆ* p⁴⁵ Γ (*rest (δι)εμερισθη*). On 1 Co 14⁵ see p. 321 (*ἐκτός εἰ μή* is a fixed formula).

6. Indirect Questions

Greek, unlike Latin, keeps the mood and tense of *direct* speech, e.g. Mk 6⁵⁵ *ὅπου ἤκουον ὅτι ἐστιν*. Therefore these

¹ R. C. Horn op. cit. p. 31; Reinhold op. cit. 107; Jannaris §§ 1988f; Radermacher² 199.

subjunctives in indirect speech will also have been subjunctive in direct speech. Thus Mt 6²⁵ is an indir. deliberative question : μή μεριμνᾶτε τί φάγητε; also Mk 9⁶ οὐ γὰρ ᾔδει τί ἀποκριθῆ (according to Latin standards this would be *he did not know what he was saying*, as in the Lk-parallel 9³³ δ λέγει); Heb 8³ after ἔχω is δ προσενέγκη; Mk 8^{1f} Lk 12¹⁷; Mayser II 1, 214, 235. Mt 10¹⁹ δοθήσεται ὑμῖν τί λαλήσητε; Mk 6³⁶. We may have fut. ind. in an indir. delib. question: Ph 1²² (p⁴⁶ B subj.), or else punctuate τί αἰρήσομαι;. In relative past time (for class. optative) NT keeps subj. as a rule: Ac 4²¹ μηδὲν εὐρίσκοντες τὸ πῶς κολάσωνται αὐτούς; but see under Optative (next ch.). This is so in Hell. Greek generally (e.g. Epict. Ench. 7; Marc. Ant. 9, 3, 7).

CHAPTER NINE

THE VERB: MOODS: OPTATIVE

THE MOOD was declining¹ during the last three centuries B.C. It is still used fairly widely to indicate a wish in the papyri, LXX and NT, in spite of the popularity of the imperative, in curses as well as requests. It was probably never used much in conversation, even in Athens; Xenophon was addicted to it but it is scarce in Attic inscriptions. The figures per 100 pp. are approximately Alciphron (*Letters*) 109, Xenophon (*Mem.*) 350, Plato (*Phaedo*) 250, Strabo 76, Polybius 37, Diodorus Siculus 13, Callimachus 49 (in 49 pp.), Aratus 94 (in 46 pp.). Even Dionysius of Halicarnassus (30 B.C.) and Diodorus Siculus (i/B.C.) who maintain the Attic tradition tend to dispense with it. In fact, the fut. optative, never more than a substitute in indirect speech for the future indic., is quite extinct in Hellenistic Greek. The aor. opt. proved toughest, lasting until viii/A.D. The optative to express a wish (volitive) was the most persistent, surviving particularly in set phrases like $\mu\lambda\gamma$ γένοιτο; whereas the potential optative, in main and conditional clauses, was rare in the Ptolemaic, and almost extinct and awkwardly used, in the

¹ Hilaire Vandaele, *L'Optatif Grec. Essai de Syntaxe historique*, Paris 1897. F. G. Allinson, "On Causes Contributory to the Loss of the Optative in Later Greek," *Studies in Honor of B.L. Gildersleeve*, Baltimore, 1902, pp. 353-356. K. Reik, *Der Optativ bei Polybius und Philo von Alexandria*, Leipzig 1907. C. Mutzbauer, *Die Grundbedeutung des Konjunctiv und Optativ und ihre Entwicklung im Griechischen* (Ein Beitrag zur historischen Syntax der griechischen Sprache), Leipzig-Berlin 1908. C. Harsing, *De optativi in chartis Aegyptiis usu*, Diss. Bonn 1910. J. Scham, *Der Optativgebrauch bei Klemens von Alexandrien in seiner sprach- und stilgeschichtlichen Bedeutung. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Attizismus in der altchristl. Literatur*, Diss. Tübingen 1913. F. Slotty, *Der Gebrauch des Konjunctiv und Optativs in den griechischen Dialekten*. I. Teil: Der Hauptsatz, Göttingen 1915. D. C. Fives, *The Use of the Optative Mood in the Works of Theodoret, Bp. of Cyrus* (Patristic Studies of the Cath. Univ. of America) 1937. R. de L. Henry, *The Late Greek Optative and Its Use in the Writings of Gregory Nazianzen* (Patr. Stud. Cath. Univ. America, 68) 1943 (on pp. 95-99 are bibliographies of LXX, NT, and Papyri). E. L. Green, "The Optative Mood in Diodorus Siculus," *Proc. & Trans. Amer. Philol. Assn.* 62. Mayser II 1, 288ff. Schwyzer II 338ff.

Imperial papyri¹. The reason for the decline probably lies in the "syntactical weakness" (Schwyzer II 337) of the optative. No one can or could quite define its essential function. The two chief functions, volitive and potential, were too dissimilar to give a unity to the mood, and the subjunctive was always at hand for a substitute for either. Moreover, the refinements inherent in the use of the optative were beyond the powers of uneducated Greeks and most barbarians. Those later writers who sought to revive the mood found it difficult to recapture the ancient subtleties. Horn has demonstrated that the optative did gain a new lease of life in the Byzantine period, usually in set phrases or interchangeably with the subjunctive, and its revival in ii/A.D. in the vulgar texts merely followed the earlier learned reaction against its disappearance. Literary writers, especially the Atticists, affected it. Even the ii-iii/A.D. papyri follow suit and the scribes of some NT MSS favoured it. Alongside this went a growing confusion in its use, indicating that the revival was artificial; even an educated writer like Procopius of Caesarea (Schwyzer II 338) confuses it with subjunctive, uses it excessively, and in a non-Attic way.

Optatives which do occur in Hell. authors may be classified:

	MAIN			SUBORDINATE					
	Volitive	Potential		Condition	Oblique	Comparat.	Final	Temporal	Total
Ptol. pap.	54	127	Total 181	13	17				30
LXX	434	41	475	26	7	18	13		64
NT	39	3	42	8	16			2	26

The NT thus shows only a slight decrease from the LXX. There is a tendency to replace optatives with the subjunctive, and optatives occur only in Lk-Ac (28), Paul (31), 1 Pt, 2 Pt (4), Jude (2), Mk (2), Heb (1).

¹ Thus it is used after *primary* tenses in the main clause: A.D. 249 ἵνα τοῦτο εἰδέναι ἔχῃς, ἐπιστέλλεται σοι; iv/A.D. ὅποταν βουλευθείης; A.D. 345 ἐάν δέ τις αὐτῶν ἀφυστερήσῃεν καὶ μὴ παραστήσωμεν.

§ 1. Main Clauses

Its disappearance was slightly slower than in dependent clauses. In main clauses it has two distinct functions: to express a wish, usually in set phrases (where the mood survived longest), and to express a rather mild affirmation, generally with $\acute{\alpha}\nu$ but occasionally without in uncultivated speech. The addition of $\acute{\alpha}\nu$ to the latter does not infallibly distinguish the two functions, although in the papyri and NT $\acute{\alpha}\nu$ is not usually lacking with potential optative.

(a) *Wish*

There is no $\acute{\alpha}\nu$. Gradually the subjunctive, fut. indic., and 3rd p. imperat. encroach upon this usage, but here the optative held out the longest. Even in class. times it was not easy to dissociate *wish* (opt.) from *exhortation* to others to fulfil the wish (subj.) or even from positive command (imper.). A cultured writer like auct. ad Heb. has the optative of wish only once. Radermacher (p. 160) illustrates this "struggle of the moods" by referring to a curse-table of 4 B.C. with $\mu\eta\ \tau\acute{\upsilon}\chi\eta\ \epsilon\upsilon\lambda\alpha\tau\omicron\upsilon$ in the fourth line but $\mu\eta\ \tau\acute{\upsilon}\chi\omicron\iota$ in the eighth; and to Acta Thomae 129 $\sigma\upsilon\upsilon\tau\mu\acute{\eta}\theta\epsilon\iota\sigma\alpha\upsilon\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega\upsilon\tau\alpha\iota$. Even in good literary texts $\eta\acute{\xi}\iota\omicron\upsilon\upsilon$, $\eta\theta\epsilon\lambda\omicron\upsilon$, $\acute{\epsilon}\beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\omicron\mu\eta\upsilon$ often take the place of the older $\acute{\alpha}\xi\iota\omicron\iota\eta\ \acute{\alpha}\nu$, $\beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\omicron\iota\mu\eta\ \acute{\alpha}\nu$, $\theta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omicron\iota\mu\iota\ \acute{\alpha}\nu$ (Ac 25²² $\acute{\epsilon}\beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\omicron\mu\eta\upsilon$; Ga 4²⁰ $\eta\theta\epsilon\lambda\omicron\upsilon$); and $\iota\upsilon\alpha$ c. subj. will now express a wish. However, the opt. $\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\eta$ occurs at all periods in the papyri and is common in Biblical Greek.

Mayser and Horn illustrate by the following occurrences the decline and revival of the wish optative in papyrus texts; it was weakest in the NT period. iv/B.C. (2), iii/B.C. (5), ii/B.C. (23), i/B.C. (1) i/A.D. (1), ii/A.D. or ii-iii/A.D. (8), iii/A.D. or iii-iv/A.D. (6), iv/A.D. (4), later (8, all $\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\iota\tau\omicron$). By contrast, let us look at their incidence in Biblical Greek:

LXX. Ge 9²⁷ 19⁹ vl. 27²⁸ 28³ 31⁴⁹. 53 vl. 34¹¹ 43¹⁴. 14. 29 44⁷*17* 48¹⁶. 16 49 6. 6. 8.—Ex 15¹⁶.—Lev 5¹⁶.—Nu 5²² 6²⁴. 24. 25. 25. 26. 26 23¹⁰. 10.—Dt 27¹⁵ (same phrase in 16. 17. 18. 19. 20. 21. 22. 23. 23. 24. 25. 26 28¹². 13. 20. 21. 22. 24. 25. 27. 28. 35. 36 29¹⁹(18) 33⁷. 16. 27.—Jo 7²⁵ 22²². 29* 24¹⁶*.—Jg 5²⁴. 24. 31 9¹⁹. 19. 20 quat. (ter A) 13¹⁷ (not A).—Ru 1⁹. 9 (not A) 16. 17 2⁴. 12. 12. 13 3¹¹. 12.—1 Km 1¹⁷ 2²⁰ 3¹⁷ 14⁴⁴. 44 20¹³. 13. 16 24¹³. 13. 16 quat. 25²². 22. 26. 31 26¹⁹. 19A 20. 24. 24. 24 A (B ind.)—2 Km 3⁹. 9. 29. 35. 35 7²⁶ 14⁷ 16⁴ 18³² 19¹³(15) bis 23⁴ 24²³.—3 Km 1³⁷. 37. 47 2²³. 23. 33 8⁵⁷ ter 10⁹ 19². 2 20(21)^{3*} 21(20)¹⁰. 10.—4 Km 6³¹. 31 (Analysis:

* $\mu\eta\ \gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\iota\tau\omicron$.

α, ββ, γγ = 41; βγ, γδ = 12.—1 Ch 12¹⁷B¹⁷B bis (S sec. ἐλέγξατο, A sec. ἐλέγξαι, 21³ 22^{12.12}.—2 Ch 7⁴¹ 24²².—1 Esd 6³²⁽³³⁾.—2 Esd 15(5)¹³.—Ps 6¹¹ quat. (R imper.) 7^{5. 6. 6.} 6B 11 (12) 4B (AR fut. ind.) 16(17)² 17(18)³⁶R^{vid} (B imper.) 19(20)^{2. 2. 3.} 3B (R*^{vid} imper.)^{4. 5.} 5B (AR fut. ind.) 20(21)^{9. 9} 24(25)^{2.} 2U (B imper.)²⁰ 30(31)^{2. 18} ter 32(33)²² 34 (35)⁴ B bis (SAU imper.)^{19. 24. 25} Bau 26. 26. 27. 27. 27 B (SAR imper.) 35 (36)¹² B (ScaR fut. ind.) 36 (37)¹⁵ B (R imper.)¹⁵ 39 (40)¹² A (B ind.)^{15. 15. 15} B (R* imper.)^{15. 17} 40 (41)³ ter 4 B (AR fut. ind.)¹⁴ 51 (52)^{6. 6} (R sec. indic.)⁶ Bc (B ind.) 62 (63)⁶ (R ind.) 66 (67)² ter 7. 8 67 (68)³ 68 (69)^{7. 7. 15. 25} 69 (70)³ quat. (SR imper.)⁴ (SR imper.) 70(71)¹ 71(72)¹⁹ 73 (74)²³ (Sca RT indic.) 84 (85)⁸ 88 (89)⁵³ 89 (90)^{5. 6} quat. 103 (104)^{34. 35} 105 (106)⁴⁸ 108 (109)^{7. 7. 13} Sca T (S imper.)^{14. 14. 15} 112 (113)² 113¹⁶ (115³)² (115¹⁴) 118 (119)^{5. 41. 170. 172} (AR* ind., T subj.) 120 (121)³ (subj?)⁷ (ART fut. ind.) 127 (128)⁵ ter (AR ind.; T subj.) 133 (134)³ A (S fut. ind., T aor. subj.) 134 (135)¹⁸ 136 (137)^{5. 6} 146 (147)¹.—Pr 4^{27b} A (B fut. ind.) 11²⁶ 24⁵² (30^{17. 17}).—Eccl. 5⁷ B (ACSc^a ind.).—Jb 1²¹ 3^{2. 4. 5. 5. 6} quat. 7. 7. 8. 9 ter 5⁴ B (A ind.)^{4. 5. 14. 15. 15. 16. 16} 6^{10. 29} 12^{25. 25} 13⁶ 15^{6. 6} C (B fut. ind.)^{28. 28. 30} B (A ind.)^{33. 33} 16^{6(5). 19(18).} 21(20). 21 (20) B 22 (21) 17⁸ B (A ind.) 9. 9 18^{7. 7. 8. 8} A (B pf. ind.) 9. 11. 11. 13. 14. 14. 17. 18 19²⁸ 20^{10. 10. 15} C (B ind.) 16. 16 B (A fut. ind.) 17. 23. 23. 24. 25. 25. 26. 26. 27. 27. 28. 28 21^{20. 20} 22²² S* 23⁴ (Sca ind.)⁵ ter 24^{18. 19. 30. 20} 27^{5. 7} 29¹³ 30²⁴ 31^{8. 8. 10. 10. 22. 22. 28. 30. 30. 40} (A subj.) 24^{10. 11} (A ind.).—Wi 7¹⁵.—Si 22² C (A fut. ind.) 25^{19 (26)} 33 (36)^{4. 11} 38¹⁵ 43^{21 (23)} S* (B fut. ind.) 45^{26 (31)} 46^{11 (14). 12 (14)} 49^{10 (12)} 50^{23 (25)} 51^{29 (37)} bis.—Jdt 10^{8. 8} 13^{20 (26)} 15^{11 (12). 10 (11)} B (SA aor. ind.).—To B 3^{9. 11} 5^{14 (19).} 17. (22). 19 (24) 7^{17 (20)} 10¹² 11¹⁷ 13^{10 (12)} bis.—To S 3⁹ 5^{10. 14. 14. 17} quat. 19 7^{7. 12. 17} 9⁶ 10^{11. 11. 12} quat. 11^{14. 17} 13^{10. 10}.—Ob¹² A.—Jon 2⁸.—Zach 3².—Isa 14²⁹ 25¹ 23²².—Je 3¹⁹ 11^{5. 20} 15¹¹ 17¹⁸ ter 20¹² 36^{22 (2922)}.—La 1²² 2¹⁸.—Da O' 3^{39. 44. 44. 44. 98} (41) 4^{16 (19). 34c.} Da ⊕ 3^{39. 44} ter 9^{8 (41)} 7^{25 (26)}.—1 Mac 8^{23. 23} 9^{10*} 13^{5*}.—2 Mac 1² V (A inf.) 3. 4. 4. 5 ter 15²⁴.—4 Mac 6¹⁵ S (A imper.) 17. 21 13⁹ A (SV subj.).

NT. Mk 11¹⁴ (vl. subj.).—Lk 1³⁸ 20^{16*. 16*}.—Ac 8²⁰ (the only pres. tense among the volitives).—Ro 3^{4*}. 6*. 31* 62*. 15* 77*. 13* 914* 111*. 11* 15^{5. 13}.—1 Co 6^{15*}.—Ga 2^{17*} 3^{21*} 6^{14*}.—1 Th 3^{11. 12. 12} 5²³.—2 Th 2^{17. 17} 3^{5. 16}.—Phm 20 δναίμην.—2 Ti 1^{16. 18} 4¹⁶.—Heb 13²¹.—1 Pt 1² 5¹⁰.—2 Pt 1².—Jude 2. 9.

Ps. Sol 4⁷ ἐξάρατ (or imper?) 8. 9. 16*. 18. 18. 19. 21 KPM (not AV) 22. 28. 29* 11⁹ 12^{4. 5. 6. 6. 8. 8} 17^{10. 27. 27. 51} 18⁶ (The only other opt. in this book renders the Heb. frequentative impf.: ὁ πλοῦτος αὐτῶν διέλθοι *went forth*).—Vit. Proph. (only final, after ἵνα).—T. Sol. D 6¹ βασιλεὺ Σολομῶν, χαίροις.—Clem. ad Cor. tit. 23¹ 45⁷ 54.—Ign. ad Eph. 2¹ 11^{2. 2} 12², ad Magn. 11, ad Trall. 13³, ad Smyrn. 5³.

Some Hell. authors: Aratus *Phaenomena* (1154 lines): 16 (χαίροιτε), 100, 154, 155, 304, 324, 460, 637, 758, 823, 824, 824, 1049, 1050, 1086, 1088, 1090.—Callimachus *Hymn* I (Zeus) 64, 68; II (Apollo) 113; III (Artemis) 84, 137 (εἴην), 137; IV (Delos) 98, 162, 195, 240, 326 (χαίροι);

VI (Demeter) 116 (εἴη).—Alciphron *Letters* II 2¹ 5³ (μη . . . γένοιτο) 14¹ 16¹ 17^{4*} 20³ 25³; III 12¹. 1 (εἴη)⁵ (εἴη)⁵ 15⁴ (γένοιτο) 26² 28⁴ 32¹. 1 35³ 37² 38³ 41; IV 3² (γένοιτο) 5¹ (εἴη) 9² (γένοιτο) 18³. 3* 16. 16 19²¹. 21.

It is clear then that the optative can still express a wish or prayer, nearly always in 3rd p. and especially in the formula μη γένοιτο (15 in NT). Only two of the NT instances are imprecations (prayers for evil): Mk 11¹⁴ Ac 8²⁰. In fact, there is a strong tendency to use the imperative: ἀνάθεμα ἔστω Ga 1^{8f} 1 Co 16²². The author of Ac uses λαβέτω instead of LXX λάβοι when citing the Psalms (1²⁰). In spite of this, there still remain 39 instances of wish-optative. The LXX does not contain any more on an average per page.

(b) *Potential*

The opt. with ἄν indicates a potential mood; sometimes it is described as an "urbane" or "deliberative" optative.

It frequently helped the writer to express what would happen on the fulfilment of some supposed condition; to express, in fact, an apodosis without a protasis. It was becoming a luxury of speech and was beginning to disappear in favour of the subj. or fut. ind. with ἄν. As with the volitive, it was largely in set phrases that it survived: thus καλῶς ἄν ἔχοι. Already in Polybius it seems to be confined to these. Careful authors use it more frequently than the NT authors, but they are in doubt whether to use ἄν or some other particle like ἵσως or δῆπουθεν. The vagaries of scribal transmission may be partly responsible for the omission of ἄν, but Reinhold (*de Graecitate patrum Apost.* p. 110) brings forward enough examples to show that there was confusion here at the close of the Hellenistic period. In the Attic inscriptions investigated by Meisterhans (p. 247f), opt. c. ἄν is found only in some poetry (iv/B.C.) but in decrees, etc., there would be little occasion for it. In the iii/B.C. papyri however this opt. is widespread in certain epistolary phrases:

καλῶς ἄν ποιήσῃς 264. 257. 245. iii.—χαρίζοιο ἄν *be so good* 258 ter. 250 bis. iii quat.—καλῶς ἄν ἔχοι 25 times in iii/B.C.—εἴη ἄν ὡς θέλω 260. 252. 223, 257.—βούλομαι P. Petr. III.—εἴη ἄν ὡς ἡμεῖς θέλομεν 257. 256. iii-ii.—εἴη ἄν τὸ δέον, 242 ter.—Other phrases 258 (Horn). iii (Horn). 223. 260 bis. 255.

ii/B.C.: χαρίζοιο ἄν 156.—χαρίζοι<ο> δ' ἄν 156.—εἴη ἄν ὡς θέλω ii (Horn). 170 (Horn). 153 (Horn).—εἴη ἄν ὡς βούλομαι 168. 153 ter.

* μη γένοιτο.

164 (cp. 2 Mac 11²⁸).—εἴη ἄν ὡς εὐχομαι BGU IV.—εἴη ἄν ὡς αἰρούμεθα Goodsp.—εἴη ἄν τὸ δέον P. Par. (156 B.C.).—Other phrases 160 (Horn). BU, P. Par. 63 (164 B.C.), 64, 64, P. Par. (156 B.C.), P. Lond. I (168 B.C.), Cairo (123 B.C.).

i/B.C.: none.

i/A.D.: εὖ ποιήσας (no ἄν) 95.

ii/A.D.: c. 130, 167.

iii/A.D.: 274, 298. late. iii–iv.

Later: 346. iv. 591. vi–vii.

It should be said that some of the above are not a fair sample of the popular speech, but are part of the florid style of officials or the affectation of literary aspirants. The less stereotyped phrases had been dropped from the living speech by the close of iii/B.C. All that was retained thereafter were certain polite set phrases which die very hard.

Unless we include 4 Mac, this optative is not common in the LXX, although we might include the deliberative optative in questions under this head. Apart from the latter there is only 2 Mac 11²⁸ outside 4 Mac (11. 5. 7. 8 no ἄν, 10 26. 24 34 S [AV ind.] 56. 13 no ἄν, 717. 22 86 96. 24). But there are questions of a potential or deliberative or futuristic kind: with ἄν: Ge 23¹⁵ 44⁸.—Dt 28⁶⁷. 67.—Jb 19²³ 25⁴ 29² 31³¹ 41⁴ (5).—Pr 20¹⁸ (24).—Si 25³ (5).—Ezk 15².

without ἄν: Nu 11²⁹.—Jg 9²⁹.—2 Km 18³³ (19¹).—Ps 119 (120)³. 3.—Ca 8¹.—Jb 23⁸ (A ἄν) 31³⁵ 38²⁰. 20.—4 Mac 8¹⁷ 14¹⁰ (Sca ἄν) 15⁴.

In NT there seems to be but one genuine instance which is not a question (Ac 26²⁹ ABS^c), and this is where in the royal presence of Agrippa, Paul employs the stilted εὐξαίμην ἄν. Luke makes the Athenians to say τί ἄν θέλοι οὗτος λέγειν; (Ac 17¹⁸), and the Ethiopian to ask *how could I?* πῶς γὰρ ἄν δυναίμην; (8³¹). Perhaps also Ac 21^{2E}. It was old-fashioned in the NT age, and the writers prefer a mere future (Ro 3⁶ 1 Co 15³⁵) or other device. But we must also include here many dependent questions of a deliberative kind which are only incidentally dependent, and are still deliberative when transformed into direct speech: Lk 1⁶² 6¹¹ (not D) 9⁴⁶ 15²⁶ (vl. om ἄν).—Jn 13²⁴ vl.—Ac 5²⁴ 10¹⁷ 17²⁰ vl. 21³³ (EHLP add ἄν). But opinions may legitimately differ whether the following have opt. simply because of the class. rules of sequence: Lk 1²⁹ (but D ἄν) 8⁹ (vl. om opt.) 18³⁶ (vl. † ἄν) 22²³ (vl. ind.). In Lk 31⁵ (διαλογιζομένων μήποτε αὐτὸς εἴη ὁ χριστός) what they actually asked themselves may be expressed by opt. The presence of ἄν would seem to decide in favour of an original potential in these doubtful cases.

In this respect LXX and NT are much of a unity, and

because of the infrequency of this opt. the LXX should be classified with the papyri of i/B.C.-i/A.D. rather than with those of iii/B.C.

T. Sol. D 4⁴ διαπορῶν τι ἄρα ἀποκρίνοιντο.—Ign. ad Eph. 2², ad Magn 2, 12, ad Rom 5², ad Polyc. 6².

Some Hell. authors: Alciphron *Letters* I 11³ (εἰποις ἂν *you might say*), 13¹ (ἠγόρουν δ τι πράξαμι *I didn't know what to do*), 14³ (πῶς . . . ὑπομεινωμεν *how could we endure?*), 22¹ ἂν; II 2² (εἰπαις ἂν *you might say*), 10⁸ ἂν, 15² ἂν; III 2² (εἰποι τις ἂν *you might say, as it were*), 11¹ ἂν; IV 2³ ἂν, 3³ ἂν, 8¹ ἂν, 10⁴, 11⁵ ἂν, 13⁶. 7 ἂν, 16⁷ ἂν, 18² ἂν 2. 3 ἂν, 19³ ἂν.—Callimachus *Hymns* I 15. 15. 91 κεν; II 26. 27. 31 ἂν, 35 κε; III 15. 104, 155 κεν, 177 κεν, 250; IV 25 κε, 126 κε; V 103.—Aratus *Phaenomena* 12 κε, 78 ἂν, 142 ἂν, 169, 195 κεν, 211 κεν, 451 κε, 456 ἂν, 463 κε, 495 κε, 530 κε, 559 κεν, 562 ἂν, 566 ἂν, 579 ἂν, 607 ἂν, 712 κε, 729 κε, 731, 782 κε, 793 ἂν, 797 κεν, 798 ἂν, 802 κε, 815 ἂν, 816 ἂν, 818 κε, 827 κεν, 839 κεν, 839, 850 κε, 857 ἂν, 873 κεν, 876 ἂν, 879 ἂν, 888 κε, 904, 915, 1006 κε, 1066, 1085, 1144, 1144 κε, 1145 ἂν, 1148, 1148, 1154 κεν.

§ 2. Dependent Clauses

Here is a still more rapid decline in the Hell. period, and the opt. has become almost entirely alien to the popular speech. In more artificial language it still serves in indirect speech and final and conditional clauses, whereas in class. Greek it regularly appeared in dependent clauses after a historic tense where the subj. would have appeared had the clause depended on a primary tense. The NT retains the subj. even in historic sequence, in common with popular Greek in general from the mid-ii/B.C. The class. rule is rarely observed in the Ptolemaic papyri (Mayser II. 1, 288).

(a) Iterative

This is the regular class. function of the opt. in dependent clauses following a historic tense. It expresses reiteration, best rendered in English by *ever* (*whoever, whenever, if ever*). The impf. ind. or aor. ind., sometimes with ἂν (see above, Indic. Mood), was substituted for this in the later period. The LXX and NT have *ὅταν* and *ὅπότεν* with impf. or aor. ind., but Mayser can find no instance of this in the Ptolemaic papyri, while Radermacher finds one or two instances in Polybius. The iterative opt. was soon confused with the potential, and ἂν was consequently added, as is seen in Aristeas 59 (Wendland) τὴν διάθεσιν εἶχεν ὥστε, καθ' ὃ ἂν μέρος στρέφοιτο, τὴν πρόσοψιν εἶναι τὴν αὐτὴν.

Clear instances of iterative opt. are found in the Ptol. pap., Philo, and NT, especially with εἰ τύχοι for *example* (1 Co 14¹⁰ 15³⁷). Papyri:—

iv/B.C.: UPZ no. 1. 12f <δ> ε δ' ἀν[ελοι] τὰ γράμματα ταῦτα [κα] ἰ ἀδικοῖ Ἀρτεμισίην. ὁ θεὸς αὐτῶι τῆ<ν> δίκην ἐπιθ[εῖη]. This is a potential opt. within a hypothetical relative clause, hardly distinguishable from the iterative.

iii/B.C.: Petr. II 18 (2b) 15 ἔτυπεν αὐτὸν κατὰ τοῦ τραχήλου καὶ εἰς δ μέρος τύχοι τοῦ σώματος (246). Formal language of a bill of complaint. Magd. 42 πληγὰς μοι ἐνέβαλεν καὶ πλείους εἰς δ τύχοι μέρος τοῦ σώματος (221).

ii/B.C.: 162 (Horn). 118 (Horn). 117 (Horn). PSI III 167 18 (118 B.C.) formal language. Teb 24. 65 τύχοι (117 B.C.). BGU VI 1253. 10 (but Lobel's emend. does away with opt. here).

i/A.D.: 18 (Horn)

ii/A.D.: 131 (Horn)

iii/A.D.: c 376 (Horn)

later: 409 and eleven other *exx.* of temporal, to viii/A.D. Stylistic revival of opt. in Byzantine Greek: v-vi/A.D., vi/A.D., c 551. 616. In an iterative temporal clause this revival appears to have begun already in 2 Clem 12³ ὅταν λαλῶμεν . . . καὶ . . . εἶη.

Except for εἰ τύχοι the iterative opt. is no longer in use in LXX and NT, having quite disappeared from the colloquial language by this time¹. Mark's method of filling the gap (ὅταν with past ind.) is found elsewhere with extreme rarity². More frequently ἄν is added³ to the indicative.

(b) Conditional

The reaction in favour of the opt. influenced a wider circle than the Atticists, particularly in conditional and final clauses in the case of non-atticizing cultured writers. After ii/A.D. the influence spread to more popular authors. Radermacher observes that the text Περὶ Ἑρμηνείας (prob. i/A.D., not atticistic)

¹ In literary writers, e.g.: Aratus *Phaenomena* 823 ὅτ' εὐδίου κεχηρμένος ἡμιατος εἶης *whenever you desire a fair day*, 1141 ὅτ' ὄμβρου σήματα φαῖνοι (*mice build nests*) *whenever Zeus shows signs of rain*.—Callimachus *Hymns* III 136 τῶν εἶη μὲν ἐμοὶ φίλος ὅστις ἀληθῆς *whoever is a true friend of mine*. VI 68 ὅσσα πάσαιτο τόσων ἔχεν ἕμερος αὐτίς.

² Polyb. IV 32.5f.—LXX Ex 17¹¹. 11, Nu 11⁹ 21⁹, Jg 6³ (A ὅταν; B ἔάν), 1 Km 17³⁴, Ps 77³⁴ 118³² 119⁷, Jb 20²² (A ὅποτε; B ὅποταν). NT Mk 3¹¹.

³ LXX Le 27¹² καθότι ἄν c. fut. ind., To 7¹¹B ὅποτε ἄν εἰσεπορεύοντο. NT Mk 6⁵⁶ ὅσοι ἄν ἤψαντο, Ac 2⁴⁵ 4³⁵ καθότι ἄν χρεῖαν εἶχεν. 1 Co 12² ὡς ἄν ἤγεσθε.

employs as a typical form of conditional sentence εἰ c. opt. in the protasis and fut. indic. in the apodosis. So also Philo¹, Herm. S. IX 12, 4 (οὐδεὶς εἰσελεύσεται, εἰ μὴ λάβοι: Harnack λάβῃ), Theophilus ad Autolyceum I 6. The atticizing influence must have been wide. Epictetus, and Diodorus (Kapff, p. 88) use opt. after εἰ quite extensively. It is rare in LXX and papyri (Harsing 38f; Mayser II 1, 293); none of the instances adduced by Horn appear to be earlier than i/A.D. and the majority are Byzantine. Radermacher notes that the Pergamum inscriptions have but one instance and prefer ἔάν c. subj. in the protasis and fut. ind. in the apodosis. Moreover in most examples from the Ptolemaic papyri εἰ c. opt. stands obliquely for the direct form ἔάν c. subj., and so ought strictly to be considered as indirect speech. Besides, most of them betray the stilted language of official letters or decrees.

Of true conditions with opt., there are only three in NT: Ac 24¹⁹ ἔδει . . . κατηγορεῖν, εἴ τι ἔχοιεν πρὸς ἐμέ, 1 Pt 3¹⁴ εἰ καὶ πάσχοιτε . . . , μακάριοι, ¹⁷ κρείττον . . . , εἰ θέλοι τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ, πάσχειν . . . There are about 25 in LXX, which is almost the same percentage, especially if 4 Mac is ignored: 1 Km 24²⁰. ²⁰ εἰ εὐροῖτό τις τὸν ἔχθρον . . . καὶ ἐκπέμψαι αὐτόν (fut. ind. in apodosis) (A εὐρών . . . ἐκπέμψαι), 14⁶ εἴ τι ποιῆσαι ἡμῖν Κύριος (sc. *it would be well*); hardly conditional: *Perhaps the Lord will.*—2 Km 16¹² εἴ πως ἴδοι Κύριος: *perhaps the Lord . . .* (see above).—4 Km 6²⁷ μὴ σε σώσαι Κύριος—πόθεν σώσω σε; Ps 138 (139)⁹ S*^{ca} (BR* subj.) ἔάν λάβοιμι τὰς πτέρυγὰς μοι (apodosis fut. ind.).—Jb 6² εἰ γὰρ τις ἰστῶν στήσαι μου τὴν ὀργὴν, τὰς δὲ ὀδῶνας μου ἄραι ἐν ζυγῷ (apod. fut. ind.), 6³ εἰ γὰρ δώῃ, καὶ ἔλθοι μου ἡ αἰτήσις, καὶ τὴν ἐλπίδα μου δώῃ ὁ Κύριος (no apodosis): *if only God would give me . . .!* 20²³ εἴ πως πληρῶσαι γαστέρα αὐτοῦ (apod. opt.), 34¹⁴ εἰ γὰρ βούλοιο συνέχειν (apod. fut. ind.), 38²⁰ εἰ ἀγάγοις με εἰς ἕρῃα αὐτῶν (a question; not a true condition).—Isa 49¹⁵. εἰ δὲ καὶ ταῦτα ἐπιλάθοιτο γυνή (apod. fut. ind.) (S* ind.).—2 Mac 9²⁴ A ὅπως ἔάν τι παράδοξον ἀποβαίῃ (V ind.).—4 Mac 2⁸ κἄν φιλάργυρος τις εἴη . . . , 4¹⁷ εἰ ἐπιτρέψειεν . . . (apod. aor. ind.), ²³ εἴ τινες αὐτῶν φάνοιεν, 5³ εἰ δὲ τινες μὴ θέλοιεν, ¹⁹ εἰ μieroφαγήσαιμεν, 6¹⁸ εἰ νῦν μεταβαλοίμεθα ¹⁹A γενοίμεθα τοῖς νέοις ἀσεβείας τύπος (S γενώμεθα), 8². ² εἰ μὲν μieroφαγήσαιεν . . . εἰ δὲ ἀντιλέγοιεν, 9² εἰ μὴ . . . γνώσει χρησαίμεθα, ²⁷ ὡς δ' εἰ φαγεῖν βούλοιο, 12⁴A εἰ μὲν μὴ πεισθῆις (S πισθῆις), 14¹⁷ εἰ δὲ καὶ μὴ δύναιτο καλύειν.

The use of slightly antique language in the presence of Felix, rather than εἴ τι ἔχουσιν, is understandable. The only way to account for the apparently impeccable Attic of the

¹ K. Reik, *Der Optativ bei Polybius and Philo*, Leipzig 1907, 154.

Petrine optatives is to suppose them to have been abstracted from the archaic periods of a solemn exhortation; even here the potential clause (opt. c. ἄν) which might have been expected in a classical apodosis does not occur, for the genius of living speech has forcibly interposed the pres. tense since persecution is at hand. Zerwick ascribes the opt. to the writer's tactfulness of heart and a reluctance to mention sufferings except very tentatively to those who were actually destined to meet them (§ 228d). The other instances of εἰ c. opt. are not so much real conditions as final clauses (Ac 17²⁷ 27¹²)¹, and there are parenthetical phrases introduced by εἰ = *if possible* or *as it were*: εἰ δυνατὸν εἶη (vl. ἦν), εἰ δύναιτο (Ac 20¹⁶ 27³⁹) and εἰ τύχοι (1 Co 14¹⁰ 15³⁷). Other clauses introduced by εἰ and dependent on a verb like ζητεῖν are virtually indirect questions, a class. survival: Ac 17¹¹ 25²⁰. The LXX also uses εἰ c. opt. in these several ways—another indication of kinship in style and syntax with the NT. In neither LXX nor NT is there an instance of εἰ c. opt. in the protasis and opt. c. ἄν in the apodosis; and notice εἰ πως in 2 Km 16¹² Jb 20²² Ac 27¹². However, the LXX has εἰ c. opt. to express a wish, Hebrew אִם; Mk 8¹² uses εἰ c. fut. ind.

The constructions of εἰ c. opt. in conditions is still common in literary writers, but the style is very affected and poetic:

Aratus *Phaenomena* 563 ἀτὰρ εἰ νεφέεσσι μέλαιναί γίνουτ' *if they be dark with clouds*, 564 ἢ ὄρεος κεκρυμμένα ἀντέλλουεν *or if they rise hidden behind a hill*, 825 εἰ δ' αὖτως καθαρὸν μιν ἔχοι *if he be so pure again*, 826 δύνου δ' ἀνέφελος *and if he set cloudless*, 838 εἰ γὰρ μὲν ἀμφοτέροις ἀμυδρὸς κεκρημένος εἶη *if he is draped both in black and red*, 855 καὶ εἰ ποτε χεῖματος ὥρη ὠρήσῃ κατῶν *if in winter his hue was wan at evening*, 858 εἰ δ' ὁ μὲν ἀνέφελος βάπτοι *but if cloudless he dip*, 872 εἰ μὲν κεῖναι μᾶλλον κνέφαος φορέοιντο ἀκτῖνες *the more those beams are borne in shadow*, 874 εἰ δ' ὀλίγος τανύοιτο περὶ δνόφος ἀκτίνεσσιν *but if but faint the dust that veils his beams*, 887 εἰ δὲ μὲν ἐκ βορέου μι' οἴη φοινίσσοιτο *but if only one shine purple to the north*, 905 εἰ δ' ὁ μὲν ἐκ βορέου Φάτνης ἀμηνῆνὰ φαείνοι *if the Ass shine feebly to the north of the Manger*.—Callimachus *Hymn III* 178 καὶ εἰ Στυμφαίτιδες εἶεν *even if they were*, IV 129 καὶ εἰ μέλλομι βόρων διψαλέην ἀμπωτίν ἔχων *even if I must wander*.—Especially frequent in the atticistic Alciphron's *Letters*: I 1. 5 εἰ χειμῶν ἐπιλάβοιτο *in case of bad weather*, 10, 4 ἔν' εἰ πού τι . . . εὐρεθῆι σώμα *if any corpse is found* (oblique), 12, 2 εἰ . . .

¹ Ac 17²⁷ ζητεῖν τ. θεόν, εἰ ἄρα γὰρ ψηλαφήσειαν αὐτὸν καὶ εὗροιν, 27¹² ἔθεντο βουλὴν ἀναχθῆναι . . . εἰ πως δύναιτο . . . παραχειμάσαι.

πύθοιτο *if he should hear* (+ fut. ind.), 13, 4; 16, 3; 20, 2; II 12; 14, 2; 15, 1; 18, 3 εἰ δὲ μάθοι *if he finds out* (+ fut. ind.); 21, 3; 28, 2; 37, 2; III 5, 2 εἰ μὴ τὸ χωρίον πρὸς τοῖς ἀργυρίοις λάβοι (*says she will not bestow her favours unless she gets the landed estate in addition to the cash*) (oblique); 5, 3; 8, 2; 10, 3. 4; 14, 3; 16, 1; 26, 4; 28, 4; 34, 1; 38, 1. 2. 3; 42, 2; IV 3, 3; 10, 3. 3; 17, 6; 19, 3. 19. 21. Often in an oblique sense after a historic tense.

(c) *Final*

This is another atticism which is very rare in the papyri. Class. authors had used the opt. after a secondary tense, but apart from the doubtful Mk 12²⁸ (ἵνα λάβοι) we find it neither in the NT nor Koine generally; it is almost absent from Polybius. The Atticists went so far as to use the opt. where the classical rule preferred subj. After ii/A.D., less literary authors followed suit, e.g. Vettius Valens and some later papyri. Radermacher finds odd examples as early as Plutarch and the apocryphal Acts of Apostles. Attic inscriptions of the period invariably have subj. after ἵνα, although they occasionally have opt. after ὅπως. Diodorus Siculus, who is distinctly a literary man, has only about eight final optatives compared with 179 subjunctives. Epictetus, who has potential opt. four times, has it only once in a final clause. Meisterhans shows it once in Attic inscriptions, iv/B.C. fin. (p. 247). Examples in the Ptol. pap. are difficult to establish: there may be a fut. opt. in ii/B.C. ἤξιωσα ἵνα χρηματισθῆσοιτο P. Tebt I. There is nothing else before ii/A.D. fin. The discarding of the final opt. in post-class. Greek represents one of the furthest departures of that Greek from the Attic model.

Opt. after ἵνα, ὅπως: percentage, as compared with subj.					
Biblical	ii/ B.C.	i/B.C.	i/A.D.	ii/A.D.	iii/A.D.
2 Mac 71% (atticist)	Polyb. 7%	Diod. Sic. 5%	Josephus 32%	Arrian 82%	Herodian 75%
LXX 1.7%			Plutarch 49%	Appion 87%	
NT nil					

It is safe to say that there is nothing of this atticistic elegance in NT. It is unlikely that the pointing in Eph 1¹⁷ is δῶνι (WH

text); B has δῶ (WH mg); and in any case the ἵνα may be imperatival; final opt. does not come very well after a present tense, except with the Atticists and much later writers, and makes the achievement of the purpose more remote than the author could have intended. The same δῶη occurs in 2 Ti 2²⁵ (vl. δῶ) after μήποτε and balances a subj., but it must be admitted that in the same epistle δῶη cannot be anything else than an opt. (116. 18)¹. There is textual uncertainty in two other places in Eph (31⁶ 61⁹) and in Jn 15¹⁶, but the opt. always rests on slender evidence. These optatives, like that in Mk 12², are probably the learned corrections of atticistic scribes. In Eph 61⁹ moreover the ἵνα is expegetical rather than final. It may seem that the class. rule of sequence in oblique clauses is being followed in Mk 14^{10f} where παραδοῖ (as if from an -ω verb) is used in a final and a relative clause, but we must remember that οἱ and ἦ were often confused and this may be a scribe's correction of παραδῆ. This could also be the explanation of ἵνα τις γνοῖ Mk 9³⁰ (a correction of a corrupt γνῆ).

Kinship in syntax between LXX and NT is further indicated by the fact that, apart from 4 Mac, there is no sure example of this optative.

LXX: Ps 37 (38)¹⁷ R* μήποτε ἐπιχαρῆσαν μοι οἱ ἐχθροί μου (B subj.).—Pr 22¹⁷ S* τὴν δὲ σὴν καρδίαν ἐπίσημον ἵνα γνοῖς (vl. subj.),¹⁹ S* ἵνα γνώρισον τὴν ὁδὸν σου (vl. subj.).—Jb 21² A ἀκούσατε . . . ἵνα μὴ εἶη μοι (B ἦ).—4 Mac 4⁶ ὅπως . . . λάβοι, 23 ὅπως . . . θάνοιεν, 5⁶ ὅπως . . . σώζοιο, 6⁸ AS^{ea} ὅπως ἐξανισταῖτο (S* ἐξανίστατο), 81² ὅπως . . . πείσειεν, 10¹ ὅπως ἀπογευσάμενος σώζοιο, 12⁶ ὅπως . . . παρορμήσειεν, 12⁶ V* ὅπως ποιήσαιεν (A ποιῆσαι), 17¹ ἵνα μὴ ψεύσειεν τι τοῦ σώματος.

Aratus *Phaen.* 381. 496. 1127 (after primary tense).—Callimachus *Hymn* I 34. 53, III 27. 61. 89. 108. 167.—Alciphron *Letters* I 15, 1 (after primary tense), II 3, 2 (primary), III 7, 5 (primary), IV 18, 3 (primary).

(d) Indirect Statements

The Atticists took this opt. too under their special protection, even after a primary tense; e.g. Alciphron IV 7, 5 τὰς νεφέλας ὀπόθεν εἶεν καὶ τίς ἀτόμους ὁποῖαι ἀγνοοῦμεν. After a secondary tense in indirect speech the opt. was employed in class.

¹ Moreover the argument about balance is weaker in view of 2 Mac 9²⁴ where an opt. does in fact balance a subj.

Greek but there was never any constraint about it; direct speech was legitimate within the dependent clause. Hellenistic writers took advantage of the concession, and, although Diodorus Siculus uses the opt. 29 times like this, he leaves the direct speech as it is in 475 instances¹. Even Atticists, like Dionysius of Halicarnassus, shared this preference. On the whole it would not appear that the opt. in, and because of, indirect speech, even after a secondary tense, was favoured in Hell. Greek. In the papyri, most of the Hellenistic examples are early (9 out of 10 are iii/B.C.) and the rest are nearly all in the Byzantine period of optative-revival (A.D. 117. 265. 336. 345. 543. 583. 583).

In the LXX and NT therefore it is a sign of atticizing style, and only a few books display it: Jb 23³ (γινώσκειν) ὅτι εὐροίμι αὐτὸν ἔλθοιμι εἰς τέλος.—2 Mac 4¹ ἐκακολόγει . . . ὡς οὗτός τε εἶη.—4 Mac 4²².—Ac 25¹⁶ ἀπεκρίθη ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἔθος . . . χαρίζεσθαι . . . πρὶν ἢ . . . ἔχει . . . τε . . . λάβοι (but οἱ and ἡ were often confused).

Alciphron I 13, 1 ἠπόρουσ ὅ τι πράξαιμι, II 5, 2 τοῦ προξένου φήσαντος ὡς δεοίμην χρημάτων *when my sponsor said that I needed money*, III 2, 1 κατεμέμφετο ὅτι μὴ θαμίζοιμι παρ' αὐτόν *blamed me for not coming to see him more often*, 2, 2 φράσας παρ' ὅτου καλοῖτο *told her who had invited her*.

(e) Indirect Questions

This opt. also is rare, and here too in class. Greek it was permissible to retain the form of the direct question. Strangely, although it had disappeared in pre-Christian times, Luke is fond of this opt. Excluding deliberative questions, which are incidentally indirect², Luke has opt. six times. Thus in Lk 9⁴⁶ τὸ τίς ἂν εἶη μείζων αὐτῶν we have an indirect question and must not translate εἶη *might be*; it is not indefinite, deliberative, or future, but means *was*. Only Est. and 2 Mac (A-text) betray any traces of it in LXX, and there is sometimes the excuse of a

¹ See the tables in Kapff op. cit. p. 63.

² These probably owe their origin to a dir. delib. question: Lk 16² ἐνένευσον . . . τὸ τί ἂν θέλοι, 31⁵ διαλογιζομένων πάντων . . . μήποτε αὐτὸς εἶη ὁ χριστός, 61¹¹ διελάλουν πρὸς ἀλλήλους τί ἂν ποιήσαιεν τῷ Ἰησοῦ. 15²⁶ ἐπυθάνετο τί ἂν εἶη ταῦτα.—Jn 13²⁴ v.l. πυθέσθαι τίς ἂν εἶη.—Ac 5²⁴ διηπόρουσ . . . τί ἂν γένοιτο τοῦτο, 10¹⁷ διηπόρει . . . τί ἂν εἶη τὸ ὄραμα, 17²⁰ βουλόμεθα οὖν γνῶναι τί ἂν θέλοι (B τίνα θέλει ταῦτα εἶναι), 21³³ ἐπυθάνετό τις εἶη καὶ τί ἔστιν πεποιηκώς (v.l. τίς ἂν).

doubly dependent clause (Est 3³ 2 Mac 33^{7A}). The only other examples, besides Clem ad Rom 14³, are in the papyri, mostly in iii/B.C.¹, and in the atticistic revival of such writers as Alciphron².

LXX: Est 3 (13)³ πυθόμενου . . . πῶς ἂν ἀχθειη τοῦτο ἐπὶ πέρας (potential?).—2 Mac 33⁷ Α ἐπερωτήσαντος . . . ποῖός τις εἴη ἐπιτήδειος (V ἦν).—4 Mac 11¹³ πυθθανομένου τοῦ τυράννου εἰ βούλοιο . . .

NT: Lk 12⁹ διαλογίζετο ποταπὸς εἴη ὁ ἀσπασμός, 8⁹ ἐπερώτων . . . τίς αὐτῆ εἴη ἡ παραβολή, 18³⁶ ἐπυνθάνετο τι εἴη τοῦτο, 22²³ συζητεῖν . . . τὸ τίς ἄρα εἴη, Ac 17¹¹ ἀνακρίνοντες τὰς γράφας εἰ ἔχοι ταῦτα οὕτως, 25²⁰ ζήτησιν ἔλεγον εἰ βούλοιο.

It is not clear why Luke should have indulged in this galaxy of atticisms. It lends at least some weight to the suggestion that the Lucan writings were finally written up not earlier than the second century.

We are led directly to a final point. Why all these optatives in Biblical Greek, if the Scriptures were written and rendered in the language of the people? The opt. was dead, as far as popular language was concerned, except for a few set phrases. It would appear from our survey that all the LXX books which have the opt. to a considerable extent must either be dated early in the Hellenistic period or else must be supposed to have been affected by the atticistic revival of this mood. Job uses it extensively, and it should be remembered that this book belongs to the Kethubim, and for a long time such works were not regarded with the reverence accorded to those of the first and second division of the Canon. As a translation the Greek Job is free enough to be called a paraphrase, and much of the Hebrew is omitted. Similar conditions apply to the Greek Proverbs, and that book, on account of its preference of οὐδέις

¹ P. Petr. III 51, 9 ἐρωτώμενος, «πόσον» εἰ «ἠ» αὐτὸς εἴη (iii/B.C.); note that πόσον and ἠ are added by the scribe himself and should not be read; doubly dependent.—II 20 πυθθανομένου . . . εἰ τι συντεθεικῶς αὐτῷ εἴης (252 B.C.); doubly dependent.—BGU VI 1246, 3 πυθόμενου . . . εἰ δυναίμην (iii/B.C.); doubly dependent.—P. Eleph. 13, 3 ἐπυνθάνομην . . . εἰ τι βούλοιο (223/B.C.).—Wilcken Theb. Book XII 12 ὑπεδείξαμεν ταυτὴν τὴν ὠνὴν αὐτῆ, εἰ πως δύναιντο προσεπειδέξασθαι τι (ii/B.C.).—P. Par 35, 29 πυθθανομένω δ' ἡμῶν, τοῦ τίνος χάριν εἴησαν (163 B.C.).—Insc. Magnes. 215.—An inscr. i/A.D.—BGU 347².10.—Post-Christian papyrus A.D. 170—Harsing appears not to be able to find any post-Christian instances: p. 31.

² I 17, 1 ἡρόμην . . . οὐ εἴη. ἡρόμην . . . τίνα τρόπον . . . ἀποκέοιτο. III 17, 1 ποῖ καταχθειῖν . . . καὶ εὐκαίρως ἐμφάγοιμι μόνος. 24, 2 εἰ ποῦ τι τῶν κόκκων ἐπιδράξασθαι δυναθῆιη.

to οὐθείς, could not be much earlier than 100 B.C. The opt. in these books, therefore, is more likely to be due to the atticistic revival than to survival from the class. usage in the early stages of Hell. Greek.

On the other hand, it is significant that we find the quota of optative in Comparative clauses almost exclusively in the Pentateuch, Psalms, Proverbs, and Isaiah¹, which is an argument for grouping these books closely. Moreover, we find support for their early date in the fact that Mayser can only find one instance of this construction, and this is in iii/B.C. (P. Cair. Zen. 14, 18 κέχρηται ἡμῖν, ὡς ἂν εἴ τις ἐχθρῶι χρησάιτο, 256 B.C.). There is no evidence that this construction is due to atticism, but it could well be a survival in iii/B.C. of the quite common class. construction, aided by the similar idiom in Hebrew (כִּאֲשֶׁר אִישׁ with impf.).

On the whole, it is more likely that the dependent optatives in Job, Psalms, and Proverbs (Kethubim) are due to a stylistic or atticistic influence rather than to a date in iii/B.C. or early ii/B.C. Isaiah, however, which has a volitive opt. and a comparative opt. once in 40 pages, and yet does not in other ways display an atticizing influence, but is good Koine Greek, may be supposed to date from iii/B.C. or early ii/B.C., if the use of the opt. is any criterion, and assuming that the needs of the synagogue lectionary would demand an early translation of this Prophetical book. The Prophets were read in the synagogues, in addition to the Pentateuch, and there was no distinction of "former" and "latter" until much later; so that the optatives in Jg, Kingdoms, Isaiah and Ezek. α might seem to be reasonably accounted for by the early date of their translation, which in turn was due to the desire to hear them in the synagogues.

There is much to be said for the suggestion that this apparent lingering of the indirect opt. into the NT period and beyond may be due to scribal activity in confusing like-sounding endings, and in addition to this, in the case of indirect questions, the potential idea may enter into each instance far more deeply than would appear at first; hence it is not the class. rule of sequence which is surviving so much as the old potential opt.—

¹ With ἄν: Ge 33¹⁰, Isa 66²⁰, Ezk 1¹⁶. Without ἄν: Ex 33¹¹ AF, Nu 22⁴. ⁷ (AF fut. ind.), Dt 13¹AF (B ind.)⁴⁴ 8⁵B (AF subj.) 28²⁹ 32¹¹, Jg 16⁹ (A ind.), Ps 82 (83)¹⁵ (R fut. ind.), Pr 23⁷ 25²⁶. ²⁶, Isa 11⁹ 21¹.

admirably suited to Christian aspiration and piety! Indeed, one must not reject too lightly the possibility that the optatives in NT owed their preservation in some measure to their incidence in the pompous and stereotyped jargon of devotion. These opt. phrases are decidedly formal (e.g. εἰ τύχοι = *e.g.*); εἴη, θέλοι and γένοιτο occur again and again. Because the LXX came to be a Church book, the same consideration should be given to the problem there. The optatives may reflect a date of translation early in the Hell. period. But if by any chance, as seems likely on other grounds, there was a new recension of some part at least of the LXX made much nearer to the Christian age, the retention of the optatives at a time when everywhere they were diminishing need not surprise us in view of their value for the liturgy, Jewish and Christian.

CHAPTER TEN

THE VERB: NOUN FORMS: INFINITIVE

IN SOME DIRECTIONS the infinitive¹ is now enlarging its sphere, especially in the infin. of purpose after verbs of motion; and, particularly in the more cultured Hell. writers, the articular infin.—a development which by chance coincides with Semitic partiality for the infin. with prepositions and thus explains its popularity in NT. In other directions the infin. is retreating, especially in face of *ἵνα* and *ὅτι*, the latter being prevalent after verbs of speaking, perceiving and believing—some of which kept very strictly to infin. in class. Greek.

§ 1. With the Function of a Dative

(a) *Final-consecutive*

This use with verbs of moving, sending, and giving, etc., or in loose connection with a whole clause which it supplements, has strongly increased in Hellenistic in comparison with class. prose. Malalas has especial preference for the final infin. after *εἶμι*, *ἔρχομαι*, *ἵσταμαι*, *ὀρμάω*, *περιτρέχω*, *πέμπω*, *ἀπάγω*, *κατάγω*, *καλέω*. In NT this development is even more pronounced. Sometimes the infin. is used alone, sometimes with *ὥστε* and more rarely *ἐφ' ὧι*.

1. The simple infin. of purpose (class. with *giving, permitting*, etc.) is used with still more verbs of motion than in class. Greek and became really popular from c. 150 B.C. :

With *ἔρχομαι* Mt 2² *ἤλθομεν προσκυνῆσαι*, 4¹ *ἀνίχθη πειρασθῆναι*, 5¹⁷, 11⁷ *ἐξήλθατε . . . θεάσασθαι*, 20³⁸ *ἦλθεν διακονηθῆναι*, 27⁵⁵ *ἠκολούθησαν διακονῆσαι* (rest ptc.), Lk 9⁵², 18¹⁰ *ἀνέβησαν προσεύξασθαι*,

¹ K.G II 3-46. Stahl 596-680. Jannaris 480-89. Wackernagel I 257-76. Meisterhans-Schwyzler § 90. Schwyzler II 357-384. Mayser II 1, 296-339. F. H. Allen, *The Infin. in Polybius compared with the use of the Infin. in Biblical Greek*, Diss. Chicago 1907. Abel §§ 69-71. Zerwick §§ 266-279^b. Ljungvik SSAA 40-45. Moulton Einl. 319ff. Pernot *Études* 31ff. 69ff. 102ff. 124ff. P. Aalto, *Studien zur Geschichte des Infinitiv im Griech.*, Helsinki 1953.

Ac 10³³ παρέσμεν ἀκοῦσαι, Jn 4⁷ ἔρχεται . . . ἀντλήσαι ὕδωρ, 14² πορεύομαι ἐτοιμάσαι τόπον, 21³ ὑπάγω ἀλιεύειν, Ro 10⁶ 1 Co 10⁷ 16⁸ Heb 9²⁴ Herm. S. IX 9, 1, Mart. Petr. 88, 7, Acta Petri et Pauli 186, 4. But John is very fond of parataxis with verbs of motion, rather than the infin.; e.g. ἔρχεσθε καὶ ὄψεσθε 14⁰; also 14⁷ 11³⁴ 14³ 19³⁸ 20¹⁹ etc. The Atticists themselves quite often used the infin.: exx. in Schmid, *Der Attizismus*, 1887–1897, II 56, III 79, IV 81, e.g. ἀφίκετο, ἀκοῦσαι. Radermacher² (p. 152) draws several exx. from apocryphal Acts of the Apostles. Pernot is exhaustive for the Gospels, and shows (pp. 103ff) that Mt often prefers infin. after verbs when Mk does not, thus, ὁμολογέω 14⁷ (cp. Mk 6²³), θέλω 15³² (cp. Mk 8⁹), δίδωμι 13¹¹ (cp. Mk 4¹¹), ἐτοιμάζω 26¹⁷ (cp. Mk 14¹²); and Mt tends to substitute an infin. for Mk's final ἵνα, thus ἀποστέλλω 21³⁴ (cp. Mk 12²), ἔρχομαι 28¹ (cp. Mk 16¹); or else εἰς τό c. inf. 26² for Mk's final ἵνα (cp. Mk 15²⁰). The fut. ptc. would have been more usual in class. Attic but it is scarcely used in NT.¹ In the Ptolemaic papyri ἀναβαίνω, διαβαίνω, ἀπέρχομαι, κατάγω are followed by infin. of purpose (Mayser II 1, 297). Witkowski ep.² 38, 34 ἐὰν ἀναβῶ κἀγὼ προσκυνῆσαι.—Xenophon of Ephesus p. 393, 29 ἐληλύθει προσεῦξασθαι τῷ θεῷ.—Acta Petri et Pauli 17 ἀπῆει ποιῆσαι.—Mart. Petr. VI εἰσέρχομαι . . . σταυρωθῆναι.—Mart. Pauli IV ἔρχεται . . . κρῖναι. In the LXX there is a marked tendency to use the infin. after verbs of coming, going, and sending: e.g. Le 14⁴⁹ 17¹¹ 21¹⁷ Isa 61^{1f}. It is used also with verbs like δίδωμι, ἀποστέλλω, as in class. Attic: Mt 25³⁵ ἐδώκατέ μοι φαγεῖν, Mk 3¹⁴ ἀποστέλλη κηρύσσειν, 7⁴ παρέλαβον κρατεῖν, Ac 12⁴ 16⁴ παραδιδόναι φυλάσσειν.—Often δίδωμι, φάγεῖν, or πιεῖν.—Ac 12^{4f} ἐξελέξω . . . λαβεῖν, 20²⁸ ἔθετο ἐπισκόπους ποιμαίνειν, Jn 6³¹ ἄρτον . . . ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς φαγεῖν (LXX Ps 78²⁴) 6⁵²; 4⁷.¹⁰ δός μοι πῆν, 4³⁸ ἀπέστειλα ὑμᾶς θερίζειν. Ἔχω (cp. Byz. Greek): Jn 4³² βρῶσιν ἔχω φαγεῖν, (8⁶) 8²⁶ πολλὰ ἔχω . . . λαλεῖν, 16¹². Πέμπω: Jn 1³³ ὁ πέμψας με βαπτίζειν.

The construction with ἵνα is sometimes substituted for infin. in the papyri, as in the phrase δέξασθαι τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς εἶνα δεικονεῖ ἡμῖν (P. Par 23, 22) which comes shortly after προσλάβεσθαι τὸν υἱὸν διακονεῖν ἡμῖν (22, 25) (165 B.C.). So also in NT: 1 Co 9¹⁵ ἀποθανεῖν ἢ . . . ἵνα . . . κενώσῃ, 14⁵ λαλεῖν . . . μᾶλλον . . . ἵνα προφητεύητε. It raises a question where the MSS differ between the constructions: have scribes and commentators introduced ἵνα or have atticistic correctors preferred the shorter form with the infin.? Mt 27²⁶ Mk 15¹⁵ Jn 19¹⁶ παρέδωκεν ἵνα σταυρωθῇ, Jn 5³⁸ δέδωκεν . . . ἵνα τελειώσω (Tert. corr. to τελειῶσαι), 11³¹ ὑπάγει . . . ἵνα κλαύσῃ (Chrys. corr. to κλαῦσαι), 5⁵ ἀνέβησαν . . . ἵνα ἀγνίσωσιν (Chrys. ἀγνίσαι), 12²⁰ ἀναβαινόντων ἵνα προσκυνήσωσιν (Chrys. προσκυνῆσαι).

2. The infin. of purpose is helped by ὥστε (and ὡς?) in LXX, NT, and occasionally in the papyri (Mayser II 1, 298) and Josephus; it is common after NT, down to Byzantine period;

¹ Ac 24¹¹ ἀνέβη προσκυνήσων. Cp. Lk 18¹⁰ Ac 8²⁷.

it helped to give the dying infin. of purpose a little longer life in this period :

Mt 10¹ ἔδωκεν ἐξουσίαν ὥστε, 27¹ συμβούλιον ἔλαβον ὥστε θανατῶσαι αὐτόν (D corr. to ἵνα θανατώσουσιν), Lk 4²⁹ ἤγαγον . . . ὥστε κατακρημνίσαι (AC εἰς τό) 9⁵² εἰσῆλθον ὥστε ἐτοιμάσαι (vl. ὡς p⁴⁵ SB), 20²⁰ ἵνα ἐπιλάβωνται αὐτοῦ λόγου, ὥστε παραδοῦναι αὐτόν τῇ ἀρχῇ τοῦ ἡγεμόνος (AWG εἰς τό), Ac 20²⁴ AHLP ὡς τελειῶσαι (E ὥστε, probably -τε has fallen out before τελ-). LXX Ge 15⁷ 1 Mac 4². 28 10³, 2 Mac 2⁶ Mart. Dasii 5 δέδοκται . . . ὥστε . . . προσαχθῆναι. Epict. IV 6, 8. ἐσπούδακας . . . μανθάνειν ὥστε ἄλυπος εἶναι. Final ὡς: Clem. Hom 12¹.

3. "Ὡστε also appears with finite verb, imperative and subjunctive (Mayser II 1, 300): Ga 2¹³ ὥστε συναπήχθη (vl. συναπηχθῆναι) Jn 3¹⁶. 'Ὡς with indic.: Clem. Hom. 2²⁵; ὡς with subj. 12¹⁷.

4. "Ὡστε c. infin. in a consecutive sense is more widely used than in class. Attic. Class. Greek would have indic. in Ac 15³⁹ ἐγένετο παροξυσμός ὥστε ἀποχωρισθῆναι αὐτοὺς ἀπ' ἀλλήλων. Clem. Hom. ὡς c. inf. 8¹¹ 20¹³.

5. Infin. without ὥστε, to express result. Lk 1⁵⁴ ἀντελάβετο Ἰσραὴλ . . . μνησθῆναι ἐλέους, 7² ποιῆσαι ἔλεος. The influence of Heb. infin. is likely in Lk 1-2 and the infin. is best rendered as a ptc. or gerundive (so also Mt 21³² Ac 7¹⁹ 15¹⁰ Ga 3¹⁰ Ph 3¹⁰).—Ac 5³ διὰ τί ἐπλήρωσεν . . . τὴν καρδίαν σου ψεύσασθαί σε, Heb 6¹⁰ οὐ γὰρ ἄδικος ὁ θεὸς ἐπιλαθέσθαι, Rev 5⁵ ἐνίκησεν . . . ἀνοῖξαι (B ὁ ἀνοίγων), 16⁹ οὐ μετενόησαν δοῦναι αὐτῷ δόξαν. Class.: Hdt V 76, Xen Hell. V 1, 14. Hellenistic: Epict. IV 1, 50, P. Oxy III 526, 3 (ii/A.D.), Herm. M. VIII 2, Did 4³. For ἵνα possibly expressing result, see p. 102.

6. The so-called Infinitive Absolute (class. ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκεῖν) is literary and very rarely found in papyri or NT: PSI IV 392, 6 (242 B.C.) ὅπερ σὺν θεῷ εἰπεῖν πεπεσμεθα. Cair. Zen. 11, 7 (256 B.C.) σὺν θεοῖς ἐλπίζω σε στεφανωθήσεσθαι.—NT: Heb 7⁹ ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν (frequent class.).—Ign. Trall. 10; Sm 2 τὸ δοκεῖν.—Diogn. 6¹ ἀπλῶς εἰπεῖν (see Schwyzer II 379).

(b) *Imperatival Infinitive*: see above, p. 78.

§ 2. Infinitive with Various Case-functions

(a) *Without Article*

To supplement verbs of perception, belief, saying, etc., it was usual in class. Greek to have the infin. as the object, but

the ptc. was also possible; and with all but verbs of believing it was also permissible to have a $\delta\tau\iota$ construction. Very prominent in NT is the vast reduction in the use of infin. and an extension of the $\delta\tau\iota$ construction, which now becomes usual except in the more educated writers, Luke, Paul, Hebrews. Even verbs of believing now have this construction. $\text{'}\Omega\varsigma$ is nearly confined to Luke and Paul¹, and $\pi\omega\varsigma$ is now being confused with $\omega\varsigma$. Later on, $\pi\omega\varsigma$ absorbs all the functions of $\delta\tau\iota$, $\omega\varsigma$, and finally drives them out altogether. The beginnings of this seem to be appearing already in NT². We notice too a reluctance to use the class. indirect speech form of accusative and infinitive; even Luke prefers the direct form (Ac 14 25^{4f}). For Mark, see Zerwick *Untersuchungen* 24ff. Later on, $\omega\varsigma \delta\tau\iota$ too becomes the equivalent of $\delta\tau\iota$ (Mayser II 3, 45 n. 1; Jannaris § 1754; Sophocles Lex. s.v. $\omega\varsigma$): Hom. Clem. 17 11²⁸ 14⁷ 16⁶. 7, P. Oxy XVI 1831, 1; 1833, 1 (v/A.D.) $\omega\varsigma \delta\tau\iota\pi\epsilon\rho$. The beginnings of this (although without a verb of speaking to introduce it) may lie in NT use of $\omega\varsigma \delta\tau\iota$ (i.e., viz., to the effect that), 2 Co 51⁹ (RV to wit; RSV that is; NEB what I mean is, that . . .) 11²¹, 2 Th 2².

1. *Infinitive as a Direct Object.* *Verba putandi* in strong contrast to class. Greek now commonly are followed by $\delta\tau\iota$ in Hell. Greek (Radermacher² 190). But $\delta\omega\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ c. accus. and infin. 1 Co 12²³ 2 Co 11¹⁶; $\acute{\eta}\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\mu\alpha\iota$ c. accus. infin. Ph 3⁸; $\lambda\omicron\gamma\iota\zeta\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ c. inf. Ro 3²⁸ 6¹¹ 14¹⁴ 2 Co 11⁵ Ph 3¹³; $\nu\omicron\mu\iota\zeta\omega$ c. inf. Lk 2⁴⁴ etc. and Paul; $\omicron\iota\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ c. inf. Jn 21²⁵ Ph 1¹⁷ 1 Clem 30⁴ OT 2 Clem 14²; $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\iota\theta\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ c. accus. inf. Ac 26²⁶; $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\pi\omicron\iota\theta\alpha$ and $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\iota\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$ Lk 20⁶ Ro 21⁹ 2 Co 10⁷, Ign Trall 3²; $\pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\omega$ c. infin. Ac 15¹¹ Ro 14²; $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\omicron\nu\omicron\sigma\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ c. accus. inf. Ac 13²⁵ 27²⁷ Herm. V. IV 1, 6. In general the infin. with these verbs is confined to Luke, Paul and Heb., as a mark of literary style (Mayser II 1, 312). $\text{'}\Theta\mu\nu\acute{\omega} \delta\tau\iota$ (Mt 26⁷⁴ Mk 14⁷¹ Rev 10⁶) is unclassical; see by contrast Heb 3¹⁸ (fut. infin.). With *verba volendi* and *iubendi*, in class. Greek $\delta\omega\sigma\tau\epsilon$ was often

¹ Mk 12²⁶ vl. $\pi\omega\varsigma$, Lk 6⁴ vl. $\pi\omega\varsigma$, 8⁴⁷ (D $\delta\tau\iota$), 23⁵⁵ 24⁶ (D $\delta\sigma\alpha$)³⁵ (D $\delta\tau\iota$), Ac 10²⁸. 38 20²⁰ ($\pi\omega\varsigma$ at 18), Ro 1⁹, Ph 1⁸, 1 Th 2¹⁰. The Hellenistic use of $\omega\varsigma = \delta\tau\iota$ is the true explanation of Mk 14⁷² Lk 22⁶¹, not that in *Nov. Test.* 2, 1958, 272ff.

² $\text{'}\Pi\omega\varsigma$ after $\acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega\tau\epsilon$ Mt 12⁴ Mk 2²⁶ 12²⁶ vl.; after $\acute{\epsilon}\theta\epsilon\omega\rho\epsilon\iota$ Mk 12⁴¹; after $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\epsilon}\chi\omega\mu\alpha\iota$ Lk 14⁷; after $\acute{\alpha}\pi\alpha\gamma\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\omega$ Ac 11¹³ 1 Th 1⁹. See also perhaps Mk 10²³ (A. Pallis, *Notes on St. Mark*, new ed. Lond., 1932, 35), and Pallis also includes Mk 10²⁴ $\acute{\lambda}\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\iota \acute{\alpha}\upsilon\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma$. $\text{'}\text{Τ}\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\eta\alpha$, $\pi\acute{\omega}\varsigma \delta\upsilon\sigma\kappa\omicron\lambda\omicron\acute{\nu}$ $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\mu$, which he explains as hyperbaton for $\acute{\lambda}\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\iota \pi\acute{\omega}\varsigma (= \delta\tau\iota) \delta\upsilon\sigma\kappa. \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\mu, \text{'}\text{Τ}\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\eta\alpha$. See also Barn. 11¹ 14⁶, 1 Clem 19³ 21³ 34⁵ 37² 50¹. Epict. IV 13, 15: $\delta\epsilon\iota\zeta\acute{\omicron}\nu \mu\omicron\iota \sigma\epsilon\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu \pi\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu . . . \kappa\alpha\iota \delta\psi\epsilon\iota \delta\tau\iota \pi\acute{\omega}\varsigma \omicron\upsilon\chi \acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega$ (yet $\delta\psi\epsilon\iota$ in II 12, 4).

added to the infin. or *δπως* and fut. ind. substituted, and later *ἵνα* which we find often in NT except in Luke, Paul and Hebrews. "ἵνα after *ἐρωτάω* is Hellenistic (Mk 7²⁸ etc., Ptol. pap. Mayser II 1, 243). The accus. of the object with infin. after *παραινώ* is a mark of literary style (only Ac 27²²). *Θέλω* usually has accus. and infin., as in Ptol. papyri (Mayser II 1, 160), but *ἵνα* in Mt 7¹²; 1 Co 14⁵ has both (*θέλω ὑμᾶς λαλεῖν . . . , μᾶλλον δὲ ἵνα προφητεύητε*); cp. MGr *θά* = *θενά* = *θέλω ἵνα*. In Jn 8⁵⁶ *ἵνα* follows *ἡγαλλιάσατο* (*was glad that he should*), just as it follows *ἐχάρην* in pap. BU IV 1081, 5 (ii-iii/A.D.), whereas the ptc. follows *χαίρω* in Ptol. pap. (Mayser II 1, 175, 353). Different from class. Greek is the passive construction (as in Latin) instead of active after *verba iubendi*: Mt 18²⁵ *ἐκέλευσεν αὐτὸν παραῆναι*, Ac 5²¹ *ἀπέστειλεν ἀχθῆναι αὐτοῦς* (P. Tebt. 331. 16 [A.D. 131] *ἀξιῶ ἀχθῆναι αὐτοῦς*), 23³ *κελεύεις με τύπτεσθαι*, Herm. S. IX 8, 3 *ἐκέλευσε διὰ τῶν παρθένων ἀπεχθῆναι* (P. Oxy I 33. col. II 14 [end ii/B.C.] *ἐκέλευσεν αὐτὸν ἀπεχθῆναι*, Mart. Matth. 243, 18ff *ἐκέλευσεν πλῆθος ἀνθρακίας ἐνεχθῆναι*; followed by active *φέρειν δέ*. Mk 6²⁷ *ἐπέταξεν ἐνεχθῆναι* (but SBCΔ act.: *ἐνέγκαι*) *τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ* (cp.³⁹), Ac 22²⁴ *εἶπας μάστιξιν ἀνετάξεσθαι αὐτὸν* (but act. in D* *ἀνετάξειν*), Mk 10⁴⁹ *εἶπεν αὐτὸν φωνηθῆναι* ADWX (but in SBCLΔ corr. to direct command). But active (like class. Greek): Ac 23¹⁰ 16²² Mk 6³⁹ *ἐπέταξεν αὐτοῖς ἀνακλιναί πάντας* (SB*G *ἀνακλιθῆναι*, to harm.¹ with Mt 14⁹), 5⁴³ D *δοῦναι* (rest *δοθῆναι*). There is textual variation in Mk 8⁷ between *παραθεῖναι*, *παρατεθῆναι*, and numerous examples of alternation in apocryphal Acts (Ljungvik SSAA 42, n. 2). For LXX, see Bonaccorsi 553, Abel § 309.

2. *Infin.* in looser dependence on main verb, without any apparent case-relationship.

a. *Adverbial*: with *be able*, *know how*, *begin*, *must*, etc., the Ptolemaic papyri and NT have only the infin.: *δύναμαι*, *ισχύω*, *ἔχω* (*must* Lk 12⁵⁰), *ἔρχομαι*. The latter never occurs with ptc. in NT, as in class. Greek (see pp. 154f); it is very frequent in the Syn. Gospels especially in a Semitic pleonastic sense as *ἤρξατο*, *ἤρξαντο* (see *JThS* 28, 352f), as it has very little force; in no instance must it definitely mean *begin to*, and often it is plainly better to ignore the auxiliary; it appears to be a periphrasis for both aor. and impf. It is liked by Mark (26 times, + 3 in D) more than Matthew (6 times) where it may even have some point (4¹⁷ 16²¹). Also with infin. are *προλαμβάνω* Mk 14⁸ (= class. *φθάνω* c. ptc.), *κινδυνεύω* Ac 19²⁷. 40, *προσποιέομαι* Lk 24²⁸, *προστίθεμαι* *to do more* (see p. 227); verbs meaning *to instigate*, *compel* (but *πέλω*, *ποιέω*, *ἀγγαρεύω* also have *ἵνα*); *to be on guard*, *be ashamed*, *be frightened* (but *ἵνα* with *βλέπετε*, *φλάσσομαι*, *προσέχω*), *to allow* (but *ἀφιημι* with *ἵνα* Mk 11¹⁶), and there is in general a larger freedom to use the infin. in loose connection

¹ Nevertheless, this accus. c. infin. construction after a verb which already has an object has ample precedent: Pass. Barth. 133, 29f *σὺ κελεύεις ἡμᾶς λυθῆναι αὐτήν*; Mart. Andr. alt. 58, 14f *κελεύσας τοῖς δημίοις ἀδικητούς αὐτοῦ τὰς ἀγκύλας καταλειφθῆναι*; also Acta Joh. 170. 29f; Acta Thom. 218, 25ff.

with the verb perhaps under Semitic influence: e.g. *to see to cast out* (Mt 7⁵ Lk 6⁴²), *looked round to see* (Mk 5³²), *be a long time in coming* (Lk 12⁴⁵).

b. *Nominal*. An infin. or *ἵνα* will follow not only a personal verb but also an adj. or noun, or an impersonal verb.

(i) *Nouns*: the Ptolemaic papyri have infin. after ἐξουσία (NT), κήρυγμα, πρόσταγμα, σχολή, χρεία (NT), ὥρα (NT) etc. The NT has *ἵνα* after συνήθεια (Jn 18³⁹), ὥρα (Jn 12²³ 13¹ 16²); ὥρα followed by infin. as in class. Greek (Ro 13¹¹); καιρὸς τοῦ c. inf. (1 Pt 4¹⁷); καιρὸς c. inf. (Heb 11¹⁵ Rev 11¹⁶); καιρὸς c. ὅτε (2 Ti 4³), ὥρα c. ὅτε (Jn 4²¹. 23 5²⁵ 16². 25), ὥρα ἐν ᾗ (Jn 5²⁸). Apparently the use of ὥρα and καιρὸς with ὅτε or ἐν ᾗ is confined to definite prophecy; the inf. indicating a nearer imminence. The NT also has infin. after ἐξουσίαν ἔχω (Jn 10¹⁸ 1 Co 9⁴¹ Heb 13¹⁰ Rev 11⁶); δίδωμι ἐξουσίαν c. infin. (Jn 1¹² Rev 13⁶), c. ὥστε (Mt 10¹), c. *ἵνα* (Ac 8¹⁹), and χρεῖαν ἔχω c. infin. (Mt 3¹⁴ etc. Jn 13¹⁰ same subject, and *ἵνα* where there is a new subject¹, 1 Th 4⁹ S^D*H), τοῦ c. accus. infin. (Heb 5¹²), c. *ἵνα* (Jn 2²⁵ 16³⁰ 1 Jn 2²⁷).

(ii) *Adjectives and adverbs*. The Ptol. pap. display ἄξιος (NT), δυνατός (NT), ἐπιτήδειος, ἔτοιμος (NT), ἐτοιμὸς (NT), ἱκανός (NT), πιστός, ὄρμος: all with infin. In the NT: ἱκανός c. *ἵνα* (Mt 8⁸ Lk 7⁶), c. infin. (elsewhere), ἄξιος c. *ἵνα* (Jn 1²⁷), c. infin. often, c. τοῦ and infin. (1 Co 16⁴), c. relative clause (Lk 7⁴), ἔτοιμος, ἐτοιμὸς ἔχω c. inf. (Ac 21¹³ 2 Co 12¹⁴ 1 Pt 4⁵), ἐν ἐτοιμῷ ἔχω c. inf. (2 Co 10⁶).

3. The Infinitive as Subject.

Impersonal verbs: δεῖ, συμφέρεi, ἔξεστιν, ἐγένετο, γίνεται, συνέβη—usually (acc. c.) infin., but sometimes *ἵνα* (e.g. συμφέρεi *ἵνα* Mt 5²⁹ 18⁶ etc., ἔδει *ἵνα* πάθη Barn 5¹³). For the Ptol. pap. Mayser II 1, 307f (infinitive).

Neuter adjectives or nouns with the copula or without: Ptol. pap. ἀναγκαῖον, δίκαιον, ἔθος, ἐπιτήδειον, etc. (Mayser II 1, 306f) mainly infinitives. NT: δυνατόν c. infin. (Ac 2²⁴), ἀρκετόν c. *ἵνα* (Mt 10²⁵), καλόν c. infin. (1 Co 9¹⁵), ἐλάχιστον *ἵνα* (1 Co 4³), βρῶμα *ἵνα* (Jn 4³⁴).

Preceding demonstrative pronoun: in Jn particularly, the infin. gives way to *ἵνα* (1 Jn 5³ αὕτη . . . *ἵνα* . . .), especially if the epexegetis is theory rather than fact (Jn 15⁸ *ἵνα* καρπὸν πολλὸν φέρητε). For fact he often substitutes ὅτι (1 Jn 2³ 3¹⁶ 5²).—Infin.: Ac 15²⁸ 1 Th 4³ Eph 3⁸ Jas 1²⁷.—But *ἵνα*: Lk 1⁴³ (although the epexegetis is fact) Jn 6⁴⁰ 17³ 1 Jn 3¹¹. 23 4²¹ 2 Jn⁶.

In Hebraistic figures of speech: Lk 21¹⁴ Ac 19²¹ τιθεῖναι (τίθεσθαι) ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ (τῷ πνεύματι): Hebraism. Ac 16¹⁴ ἤς διήνοιξεν τὴν καρδίαν (Hebraism) προσέχειν (cp. τοῦ inf. Lk 24⁴⁵). Lk 2¹ δόγμα . . . ἀπογράφεσθαι πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην. Ac 14⁵ ἐγένετο ὄρμη.—On the other hand we find *ἵνα* following: Mt 18¹⁴ etc. θέλημά ἐστιν, Jn 13³⁴ Ac 17¹⁵ ἐντολή *ἵνα*, Ac 27⁴² βουλή ἐγένετο, Jn 13² put into the heart *ἵνα* παραδοῖ αὐτόν.

¹ Hence Jn 16³⁰ the vl. of Syr^{1ew} is not likely to be correct, having *ἵνα* introducing the same subject: οὐ χρεῖαν ἔχετε *ἵνα* τινὰ ἐρωτᾶς. Nor can οὐ χρεῖαν ἔχετε γράφειν be correct in S^{*AD} at 1 Th 4⁹.

4. *The Infinitive with πρὶν, πρὶν ἤ.*

Πρὶν occurs three times (all iii/B.C.) and πρὶν ἤ five times in Ptol. pap. in Mayser's list. In NT and Koine generally we do not find the indic. but (a) after a positive sentence, accus. c. infin.: Mt 26³⁴. 7⁵ (A adds ἤ) Mk 14⁷² Lk 22⁶¹ (B adds ἤ) Jn 4⁴⁹ 8⁵⁸ (not D and lat)¹ 14²⁰ Ac 2²⁰ OT (WH text); ἤ c. infin. Mt 1¹⁸ πρὶν ἤ συνελθεῖν αὐτούς, Mk 14³⁰ (SD om ἤ), Ac 2²⁰ (WH^{ms}) 7². (b) after a negative sentence: ἤ c. subjunctive Lk 2²⁶; ἤ c. optative Ac 25¹⁶; ἤ c. infin. Diogn. 2³. In LXX and NT πρὶν is being superceded by πρὸ τοῦ, but it occurs mainly in To, Si, Isa, and 2-4 Mac.

(b) *Articular Infinitive*²

Essentially the function of an article with an infin. is the same as with a noun since the infin. is probably in origin a noun, except that with the infin. the article often appears for no reason except to supply the case-ending which is lacking. The cult of the articular infinitive was promoted by the Atticists but it is already seen in Luke, Paul, Hebrews, James and Peter, and especially in the higher kinds of Koine writing³. Votaw⁴ shows in his thesis that in the OT translation books the anarthrous and articular infinitives are about equal in number, whereas in NT the articular is rarer. It is almost absent from the Johannine writings, but in the Ptol. pap. its use is not confined to literary or official texts (Mayser II 1, 321).

It serves the purpose of almost every kind of subordinate clause.

A. *Without Preposition.*

1. Τό c. infin. serves the purpose of a mere infin. comparatively rarely in the Ptol. pap. and almost exclusively in the bureaucratic style. It is hardly used in the NT outside Paul:

Mt 15²⁰ τὸ . . . φαγεῖν (subject), 20²⁸ τὸ καθίσαι obj., Mk 9¹⁰ τὸ ἀναστῆναι (subject), 12³³ τὸ ἀγαπᾶν (subject),¹ Ac 25¹¹ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν, Ro 4¹³ τὸ κληρονόμον αὐτὸν εἶναι, 7¹⁸ τὸ θέλειν . . . τὸ κατεργάζεσθαι, 13⁸ τὸ . . . ἀγαπᾶν, 1 Co 11⁶ τὸ κείρασθαι ἢ ξύρασθαι, 14³⁹, 2 Co 8^{10f} τὸ θέλειν, Ph 1²⁴ τὸ δὲ ἐπιμένειν τῇ σαρκί, 2⁶ 4¹⁰ τὸ ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ φρονεῖν, Ga 4¹⁸ (SABC om τό), Heb 10³¹. 1 Co 7²⁶ 2 Co 7¹¹ 9¹ περισσόν μοι ἐστὶν τὸ γράφειν, 10² δέομαι τὸ μὴ παρὼν θαρρῆσαι, Ro 14¹³ τὸ μὴ

¹ For πρὶν without verb, used as preposition, see pp. 260, 270.

² Goodwin 315. Moulton Einl. 343. H. F. Allen, op. cit. 29ff.

³ There is but one instance of the very literary practice of adding an adj. (Heb 2¹⁵ διὰ παντός τοῦ ζῆν) as in 2 Mac 7⁹ ἐκ τοῦ παρόντος ζῆν, and class. Greek.

⁴ C. W. Votaw, *The Use of the Infin. in Biblical Greek*, Chicago 1896.

τιθέναι πρόσκομμα, ²¹, 2 Co 2¹, 1 Th 3³ τὸ μηδένα σαίνεσθαι, ⁴⁶ τὸ μὴ ὑπερβαίνειν, Ac 4¹⁸ τὸ καθόλου μὴ φθέγγεσθαι (S*B om τὸ).—LXX 2 Esd 6⁸ τὸ μὴ καταργηθῆναι.

2. Τοῦ c. infin.¹ is used often in LXX (Hebrew Infin. Construct), more rarely in the Ptol. pap.; it belongs to a higher level of the Koine, and is mainly found in Paul (13) and Luke (44) in NT, and scarcely elsewhere except in Mt and Mk ².

(i) Exegetical: after nouns like χρόνος (Lk 1⁵⁷ τοῦ τεκεῖν), καιρός (1 Pt 4¹⁷), ἐπιποθία (Ro 15²³), ἐξουσία (Lk 10¹⁹), εὐκαιρία (Lk 22⁹), γνώμη (Ac 20³) *to be of opinion that*, also ἐλπὶς and χρεῖα. See also Lk 2⁶ Ac 27²⁰ 1 Co 9¹⁰ Heb 5¹². But John on the contrary sometimes introduces ἵνα instead of τοῦ c. infin. after nouns like χρεῖα, ὄρα, χρόνος. Rev 12⁷ is possibly exegetical or appositional ὁ Μιχαὴλ καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ τοῦ ACP (p⁴⁷ SB om τοῦ) πολεμῆσαι; on the other hand, it is more probably a translation of Semitic imperatival ? c. infin. (Moulton-Howard 448f); note the subjects of the infin. in the nom., which is not Greek at all; in support of imper. cp. LXX Hos 9¹³ Ἐφραΐμ τοῦ ἐξαγαγεῖν *Ephraim must . . .*, Eccl 3¹⁵ 1 Ch 9²⁵; elsewhere in Rev τοῦ c. inf. is also never sure (9¹⁰ p⁴⁷ SAP om τοῦ; quite weak vl. 14¹⁵); Debrunner suggested that the author was following his tendency elsewhere to use the nom. in preference to another case, so here instead of gen. or dat.³—After adjectives, as class. (Xen. Anab. 7, 7, 48; Polyb. 39, 9, 12): Lk 17¹ ἀνένδεκτον . . . τοῦ . . . μὴ ἔλθειν *impossible that*, 24²⁵, Ac 23¹⁵ ἔτοιμοὶ ἔσμεν τοῦ ἀνελεῖν αὐτόν, 1 Co 16⁴ ἄξιον . . . τοῦ πορεύεσθαι.—After verbs which in class. Greek took the gen.: Lk 1⁹ ἔλαχε τοῦ θυμιάσαι (so LXX 1 Km 14⁴⁷; but class. has inf. only), 2 Co 1⁸ ἐξαπορηθῆναι . . . τοῦ ζῆν.

(ii) Consecutive or final sense, especially Luke and Paul, and the most common type in NT; on the whole, however, Paul prefers εἰς τό or πρὸς τό for final and consec.: Mt 13³ ἐξῆλθεν . . . τοῦ σπεῖρειν, 21³ ζητεῖν τοῦ ἀπολέσαι, 21³² μετεμελήθητε τοῦ πιστεῦσαι (consec.), 31³ 11¹ 24⁴⁵ (D om τοῦ); Lk 2²¹ *eight days* τοῦ περιτεμεῖν (fin. or consec.), Ro 8¹² ὀφείλεται . . . τοῦ κατὰ σάρκα ζῆν, 1²⁴ τοῦ ἀτιμάζεσθαι (consec.), 11⁸ OT ὀφθαλμοὺς τοῦ μὴ βλέπειν *such as*, ¹⁰ OT σκοπισθήτωσαν οἱ ὀφθ. τοῦ μὴ βλέπειν, 1 Co 10¹³ τοῦ δύνασθαι, Ac 14⁹ πίστιν τοῦ σωθῆναι (consec.), 9¹⁵, 2 Co 8¹¹ ἡ προθυμία τοῦ θέλειν, Ph 3²¹ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ δύνασθαι αὐτόν *the power by which he can*, Ac 3¹² Ro 7³ Ph 3¹⁰ Heb 10⁷ OT 11⁵ Hom. Clem. 9²². Often the consec. sense is only weak: Lk 1⁷³ 4¹⁰ 5⁷, 24²⁵ βραδεῖς τῆ καρδίᾳ τοῦ πιστεῦσαι, Ac 7¹⁹ 18¹⁰, Ro 6⁶ 7⁸

¹ Schwyzer II 132. Birklein, *Entwicklungsgeschichte des substantivierten Infinitivs*. (= Schenz, Beitr. III 1, Würzburg 1888) 55f. Moulton-Howard 448ff.

² But see Thuc. I 4, etc., and Tacitus *Ann.* II 59 *Aegyptum proficiscitur cognoscendae antiquitatis*.

³ Blass-Debr. § 400, 8.

Ph 3¹⁰, LXX 3 Km 17²⁰.—The mere infin. already has the same final sense, but for the purpose of clarity τοῦ may be added to a second final infin. (only in writings with pretence to style, viz. Mt Lk Ac, e.g. Mt 2¹³ μέλλει γὰρ H. ζητεῖν τὸ παιδίον τοῦ ἀπολέσαι αὐτό, Lk 1⁷⁷ ἐτοίμασαι . . . τοῦ δοῦναι, 7⁸¹ ἐπιφάναι τοῖς ἐν σκότει . . . τοῦ κατευθῆναι, 22²⁴ παραστήσαι . . . καὶ τοῦ δοῦναι, Ac 26¹⁷¹ ἀποστέλλω σε, ἀνοῖξαι . . ., τοῦ ἐπιστρέψαι . . ., τοῦ λαβεῖν. For τοῦ after ἐγένετο, see Ac 10²⁵.—Τοῦ μή c. inf. after verbs of hindering, ceasing, etc. (Lk and LXX) has class. precedent (Xen. Anab. 3, 5, 11), but the use goes further in NT and LXX and τοῦ μή has a consecutive sense: Lk 4⁴² 17¹ 24¹⁶ Ac 10⁴⁷ 14¹⁸ 20²⁰. 27, LXX Ge 16² συνέκλεισεν τοῦ μή, 20⁶, Ps 38² 68²⁴ (Ro 11¹⁰).—Another Septuagintism, especially in Lk–Ac and Jas, is τοῦ c. inf. after verbs which in class. Greek would take the simple infin., e.g. Lk 4¹⁰ OT ἐντέλλεσθαι (Ps 90 (91)¹¹), 5⁷ κατανεύειν, 9⁵¹ στηρίζειν τὸ πρόσωπον, Ac 3¹² ποιεῖν (BU II 625, 28 πᾶν ποιεῖν τοῦ: ii–iii/A.D.), Ac 2¹ D 10²⁵ (not D) Act. Barn. 7 ἐγένετο, 15²⁰ ἐπιστεῖλαι αὐτοῖς τοῦ ἀπέχεσθαι, 21¹² παρεκαλοῦμεν . . . τοῦ μή ἀναβαίνειν αὐτόν, 23¹⁵ ἔτομος, 20 συντίθεσθαι. 27¹ ἐκρίθη τοῦ *it was determined to*, 20³ ἐγένετο γνώμη τοῦ, Jas 5¹⁷ προσεύχεσθαι, Herm. V. III 7, 2 ἀνέβη ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν; LXX e.g. 3 Km 1³⁵ ἐνετειλάμην, Ezk 21¹¹ 1 Mac 5³⁹ ἔτομος.

3. Τῷ c. infin. is sometimes instrumental in the Koine but usually causal (Mayser II 1, 323f; II 3, 61¹⁰; Polyb.). Only once in NT and causal: 2 Co 2¹³ *had no rest because* τῷ μὴ εὐρεῖν με Τίτον (various corrections: DE ἐν τῷ μὴ; LP τὸ μὴ; S*C² τοῦ μὴ).

B. With a Preposition or Prepositional Adverb¹.

The construction was frequent enough in class. Greek, but in Hellenistic (especially NT) its frequency is proportionately far higher, particularly εἰς τό and ἐν τῷ. The prepositions occur in the following order of frequency in NT (Burton § 407): εἰς (63–72), ἐν (52–56), διὰ (27–31), μετὰ 15, πρὸς 12, πρό (9), ἀντί, ἐκ, ἕνεκεν, ἕως 1. In the Ptol. pap. on the other hand it is: διὰ 112, περί 38, μέχρι 18, πρὸς 16, ἐπὶ 15, ἕως 14, πρό 11, εἰς 10, χάριν 10, ὑπό 10, παρὰ, ἕνεκα 8, πρὸς c. dat. 7, ἐν, μετὰ 5, ἅμα, ἐκ 4, πλὴν 3, ἄνευ 2, ἀντί 1. Conspicuous is the frequency of διὰ in the Koine, and of εἰς and ἐν in Biblical Greek.

1. Διὰ τό c. infin. almost = ὅτι or διότι, denoting cause: Mt 13⁵. 6 24¹² Mk 4⁵. 6 Lk 2⁴ 6⁴⁸ 8⁶ 9⁷ etc., in Jn 2²⁴ διὰ τὸ αὐτὸν γινώσκων πάντας (om. Syr^{sin}) (the preposition with art. infin. is unusual in Jn),

¹ Mayser II 1, 324ff. Burton §§ 406–417. Goodwin §§ 800–803. Johannessohn DGPS *passim*.

Ac 4² 8¹¹ etc., Ph 1⁷ (no other ex. in Paul), Heb 7^{23f} 10², Jas 4² (parallel with *διότι* in³). LXX Ge 39⁹ Ex 16⁸ 17⁷ 19¹⁸ 33³ Dt 13⁶ 1 Mac 6⁵³ 10⁷⁷ 11² 14³⁵ 2 Mac 2¹¹ 3¹⁸. 38 4³⁰ 6¹¹ 8³⁶ 10¹³ 15¹⁷ 3 Mac 1¹¹ 5³⁰ 4 Mac 15⁴. In Mk 5⁴ it is evidential rather than causal (Burton § 408).

2. *Εἰς τό* c. inf. = *ἵνα* or *ὥστε*, expresses purpose or result in Xenophon and often in LXX and post-Christian Greek, and is difficult to distinguish from *τοῦ* c. inf.; it occurs in Heb, 1 Pt, and Jas, but especially in Paul where it expresses hardly anything but purpose (e.g. Ro 12⁸ *εἰς τό σωφρονεῖν*, while Luke favours *τοῦ* c. inf. It may also express "tendency, measure of effect, or result" (Burton § 411). In LXX: = ὧ Ge 30³⁸ *εἰς τό πιεῖν*, 32⁸ *εἰς τό σφίξασθαι*, 49¹⁵ *εἰς τό πονεῖν*, Ex 27²⁰ *εἰς φῶς καῦσαι*, 1 Mac 12³⁶ *εἰς τό διαχωρίσαι*, 2 Mac 1³ *εἰς τό σέβασθαι*, 2²⁵ *εἰς τό . . . ἀναλαβεῖν*, 3 Mac 6⁶ *εἰς τό μὴ λατρεῦσαι*, 7³ *εἰς τό . . . κολάζεσθαι*: Johannessohn DGPS 300-2. See Mayser II 1, 331 and Moulton Proleg. 220 for papyrus exx.: here it is telic, but remoter purpose is in mind, which is just the position in NT according to Moulton. It is not strictly final.

These exx. seem to be final or very near it:

Mt 20¹⁹ *εἰς τό ἐμπαῖξαι*, 26² 27³¹.—Mk 14⁵⁵ (D *ἵνα θανατώσουσιν*).—Lk 5¹⁷ (not D).—Lacking in Joh. writings.—Ac 7¹⁹.—Ro 11¹. 20 (but a causal clause follows, and so may this be; as the passage deals with divine action, however, it is better to retain the usual near-final meaning of *εἰς τό*, whatever theologians may say: i.e. RV text is correct against RSV and NEB), 3²⁶ (parall. to 2⁵ *εἰς ἔνδειξιν*), 4¹¹. 11. 18. 18 7⁴ 8²⁹, Eph 1¹², Ph 1¹⁰, 1 Th 2¹⁶ *εἰς τό ἀναπληρῶσαι* the purpose of God (final), 3⁵ *in order to know*, 1 Co 10⁶ 9¹⁸.—Heb 2¹⁷ 8⁸ (6 other exx. in Heb, all final).

These exx. may have a looser connection with what goes before. Here we are reminded of Westcott's distinction between *εἰς τό* and *ἵνα*, especially where they occur in close proximity; *εἰς τό* marks the remoter aim. Moulton (Proleg. 218ff) felt that in Heb. the use was uniformly telic, but Paul's use was not so uniform:—

Ro 12³, *φρονεῖν εἰς τό σωφρονεῖν*, 1 Co 8¹⁰ *εἰς τό ἐσθίειν* expresses a measure of effect (*leading him to eat*), 11²² *μὴ γὰρ οὐκίας οὐκ ἔχετε εἰς τό ἐσθίειν καὶ πίνειν* *houses to eat and drink in*, 2 Co 8⁶ *εἰς τό* *to such a degree that*, Ga 3¹⁷, 1 Th 2¹² either equivalent to simple infin. or to *ἵνα* after verbs of exhorting, etc., 3¹⁰ *δεόμενοι εἰς τό ἰδεῖν* = *ἵνα ἰδῶμεν*, 4⁹ same (epexegetic).—Heb 11³ *by faith we perceive that the universe was fashioned by the word of God* *εἰς τό μὴ ἐκ φαινομένων τό βλεπόμενον γεγονέναι*: perhaps consec. (NEB), but Westcott urged its final force because Heb always makes *εἰς τό* c. inf. final.—Jas 1¹⁹ *ταχύς εἰς τό ἀκοῦσαι* the infin. simply limits an adj. as it limits a noun in Ph 1²³: *τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν ἔχων εἰς τό ἀναλῦσαι* (p⁴⁶ DEFG om *εἰς* in error).

3. *Μετὰ τό* c. inf. indicates time: *after*. Mt 26³², Mk 1¹⁴ 14²⁸ 16¹⁹, Lk 12⁵ 22²⁰, Ac 1³ 7⁴ 10⁴¹ 15¹³ 19²¹ 20¹, 1 Co 11²⁵, Heb 10¹⁵. 26.—LXX Ge 5⁴ etc., Ru 2¹¹, 1 Km 1⁹ 5⁹, 1 Mac 1⁹. 20.—For Polyb. and Diod. Sic. see Krebs, *Die Präp. bei Polyb.* 61.

4. Πρὸς τὸ c. inf. indicates purpose but is sometimes weakened with *reference to*, and is much rarer than εἰς τὸ. It may express tendency and ultimate goal, rather than purpose, as in papyri.

Mt 5²⁸ ὁ βλέπων γυναίκα πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι: there is hardly any telic force, but simple accompaniment (*and*); not even consecutive 6¹ πρὸς τὸ θεαθῆναι αὐτοῖς (final), 13³⁰ 23⁵ 26¹².—Mk 13²².—Lk 18¹ πρὸς τὸ δεῖν προσεύχασθαι *with regard to*.—Ac 3¹⁹ SB (rest εἰς).—2 Co 3¹³ final, Eph 6¹¹ (DEFG εἰς), 1 Th 2⁹, 2 Th 3⁸.—Jas 3⁸ TR.

LXX: Je 34¹⁰, 1 Mac 10³⁸ 12¹⁰, 2 Mac 4⁴⁵ 5²⁷, 3 Mac 4¹¹ (all final). Polyb. 1, 48, 5.—Jos. Ant. 14, 170; 15, 148, etc.

No doubt the obvious correspondence with the Heb. לְ c. inf. assisted in the weakening of this expression in Bibl. Greek, till it means simply *in* — *ing* or is merely like a simple ptc, as in רָחֵם־לְּ.

5. Παρὰ τὸ c. inf. is not NT, but 1 Clem 39⁶. 6 = LXX Jb 4²⁰. 21 *because*, Polybius, papyri. LXX: causal Ge 29²⁰ (A om) Ex 14¹¹ Dt 9²⁸ 4 Km 1³. 6. 16 A Ba 3²⁸ Ze 3⁶ 4 Mac 10¹⁹ Dit. Syll.³ 834¹⁰.

6. Ἀντὶ τοῦ *instead of* (original meaning): Jas 4¹⁵. But causal Ezk 29⁹ 34⁷⁻⁹ 36³, pap. 113 B.C.

7. Διὰ παντός τοῦ ζῆν Heb. 2¹⁵.

8. Ἐκ τοῦ 2 Co 8¹¹ ἔχειν *according to your means* (cp. καθὸ ἂν ἔχη¹²).

9. Ἐνεκεν τοῦ 2 Co 7¹² φανερωθῆναι (ἐν. redundant, but analogy of ἐν. τοῦ ἀδικήσαντος just before. Ἐνεκα before τοῦ c. inf. in Joseph. Ant. 11, 293, and in papyri (Mayser II 1, 325), and LXX 1 Esd 8²¹ ἔνεκεν τοῦ μὴ γενέσθαι ὀργήν, Am 1⁶ 2⁴ etc., and Menander Fr. 425, 2.

10. Ἐως τοῦ Ac 8⁴⁰ ἔλθεῖν (founded on the analogy of πρὶν, and post-class.); Polyb., Joseph., etc., pap. from iii/B.C.; LXX especially frequent with ἔλθεῖν Ge 10¹⁹ 19²² 43²⁵ 1 Mac 7⁴⁵ (without τοῦ) 16⁹; Ge 3¹⁹ 8⁷ 13¹⁰ 24³³ 28¹⁵ 33³ 1 Mac 3³³ 5¹⁹. 54 14⁴¹ (Johannessohn DGPS 304).

11. Μέχρι (ἄχρι) τοῦ c. inf. (class.) not Bibl. Greek.

12. Πρὸ τοῦ *before*. In all parts of LXX (usually = ׀׀׀׀) but only twice in Isa, twice in 2-4 Mac, and not in Wi or Si (these books prefer πρὶν): Ge 17, Ex 2, Le 1, Dt 1, Jos 1, JgRu 2, 4 Km 2, Ch 2, To 5, Jdt 2, Jb 2, Ps 6, Pr 6, MP 5, Isa 2, Je 4, Ezk 1, 2 Mac 2. With pres., Jn 17⁵ εἶναι, D γενέσθαι). With aor. Mt 6⁸, Lk 22¹ 22¹⁵ Ac 23¹⁵ Jn 14⁹ 13¹⁹, Ga 2¹³ πρὸ τοῦ γὰρ ἔλθεῖν τινος. 3²³. In Ptol. pap. only aor. inf. (Mayser II 1, 327).

Of other genitive prepositions, NT has no πλὴν (class. *except*) or ὑπέρ (class. final; 2 Mac 4³⁶), and no ἀπό, ἐπί, μετά, περί, ἄνευ (Am 3⁵), χωρὶς or χάριν.

13. Ἐν τῷ c. infin.¹ is a marked feature of the style of Luke; in a temporal sense it occurs about 30 times in Lk, but only 5 in Ac. In its temporal sense it is a Hebraism and non-classical: it is the usual LXX rendering of ׀ c. infin. (Heb) and it renders ׀ c. infin. (Aram. Dan

¹ Mayser II 1. 328; Moulton-Howard 451; and see above (Introduction p. 8).

zealous RSV, 2⁵⁵ ἐν τῷ πληρῶσαι λόγον *because he fulfilled the command* RSV, 2⁵⁶ ἐν τῷ ἐπιμαρτύρασθαι τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ *because he testified in the assembly* RSV.

NT: Lk 1²¹ ἐθαύμαζον ἐν τῷ *because he delayed*, Mk 6⁴⁸ βασιανίζομένους ἐν τῷ ἐλαύνειν *by the rowing*, Ac 3²⁶ ἐν τῷ ἀποστρέφειν instr. (Je 11¹⁷), 4³⁰ similar, Heb 8¹³ ἐν τῷ λέγειν *because he says*, 2⁸ ἐν τῷ ὑποτάξει causal, or like a ptc.

It appears also in LXX in a final sense, translating ל: 1 Km 1²⁶ ἐν τῷ προσεύξασθαι *here in order to pray*.

(c) Other uses include an exegetical: He 3¹² ἐν τῷ ἀποστῆναι NEB (RSV consec.), 2 Co 2¹³ DE ἐν τῷ μὴ εὑρεῖν (see above p. 142) Preisigke Sammelbuch I 620, 6f (inscr. 97 B.C.) λείπεσθαι ἐν τῷ μὴ εἶναι ἔσυλον *is wanting in this, that it has no . . .*; 1 Clem 10¹ πιστὸς εὐρέθη ἐν τῷ αὐτὸν ὑπήκοον γενέσθαι *in this, that . . .*, Lk 12¹⁵ οὐκ ἐν τῷ περισσεύειν τινὶ ἢ ζωῇ αὐτοῦ ἐστιν.

§ 3. Cases with the Infinitive¹

1. (a) There are few exceptions in the Koine to the class. rule that the subject of a dependent infin. is not expressed again if it is the same as the subject of the independent verb; dependence of the infin. upon a preposition makes no difference. (b) If the infin. has a nominal predicate or is connected with an apposition which defines the subject of the main verb, the apposition is not a ground for altering the construction to that of accus. and infin.; however, a nominal predicate will do this sometimes. (c) Also, if the object of the infin. is identical with the object of the main verb, there need be no repetition of the object.

Examples:—

(a) Subject of infin. not expressed: Lk 24²³ λέγουσαι . . . ἑωρακέναι, Ro 1²² φάσκοντες εἶναι σοφοί, 1 Jn 2^{6. 9} ὁ λέγων ἐν αὐτῷ μένειν . . . ἐν τῷ φωτὶ εἶναι, Ti 1¹⁶ θεὸν ὁμολογοῦσιν εἰδέσθαι, Jas 2¹⁴. Also for θέλω, βούλομαι, ζητέω, etc. there are abundant exx.

(b) Nom. with infin.: Mt 19²¹ θέλεις τέλειος εἶναι, Jn 7⁴ WH ζητεῖ αὐτὸς ἐν παρρησίᾳ εἶναι (p⁸⁶ BW*D have αὐτὸ accus.; syr^{our} b e om αὐτός), Ac 18¹⁵ κριτὴς ἐγὼ τούτων οὐ βούλομαι εἶναι, Ro 9⁸ ἠγχομένη ἀνάθεμα εἶναι αὐτὸς ἐγώ, 1²² φάσκοντες εἶναι σοφοί *claiming to be wise*, Ph 4¹¹ ἔμαθον αὐτάρχης εἶναι *learned how to be*, 2 Co 10² δέομαι τὸ μὴ πάρων θαρρῆσαι *I beg that when I am present I may not be bold*, Heb 5¹² ὀφειλοντες εἶναι διδάσκαλοι, 11⁴ ἐμαρτυρήθη εἶναι δίκαιος *certified to be righteous*. The construction conflicts with that in Mk 14²⁸ (μετὰ τὸ

¹ K-G II § 475f. Schmid *Atticismus* II 57; III 81; IV 83. 620. Maysen II 1, 334ff.

ἐγερθῆναι με προάξω), Ac 5³⁶ (Θεῦδας λέγων εἶναι τινα ἐαυτόν), and Jas 4² (οὐκ ἔχετε διὰ τὸ μὴ αἰτεῖσθαι ὑμᾶς).

(c) Also if the obj. of the infin. is identical with that of the governing verb, there need be no repetition of the obj.: Ac 26²⁸ ἐν ὀλίγῳ με πείθεις Χριστιανὸν ποιῆσαι *you seek to convince me that you have made me in a moment a Christian*; a striking parallel is provided by Fridrichsen (*Coniectanea neot.* III, 1938) from Xen. Mem. I 2, 49 πείθων τοὺς συνόντας αὐτῷ σοφωτέρους ποιεῖν τῶν πατέρων (K-G II 32; Zerwick § 279^b).

2. Although class. writers preferred a personal construction it was possible to make it impersonal, and on the whole the latter is preferred in NT and Koine. But δοκέω at least has personal construction in NT: Act 17¹⁸ δοκεῖ καταγγελεὺς εἶναι, 1 Co 3¹⁸ εἴ τις δοκεῖ σοφός εἶναι; 8² 14³⁷, Ga 2⁹ etc., Jas 1²⁶ (whereas there is impersonal δοκεῖ in Herm. M. IV 2, 2; S. IX 5, 1; Clem. Hom. 10²); and we find personal ἔδοξα ἑμαυτῷ δεῖν πρᾶξαι (Ac 26⁹) as well as impersonal ἔδοξέ μοι (Lk 1³ etc., Ac 15²⁸ etc.), and there is, even in the passive, δεδοκιμάσμεθα πιστευθῆναι (1 Th. 2⁴) *we have been approved to be entrusted with*. Adjectives like δυνατός and ἰκανός have a personal construction too. Moreover, there is the personal construction with πρέπει (Heb 7²⁶). However, there is nothing like the class. λέγομαι εἶναι.

3. Quite often in the Koine and NT, although the governing verb and the infin. have the same subject, the latter will be in the accus. This is distinct from class. Greek, which has either the nominative or no noun at all with the infin. It is a Latin construction and is reproduced in Greek inscriptional translations from the Latin but, as Moulton pointed out (Proleg. 213), this perfectly natural levelling process developed in regions untouched by Latin, and no outside influence was needed to increase the tendency towards uniformity. The reflexive pronoun, and sometimes the non-reflexive pronoun, in the accus. case, is added superfluously to the infin. In class. Greek they preferred to insert a non-reflexive referring to the subject of the main verb in the nominative; so they would probably have put αὐτὸς δέ for ἐαυτόν in Ac 25⁴ (ἀπεκρίθη τηρεῖσθαι τὸν Παῦλον, ἐαυτόν δὲ μέλλειν . . .) where Luke may have deviated from class. usage into the accus. because he wished to co-ordinate the new subject with Παῦλον.

Reflexive pronoun:

Lk 23⁸ λέγοντα ἐαυτόν Χριστὸν βασιλέα εἶναι, 20²⁰ ὑποκρινομένους ἑαυτοὺς δικαίους εἶναι (D om εἶναι), Ac 5³⁶ λέγων εἶναι τινα ἐαυτόν,

8^o λέγων εἶναι τινα ἑαυτὸν μέγαν, Ro 2¹⁹ πέποιθας σεαυτὸν ὁδηγὸν εἶναι *you are sure that you are* (αὐτός would be class., as in fact in 9^o), 6¹¹ λογίζεσθε ἑαυτοὺς εἶναι νεκροὺς (hardly accus. in class. Greek), 2 Co 7¹¹ συνεστήσατε ἑαυτοὺς ἀγνοῦς εἶναι (non-reflexive with ptc. in class. Greek, Rev 2⁹ 3⁹ τῶν λεγόντων Ἰουδαίους εἶναι ἑαυτοὺς (gen. in class. Greek), Ph 3¹³ ἐγὼ ἑμαυτὸν οὕτω λογίζομαι κατελιηφέναι (superfluous ἑμαυτόν), Heb 10³⁴ γινώσκοντες ἔχειν ἑαυτοὺς κρείσσονα ὑπαρξίν.

Non-reflexive pronouns:

Lk 20⁷ D ἀπεκρίθησαν μὴ εἶδέναι αὐτοὺς πόθεν, Ac 25²¹ ἐπικαλεσαμένου τηρηθῆναι αὐτόν, Eph 4²² ἀπόθεσθαι ὑμᾶς (but a long way from governing verb ἐδιδάχθητε).

In the Ptol. pap., on the other hand, the non-refl. predominates over the reflexive (Mayser II 1, 335f).

4. The personal pronoun and not the reflexive, is added quite often when the articular infin. is introduced by a preposition: there is but one NT instance of this without a preposition (2 Co 2¹³ τῷ μὴ εὔρεϊν με Τίτον). Mt 26³² Mk 14²⁸ μετὰ τὸ ἐγερθῆναι με προάξω (for αὐτός), Mt 27¹² Lk 2⁴ ἀνέβη . . . διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτόν (superfluous pronoun), 19¹¹ 9³⁴ 10³⁵ 22¹⁵, Ac 1³ παρέστησεν ἑαυτὸν ζῶντα μετὰ τὸ παθεῖν αὐτόν, 4³⁰ 8⁴⁰ 19²¹D, Ro 1²⁰ καθορᾶται . . . εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτοὺς ἀναπολογήτους, 3⁴ OT, Heb 7²⁴ (superfl. αὐτόν), Jas 4² οὐκ ἔχετε διὰ τὸ μὴ αἰτεῖσθαι ὑμᾶς, Jn 2²⁴. Frequent in Hermas (V. II 1, 3; M. IV 1, 7; S. VI 1, 5; VIII 2, 5. 9; 6, 1; IX 6, 8; 18, 3). Papyri (Mayser II 1, 336).

5. The infin. is often used alone, where in class. Greek they would have employed the full accus. c. infin. construction.

Mt 23²³ εἶδει ποιῆσαι (sc. ὑμᾶς), Lk 22⁶ ἦν αὐτῷ κερηματοσιμένον μὴ ἰδεῖν θάνατον (sc. αὐτόν), Ac 12¹⁵ ἡ δὲ δι᾿ ἄσχυρῆτος οὕτως ἔχειν (sc. ταῦτα, as in 24⁹), Ro 13⁵ ἀνάγκη ὑποτάσσεσθαι, Heb 13⁶ p⁴⁶ M ὥστε θαρροῦντας λέγειν (rest add ἡμᾶς), 1 Pt 2¹⁵ φημοῦν (sc. ὑμᾶς?). Mayser II 1, 336f.

6. The accus. c. infin. is restricted in use in the Koine in comparison with class. Greek, the ὅτι periphrasis having taken its place in nearly all NT writers according to the tendency of later Greek. But there is still a place for accus. c. infin., after verbs of stating, showing, perceiving, making, allowing, and κελεύω (where the obj. is a different person from the subject). Then there is ἐγένετο and συνέβη and similar expressions like δεῖ and ἀνάγκη. Some anomalies occur, as when the accus. inadvertently remains (as sometimes in class. Greek) even

although the infin. is replaced by *ἵνα* or *ὅτι*: Mk 12⁴ οἶδά σε τίς εἶ, Lk 13²⁵ οὐκ οἶδα ὑμᾶς πόθεν ἐστέ, Mk 11³² εἶχον τὸν Ἰωάννην ὅτι προφήτης ἦν, Jn 9²⁹ τοῦτον δὲ οὐκ οἶδαμεν πόθεν ἐστίν, Ac 3¹⁰ 4¹³ 16³ p⁴⁵DEH ἤδειςαν τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ ὅτι Ἑλληγ ὑπῆρχεν, 27¹⁰, 2 Th 2⁴ ἀποδεικνύντα ἑαυτὸν ὅτι ἐστίν θεός.

7. The accus. c. inf. occurs as well as gen. or dat. c. infin. (especially in Luke).

(a) with verbs of commanding: Mk 6²⁷ ἐπέταξεν ἐνεχθῆναι τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ, Ac 15² ἔταξαν ἀναβαίνειν Παῦλον, 10⁴⁸ προσέταξεν αὐτοὺς βαπτισθῆναι. Dative:—Mk 6³⁹ etc. Ac 22¹⁰ 1 Co 5¹¹ ἔγραψα ὑμῖν μὴ συναναμίγυσθαι, Rev 3¹⁸ συμβουλεύω σοι ἀγοράσαι παρ' ἐμοῦ. N.B. λέγω c. dat. Mt 5³⁴. 39 Lk 12¹³ Ac 21⁴, c. accus. Mk 5⁴³ Lk 19¹⁵ Ac 22²⁴.

(b) with impers. expressions: ἔξεστιν, ἔθος ἐστίν, ἀθέμιτον αἰσχρὸν καλὸν ἐστίν, συμφέρει. Accus.:—Jn 18¹⁴ συμφέρει ἕνα ἀνθρωπὸν ἀποθανεῖν, Mt 17⁴ Mk 9⁵ Lk 9³³ καλὸν ἐστίν ἡμᾶς ὧδε εἶναι, Ro 13¹¹ ὦρα ἡμᾶς ἐγερθῆναι (ἡμῖν class.), Mk 9⁴⁵ καλὸν ἐστίν σε εἰσελθεῖν . . . χωλόν, Mk 9⁴³. 47 (vl. σοι and σε), Mt 18⁹ σοι. Dative:—Lk 2³⁸ ἦν αὐτῷ κεχρηματισμένον μὴ ἰδεῖν θάνατον, Ac 5⁹ συνεφανήθη ὑμῖν πειράσαι. Wavering:—Mt 3¹⁵ πρέπον ἐστίν ἡμῖν πληρῶσαι (S* ἡμᾶς), Mk 2²⁶ ἔξεστιν c. accus. SBL (c. dat. ACDW), Lk 6⁴ ἔξεστιν c. accus. (D dat., like Mt 12⁴), 20²² ἔξεστιν c. accus. (CDW dat.), [Mk 10² ἔξεστιν dat.] [P. Lille 26⁶ (iii/v.c.) ἔξεστιν accus.], 1 Co 11¹³ πρέπον ἐστίν accus., papyri Mayser II 1, 338.

(c) With ἐγένετο¹ often: e.g. Ac 9³ ἐγ. αὐτὸν ἐγγίζειν, 16¹⁶ ἐγ. δὲ . . . παιδισκὴν τινὰ ὑπαντῆσαι ἡμῖν, and even after a dat.: 22⁶ ἐγένετο δὲ μοι . . . περιεστράψαι φῶς. This is sometimes so, even when the person in the dat. is the same as in the accus.: 22¹⁷ ἐγ. μοι . . . γενέσθαι με, Ga 6¹⁴ p⁴⁶ ἐμοὶ δὲ μὴ γένοιτό με καυχᾶσθαι (rest om με).

(d) With verbs of asking, etc. (ἐρωτάω, παρακαλέω, αἰτέομαι, ἀξιόω, παραινέω) the accus. c. inf. may follow: Ac 13²⁸ ἠτήσαντο Πειλάτον ἀναιρεθῆναι αὐτόν, 1 Th 5²⁷ ὀρκίζω ὑμᾶς ἀναγνωσθῆναι τὴν ἐπιστολὴν, Ac 21¹² παρεκαλοῦμεν τοῦ μὴ ἀναβαίνειν αὐτόν. But with δέομαι the gen. follows: Lk 9⁸⁸ δέομαι σου ἐπιβλέψαι, Ac 26³ (δέομαι ἡμᾶς is class.).

(e) Often there is accus. c. inf., although it stands in apposition to a pronoun in the gen. or dat.: e.g. Lk 17³¹ τοῦ δοῦναι ἡμῖν . . . ῥυσθέντας λατρεύειν, Ac 15²². 25 (ABL dat.) etc., Ga 6¹⁴ p⁴⁶, Heb 2¹⁰ [2 Pt 2²¹ κρεῖττον ἦν αὐτοῖς μὴ ἐπεγνωκέναι . . . ἢ ἐπιγνοῦσιν ὑποστρέψαι is classically correct; Lk 9⁵⁹ (but accus. in DΘ), Ac 27³ SAB (but accus. in HLP)].

¹ But the dat. and infin. is more usual with ἐγένετο: Ac 11²⁶ ἐγένετο αὐτοῖς διδάξαι, 20¹⁶, Ga 6¹⁴, P. Par. 26 (163 v.c.) ὑμῖν γίνονται κρατεῖν.

CHAPTER ELEVEN

THE VERB: ADJECTIVE-FORMS: PARTICIPLE

THE USE OF the participle¹ is more lavish in Greek than in Latin. We are here discussing its substantival, adverbial, attributive, and predicative uses, leaving the genitive and accusative absolute for a later chapter. The predicative use (e.g. *παύομαι λέγων*), which supplements the main verbal idea, is on its way out. The adverbial use (e.g. *1 Ti 1¹³ ἀγνοῶν ἐποίησα*) is still strong, and so are the attributive and substantival. As far as forms go, the fut. is in eclipse (see pp. 86f, 135). For *Aktionsart*, see above pp. 86f. For periphrastic conjugation, see above p. 89.

The participle is not so much a mood, as an adjective, and so its modal function will be apparent only from the context. The ptc. standing independently as a main verb may be like an indicative or an imperative, but the NT and papyri instances are not difficult to explain as true participles (see p. 343).

§ 1. Substantival Participle

The neuter ptc., usually with article (as class.), is often used in the Koine to designate an abstract or concrete noun, whether individually or collectively. It is also used with masc. or fem. article of a person. The neuter is not so frequent as in class. Greek. For papyri, Mayser II 1, 346ff.

(a) *Personal*. Articular: these have pres. tense where we expect aor., esp. Mk 5¹⁵.¹⁶ *ὁ δαίμονιζόμενος* even after his healing; action (time or variety) is irrelevant and the ptc. has become a proper name,

¹ K-G I 197-200; II 46-113. Stahl 680-761. Schwyzer II 384ff. Moulton Einl. 284-288; 352-368. Mayser II 1, 339-357. Jannaris 489-506. Wackernagel I 281-294. Radermacher² 205-210. H. Balsler, *De linguae Graecae participio in neutro genere substantive posito*², Leipzig 1878. C. B. Williams, *The Participle in the Book of Acts*, Diss. Chicago 1909. H. B. Robinson, *Syntax of the Participle in the Apostolic Fathers*, Chicago 1915. C. O. Gillis, *Greek Participles in the Doctrinal Epistles of Paul*, Diss. of S-W. Bapt. Sem., 1937. W. K. Pritchett, "Μή with the Participle," *AJP* 79, 1958, 392ff.

it may be under Hebraic influence, insofar as the Heb. ptc. is also timeless and is equally applicable to past, pres. and fut. So also Heb 7⁹ ὁ δεκάτας λαμβάνων, Ph 3⁶ διώκων τὴν ἐκκλησίαν. Sometimes the pres. has its proper durative force, e.g. 1 Th 1¹⁰ ὁ ρυόμενος ἡμᾶς (Jesus' work is durative), 2¹² (5²⁴) ὁ καλῶν ὑμᾶς, 4⁸ ὁ διδοῦς τὸ πν. αὐτοῦ. . . . Virtually a proper name: ὁ ἐρχόμενος (fut), Mt 26⁴⁶ ὁ παραδιδούς με (*my betrayer*), Mk 1⁴ 6¹⁴. 2⁴ ὁ βαπτίζων (*the Baptizer*), Jn 8¹⁸ ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ μαρτυρῶν, 6⁸⁸, Ac 17¹⁷ τοὺς παρατυγχάνοντας (*casual passers-by* NEB), Ro 2¹ ὁ κρίνων (*you the judge*), Ro 8³⁴ τίς ὁ κατακρινῶν, Eph 4²⁸ ὁ κλέπτων (generic), LXX 1 Km 16⁴ ὁ βλέπων (gen.), Si 28¹ ὁ ἐκδικῶν (gen.). This ptc. can have an obj. or complement: Jn 1²⁹ ὁ ἄλρων (*the sin-bearer*), Ga 1²³ ὁ διώκων ἡμᾶς (*our persecutor*), Mt 27⁴⁰, BU 388 III 16 ὁ παρὰ Πτολεμαῖδος ἀργυρώματα λαβών.

Anarthrous: Mt 2⁶ OT ἡγούμενος *prince*, Mk 1³ OT φωνὴ βοῶντος *voice of a herald*, Lk 3¹⁴ στρατευόμενοι, Ro 3^{11f} OT BG(A) (*rest art.* LXX Ps 13 (14)^{11f} usually anarth.), Rev 2¹⁴ ἔχεις ἐκεῖ κρατοῦντας.

With πᾶς, usually articular (unless it means *every*): Mt 5²² πᾶς ὁ ὀργιζόμενος, 28. 32 πᾶς ὁ ἀπολύων *anyone who divorces*, 7²⁶ πᾶς ὁ ἀκούων *any hearer*, 8 πᾶς ὁ αἰτῶν λαμβάνει *every beggar receives*, Lk 6³⁰ ADPR 47 etc., Ac 1¹⁹ πᾶσι τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν, 10⁴³ 13³⁹, Ro 1¹⁶ 2¹ etc. Anarthrous: Mt 13¹⁹ παντὸς ἀκούοντος, Lk 11⁴ παντὶ ὀφείλοντι, 6³⁰ SBW, 2 Th 2⁴, Rev 22¹⁵.

(b) *Neuter*: Mt 1²⁰ τὸ ἐν αὐτῇ γεννηθέν *her unborn baby*, 2¹⁵ and often τὸ ῥηθέν, Lk 2²⁷ κατὰ τὸ εἰθισμένον (D ἔθος), 12³⁸. 44 τὰ ὑπάρχοντα *property* (8³), 3¹³ τὸ διατεταγμένον ὑμῖν *your assessment*, 4¹⁶ τὸ εἰωθὸς αὐτῷ *his custom*, 8⁵⁶ τὸ γεγονός *the occurrence*, 9⁷ τὰ γινόμενα *happenings*, Jn 16¹³ τὰ ἐρχόμενα *the future*, 1 Co 12⁸ τὰ ἐξουθενημένα . . . τὰ μὴ ὄντα . . . τὰ ὄντα, 7³⁵ 10³³ Sc τὸ . . . συμφέρον (but *rest σύμφορον*) *your welfare*, 10²⁷ πᾶν τὸ παρατιθέμενον, 14⁷. 9 τὸ αὐλούμενον, etc., 2 Co 3^{10f} τὸ δεδοξασμένον, τὸ καταργούμενον, 2 Th 2⁶ τὸ κατέχον, Heb 12¹⁰ κατὰ τὸ δοκοῦν αὐτοῖς . . . ἐπὶ τὸ συμφέρον, 12¹¹ πρὸς τὸ παρόν, P. Fay. 91, 28 κατὰ τὰ προγεγραμμένα, BU 362 V 9 τὰ κελυσοθέντα; in Hell. Greek τὸ συνειδός = *conscience* (but a noun in Paul). Ambiguous is τὰ διαφέροντα (Ro 2¹⁸ Ph 1¹⁰; see ICC in loc.): either *different values* (= *moral distinctions* NEB) or *superior things* (RV, RSV, Lat. *utiliora*).

§ 2. Attributive Participle

Normally the ptc. ὢν is used with the predicate when further defining words are added to the predicate, e.g. Ac 14¹³ SB ὁ τε ἱερεὺς τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ ὄντος πρὸ τῆς πόλεως, 28¹⁷ τρὸς ὄντας τῶν Ἰουδαίων πρώτους, Ro 8²⁸ τοῖς κατὰ πρόθεσιν κλητοῖς οὖσιν, 2 Co 11³¹ ὁ ὢν εὐλογητὸς εἰς . . . , 1 Ti 1¹³ τὸν πρότερον ὄντα βλάσφημον. There is no need for ὢν where the predicate stands alone. The redundant use of ὢν is however characteristic of Ac and the Ptol. papyri: Ac 5¹⁷ ἡ οὖσα αἴρεσις τῶν Σαδδουκαίων, 13¹ τῆν

οὔσαν ἐκκλησίαν, 14¹³ D τοῦ ὄντος Διὸς πρὸ πόλεως, Ro 13¹ αἱ δὲ οὔσαι, Eph 1¹ p⁴⁶ D τοῖς ἁγίοις οὔσιν καὶ πιστοῖς (which thus need not be rejected), P. Tebt. 309 (ii/A.D.) ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄντος ἐν κώμῃ [τοῦ ἱεροῦ] θεοῦ . . . , P. Lille 29, 11 (iii/B.C.) τοὺς νόμους τοὺς περὶ τῶν οἰκετῶν ὄντας. It is conclusive from the papyri that the ὄν is somewhat redundant and means little more than *current* or *existent*. Translate *the local Zeus* (14¹³D), *the local church* (13¹), *the local school of the Sadducees* (5¹⁷); see *Beginnings* IV 56, Schwyzer II 409, Mayser II 1, 347f, Moulton Einl. 360.

The attributive ptc. stands both with and without the article and is equivalent to a relative clause: Mt 17²⁷ τὸν ἀναβάντα πρῶτον ἰχθύν, 25³⁴ τὴν ἐτοιμασμένην ὑμῖν βασιλείαν *which has been prepared*, Mk 3²² οἱ γραμματεῖς οἱ ἀπὸ Ἱεροσολύμων καταβάντες, 5²⁵ γυνή οὔσα ἐν ῥύσει αἵματος, 14²⁴ τὸ αἶμα . . . τὸ ἐχχυννόμενον (pres.), Lk 6⁴⁸ ὁμοίός ἐστιν ἀνθρώπῳ οἰκοδομοῦντι οἰκίαν (= a rel. clause in the parallel Mt 7²⁴), 10³⁷ ὁ ποιήσας τὸ ἔλεος, 15¹² τὸ ἐπιβάλλον μέρος τῆς οὐσίας, Ro 3⁵ μὴ ἄδικος ὁ θεὸς ὁ ἐπιφέρων τὴν ὀργήν; Ga 3²¹ νόμος ὁ δυνάμενος ζωοποιῆσαι. Anarthrous: Ac 19²⁴ Δημήτριος . . . ποιῶν ναοὺς ἀργυροῦς *Demetrius, a maker of silver shrines* (attrib.) or *because he made* (adverbial), Heb 7⁸ ἀποθνήσκοντες ἄνθρωποι *mortal men* (attrib.) not adverbial. We must distinguish the attributive ptc. from a simple apposition (e.g. οἱ δὲ Φαρισαῖοι ἀκούσαντες εἶπον Mt 12²⁴, not *the Pharisees who heard*).

Also equivalent to a relative clause is the very frequent apposition ὁ λεγόμενος, (ἐπι)καλούμενος, with proper name following, always with an article after the person or object named: Mt 1¹⁸ Ἰησοῦς ὁ λεγόμενος Χριστός, Jn 5² κολυμβήθρα ἡ ἐπιλεγόμενη . . . Βηθεσδά (S* τὸ λεγόμενον; W τῇ ἐπιλεγομένῃ) [the omission of ἡ D is an atticistic correction¹ made by those who were oblivious of NT usage], Ac 1¹² ἄνδρες τοῦ καλουμένου ἐλαιῶνος, 10¹⁸ Σίμων ὁ ἐπικαλούμενος Πέτρος (rel. clause 10^{5. 32}), Rev 12⁹ ὁ ὄφις . . . ὁ καλούμενος Διάβολος.

Whereas in class. Greek a relative clause would have been more correct after an anarthrous noun, in NT we often find an articular ptc., especially if it imparts some information which is well known, perhaps because of misunderstanding of an underlying Semitic ptc. (Moule 103), although it is not quite peculiar

¹ In cl. Attic the art. was not placed before the ptc., but before the proper noun. BU 512, 2 παρὰ Σύρου Συρίωνος ἐπικαλουμένου Πετακά is half-way between class, and NT usage.

to Biblical Greek, viz. BU 416³ καμήλους δύο θηλείας αἱ κεχαραγμέναι = *who were*

Mk 15⁴¹ ἄλλαι πολλαὶ αἱ συναναβάσαι, Lk 7³² παιδίοις τοῖς ἐν ἀγορᾷ καθημένοις, Jn 12¹² ὄχλος πολὺς (BL add art.) ὁ ἐλθὼν, Ac 4¹² οὐδὲ γὰρ ὄνομά ἐστιν ἕτερον τὸ δεδομένον = ὁ ἐδόθη, 1 Co 2⁷ θεοῦ σοφίαν . . . τὴν κεκρυμμένην, 1 Pt 1⁷ χρυσοῦ τοῦ ἀπολλυμένου, 2 Jn⁷ ὅτι πολλοὶ πλάνοι . . . οἱ μὴ ὁμολογοῦντες, Jude⁴ τινες ἄνθρωποι οἱ πάλαι προγεγραμμένοι. Unclassical also is the ellipse of the art. in 1 Pt 3^{19, 20} with a ptc. which follows a definite antecedent: τοῖς . . . πνεύμασιν . . . ἀπειθήσασιν ποτε. But after τινες the articular ptc. is classical (Stahl 691, 694): Lk 18⁹ πρὸς τινὰς τοὺς πεποιθότας ἐφ' ἑαυτοῖς, Ga 1⁷ εἰ μὴ τινὲς εἰσὶν οἱ ταράσσοντες ὑμᾶς, Col 2⁸. Mk 14⁴ is not an instance because here we have a periphrastic tense: ἦσαν τινες ἀγανακτοῦντες. Lysias 19, 57 (v-iv/b.c.) εἰσὶ τινες οἱ προαναλίσκοντες. Also cp. the class. Greek construction οὐδεὶς (ἐστίν) ὁ with fut. ptc.

We also find in the NT, as in class. Greek, the articular ptc. dependent on a personal pronoun: Jn 1¹² αὐτοῖς . . . τοῖς πιστεύουσιν, Ac 13¹⁶ (sc. ὑμεῖς), Ro 9²⁰ σὺ τίς εἶ ὁ ἀνταποκρινόμενος (Jas 4¹² σὺ τίς εἶ ὁ κρίνων [vl. ὁς κρίνεις]), 14⁴, 1 Co 8¹⁰ (p⁴⁶ B om σε). In some passages we must supply the pronoun, esp. with the imper.: Mt 7²³ OT 27⁴⁰, Lk 6²⁵, Heb 4³ 6¹⁸.

§ 3. Adverbial Participle ¹

This circumstantial ptc. differs from a supplementary ptc. in that the latter cannot without impairing the sense be detached from the main verbal idea, whereas the circumstantial is equivalent to a separate participial clause. Such clauses may be either syntactically "joined" to the construction of the sentence, or they may be "absolute". Normally the clause will have reference to some noun or pronoun in the sentence agreeing with it in gender and number and case, but it may be syntactically independent in an isolated construction (see below, p. 322).

The relationship of this ptc. to the predicate may be of time, manner, cause, purpose, condition, or concession. This is not expressed by the ptc. itself, unless fut., but it is learned from the context or else from some added particle like καίπερ, ἅμα, εὐθύς, ποτέ, νῦν. The Koine does not on the whole favour this

¹ K-G II 77ff. Stahl 681ff. Moulton Einl. 363ff. Mayser II 1, 384ff.

method but prefers a prepositional phrase, a true temporal (etc.) clause, or a further co-ordinate sentence; thus Luke prefers *κατὰ ἀγνοίαν ἐπράξατε* (Ac 3¹⁷) to *ἀγνοῶν ἐποίησα* (1 Ti 1¹³).

(a) *Modal-temporal* is the most frequent kind of adverbial participial phrase in NT and Koine, as well as elsewhere. Often there is no stress whatever on the temporal relationship.

Mt 19²² ἀπῆλθεν λυπούμενος *in sorrow*, Mk 11⁵ *what do you mean by loosing?* Mt 27⁴ *by betraying*, 21⁶ 13² 61⁷ 19²².—Mk 17.—Jn 16⁸.—Ac 21³².—1 Ti 1¹³.—1 Pt 5¹⁰.—BU 467, 15 etc. With *ἄμα*:—Mk 12²⁸ D Ac 24²⁶ 27⁴⁰ Col 1¹² p⁴⁶B, 4³. With *εὐθὺς*:—Mk 6²⁵. With *οὕτως* (modal), class., in NT in Ac only: 20¹¹. 25 27¹⁷.

Under this head should be included the large number of pleonastic participles in Biblical Greek (for pleon. ptc. in Ptol. pap., see Mayser II 1, 349). Apart from verbs of speaking (see below) the ptes are *ἄγων* (pap.), *ἀρξάμενος*, *ἔχων* (pap.), *φέρων* (pap.), and (most used in NT) *λαβών*. These often have the meaning of the preposition *with*: Mt 15³⁰ (BU 909, 8) *ἔχοντες μεθ' ἑαυτῶν* (double pleonasm), LXX Ge 24¹⁵ *ἔχουσα τὴν ὕδριαν ἐπὶ τῶν ὄμων αὐτῆς*, 1 Mac 8⁶ *ἔχοντα ἑκατὸν εἴκοσι ἐλέφαντας*, Mt 25¹ *παραλαβών, λαβών*, Mk 14³ *ἔχουσα ἀλάβαστρον μύρου*, Lk 24^{2D}, Ac 21²³ *εὐχὴν ἔχοντες ἀφ' ἑαυτῶν*, Jn 18³ *with a detachment* = Mt 26⁴⁷ *μετ' αὐτοῦ*; much of this is paralleled in the Koine. But *λαβών* and some other merely descriptive ptes. seem to owe their origin in Bibl. Greek to a Hebraic pattern. In Heb. such a ptc. indicates a movement or an attitude which precedes an action. Usually it is superfluous, but it can have its justification sometimes, perhaps very slightly temporal: Mt 13³¹. 33 14¹⁹ 21³⁵. 39 etc. LXX Jdt 12¹⁹ *καὶ λαβοῦσα ἔφαγε καὶ ἔπιε*, Nu 7⁶ 1 Esd 3¹³. So *ἀναστάς* (ⲁⲛⲉ) and verbs of "departure": Mt 2²⁰ *ἐγερθείς*; 26⁶² *ἀναστάς*, Mk 10¹, Lk 15¹⁸. 20 24¹², Ac 5¹⁷ 8²⁷ 9⁶. 11. 34. 39 10²⁰ 11⁷ 22¹⁰. 16, LXX Ge 22³ Nu 22²⁰; Mt 13²⁸. 46 *ἀπελθών*, 25¹⁸. 25; Mt 28 25¹⁶ 21⁶ Lk 7²² 13³² 14¹⁰ *πορευθείς*; 15²⁵ *ἐρχόμενος*; LXX Ge 21¹⁴ Ex 12²¹ *ἀπελθόντες*; Ge 45²⁸ 1 Mac 7⁷ *πορευθείς*; all these verbs after Heb. *גָּחַן*. After Heb. *בָּשׂ* is *καθίσας*: Mt 13⁴⁸ Lk 5³ 14³¹ 16⁶, LXX Nu 11⁴ Dt 1⁴⁵.

Reminiscent of the class. *ἀρχόμενος* *at the beginning*, *ἀρξάμενος* occurs with meaning *from . . . onwards* (class., and Lucian *somn.* 15 *ἀπὸ τῆς ἔω ἀρξάμενος ἀχρι πρὸς ἐσπέραν*) and pleonastically (perhaps

again, through Heb. influence)¹: LXX Ge 44¹² ἀπὸ τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου ἀρξάμενος (+ ἕως . . . unclass.), Mt 20^{8f}, Lk 23⁵, 24²⁷ ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ Μωϋσεως, 47 ἀπὸ Ἰερουσαλήμ, Jn 8⁹ ἀπὸ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων (+ ἕως τῶν ἐσχάτων unclass.), Ac 1²² + ἄχρι, 8⁵⁵ ἀπὸ τῆς γραφῆς ταύτης, 11⁴ ἀρξάμενος Πέτρος ἐξετίθετο αὐτοῖς καθεξῆς, only slightly pleonastic, as the emph. is on καθεξῆς; cp. LXX Jg 19⁶ ἀρξάμενος (B ἄγε δὴ) αὐλλίσθητι, Jb 6⁹, Xen. of Eph. 5, 7, 9 ἀρξάμενη κατέχομαι. The Hebraism προσθεὶς ἔφη is similar (see below p. 227). But besides the pleonastic ptc., parataxis with καὶ is possible, also on the Heb. model; use of the participial phrase is reduced in Biblical Greek through this co-ordination. In LXX the ptc. has yielded to parataxis under Heb. influence: cp. Ge 32²² ἀναστὰς δὲ τὴν νύκτα ἐκείνην ἔλαβε τὰς δύο γυναῖκας . . . καὶ διέβη with 32²⁸ καὶ ἔλαβεν αὐτοὺς καὶ διέβη. NT authors however usually have recourse to the ptc.; but exx. of parataxis are Lk 22¹⁷ λάβετε τοῦτο καὶ διαμερίσατε, Ac 8²⁶ ἀνάστηθι καὶ πορεύου (but D ἀναστὰς πορεύθητι), 9¹¹ B lat copt ἀνάστα πορεύθητι (rest ἀναστὰς), 10²⁰ D* ἀνάστα κατὰβηθι (rest ἀναστὰς), 3 Km 19⁵. 7 T. Abr B 110²⁰.

Very frequent also in NT are the pleonastic participles λέγων, εἰπών, ἀποκριθεὶς, etc. In both LXX and NT the λέγων which corresponds to ܠܘܢܐ appears repeatedly after ἀποκρίνομαι, λαλέω, κρᾶζω, παρακαλέω, etc., and often we have the formula ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν² (but not in Jn): twice in second part of Ac (19¹⁵ 25⁹) LXX Ge 18⁹; it is the LXX tr. of ܘܡܢܗ ܝܘܢܝ, whereas the asyndetic ἀπεκρίθη λέγων in Jn may be Aramaic; there never occurs ἀποκρινόμενος εἶπεν (Plato) or ἀπεκρίθη εἰπών.

This was already in slight use in class. Greek (Hdt ἔφη λέγων, εἰρώτα λέγων, ἔλεγε φάς), and can with little effort be paralleled in the Ptol. pap. Although the ptc. here has an obj. it does occur without: UPZ I 6³⁰ (163 B.C.) ἀπεκρίθησαν ἡμῖν φήσαντες, P. Giss. 36¹⁰ (135 B.C.) τάδε λέγει Ἄ. καὶ Ἄ. καὶ . . . αἱ τέτταρες λέγουσαι ἐξ ἑνὸς στόματος (Mayser II 3, 63¹⁴). However, λέγων is not pleonastic if the preceding verb governs an obj.: BU 624¹⁵ πολλὰ γὰρ ἠρώτησε λέγων ὅτι δουλεύσω, P. Par. 51²³ καὶ πάλιν ἤξιωκα τὸν Σάραπιν καὶ τὴν Ἰσιν λέγων. Ἔλθε . . . Pleonastic for certain are:—BU 523⁶ καὶ ἀντέγραφας λέγων . . . πέμψον, P. Par. 35³⁰ ἀπεκρίθησαν ἡμῖν φήσαντες. There is no doubt, however,

¹ On pleonastic ἀρχομαι see J. W. Hunkin, "Pleonastic ἀρχομαι in the NT", *JThS*, 25, 1924, 390-402; G. Delling in Kittel WB I 477; Lagrange *S. Luc* CVI.

² Mt 25⁹ (pl.), 37. 44 (fut.), Mk 15⁹ (D ἀποκριθεὶς λέγει), Jn 12²³ (pres.), Ac 15¹³ (not D). Ἀπεκρίνατο λέγων LXX Ezk 9¹¹B (rare). Note the difference between Synoptists and Jn. The Synoptists follow LXX but are more idiomatic in that they put the Heb. main verb in the ptc. (ἀποκριθεὶς); but Jn does not favour the ptc. and even prefers asyndeton. He also avoids the other redundant ptes. of the Synoptists: ἐλθών, ἀφείς, ἀναστὰς. He prefers co-ordination.

that such expressions when used on a large scale, as in Bibl. Greek, point away from the popular language to a specialized Semitic background. Cp. the concentration of ἀποκριθεὶς (ἀπεκρίθη καὶ) εἶπεν in Rec. B of T. Abr.: 106⁴. 11. 18 107¹B 108¹. 21. 23 110⁷. 16. 21 111¹⁸ 112⁶. 9 113⁹ 114⁶ 118¹⁵.

Λέγων occurs with other verbs too, especially in Luke, John and Paul. Thoroughly Septuagintal is Lk 1⁶³ ἔγραψεν λέγων (*as follows*), LXX 2 Km 11¹⁵ ἔγραψεν ἐν βιβλίῳ λέγων, 4 Km 10⁶, 1 Mac 11⁵⁷ (see Klostermann on the passage in Lk);

Also Lk 5²¹ ἤρξαντο διαλογίζεσθαι . . . λέγοντες (12¹⁷); Mt 15²³ ἠρώτων λέγοντες, 26⁷⁰ ἠρνήσατο λέγων (cp. Ac 7³⁵ εἰπόντες), Lk 12¹⁶ 20³ εἶπεν λέγων, Jn 1³² ἐμαρτύρησεν λέγων (S* e om λέγων), 4³¹ 9² (D om) etc. ἠρώτων (-τησαν) λέγοντες, 19¹² ἐκραύαζον (vl. ἐκραζον) λέγοντες (S* ἔλεγον for ἐκρ. λ.), Mt 8²⁹ ἐκραζαν λέγοντες, 14³⁰ etc. Other participles of *saying* occur with these verbs: Lk 5¹³ ἤψατο εἰπών, 22⁸ ἀπέστειλεν εἰπών, Ac 7³⁵ ἠρνήσαντο εἰπόντες (prob. not pleon.), 21¹⁴ ἠσυχάσαμεν εἰπόντες, 22²⁴ ἐκέλευσεν . . . εἶπας, Jn 11²⁸ ἐφώνησεν τὴν ἀδελφὴν εἰπούσα (not pleon. = *with the words*); Mt 2⁸ πέμψας εἶπεν *sent with the words*, Mk 5⁷ κράζας λέγει (D εἶπε), 9²⁴ κράζας ἔλεγεν (DΘ λέγει; p⁴⁵ W εἶπεν), Ac 13²² εἶπεν μαρτυρήσας.

Moreover, in Heb. *answered* is followed by אָמַן and so, besides ἀπεκρίθη λέγων, the NT and LXX also have ἀπ. καὶ εἶπεν (often Jn, not Mt, rarely Mk Lk), the participial construction thus giving way in Bibl. Greek to the paratactic: ἀπεκρίθη καὶ εἶπεν Jn 14²³ 18³⁰ 20²⁸ etc. (Jn almost always so, unless ἀπ. stands without addition), Lk 17²⁰, LXX Je 11⁵ ἀπεκρίθη καὶ εἶπα, Mk 7²⁸ ἀπεκρίθη καὶ λέγει. With other verbs (in Jn especially): 1²⁵ ἠρώτησαν αὐτὸν καὶ εἶπαν αὐτῷ, 9²⁸ ἐλοιδόρησαν αὐτὸν καὶ εἶπαν, 13²¹ ἐμαρτύρησαν καὶ εἶπεν, 18²⁵ ἠρνήσατο καὶ εἶπεν, Lk 8²⁸D, Ro 10²⁰ ἀποτολμᾷ καὶ λέγει.

Thoroughly Septuagintal also is the addition of the ptc. of the same verb in order to strengthen the verbal idea. It renders the Hebrew Infinitive Absolute¹, being the nearest approach to the infin., since the infin. itself would be too literal. It is very rare indeed in secular Greek; better Greek would render the Inf. Absol. idea by means of the dat. of the verbal substantive, and yet in the LXX it is rendered 171 times by the ptc. (against 123 by the dat., 23 by accus., and 5 through an adverb). E.g. Ge

¹ K-G II 99f. Moulton Einl. 118f. H. St. John Thackeray, "The Infinitive Absolute in the LXX," *JThS* 9, 1908, 597ff; *OT Grammar* 48f. Johannessohn DGKPS 57.

22¹⁷ εὐλογῶν εὐλογήσω σε, 26²⁸ ἰδόντες ἐωράκαμεν, Ex 3⁷ ἰδὼν ἰδον, Jb 6¹, 1 Km 20³. In NT, only in LXX-quotations: Mt 13¹⁴ βλέποντες βλέψετε, Ac 7³⁴ ἰδὼν εἶδον, Heb 6¹⁴ εὐλογῶν εὐλογήσω σε καὶ πληθύνων πληθύνω σε, Eph 5⁵ ἵστε γινώσκοντες (uncertain textually), 1 Clem 12⁵ γινώσκουσα γινώσκω, P. Tebt. II 421¹² (iii/A.D.) ἐρχόμενος δὲ ἔρχου (ε)ἰς Θεογονίδα (but this may not be an instance: simply *when you come, come to Th.*).

(b) *Causal use.* This follows the class. pattern in the Koine, except that in NT we do not find ἄτε, οἶον or οἶα (papyri). Mt 11⁹ δίκαιος ὢν (= ὅτι), Lk 10²⁹ θέλων δικαιῶσαι ἑαυτόν, Ac 19³⁶ ἀναντιρρήτων . . . ὄντων τούτων, 23¹⁸ ἔχοντά τι λαλῆσαι σοι *because he has something to say*, 2 Co 12¹⁶ ὑπάρχων πανοῦργος, 1 Th 5⁸; Phm⁹ is ambiguous (causal or concessive), so also Ga 2³. The papyri show a hybrid construction, beginning with διὰ τό c. inf. and ending with the causal ptc.: P. Par. 12²¹ διὰ τὸ χωλὸν ὄντα, P. Leip. 108⁵ διὰ τὸ ἐμὲ μετριῶς ἔχοντα.

(c) *Concessive use.* Not frequent. Koine has καίπερ, καίτοι, and καὶ ταῦτα, like NT. Mt 7¹¹ πονηροὶ ὄντες, Ac 19³⁷, 17²⁷ καὶ γε (D* καίτε; S καίτοιγε; A καίτοι), 1 Co 9¹⁹ ἐλεύθερος ὢν, 2 Co 10³ ἐν σαρκί . . . περιπατοῦντες, Ph 3⁴ καίπερ, Phm⁸ πολλὴν . . . παρρησίαν ἔχων, Heb 5⁸ καίπερ ὢν υἱὸς 4³ καίτοι c. gen. ptc., 11² καὶ ταῦτα, 7⁵ καίπερ, 12¹⁷ καίπερ (p⁴⁶ καίτοι), 2 Pt 1¹² καίπερ.—P. Par. 8, 16 νυνὶ πλεονάκις ἀπαιτούμενοι οὐκ ἀποδίδωσι *although they are often asked to do it*.

(d) *Conditional use.* Papyri (Mayser II 1, 351): BU 543¹³ εὐορκοῦντι ἔστω μοι εὖ, ἐφιορκοῦντι δὲ ἐναντία, 596¹¹ τοῦτο οὖν ποιήσας *if you do that* ἔσθη μοι μεγάλην χάριταν κατατεθειμένος.

Lk 9²⁵ κερδήσας (Mt 16²⁶ ἐὰν κερδήσῃ), Ac 15²⁹, Heb 11³², Jn 15² μὴ φέρον καρπὸν *if it does not*, but (same verse) πᾶν τὸ καρπὸν φέρον (substantival ptc.) = *fruiting branch*; however, Jn's method is often to have variety of vocabulary and syntax in close proximity.

(e) *Final use.* Papyri (op. cit. 351f) esp. with ἀποστέλλω, πέμπω etc., with fut. ptc. (class.); only in Mt Lk. Mt 27⁴⁹ ἔρχεται σώσων (W σώζων, S* σώσαι, D καὶ σώσει), Ac 8²⁷ ἐληλύθει προσκυνήσων, 22⁵ ἐπορευόμενῃ ἄξων, 24^{11.17}, 25¹³ ἀσπασόμενοι vl. Usually it is the pres. ptc.: Lk 7⁶ ἔπεμψεν φίλους ὁ ἑκατοντάρχης λέγων αὐτῷ, 10²⁵ ἀνέστη ἐκπειράζων αὐτόν.

The addition of ὡς (ὡσπερ, ὡσει)¹ will express subjective motive: Ac 3¹² ἡμῖν τε ἀπειθεῖτε ὡς . . . πεποιηκόσιν, 28¹⁹, Lk 16¹ 23¹⁴ 1 Co 4¹⁸ ὡς μὴ ἐρχομένου δέ μου, 7²⁵ *in the conviction that*, Heb 13¹⁷ ἀγρυπνοῦσιν ὡς λόγον ἀποδώσοντες *with the thought that they must* (fut. ptc.), 12²⁷, 1 Pt 4¹², Rev 1¹⁵, Ac 23¹⁵. 20 27³⁰ *under pretence of*, 2 Co 5²⁰ gen. abs. (as well as comparison: Ac 2² Rev 1¹⁵).

N.B. class. Greek was fond of lengthening sentences by accumulating the circumstantial participles. The nearest approach to this form of ugliness in NT is 2 Pt 2¹²⁻¹⁵ βλασφημοῦντες ἀδικούμενοι ἡγούμενοι ἐντροφῶντες. On the other hand, Luke introduces ptc. quite effectively and thus presents a flowing style which is refreshing after the jerky epistolary style of Paul; Lk 4²⁰ καὶ πτύξας τὸ βιβλίον ἀποδοὺς τῷ ὑπηρέτῃ ἐκάθισεν; with καὶ connecting, Ac 14²⁷ παραγενόμενοι δὲ καὶ συναγαγόντες, 18²² κατελθὼν εἰς Καισάρειαν, ἀναβάς καὶ ἀσπασάμενος τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, κατέβη εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν (asyndeton to avoid ugliness), 23 ἐξῆλθεν, διερχόμενος τὴν Γαλατικὴν χώραν, στηρίζων τοὺς μαθητάς = ἐξῆλθεν καὶ διήρχετο στηρίζων, 19¹⁶ ἐφαλόμενος ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐπ' αὐτοῦς . . . , κατακυριεύσας ἀμφοτέρων ἴσχυσεν = ἐφῆλετο καὶ . . . (the vl. καὶ κατακυριεύσας S*HLP gives the second ptc. a weaker connection with the first). Matthew, whose gospel is more stylistic than the others, has a little of the same tendency: 14¹⁹ κελεύσας (SZ ἐκέλευσεν) . . . λαβῶν . . . ἀναβλέψας, 27⁴⁸ δραμῶν . . . καὶ λαβῶν . . . πλήσας τε (τε om D) . . . καὶ περιθεῖς.

§ 4. Predicative Participle ²

In the same way as the ordinary adj., the ptc. may fulfil the rôle of a predicate and answer either to the subject or the direct complement of the proposition. In this way, with εἶναι and γίνεσθαι the ptc. forms a periphrastic tense (see pp. 87-89).

As a predicate answering to the subject the ptc. is found with verbs expressing a manner of existence, like ὑπάρχω, but in NT this is restricted and is found almost only in Luke, Paul and Hebrews. In the Ptol. pap. (Mayser II 1, 352f) the predicating ptc. is apparently still very well attested, though not in comparison with class. Greek. When this kind of verb has an adj. or prepositional phrase as a predicate, strictly there should be introduced the ptc. ὢν, but not so inevitably in NT and Hell. Greek; thus Phrynichus designates φίλος σοι τυγχάνω as "Hellenistic". The omission of ὢν is to be remarked in the

¹ With this ὡς there may be ellipse of the ptc. (class.): Ro 13¹³ ὡς ἐν ἡμέρᾳ, 1 Co 9²⁶ 2 Co 2¹⁷, Ga 3¹⁶ Eph 6⁷ Col 3²³ 2 Th 2², 1 Pt 4¹¹.

² K.-G II §§ 481-484. Stahl 699ff. Mayser II 1, 352ff. Moulton Einl. 361ff. Radermacher² 208.

following NT passages (as also in Strabo, Appian, and Philostratus):

Mk 12³, Lk 4¹ Ἰησοῦς δὲ πλήρης πνεύματος ἁγίου ὑπέστρεψεν, Ac 6⁸ πλήρης, 19³⁷ οὔτε ἱεροσούλους οὔτε βλασφημοῦντας (concessive), Heb 7^{2f}.

(A) *The Participle in the Nominative*

As in class. Greek, and often in the Koine:—

MODIFYING VERBS:

	NT examples	Parallels, excl. class. Greek
ὑπάρχω	Ac 8 ¹⁶ , Jas 2 ¹⁵ (Ac 19 ³⁶ ptc. prob. adjectival)	Koine i/v.c.
προϋπάρχω	Lk 23 ¹² (not D) (Ac 8 ⁹ ptc. prob. adverbial)	Josephus
παύομαι	Lk 5 ⁴ , Ac 5 ⁴² , 6 ¹³ etc., Eph 1 ¹⁶ Col 1 ⁹ , Heb 10 ²	Hell., LXX Ge 11 ⁸ , 18 ³³ , Nu 16 ³¹ etc., Hermas
τελέω	Mt 11 ¹ , Lk 7 ¹ D	Hermas Josephus
διατελέω	Ac 27 ³³	LXX 2 Mac 5 ²⁷ , Hom. Clem 14 ⁸ , Pap. Milligan p. 9 διατελῶ εὐχομένη <i>I pray continually</i>
ἐπιμένω	Jn 8 ⁷ , Ac 12 ¹⁶	Koine 2 Cl. 10 ⁵
διαλείπω	Lk 7 ⁴⁵ , Ac 8 ²⁴ D, 17 ¹³ D	LXX Je 17 ⁸ , 51 (44) ¹⁸ Lit. Hell. Koine
ἐγκακέω	Ga 6 ² , 2 Th 3 ¹³	
λανθάνω	Heb 13 ²	P. Hamb. I 27, 9 (250 B.C.)
φαίνομαι	Mt 6 ¹⁸	Koine
προφθάνω	Mt 17 ²⁵	Ep. Arist. 137
καλῶς ποιέω	Ac 10 ³³ , Ph 4 ¹⁴ , 2 Pt 1 ¹⁹ , 3 Jn ⁶	Koine

VERBS OF EMOTION:

ἀγαλλιάομαι	Ac 16 ³⁴	
τρέμω	2 Pt 2 ¹⁰	
χαίρω	Mt 2 ¹⁰ (<i>they were glad to see the star</i>), Jn 20 ²⁰ , Ph 2 ²⁸	Koine
εὐχαριστῶ	1 Co 14 ¹⁸ KL (p ⁴⁸ inf; SBD λαλῶ)	

VERBA SENTIENDI:

συνιῆμι	2 Co 10 ¹² SB p ⁴⁶ αὐτοὶ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἑαυτοὺς μετροῦντες . . . οὐ συνιᾶσιν <i>they do not realise that they are measuring themselves by their own standards</i> (but D*G vulg. om οὐ συνιᾶσιν ἡμεῖς δέ)	Plut. 3. 231d Lucian D. Deor. 2, 1
μανθάνω	1 Ti 5 ¹³ ἀμα δὲ καὶ ἀργαὶ μανθάνουσιν περιέρχόμενοι or sc. εἶναι?). Cp. class. μανθάνω διαβεβλήμενος. More often inf.: Ph 4 ¹¹ , 1 Ti 5 ⁴ , Ti 3 ¹⁴ , 1 Cl. 8 ⁴ OT, 57 ²	

(B) *The Participle in Oblique Case*

(a) With verbs of sensual or spiritual perceiving and knowing: ἀκούω, βλέπω, γινώσκω, ἐπίσταμαι, εὐρίσκω, θεάομαι, θεωρέω, κατανοέω, οἶδα, ὁράω; all these are found in the Ptol. pap. (Mayser II 1, 354ff). Also in NT are: δοκιμάζω, ἔχω, μανθάνω. This ptc. is quite plentiful in NT, where it is almost always in an oblique case (Lk 8⁴⁶ ἔργων δύναμιν ἐξεληλυθυῖαν ἀπ' ἐμοῦ *I felt that power had gone out*, not *I felt the power going*

out), and we do not find parallels to the class. ὁρῶ ἡμαρτηκῶς *I see that I have sinned* (NT has ὅτι, see Mk 5²⁹ 1 Jn 3¹⁴). Ἄγνοέω and αἰσθάνομαι are found with ptc. in the papyri, but not NT.

Ἀκούω: in NT, if the content of the hearing is given, usually the accus. c. infin. or else ὅτι or ὡς; it is no longer frequently the ptc. In class. Greek the ptc. tended to denote facts and the infin. mere hearsay; but this distinction has quite disappeared and all we can say is, that with the ptc. the accus. appears to denote what is learned (indirect speech), while the gen. is retained for direct audition or hearing with the ears.

Accus. with ptc.: Mk 5³⁶ παρακούσας τὸν λόγον λαλούμενον exceptional (this is direct audition and one would expect gen. B seeks a remedy by inserting the article: τὸν λόγον τὸν λαλούμενον, since without it the meaning should be *overhearing that the word was being spoken*); Lk 4²³ οὐα ἠκούσαμεν γενόμενα; Ac 7¹² ἀκούσας ὄντα σιτία; 2 Th 3¹¹ ἀκούομεν γάρ τινας περιπατοῦντας *we hear that*; 3 Jn⁴ ἀκούω τὰ ἐμὰ τέκνα . . . περιπατοῦντα; P. Par. 48¹² ἀκούσαντες δὲ ἐν τῷ μεγάλῳ Σαρατείῳ ὄντα σε *that you were*. Even in Ac sometimes (9⁴ 26¹⁴) the accus. stands for class. gen.; indeed, the gen. is rare in NT outside Ac.

Gen. with ptc.: Mk 12²⁸ ἀκούσας αὐτῶν συζητούντων, 14⁵⁸, Lk 18³⁶ ὄχλου διαπορευομένου, Jn 1³⁷ ἤκουσαν . . . αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος, Ac 2⁶ 6¹¹ etc. Note in Ac 11⁷ 22⁷ ἤκουσα φωνῆς λεγούσης μοι (but accus. in 9⁴ 26¹⁴ [E gen]); if this pointless variation can occur in a writer like Luke, the class. distinction between accus. and gen. has now broken down.

Βλέπω, θεωρῶ, θεάομαι, κατανοέω, ὁράω: ptc. Mt 24³⁰ ὄφονται τὸν υἱὸν . . . ἐρχόμενον, 15³¹, Mk 5³¹ βλέπεις τὸν ὄχλον συνθλίβοντά σε, Jn 1³² θετέαμαι τὸ Πν. καταβαῖνον, ³⁸. Papyri. LXX To 11¹⁶ Su³⁷. Use of ὄντα is class.: Heb 3¹ κατανοήσατε τὸν ἀπόστολον . . . πιστὸν ὄντα; Ac 8²³ ὁρῶ σε ὄντα. 17¹⁶ θεῶρ. κατείδωλον οὖσαν τὴν πόλιν. But the ptc. of the verb *to be* may be omitted: Mt 25^{38f} σε εἶδομεν ξένον, ἀσθενῆ (BD corr. to ptc. ἀσθενοῦντα), Jn 1⁵⁰ εἶδόν σε ὑποκάτω τῆς συκῆς; the use of ὡς occurs instead in Ac 17²² ὡς δεισιδαιμονεστέρους ὑμᾶς θεωρῶ, of which the sense must be *from what I see, it appears as if*, when we compare 2 Th 3¹⁵ ὡς ἐχθρὸν ἠγεῖσθε *as if he were an enemy*.

Sometimes with *to see*, as with other verbs, this kind of ptc. (especially in the pf.) is more plainly separated from the obj. of the main verb, and becomes in effect a distinctive complement, leaving the obj. and its main verb still very closely linked together: Mt 22¹¹ εἶδεν ἄνθρωπον οὐκ ἐνδεδυμένον, etc. (relative clause) = *he saw a man and he had not on*, Mk 11¹³ ἰδὼν συκὴν ἀπὸ μακρόθεν ἔχουσαν φύλλα (*which had*), LXX To 11⁷ εἶ τινα . . . ἐθεώρουσαν τεθνηκότα *who was dead*, P. Leip. 40²⁰ καὶ εἶδεν τὰς θύρας χαμαὶ ἐρριμμένας *which were*. On ὅτι after *to see*, (see pp. 136f). In Mark the accus. c. ptc. construction occurs after ἰδεῖν 15 times, and ὅτι occurs 6 times.

Γινώσκω: in the Ptol. pap. usually with accus. c. ptc., but quite often also with infin. or ὅτι, διότι or ὡς—without much difference of meaning (Mayser II 1, 354f). Infin. or ὅτι also in NT. Lk 8⁴⁶ (Luke

has altered Mk 5³⁰ which is not a case in point, since Mk uses the ptc. attributively: ἐπιγνούς τὴν ἐξ αὐτοῦ δύναμιν ἐξελθοῦσαν), Ac 19³⁵, Heb 13²³, BU 1078² γείνωσκέ με (this stereotyped letter-formula is very common in Ptol. pap.) πεπρακότα πρὸς τὸν καιρὸν, 1078¹⁰ γείνωσε δὲ ἡγεμόνα εἰσεληλυθότα τῇ τρίτῃ καὶ εἰκάδι.

Δοκιμάζω: 2 Co 8²² ὃν ἐδοκιμάσαμεν *we have proved* σπουδαῖον ὄντα (for inf. see p. 147). With ptc., absent from LXX and papyri.

Ἐπίσταμαι: Ac 24¹⁰ ὄντα σε κριτὴν ἐπιστάμενος, 26³ γνώστην ὄντα σε . . . ἐπιστάμενος AC 614 (S* BEH om ἐπιστ.), 1 Clem 55² ἐπιστάμεθα πολλοὺς παραδεδωκότας ἑαυτοὺς, Ptol. pap., but more often with ὅτι or διότι. With ὅτι Ac 15⁷ etc.

Εὑρίσκω as a rule with ptc. (class.). Very often in Ptol. pap.: P. Leip. 40¹⁰ εὑρήκασι τοῦτον . . . τυπτόμενον ὑπὸ γαλλιαρίων. Mt 12⁴⁴ εὑρίσκει (sc. τὸν οἶκον) σχολάζοντα, 24⁴⁶ ὃν . . . εὑρίσκει οὕτως ποιοῦντα etc., LXX Ge 26¹² καὶ εὔρεν . . . ἑκατοστεύουσαν κριτὴν. Away from the obj.: Ac 9² τινὰς εὔρη τῆς ὁδοῦ ὄντας *who were*. Passive with nom. of ptc. like class. φαίνομαι: Mt 1¹⁸ εὔρεθῃ ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχουσα.

Οἶδα: only 2 Co 12² οἶδα . . . ἀρπαγέντα τὸν τοιοῦτον (but ὅτι in 3^r). Ptol. pap. dates: 254 253 145. With adj. without ptc. Mk 6²⁰. Elsewhere infin. or (usually) ὅτι, as in LXX and often in papyri.

(b) With verba dicendi et putandi (Mayser II 1, 312ff, 356):

Ἔχω: Lk 14¹⁸ ἔχε με παρητημένον. P. Oxy. 292, 6 διὸ παρακαλῶ σε . . . ἔχειν αὐτὸν συνεσταμένον.

Ἥγέομαι: Ph 3² ἀλλήλους ἡγούμενοι ὑπερέχοντας ἑαυτῶν.

Ὁμολογέω: 1 Jn 4² Ἰ.Χ. ἐν σαρκὶ ἐλεληλυθότα (B inf.), 3 S, 2 Jn⁷. Without ὄντα: Jn 9²², Ro 10⁹.

(c) With verba declarandi (Mayser II 1, 355) never in NT, but Ign. Rom. 10² δηλώσατε ἐγγύς με ὄντα.

PART II

WORD-GROUPS DEFINING A NOUN OR ADJECTIVE

This page intentionally left blank

CHAPTER TWELVE

THE ADJECTIVAL AND PREDICATIVE DEFINITE ARTICLE

THE NEW TESTAMENT USE of the article comes well up to class. Attic standards on the whole¹. In later papyri the art. is used as a relative pronoun, but never in NT; nor is it a demonstrative pronoun except in the poetic quotations in Ac 17²⁸ and except with μέν and δέ. In Ionic (Herodotus) and later vernacular Greek the art. is sometimes omitted between the preposition and infin., but never in NT.

We have already considered the art. in its substantival use (see pp. 36f). In its adjectival, it particularizes an individual member of a group or class.

§ 1. The Individual Article with Proper Nouns²

(a) Names of persons

In class. Greek, names of persons without attribute or apposition have no art. at their first mention. This appertains

¹ T. F. Middleton, *The Doctrine of the Greek Article*, 1808, rev. by H. J. Rose, 1858 last ed. K-G I 598-640. Schwyzer II 19-27. Jannaris, index. Mayser II 1, 56ff; II 2, 1-117, 171 (lit); III 3, index. Winer-Schmiedel §§ 17ff. Wackernagel II 125-152. Moulton Einl. 128ff. Radermacher² 112-118. Abel §§ 28-32. E. C. Colwell, "The Definite Article," *JBL* 52, 1933, 12-21. A. Svensson, *Der Gebrauch des bestimmten Artikel in d. nachklass. Epik.* 1937 Lund. Humbert §§ 59-77. D. M. Nelson, *The Articular and Anarthrous Predicate Nominative in the Greek NT*, unpubl. diss. of S. Baptist Theol. Seminary, Louisville, 1945. R. H. Poss, *The Articular and Anarthrous Construction in the Epistle of James*, diss. of S-W. Baptist Theol. Seminary, 1948. J. Gwyn Griffiths, "A Note on the Anarthrous Predicate in Hellenistic Greek," *Exp. T.* 62, July 1951, 314. B. M. Metzger, reply to Griffiths, *Exp. T.* 63, Jan. 1952, 126. H. G. Meecham, "The Anarthrous θεός in John i.1 and 1 Cor. iii.16", *Exp. T.* 63, Jan. 1952, 126. Moule 106-117. R. W. Funk, *The Syntax of the Greek Article: Its Importance for Critical Pauline Problems* (Diss., Vanderbilt Univ.) 1953.

² Carolus Schmidt, *De articulo in nominibus propriis apud Atticos scriptores pedestres*, Kiel 1890. H. Kallenberg, *Philologus* 49, 1890, 515-547; *Studien über den gr. Artikel*, Berlin 1891. F. Völker, *Syntax der griechischen Papyri: I Der Artikel*, Münster 1903. Gildersleeve II §§ 536ff. *AJP* 11, 1890, 483ff; 24, 1913, 482 (articles by Gildersleeve); 27, 1916, 333-340 (F. Eakin, for i-ii/A.D. pap.); 341ff (C. W. E. Miller). A. Deissmann, "Die Artikel bei Eigennamen in der späteren griech. Umgangssprache," *Berliner philol. Wochen schr.* 22, 1902, 1467f. B. Weiss, "Der Gebrauch des Artikel bei den Eigennamen", *Th. Stud. u. Krit.* 86, 1913, 349-389.

also in Hellenistic: the art. is used after the person has already been pointed out (*anaphoric*, or pointing back) or when he is often referred to, as in letters in the papyri, giving a familiar tone proper to the colloquial language. A father's or a mother's name, appearing in the gen., usually has the art., although there are many exceptions. Moreover, names of slaves and animals have the art. even when mentioned for the first time, whereas the names of more important persons are anarthrous. The NT formula $\Sigma\alpha\tilde{\upsilon}\lambda\omicron\varsigma \acute{o} \kappa\alpha\iota \Pi\alpha\tilde{\upsilon}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ has many parallels in the Koine. The final development of the popular tendency to use the art. is seen in MGr where proper names almost always have it. It is a mark of familiar style, like pointing with the finger, but despite the pundits it was largely a matter of individual caprice even in class. Greek, for some writers, like Plato, are extremely partial to articular personal names¹. No rule will account for τὸν Ἰησοῦν δὲν Παῦλος κηρύσσει in Ac 19¹³ and τὸν Ἰησοῦν γινώσκω καὶ τὸν Παῦλον ἐπίσταμαι in 15. Moreover, the MSS are frequently divided. In other places, Luke abides by the rule: thus in Ac 8³ we are introduced to $\Sigma\alpha\tilde{\upsilon}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ (anarth.) but are referred back (anaphoric) in 9¹ to ὁ δὲ $\Sigma\alpha\tilde{\upsilon}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$, and meanwhile $\Delta\alpha\mu\alpha\sigma\kappa\acute{o}\nu$ (anarth.) has been introduced, to be referred to anaphorically in 9³ as τῇ $\Delta\alpha\mu\alpha\sigma\kappa\tilde{\omega}$.

Ἰησοῦς

In the Gospels, except perhaps Jn, Jesus takes the art. as a matter of course except where an articular appositional phrase is introduced (Mt 26⁶⁹. 71 μετὰ Ἰ. τοῦ Γαλιλαίου [Ναζωραίου], 27¹⁷. 22 Ἰ. τὸν λεγόμενον Χρ.—Lk 24³ Ἰ. ὁ παῖς, 24¹⁹ περὶ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Ναζαρηνοῦ). The rule is almost invariable in Mk, even with the gen. (5²¹. 27 14⁵⁵. 67 15⁴³); the exceptions are Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (1¹) and the vocative (1²⁴ 5⁷ 10⁴⁷). This would indicate that in 1⁹ the anarthrous Ἰησοῦς is to be taken closely with the phrase which follows, i.e. *Jesus of Nazareth in Galilee*. The

¹ As the following statistics for the art. with proper names will indicate:

In the first thousand verses of

Aesch. *Prom. V* the art. occurs 210 times

Soph. *Oed. T.* " " " 303 "

Eurip. *Med.* " " " 159 "

Aristoph. *Vespae* " " " 562 "

(where the speech is much less elevated)

Plato *Phaed.* " " " 768 " .

(Gildersleeve, *AJP* 11; 486n.).

article does not occur before the prepositional phrase, it is true, but in any case this is not usual in Mark (except for scribal insertions). If it were *Jesus came from N. in Galilee*, it would have to be ὁ Ἰησοῦς to accord with Mark's practice. In Mt there is rather more latitude (anarthrous in the gen.: 14¹ 26⁵¹, and nom. 20³⁰; Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ 1¹).

In view of this it is over subtle to explain the anarthrous Jesus in some MSS of Mt 28⁹ Lk 24¹⁵ on the ground that it is his first appearance as the risen Christ; rather accept the reading ὁ Ἰησοῦς of DL, which accords with Gospel usage.

Even in Ac, the first mention of Jesus is articular (1¹ SAE; but anarth. in BD).

Jn however normally follows the class. idiom by introducing proper names without the art., and adding it subsequently. This is usual also in the Koine and the rest of NT. E.g. the risen Christ is now τὸν Ἰησοῦν 20¹⁴ on his first appearance. However, ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς appears to be a set phrase (148. 50 etc.). The MSS are particularly divided in Jn 21.

In the Epistles and Rev., however, Jesus stands without the art., except for: 2 Co 4^{10f} (D*FG om art.), Eph 4²¹, 1 Th 4¹⁴, 1 Jn 4³; and then there is strong anaphora. The Epistles also usually omit the article with Χριστός; it is here regarded as a proper name rather than = Messiah, probably reflecting a development in Christology. But in Col 2⁶ the author reverts to the earlier designation of Χριστός as a title = Messiah. See H. J. Rose's appendix to his ed. of Middleton, 486-496, for the art. with Ἰησοῦς, κύριος, Χριστός.

Indeclinables

The art. without its proper force has occasionally to serve to determine the case: Mt 1^{21f} ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ἰσαάκ . . . τὸν Ἰακώβ etc. (But the same form is also used in the case of declinable nouns, such as τὸν Ἰούδαν² and τοῦ Οὐρίου.⁶) It is superfluous with names which have a clause in apposition. Mt 1⁶ τὸν Δαυὶδ τὸν βασιλέα (700 om τὸν β.), in 1⁶ τὸν Ἰωσήφ τὸν ἄνδρα Μαρίας (P. Oxy. I 2 B 6 prob. rightly om the first τὸν), Jn 4⁵ Ἰωσήφ τῷ υἱῷ αὐτοῦ (SB add τῷ), Lk 3²³⁻³⁸ ὧν υἱός, ὡς ἐνομίζετο, Ἰωσήφ τοῦ Ἡλεί τοῦ Ματθαῖ . . . τοῦ Ἀδάμ τοῦ θεοῦ. N.B. no art. with the first in the list of genitives, as in the ii/A.D.

inscriptions (Moulton Proleg. 236), Ac 7⁸ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ἰσαάκ, 13²¹ ἔδωκεν . . . τὸν Σαούλ.

THE DECLENSION OF Αβρααμ IN NT IS AS FOLLOWS:

Nom	Αβρααμ	—18 times
Voc	Αβρααμ	—Lk 16 ²⁴⁻³⁰
Acc	{ τὸν Αβρααμ Αβρααμ	—Mt. 3 ⁹ Lk 3 ⁸ 16 ²³ Heb 7 ⁶ —Lk 13 ²⁸ Jn 8 ^{57f} Ro 4 ¹
Gen	{ τοῦ Αβρααμ Αβρααμ	—rare (and then anaph.): Jn 8 ³⁹ Ga 3 ^{14. 29} —19 times
Dat	{ τῷ Αβρααμ Αβρααμ	—11 times —Heb 7 ¹
with prepn.	Αβρααμ	—always, exc. Ga 3 ⁹

The genitive of proper nouns

In the papyri a parent's name is added in the gen. with the nominative art. normally. In the more official papyrus texts however the parental gen. has the nom. art. before it only when the name of the son or daughter is in the gen. Thus Mt 10² is thoroughly vernacular (Mayser II 2, 7. 22ff. 118): Ἰάκωβος ὁ τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου. Also in the accus. Δαυὶδ τὸν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ Ac 13²² OT, but sometimes as in class. Greek without the art.: Ἰούδαν Σίμωνος Ἰσκαριώτου Jn 6⁷¹ etc., Σώπατρος Πύρρου Βεροιαῖος Ac 20⁴ (pap. exx. in Abel § 44a). However, with the gen. case it is not usual to repeat the art., and τοῦ τοῦ (*of the son of*) is avoided (exc. 1 Clem 12² ὑπὸ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ τοῦ Ναυή): e.g. in class. Greek Περικλέους τοῦ Ξανθίππου, where τοῦ belongs to the first name since in the nom. we have Περικλ. ὁ Ξανθίππου; in NT Ἰωσήφ τοῦ Ἠλὶ τοῦ . . . Lk 3^{23ff} (see Klostermann p. 419 on this passage for parallels); papyri Βερενίκης τῆς Νικάνορος (254 B.C.) Mayser II 2, 7f.

It is not clear whether we are to supply υἱός with the apostle Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου (Lk 6¹⁶ Ac 1¹³) or ἀδελφός following Jude¹.

To identify a mother by her son we have (as class.) Μαρία ἡ Ἰωσήτος Mk 15⁴⁷ (mother, not wife, because this follows Μαρία ἡ Ἰακώβου τοῦ μικροῦ καὶ Ἰωσήτος μήτηρ⁴⁰), Μαρία ἡ Ἰακώβου Mk 16¹ Lk 24¹⁰. The art. is omitted except for Mt 27⁵⁶

ἡ τοῦ Ἰακ. μήτηρ. And to identify a wife by her husband (class. also): P. Ryl. II 140⁷ Ἀντωνίας Δρούσου *the estate of A., wife of D.*, Mt 1⁶ τῆς τοῦ Οὐρίου, Jn 19²⁵ Μαριάμ ἡ τοῦ Κλωπᾶ. The possession of slaves by a family may be indicated by this construction: τοὺς (scil. brothers, Christians) ἐκ τῶν (scil. slaves) Ἀριστοβούλου, Ναρκίσσου Ro 16^{10, 11}, τῶν (scil. slaves?) Χλόης I Co 1¹¹.

(b) *Geographical names*

(1) *Names of peoples.* These do not require the art. any more than personal names. (a) Anarthrous Ἰουδαῖοι in Paul's defences against the Jews: Ac 26^{2, 3, 4, 7, 21} 25¹⁰; πάντες Ἰουδαῖοι 26⁴ BC*E* (+ οἱ SAC² therefore wrong), the exception being 25⁸ (τὸν νόμον τῶν Ἰουδαίων). Anarthrous Ἰουδαῖοι also in Paul, exc. in I Co 9²⁰ (ἐγενόμην τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις ὡς Ἰουδαῖος) where he must have some special occasion in mind like Timothy's circumcision; τοῖς ἀνόμοις etc. (the Galatians?) in the following clauses, with τοῖς virtually demonstrative. (b) Anarthrous Ἕλληνες, although in class. Greek regularly with the art. (K-G I 599; Gildersleeve II § 538), and also in the Ptol. pap. (Mayser II 2, 13); the point with Paul is never the totality of a nation, but its characteristic (*the Greek way of life*); consequently Ro 1⁴ (Ἕλλησίν τε καὶ βαρβάρους) is, like σοφοῖς τε καὶ ἀνοήτοις which follows it, quite class.¹: Demosth. 8, 67 (πᾶσιν Ἕλλησι καὶ βαρβάρους = all, whether Greeks or barbarians). (c) Correctly class.: Ἀθηναῖοι πάντες Ac 17²¹. (d) But in the Gospel narrative (and to some extent in Ac) we usually find the art. with Ἰουδαῖοι and other names of nations: however, Mt 28¹⁵ παρὰ Ἰουδαίους (D adds τοῖς), 10⁵ Lk 9⁵² εἰς πόλιν (κώμην) Σαμαριτῶν, Jn 4⁹ οὐ γὰρ συγχρῶνται Ἰουδαῖοι Σαμαρίταις (vl.). (e) An instance of a national name in masc. sing. is ὁ Ἰσραήλ (prob. because Jacob is thought of). The art. is wanting in Hebraic phrases like γῆ Ἰσραήλ, ὁ λαὸς Ἰσραήλ, etc. To conclude, class. Greek has art. only if it is anaphoric or the people is well known (K-G I 598f); there is no art. in the Attic inscriptions (Meisterhans-Schwyzler 225, 14); in the Ptol. pap. there is very little conformity with any rule (Mayser II 2, 12f).

¹ Blass-Debr. § 262, 1.

(2) *Lands and islands*¹. Like personal names, place names have the art. only if there is some special reason. But ἡ Ἀσία and ἡ Εὐρώπη take the art. regularly from early times, and in the Ptol. papyri (ἡ Ἀσία only), as the two grand divisions of the earth that are naturally opposed to each other; ² but Ἀσία is articular even when it is used to denote the Roman province (in Ac 2^{9f} Μεσοποταμία, Ἀσία and ἡ Λιβύη ἡ κατὰ Κυρήνην are the only places with an art., because they seem like adjectives and one can supply γῆ). The only exceptions are Ac 6⁹ (ἀπὸ Κιλικίας καὶ Ἀσ.) and 1 Pt 1¹ (where the names of all the countries are without the art. and there is no art. at all in the whole address³. Beginnings of letters are formula-like: ἐκλεκτοῖς παρεπιδήμοις διασπορᾶς Ποντοῦ etc.). Many other names of countries also, being originally adjectives (sc. γῆ, χώρα) are never anarthrous. Cp. ἡ Ἰουδαία γῆ in Jn 3²² and also according to D in 4³. (The anarthrous Ἰουδ. Ac 2⁹ therefore is corrupt; there are several emendations proposed). Ἡ Γαλιλαία (except Lk 17¹¹ μέσον Σαμαρείας καὶ Γαλιλαίας, where the omission with Σ. has caused omission with Γ. for balance). Ἡ Ἑλλάς Ac 20² (so MGr). Ἡ Ἰουδαία (for which the Hebraic γῆ Ἰούδα is also used Mt 2⁶). Ἡ Μεσοποταμία. Ἡ Μυσία (adj.). But names of countries in -ία that are identical with the feminines of related adjectives fluctuate (Gildersleeve II § 547): e.g. in one section of Xenophon (Anab. 1, 2, 21) we have εἰς τὴν Κιλικίαν and ἐν Κιλικίᾳ and εἰς Κιλικίαν; NT anarthrous Ac 6⁹. Ἀραβία also fluctuates in Xen. and Hdt. Φρυγία fluctuates in Dem., Isocr., Xen., and Hdt. NT Φρυγίαν καὶ Παμφυλίαν Ac 2¹⁰ (although strictly adjs.), but τῆς Παμφυλίας Ac 13¹³. The NT always has art. with Ἰταλία, generally with Ἀχαΐα (exc. Ro 15²⁶ 2 Co 9²). If χώρα or γῆ accompany the proper names, as frequently in Hdt., then those proper names are frankly adjectival, and we find the art. Gildersleeve II § 548). The preposition makes a difference; thus εἰς Συρίαν (although

¹ K-G I 598f. Meisterhans-Schwyzler 225, 15 (anarthrous except for Attica, Greece, and Asia, in Attic inscriptions). Gildersleeve II § 547ff. Radermacher² 116 (articular, if the adjectival nature of the name is still obvious, i.e. scil. γῆ). Thus ἡ Μεσοποταμία, ἡ Ἀσία, but Ἀγρυπτος). Mayser II 2, 13f.

² K-G I 599. Gildersleeve 239ff.

³ See pp. 221f. Winer-Schmiedel § 18, 14. See also Mayser II 2, 14 for parallels in the abbreviated style of memorials, etc., where there is a long list as in 1 Pt 1¹.

strictly an adj.), Ac 21³, but Σ. does not have the art. in Isoc., Plato or Xen. (Gildersleeve II § 547); also εἰς Ἀραβίαν Ga 11⁷. Not being an adj., Αἴγυπτος never takes the art. in NT if we can except the reading of SBDAC p⁴⁵ in Ac 7¹¹ (where in any case the adj. ὄλος appears) and that of BC in 7³⁶. In the Ptol. pap. however, it has the art. always, except after a preposition and in the subordinate genitive (Mayser II 2, 13f). However, the geographical genitive does require the art. and so does the post-positive partitive genitive of the name of a country. This was in fact a rule of class. Greek, well observed by Thucydides (Gildersleeve II § 553). See Ac 13¹⁴ Ἀντιόχειαν τῆς Πισιδίας DEHLP (rest accus.), 21³⁹ Ταρσεύς, τῆς Κιλικίας, 22³ 27⁵.

(3) *Names of towns and cities.* In MGr they always have the art. unless the town is preceded by a preposition (e.g. ἐξ Ἀμβούργου εἰς Νέαν Ὑόρκην); there was always, even in class. Greek, a tendency to resist the art. with common or proper nouns in prepositional phrases. But in class. Greek names of towns do not require the art. and even the anaphoric use is sometimes merely a device to avoid a hiatus; NT follows the rule, and has the art. only for a special reason. The art. is present only because it is anaphoric in Ac 9³. 38. 42 (τῆς Ἰόππης), 17¹³ (ἐν τῇ Β, because εἰς Β. in ¹⁰), ¹⁶ (ἐν ταῖς Ἀ., because ἕως Ἀ. in ¹⁵); in 18² τῆς Ῥώμης is due to attraction to τῆς Ἰταλίας; in 28¹⁴ the art. denotes Rome as the goal of the journey (demonstrative). Even Τρώας, although subject to an art. because it is Ἀλεξάνδρεια ἢ Τρώας, is anarthrous in Ac 16⁸ 20⁵ 2 Ti 4¹³ (as in Xen. Hdt), and is articular only anaphorically in Ac 16¹¹ 20⁶ 2 Co 2¹² (referring to 1²³ where Troas was in mind). Yet there is no apparent reason for the art. with towns mentioned as halting-places: Ac 17¹ τὴν Ἀμφίπολιν καὶ τὴν Ἀπολλωνίαν (εἰς Θεσσ. because of the preposition). Note further ἤλθομεν εἰς Μίλητον (Ac 20¹⁵), but on leaving and so anaphoric ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς Μιλήτου (¹⁷), both with preposition; also παραπλευσαι τὴν Ἐφεσον (¹⁶), but πέμψας εἰς Ἐφεσον (because preposition). Yet there is a preposition with articular place-names in 20¹³ 21¹ (in spite of εἰς Πάταρα, etc.), 23³¹. Thus there is a rule, but it is not unbroken.

Unless an adj. is present (Rev 3¹²) Ἱεροσόλυμα, Ἱερουσαλήμ rarely take the art. If they do, it is anaphoric: Jn 2²³ 5². In Jn 10²² the art. is absent (but added by ABWL). The exceptions

to this rule are Jn 11¹⁸ Ac 5²⁸. Josephus usually observes it.

(4) *Names of rivers and seas*¹. They are generally articular in NT and Ptol. pap. (except sometimes with a preposition). In class. Greek rivers usually take ὁ ποταμός, like Mk 1⁵ ὁ Ἰορδάνης ποταμός (elsewhere ὁ Ἰορδάνης) and Her. V. I 1, 2 τὸν ποταμὸν τὸν Τίβεριν. Cp. Jn 18¹ τοῦ χειμάρρου Κεδρών (SBCD corrupt). Ac 27²⁷ ὁ Ἀδρίας (class.).

(c) *Astronomical names and natural phenomena*

Winds. Always without art. in NT. Νότος *south wind* Lk 12⁵⁵ Ac 27¹³ 28¹³. With and without in the papyri (Mayser II 2, 18).

Points of the compass. With prepositions, they never have art. in NT: Mt 2¹ 8¹¹ etc. (ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν), 12⁴² (βασιλίσσα νότου), 24²⁷ (ἕως δυσμῶν), Lk 12⁵⁴ (ἀπὸ δυσμῶν), 13²⁹ (ἀπὸ βορρᾶ καὶ νότου), Rev 7² 16¹² (ἀπὸ ἀνατολῆς ἡλίου). The NT exception is Mt 2².⁹ ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ; therefore perhaps not a compass-point but *in its rising*.

Ἥλιος and σελήνη. The art. prevails, as in papyri (Mayser II 2, 18f), but we do find Mt 13⁶ ἡλίου δὲ ἀνατείλαντος (D adds τοῦ), Lk 21²⁵ ἐν ἡλίῳ καὶ σελήνῃ καὶ ἄστροις (yet foll. by ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς), Ac 27²⁰ μήτε δὲ ἡλίου μήτε ἄστρον ἐπιφαινόντων, 1 Co 15⁴¹ ἄλλη δόξα ἡλίου . . . σελήνης . . . ἀστέρων, Rev 7² 16¹² ἀπὸ ἀνατολῆς ἡλίου, 22⁵ φωτὸς ἡλίου.

§ 2. The Individual Article with Common Nouns²

(a) *Individual anaphoric use: Introduction*

Used with nouns, the art. has the same double import in Hell. Greek as in class. Greek: it is either individualizing or generic. It either calls special attention to one definite member of a class so that ὁ = οὗτος ὁ (e.g. πλείονες = *more*, but οἱ πλείονες = *the majority*), or else it makes the contrast between the whole class, as such, and other classes, so that οἱ ἄνθρωποι = *mankind*, as opposed to οἱ θεοί. The generic use is considered below, pp. 180f. The necessity for using the art. is not dispensed

¹ K.-G I 599f. Gildersleeve II §§ 558-561. Mayser II 2, 16.

² K.-G I 589f. Gildersleeve II §§ 565-567, 569, 571-572.

with by the addition of οὗτος or ἐκεῖνος, or a possessive. But the art. is often omitted where we expect it by the rules, especially in set phrases, titles, salutations, letter headings, pairs, lists (e.g. Ro 8^{35-38f}), definitions (e.g. Ro 11^{6f} 8²⁴). The Heb. construct state had an influence here (see pp. 179f). Sometimes the absence is almost inexplicable: Jas 2⁸ νόμον τελεῖτε βασιλικόν; we must understand it predicatively *the law as a royal commandment* (Radermacher² 117). Codex Bezae will often omit the art. in an arbitrary way, perhaps through Latin influence.

The individualizing use of the art. was described by Apollonius Dyscolus, an early grammarian, as *anaphoric*, in that it refers back to what is already familiar. Thus ὁ ἀδελφός αὐτοῦ is anaphoric, *that brother of his*; while ἀδελφός αὐτοῦ is *a brother of his*. It means that the art. will not normally be used when a person or object is first introduced, or when only an undefined part of a group or class is referred to, or when a person or object is thought of only predicatively (and therefore not individually and definitely). In such cases there is no anaphora to particular or well-known specimens or to a class considered as a whole. So it is usual to express a predicate without the art. (see exceptions, pp. 182-184).

It is not difficult to find instances where NT writers conform to this rule; we have seen it already with the proper names. We see it again in Lk 4¹⁷ βιβλίον and afterwards τὸ βιβλίον; Ro 5³⁻⁵ ὑπομονὴν κατεργάζεται, ἡ δὲ ὑπομονὴ δοκιμὴν, ἡ δὲ δοκιμὴ ἐλπίδα· ἡ δὲ ἐλπίς . . . ,⁷ (although he is not previously mentioned, *your good man* τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ is very definite); Jas 2¹⁴ πίστιν and then ἡ πίστις; LXX Bel et Drac.³⁻⁴ Βήλ and then τῷ Βήλ. Therefore when we find τῷ ἁμαρτωλῷ Lk 18¹³ it must be the *sinner of sinners*; in Ro 12¹⁹ we must think of it as *the well-known wrath*; in 1 Co 10¹⁴ that *worship of idols which you know so well*; in Rev 3¹⁷ ὁ ταλαίπωρος is *that wretched man*; Mt 5¹ τὸ ὄρος = that great hill which stood like a throne behind the sea (Zerwick § 124), Lk 14¹⁷ τὸν δοῦλον is the servant whose particular task it was to do this; Mt 8¹² ὁ κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὁ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων *that memorable or greatest of all*.

The art. was commonly used in class. Attic prose to mark a proper or usual connection of an obj. with its subject: τὴν χεῖρα is *his hand* Jn 7³⁰, τὸν ἀδελφόν *his brother* 2 Co 12¹⁸, just as in the papyri ἡ γυνὴ καὶ οἱ υἱοὶ is *his wife and children* (Mayser II 2,

23), and Ac 21⁵ σὺν γ. καὶ τέκνοις = *with their wives and children* (art. omitted because a formula, like Ac 11⁴ σὺν γυναιξίν, Ro 1⁷ ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν), Heb 12⁷ τίς γὰρ υἱός, ὃν οὐ παιδεύει πατήρ (not ὁ πατήρ *his father*) *a father*.

(b) *Articular Use with certain nouns*

1. θεός and κύριος¹.

Since these words come near to being proper nouns in NT, it is not surprising that the art. is so often omitted. Κύριος even more than θεός seems to have assumed this rôle, for we have Mt 21⁹ ὀνόματι κυρίου, Ac 2²⁰ v1. τὴν ἡμέραν κυρίου, 5⁹ τὸ πνεῦμα κυρίου, 2 Co 3¹⁷ τὸ πνεῦμα κυρίου, τὴν δόξαν κυρίου, Jas 5¹¹ τὸ τέλος κυρίου². These names are especially anarthrous after a preposition, e.g. ἐν κυρίῳ *passim*, ἀπὸ θεοῦ Jn 3², or when they depend in the gen. on another anarthrous noun: Mt 27⁴³ θεοῦ εἰμι υἱός, Lk 3² ἐγένετο ῥῆμα θεοῦ. Another near-proper name is θεὸς πατήρ 2 Pt 1¹⁷ Jude¹. In the LXX the anarthrous $\kappa\eta\eta$ is rendered by the more slavish translators by means of anarthrous κύριος; but the addition of κ , $\kappa\alpha$, and $\kappa\alpha\iota$ causes the art. to be used, hence: τῷ κυρίῳ, τὸν κύριον. But in NT we have both ἄγγελος κυρίου and ἐν κυρίῳ. Like the LXX is κύριος ὁ θεός, with and without gen.: Lk 1⁶⁸ OT κύριος ὁ θεὸς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ, Rev 1⁸ etc. κύριος ὁ θεός. As a general rule it may be said that for Paul ὁ κύριος = Christ, and κύριος = Yahweh (Zerwick § 125^a); in which case, we must understand ὁ δὲ Κύριος τὸ πν. ἐστίν (2 Co 3¹⁷) as = Yahweh but anaphoric.

2. οὐρανός, γῆ, θάλασσα, κόσμος.

These words are frequently anarthrous, especially after a preposition. But οὐρανός is anarthrous where there is no preposition: Ac 3²¹ 17²⁴ 2 Pt 3¹⁰ (ABC add οἱ). Papyri: Mayser II 2, 29. Γῆ prefers the art., even sometimes with a

¹ B. Weiss, *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.* 84, 1911, 319-392, 503-538. Bauc s.v. κύριος II 2. W. W. Graf Baudissin, *Kyrios als Gottesname im Judentum . . .*, I Teil, Giessen 1929; *Der Gebrauch des Gottesnamens Kyrios in Sept.*

² This flatly contravenes the canon of Apollonius to the effect that an anarthrous noun may not be governed by a noun having the art.; but κύριος must be taken as a proper name = Yahweh.

preposition; however, we have it anarthrous: Mk 13²⁷ ἀπὸ ἄκρου γῆς ἕως ἄκρου οὐρανοῦ, Ac 17²⁴ οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς κύριος, 2 Pt 3⁵ οὐρανοὶ . . . καὶ γῆ,¹⁰ οὐρανοὶ (ABC add οἱ) . . . στοιχεῖα . . . γῆ (CP add ἡ). With the preposition, anarthrous: Mt 28¹⁸ (BD add τῆς), Lk 21⁵ 1 Co 8⁵ 15⁴⁷ Eph 3¹⁵ Heb 12²⁵ 8¹. Θάλασσα too is anarthrous after a preposition or in gen. after another noun: Mt 4¹⁵ OT ὄδὸν θαλάσσης, Lk 21²⁵ ἕλκους θαλάσσης, Jas 1⁶ κλύδωνι θαλάσσης, Jude¹³ κύματα ἄγρια θαλ. The same is true of κόσμος: anarthr. predicate Ro 4¹³ 11¹².¹⁵, and in prepositional formulae: ἐν κόσμῳ 1 Co 8⁴ 14¹⁰ Ph 2¹⁵ etc. 2 Pt 1⁴ vl., ἀπὸ [καταβολῆς] κόσμου Mt 25³⁴ etc. Also anarthrous: 2 Co 5¹⁹ Ga 6¹⁴.

3. θάνατος.

It frequently appears without an art., especially in certain phrases like ἕως θανάτου (Mt 26³⁸), ἔνοχος θανάτου, ἄξιον θανάτου, παραδίδόναι εἰς θάνατον, γεύεσθαι θανάτου. Apart from the anaphoric use (e.g. ἡ πληγὴ τοῦ θ. Rev 13³.¹²), the art. is used (a) either of the actual death of a definite person (1 Co 11²⁶), or (b) of death in the abstract: Jn 5²⁴ καταβέβηκεν ἐκ τοῦ θ. εἰς τὴν ζωὴν, or (c) where Death is half personified (Rev 13³.¹²), or (d) where assimilation to a noun in connection with it causes a borrowing of the art.: τὸ ἀπόκριμα τοῦ θ. (2 Co 1⁹).

4. πνεῦμα.

It is urged sometimes (e.g. A. M. Perry, *JBL* 68, 1949, 329ff) that the omission of the art. is important theologically, but the usage is often arbitrary. Τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα (rather more often τὸ πν. τὸ ἅγ.) is sometimes personal. When it is anarthrous it is a divine spirit inspiring man (1 Th 1⁵), but the matter is complicated threefold by the question of the non-use of the art. with proper nouns, and in prepositional expressions (increased in Hell. Greek), and even (in Biblical Greek through influence of the Heb. construct state) before a genitive. In none of these situations need the lack of the art. indicate any indefiniteness of reference, and with πνεῦμα the reference could still be to the Pentecostal Spirit. Nevertheless in Luke τὸ πν. τὸ ἅγ. tends to be the Pentecostal Spirit while ἅγιον πνεῦμα is an unknown power, God's spirit as opposed to that of men or demons (Procksch in Kittel WB I 105). Doubtless also anaphora

complicates the matter, as in Luke 2^{26, 27} Ac 2⁴ 8¹⁸. In 10⁴⁴ ἔπεσεν τὸ πν. τὸ ἅγ. ἐπὶ πάντας, there is reference to the well-known fact of the out-pouring. Omission, even when the reference is the Holy Spirit, is also occasioned by the presence of a preposition or by assimilation to an anarthrous noun: Ro 14¹⁷ after a list of anarthrous abstract nouns and after ἐν, Mt 1¹⁸ ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου. Without a preposition (Lk 1^{15, 35, 41, 67} 2²⁵ 3¹⁶ 4¹ 11¹³ Ac 12 4²⁵ 6⁵ 7⁵⁵ 8^{15, 17, 19} 10³⁸ 11²⁴ 19²) it is not the personal Holy Spirit, but the influence of a divine spirit which is intended, if St. Luke omits the article.

5. γράμματα:

2 Ti 3¹⁵ ἱερὰ γράμματα SC^bD*FG 33 Clem Epiph (AC* corr. to τὰ) is a technical formula (see Schrenk in Kittel WB I 765^{1ff}), Est 6¹, Jos. Ant. 16, 168.

6. ἐκκλησία:

1 Co 14⁴ ἐκκλησίαν οἰκοδομεῖ, 3 Jn⁶ ἐνώπιον ἐκκλησίας. Is it a *congregation* or *the Church*? (see K. L. Schmidt in Kittel WB III 508^{18ff}).

7. Abstract nouns ¹.

They may be articular or anarthrous in all periods down to MGr. They tend to be anarthrous if there is greater emphasis on the abstract quality, but no vital difference was felt in class. Greek; the passage is too easy from articular to anarthrous. Thus Plato *Meno* 99A ἡ ἀρετή, 99E ἀρετή, 100B ἡ ἀρετή . . . ἀρετή. So Paul, Ro 3³⁰ ὃς δικαιώσει περιτομὴν ἐκ πίστεως καὶ ἀκροβυστίαν διὰ τῆς πίστεως (prob. no significance for exegesis, but the art. is anaphoric: *by that same faith*). Translators do not trouble to distinguish τῇ χάριτι in Eph 2⁸ from χάριτι in 2⁵ (NEB *by his grace* both times); it may be that τῇ is merely anaphoric, looking back to ⁵, but there is another point of view: omission of the art. tends to emphasize the inherent qualities of abstract nouns while the art. makes them more concrete, unified and individual. In 2⁸ then the reference is to God's historical act of saving grace; in 2⁵, to grace as such, in contrast to other means of redemption (Zerwick § 131). The difficulty therefore is to account for the presence of the art.,

¹ K-G I 606 i. Gildersleeve II §§ 565-567. Maysen II 2, 30f.

just as with concrete nouns the problem is rather to account for its absence.

E.g. Mt 5⁶ τὴν δικαιοσύνην (contrast 5¹⁰), 7²³ τὴν ἀνομίαν (difficult), Ro 12⁷ εἴτε διακονίαν, ἐν τῇ διακονίᾳ· εἴτε ὁ διδάσκων, ἐν τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ; Ro 12^{9f} ἡ ἀγάπη ἀνυπόκριτος, τῇ φιλαδελφίᾳ φιλόστοργοι, τῇ τιμῇ ἀλλήλους προηγούμενοι, τῇ σπουδῇ μὴ ὀκνηροί, because they are virtues assumed to be well known; 1 Co 13¹³ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐπιστήμη, οὐκ ἔστιν ἐπιστήμη, οὐκ ἔστιν ἐπιστήμη . . . μείζων δὲ τούτων ἡ ἀγάπη (anaph.), 14²⁰ μὴ παιδία γίνεσθε ταῖς φρεσίν, ἀλλὰ τῇ κακίᾳ νηπιάζετε (art. by attraction to the concrete ταῖς φρεσίν *your mind*), Col 3⁵ πορνείαν ἀκαθαρσίαν πάθος ἐπιθυμίαν . . . καὶ τὴν πλεονεξίαν, ἥτις ἐστὶν εἰδωλολατρία and *that principal vice, covetousness* (the added clause individualizes the noun, as in Ac 19³ 26²⁷ 2 Co 8¹⁸), Heb 1⁴ εἰς διακονίαν, κληρονομεῖν σωτηρίαν (2³ 5⁹ 6⁹ 9²⁸ 11⁷), but τῆς σωτηρίας 2¹⁰.

Νόμος.

Paul is fond of anarthrous νόμος, but on no easily intelligible principle. Thus, in Ga, ὁ νόμος 10 times, νόμος 21. Ro 2¹³ is especially difficult: οὐ γὰρ οἱ ἀκροαταὶ νόμου (+ τοῦ KLP) δίκαιοι παρὰ τῷ (BD* om) θεῷ, ἀλλ' οἱ ποιηταὶ νόμου (+ τοῦ D^eEKL) δικαιωθήσονται; it may not be the total Mosaic Law which Paul has in mind, but law as such (yet we still expect anaphoric τοῦ on the second mention). See also anarthr. νόμος in Jas 1²⁵ 4¹¹ 2¹¹ (but artic. in 1⁰), 1² νόμος ἐλευθερίας (not Mosaic). Attempts have been made, from Origen onwards, to establish a principle¹ that the articular form indicates the Mosaic Law, but the context is a surer guide. See also Ro 3²⁰ διὰ γὰρ νόμου ἐπίγνωσις ἁμαρτίας (epigrammatic: *to know any sin there must be some law*), 5¹³ ἄχρι γὰρ νόμου (*till a law came*), 6¹⁴ ἁμαρτία (not *no sin*, but "sin as power", as usual in Paul; see Lohmeyer *Zschr. f. nt. Wiss.* 29, 1930, 2ff; J. Jeremias, *Die Abendmahlswoorte Jesu*, 1935, 72f) ὑμῶν οὐ κυριεύσει· οὐ γὰρ ἐστε ὑπὸ νόμον (*under any law*).

Σάρξ being virtually an abstract noun is anarthrous: *the natural state of man*; frequent ἐν σαρκί and κατὰ σάρκα (+ τὴν as v1. 2 Co 11¹⁸ Jn 8¹⁵).

ἀλήθεια.

Altogether inexplicable by the rules of anaphora are Jn 8⁴⁴ (καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ οὐκ ἔστηκεν, ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἀλήθεια ἐν αὐτῷ), 17¹⁷ (ἀγίασον αὐτοὺς ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ· ὁ λόγος ὁ σὸς ἀλήθειά ἐστιν),

¹ Sanday-Headlam *ICC Ro* on 2^{13f}, p. 58; Burton *ICC Ga* 447-460.

3 Jn³ (μαρτυρούντων σου τῇ ἀληθείᾳ, καθὼς σὺ ἐν ἀληθείᾳ περιπατεῖς). But Colwell's rule (see below, pp. 183f) may be relevant (Moule 112). Zerwick's suggestion is (§ 132) that the definite reference with the art. is to Christ as the real truth, life, light, etc.; all other truths, lives, lights, being transitory. So he explains the repeated art. in Jn 14⁶ ἡ ὁδος καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια καὶ ἡ ζωή, which otherwise is inexplicable, not being anaphoric. Therefore 2 Jn¹ (οὗς ἐγὼ ἀγαπῶ ἐν ἀληθείᾳ, καὶ οὐκ ἐγὼ μόνος ἀλλὰ καὶ πάντες οἱ ἐγνωκότες τὴν ἀληθειάν) *whom I sincerely love, and . . . all who have sincere standards* (anaphora?), ⁴ (περιπατοῦντες ἐν ἀληθείᾳ) *behaving with sincerity*, ³ sincerity, 3 Jn¹ *whom I sincerely love*, 2 Ti 2²⁵ 3⁷ Ti 1¹ ἐπίγνωσις ἀληθείας, Heb 10²⁶ ἡ ἐπίγνωσις τῆς ἀληθείας (not Christ, but articular by attraction), Eph 4²¹ (καθὼς ἐστὶν ἀλήθεια ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ), 2 Co 11¹⁰ (ἐστὶν ἀλήθεια Χριστοῦ ἐν ἐμοί), 3 Jn⁴ (cp. above) ἵνα ἀκούω τὰ ἐμὰ τέκνα ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ περιπατοῦντα *in the Truth* (Christ), ⁸ ἵνα συνεργοὶ γινώμεθα τῇ ἀληθείᾳ (Christ), ¹² Δημητρίῳ μεμαρτύρηται ὑπὸ πάντων καὶ ὑπὸ αὐτῆς τῆς ἀληθείας *Christ himself*. This distinction is a peculiarity of Biblical Greek; the papyri have the art. each time, P. Par 46; 47 (152 B.C.); 63. 16 (165 B.C.).

In the Ptol. pap. the following other abstract nouns are articular: φιλοτιμία, ἀηδία, τολμηρία, μέγεθος, ὕψος, πλῆθος, λογεῖα. The following are anarthrous: φιλανθρωπία, ἀντίληψις, ἐπισημασία, εὐγνωμοσύνη, ἀμνησία, ἡγεμονία μέγεθος (usually), φύσις, βάθος, μῆκος (usually), κρίσις, ἀναμέτρησις. These vary: πλάτος, γνώσις (Mayser II 2, 31).

8. Numerals.

Usually with cardinal numerals there is no art., but if the art. stands it indicates (as in class. Greek) a certain fraction, as in the scribal correction of Mt 25² αἱ (Z) πέντε . . . αἱ (E) fam¹³ 543 28) πέντε, after δέξα, *the first five of them . . . the other five of them*; Lk 17¹⁷ οἱ ἐννέα *the nine of them*; Rev. 17¹⁰ ἐπτὰ . . . οἱ πέντε . . . ὁ εἷς . . . ὁ ἄλλος. Or else the art. marks a contrast of one fraction from another. Thus in Mt 20²⁴ = Mk 10⁴¹ *the ten* are the *remaining* ten disciples, not a fixed group of disciples (Wackernagel II 318).

The ordinary numeral also commonly lacks the art. as in class. Greek (e.g. ὀγδόω ἔτει), especially after a preposition, and especially with ὥρα. Mt 27⁴⁵ ἀπὸ ἑκτῆς ὥρας, Mk 15³³, Ac 12¹⁰ 16¹² (vl. -τη prob. corrupt), 2 Co 12². But there is anaphora

with ὥρα in Mt 20⁹ 27⁴⁶. In Mt 20⁶ there is the art. because of ellipse of ὥρα, and in Ac 3¹ because further defining words are introduced (τὴν ὥραν τῆς προσευχῆς τὴν ἐνάτην). Cp. papyri: P. Petr. II 10 (2) 5 (240 B.C.), P. Hib. 110, 65. 100 (253 B.C.) ὥρας πρώτης; P. Hib. 75, 79 (255 B.C.) ὥρα ἰᾱ; 106 (255 B.C.) ὥρας ἰβ̄. With ἡμέρα the art. tends to be used, e.g. τῆ τρίτη ἡμέρα always, and Jn 6^{39ff} ἐν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρα (but 2 Ti 3¹ Jas 5³ ἐν ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις); but a preposition may cause its omission: Ac 20¹⁸ Ph 1⁵ (+ τῆς p⁴⁶ SBAP) ἀπὸ πρώτης ἡμέρας, like 1 Pt. 1⁵ ἐν καιρῷ ἐσχάτῳ.

(c) *Absence of Article after Prepositions*¹

Such phrases may be formulae inherited from a pre-articular age of Greek. In class. Greek they are often anarthrous, like proverbs and enumerations, although anaphora or contrast may restore the art.: e.g. Lys. 12, 16 εἰς ἄστυ *to town*, but 54 εἰς τὸ ἄστυ; Demosth. 19, 30 ἐν ἀγορᾷ but 27, 58 ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ. In NT: Mk 7⁴ ἀπ' ἀγορᾶς, 15²⁷ ἐκ δεξιῶν . . . ἐξ εὐωνύμων, Mt 24³³ ἐπὶ θύραις, Lk 7³² ἐν ἀγορᾷ (but in Mt 11¹⁶ etc. ἐν ταῖς ἀγοραῖς [CEFW om ταῖς]), Jn 6¹⁷ εἰς πλοῖον *aboard*; papyri ἐπὶ πόταμον *riverwards*, κατὰ πόλιν *in town*, κατὰ γῆν καὶ θάλασσαν *by land and sea* (class.), ἐν δεξιᾷ *on the right* (class.). The omission in time-designation is class.: e.g. πρὸς ἐσπέραν Lk 24²⁹ (Ac 28²³), πρὸ καιροῦ Mt 8²⁹ (24⁴⁵ Lk 4¹³ 8¹³ Ac 13¹¹ Ro 5⁶ Heb 11¹¹), διὰ νυκτός Ac 5¹⁹ (vl. art.), μεχρὶ μεσονυκτίου Ac 20⁷ (but κατὰ τὸ μεσονύκτιον 16²⁵). For personal anatomy one might expect the individualizing art., but ἐπὶ πρόσωπον Lk 5¹² etc. (2 Co 10⁷), and the omission occurs also in profane authors like Polybius; class. similar κατ' ὀφθαλμούς, ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς.

Formulae like ἀπ' ἀγροῦ understandably have no art. because no individual field is in mind; but referring to a definite field in Mt 13²⁴ ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ αὐτοῦ. But also ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ (D Chrys om τῷ) without indiv. reference (Mt 13⁴⁴) like τὰ κρίνα τοῦ ἀγροῦ (6²⁸). The excuse for the art. must then be that it is generic, *the country* (like τὸ ὄρος *the highlands* Mk 3¹³ etc.).

(d) *Absence of Article before a noun which governs a genitive*²

A noun is sometimes made definite by a defining gen. or adj. In Heb. a noun may be in the construct state or have a suffix

¹ K.-G I 605f. Gildersleeve II § 569. Eakin 333. Maysor II 2, 14ff.

² Radermacher² 116. Zerwick §§ 136-137.

attached to it, and in either case it would be anarthrous. This influenced the LXX and in turn the NT writers in varying degrees. Thus ἄγγελος κυρίου is not *an angel* but *the angel*, δόξα λαοῦ σου is *the glory*. It usually happens that the second noun is also anarthrous; this balance is a Greek characteristic, not Heb. The canon of Apollonius Dyscolus asserts that, of nouns in regimen, either both have the art. (like ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τῆς ἀληθείας Col 1⁵), or neither (like ἐν λόγῳ ἀληθείας 2 Co 6⁷). Philo tends to violate the canon, Plato to keep it (exx. in Radermacher² 116). But the canon must be modified to this extent, that the governing noun may be anarthrous while the governed is articular (Ro 3²⁵ εἰς ἐνδειξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ; Eph 1⁶ εἰς ἔπαινον δόξης τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ); this through Heb. influence. It is obvious that this omission occurs chiefly in prepositional phrases, to which secular writers normally do not add a gen. after the Semitic way: ἀπὸ προσώπου, διὰ χειρός, διὰ στόματος, ἀπὸ ὀφθαλμῶν σου Lk 19⁴²; ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός (Mt 19¹² Lk 1¹⁵ Ac 3² 14⁸), ἐν βίβλῳ ζωῆς Ph 4³ (cp. Rev, Mk 12²⁶), ἐν δακτύλῳ θεοῦ (Lk 11²⁰). A further complication is that proper nouns and geogr. names in the gen. may be anarthrous even when subordinate to an articular noun: ἡ Ἄρτεμις Ἐφεσίων, τὴν Ἐφεσίων πόλιν, ἐν τῷ βίβλῳ Μωϋσεως.

(e) *Generic Article*¹

The principle of the generic art. is to select a normal or representative individual. When all is said, the whole question is affected by personal taste; we have in one sentence both ὑπὲρ δικαίου and ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ Ro 5⁷ (ICC Ro 128). Almost all the exx. in poetry have been explained on other principles, sometimes by anaphora, sometimes on the principle of contrast (Gildersleeve II § 563). Contrary to our own usage, the art. is put before nouns denoting a species, family or class of any of the kingdoms of nature; and before abstract nouns of virtues, vices, sciences, etc. (Jannaris § 1201), e.g. ὁ ἄνθρωπος *mankind*, ὁ σῖτος *corn*, ἡ ἀρετὴ *virtue*, ὁ κλέπτης (Jn 10¹⁰) *thieves*.

A generic art. also accompanies plurals like ἄνθρωποι, ἔθνη, νεκροί (exc. after a preposition): Mt 14² ἠγέρθη ἀπὸ τῶν νεκρῶν, 22³¹, 1 Co 15⁴² τῆς ἀναστάσεως τῶν νεκρῶν, Eph 5¹⁴ OT ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, Col 2¹² BDEFG (rest om τῶν), 1 Th 1¹⁰ (ACK om τῶν). But Mt 17⁹ etc. ἐκ νεκρῶν

¹ K-G I 589, 1. Maysen II 2, 41ff. Gildersleeve II §§ 563f.

ἐγεροῦ, Ac 17³² 23⁶ etc. ἀνάστασιν νεκρῶν (construct state and Apoll. canon), 1 Pt 4⁵ κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς, Heb 1⁴ B p⁴⁶ Chrys ἀγγέλων. Double art.: τὰ ἔθνη τοῦ κόσμου Lk 12³⁰ (Apoll. canon); but ἔθνη is especially liable to be anarthrous: Ac 4²⁵ OT Ro 11^{12f} 15¹² OT; οὐχὶ καὶ ἔθνῶν Ro 3^{29f}; esp. with prepositions Ac 4²⁷ 15¹⁴ 2 Co 11²⁶ Ga 2¹⁵.

(f) *Repetition of Article with several nouns connected by καὶ* ¹

The art. may be carried over from the first noun to the other(s), especially if they are regarded as a unified whole and the gender and number are the same: Col 1² τοῖς ἐν Κ. ἀγίοις καὶ (sc. τοῖς) πιστοῖς ἀδελφοῖς ἐν Χ. *the saints and the faithful brethren*; Eph 2²⁰ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ προφητῶν; Lk 22⁴ τοῖς ἀρχιερεῦσιν καὶ στρατηγοῖς; Ac 15² πρὸς τοὺς ἀποστόλους καὶ πρεσβυτέρους. This is so even occasionally when the gender is different but the number the same, as in P. Tebt. I 14¹⁰ (114 B.C.); Lk 1⁶ ἐν πασαῖς ταῖς ἐντολαῖς καὶ δικαιομασίαις τοῦ κυρίου, 14²³ εἰς τοὺς ὁδοὺς καὶ φραγμούς, Mk 12³³ vī. Ac 15^{20. 29} 21²⁵ Col 2²² κατὰ τὰ ἐντάλματα καὶ διδασκαλίας τῶν ἀνθρώπων, unless κατὰ τὰ is due to dittography (but in LXX Isa 29¹³, to which this is an allusion, there is no κατὰ as well as no τὰ).

One must look critically at the common view that in Ti 2¹³ we have two clauses in apposition: τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ καὶ [sc. τοῦ] σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰ.Χ. The same is true of 2 Pt 1¹ τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ [sc. τοῦ] Ἰ.Χ. (S κυρίου for θεοῦ) ². In Hell., and indeed for practical purposes in class. Greek the repetition of the art. was not strictly necessary to ensure that the items be considered separately. The relevant consideration on the other side is that the phrase *God and Saviour* in contemporary language referred to only one person, c. A.D. 100. Moreover, the art. could have been repeated to avoid misunderstanding if separate individuals had been intended ³.

Often the repetition, even with nouns of the same gender, does indeed indicate that two distinct subjects are involved. Οἱ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ Σαδδουκαῖοι involves no misunderstanding, but

¹ K-G I 611, 2. Gildersleeve II §§ 603–605. Mayser II 2, 47ff. Radermacher² 115. Zerwick §§ 138, 139.

² See Lock in ICC on Ti 2¹³, Hort on Jas 2¹, Moulton Proleg. 84, A. T. Robertson, "The Greek Article and the Deity of Christ", *Expositor* VIII, 21 (1921) 182–188, Stauffer in Kittel WB III 107²⁶⁸, Moule 109. Stauffer's plea, based on position of ἡμῶν, is grammatically weak.

³ *NEB* (text) is probably correct, following previous standard versions except AV which follows Vulgate (comma between, in Sixtine and Clementine).

the repetition of the art. prevents misunderstanding in Lk 11⁵¹ μεταξὺ τοῦ θουσιαστηρίου καὶ τοῦ οἴκου, Jn 19⁶ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ ὑπηρέται (not a unified whole like the chief-priests, elders and scribes of Mt 16²¹ etc.), Ac 26³⁰ ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ ὁ ἡγεμῶν, 1 Co 3⁸ ὁ φυτεῦν καὶ ὁ ποτίζων ἐν εἰσιν (cp. Jn 4³⁶), 1 Th 17.⁸ ἐν τῇ Μακεδονίᾳ καὶ ἐν τῇ Ἀχαΐᾳ (two separate provinces), then they are grouped together (ἐν τῇ Μακεδονίᾳ καὶ Ἀχαΐᾳ) and contrasted with ἀλλ' ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ. Repetition generally takes place with τε καί, and that is probably why D adds τῶν in Ac 14⁶ τῶν ἔθνῶν τε καὶ Ἰουδαίων. There is frequently a variety of readings, e.g. Ro 4¹² τοῖς οὐκ ἐκ περιτομῆς μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς στοιχοῦσιν (ICC Ro in loc.)

(g) Article with Quotations¹

As in class. Greek the neuter art. may be prefixed to quoted words: Mt 19¹⁸ τὸ Οὐ φονεύσεις (DM om τό), Mk 9²³ *so far as the εἰ δύνῃ is concerned*, Ro 13⁹, 1 Co 4⁶ τὸ Μὴ ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ γέγραπται; unless we emend, it is best taken as a quotation of a slogan (Howard in *Exp. T* 33, 479), Ga 4²⁵ v.l., 5¹⁴, 6⁹ τὸ δὲ Καλὸν ποιῶντες μὴ ἐγκακῶμεν (τό introduces a proverbial phrase; or τὸ καλόν is generic), Eph 4⁹, Heb 12²⁷.

(h) Article with Indirect Interrogatives²

Class., but in NT this usage is rarely represented except in Lk-Ac. The meaning is not affected by the addition of the art.: Lk 1⁸² ἐνένευον . . . τὸ τί αὐτοὶ θέλοισι, 9⁴⁶ 19⁴⁸, Ac 4²¹ 22³⁰, 1 Th 4¹, Ro 8²⁶ (ICC in loc; Moule 200); Mk 9¹⁰ τί ἐστὶν τὸ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῆναι (unless τό . . . is articular infin.).

In conclusion, almost anything in Greek can by the addition of the art. be made substantival, whether adj., ptc., infin., adv., prepositional expression, numeral, or any phrase whatever.

A characteristic of Hell. Greek is an anarthrous noun followed by an articular attribute (Zerwick § 145). See below pp. 185, 206, 221.

§ 3. The Article with a Predicate

An adj. or ptc. or a second noun may refer to a noun either as an attribute or as a predicate. As an attribute it usually

¹ K-G I 596f. Gildersleeve I 265.

² Mayser II 1, 80; II 3, 52f.

occurs between art. and noun. As a predicate it occurs either before the art. or after the noun, and the connection between them will be supplied by a copula, either stated or understood.

Although predicate nouns are usually anarthrous, the art. thus distinguishing the subject from the complement, the art. may be inserted if the predicate noun is supposed to be a unique or notable instance (e.g. Mt 6²² *the eye alone is the light of the body*). A predicate adj. or ptc. and the pronoun ὁ αὐτός (*the same*) will also have the art.

E. C. Colwell (*JBL*, 52, 1933, 12-21) formulates rules for the art. with predicate nouns in NT in sentences in which the verb occurs. He finds that (a) definite predicate nouns take the art., if (as is usual) they follow the verb; (b) otherwise they usually lack it; (c) proper nouns lack it; (d) in relative clauses it does not apply since nouns always follow the verb, anarthrous or not. Obviously if such a rule stands the test, it is valuable for textual decisions and translation.¹

Examples: (a) Mt 5¹³ ὑμεῖς ἐστε τὸ ἄλας τῆς γῆς, 13³⁷, 16¹⁶ σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστός, 24⁴⁵, 26⁶³, 27^{11. 37}, Mk 3¹¹, 6³ οὐχ οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ τέκτων, 15^{2. 12} ὃν λέγετε τὸν βασιλέα τῶν Ἰουδ. (not AD), 3⁹, Lk 4⁴¹, 22⁷⁰, 23^{3. 37}, Jn 14. 8. 3^{9. 49}, 5³⁵ ἐκεῖνος ἦν ὁ λύχνος, 8¹² ἐγὼ εἰμι τὸ φῶς (cp. 9⁵ φῶς εἰμι), 4⁴, 11²⁷, 18³³, 20³¹, Ac 9²⁰, 21³⁸, Jas 3⁶ ὁ κόσμος predicate (M. Dibelius, *Der Brief des Jakobus*, Gött. 1921, in loc.), 1 Jn. 3⁴ καὶ ἡ ἀμαρτία ἐστὶν ἡ ἀνομία 4¹⁵ 5⁶. With an adj. usually the predicate adj. is anarthrous, but Mt 19¹⁷ εἰς ἐστὶν ὁ ἀγαθός, Rev 3¹⁷.

(b) Mt 4^{3. 6} 14³³ 27⁴⁰. 5⁴ *Son of God* precedes the verb and so anarthr., 4² *King of Israel* precedes, 13³⁹.—Mk 15³⁹ Lk 4^{3. 9} Jn 10³⁶ *Son of God* precedes.—Jn 5³⁷ *Son of man* precedes.—Jn 1¹ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος (there need be no doctrinal significance in the dropping of the art., for it is simply a matter of word-order), 9⁵ φῶς εἰμι, 14⁹ βασιλεὺς εἶ τοῦ Ἰσρ. 19²¹ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδ. εἰμι.

There are three passages in Mt where the author, striving for variety, has fallen into a definite pattern.

(1) 12⁴⁸ *my mother* (artic.) follows verb, 5⁰ *my mother* (anarthr.) precedes verb. (2) 13^{37. 39} ὁ σπείρων . . . ἐστὶν ὁ υἱός (artic. following) ὁ δὲ ἀγρός ἐστὶν ὁ κόσμος . . . οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ υἱοί . . . τὰ δὲ ζιζάνια εἰσιν οἱ υἱοί . . . , ὁ δὲ ἐχθρὸς . . . ἐστὶν ὁ διάβολος, ὁ δὲ θερισμὸς συντέλεια αἰῶνος ἐστὶν (anarthr. preceding), οἱ δὲ θερισταὶ ἄγγελοί εἰσιν. (3) 23^{8. 10} εἰς γὰρ ἐστὶν ὑμῶν ὁ διδάσκαλος (artic. following) . . . εἰς γὰρ ἐστὶν ὑμῶν ὁ πατήρ (idem) . . . ὅτι καθηγητὴς ὑμῶν ἐστὶν εἰς ὁ Χριστός (anarthr. preceding). See also Mt 18^{1. 4}.

¹ Thus Colwell's rule tends to prove WH wrong in 2 Pt 1¹⁷ ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός μου οὗτός ἐστιν. Then Tischendorf rightly places the predicate after the verb. (SA, etc.).

Colwell notes that variants in the MSS, as well as the undoubted text, also obey his canon, and from this he infers that not only among the NT authors but also among the scribes of a much later period this articular rule applied. For instance, it is true of S and B which, though they differ, differ according to rule in these passages: Mt 23¹⁰ B καθηγητης υμων εστιν εις (anarthr. preceding), S εις γαρ υμων εστιν ο καθηγητης (artic. following).—Jn 1⁴⁹ B συ βασιλευς ει του Ισραηλ (anarthr. preceding), S συ ει ο βασιλευς του Ι (artic. following).—Jas 2¹⁹ B εις θεος εστιν (anarthr. preceding), S εις εστιν ο θεος (articular following).

In Colwell's count, which is somewhat arbitrary, only 15 articular predicate nouns precede the verb ¹, while 239 follow it, and only 40 anarthrous predicate nouns follow the verb ² while 99 precede it. Judicious selection among the MS variants may remove some of the exceptions to Colwell's canon but cannot remove all. So that while the canon may reflect a general tendency it is not absolute by any means; after all, it takes no account of relative clauses or proper nouns, and he has also omitted a considerable class of "qualitative" nouns like that in *ὁ θεὸς ἀγάπη ἐστίν*. Moreover, he is the first to admit the lack of objectivity in his method of counting: he professes to include only *definite* nouns among his anarthrous predicates, and the degree of definiteness is extremely difficult to assess.

¹ Lk 4⁴¹, Jn 1²¹ 6⁵¹ 15¹, Ro 4¹³ 1 Co 9¹. 2 11³. 25 2 Co 1¹² 3². 17, 2 Pt 1¹⁷, Rev 19⁸ 20¹⁴.

² E.g. Mt 20¹⁶, 27⁴³ *Son of God* (anarthr. following; but θεοῦ precedes), Mk 4³² 9³⁵ 12³⁸, Lk 20³³ 22²⁴, Jn 4¹⁸ 18¹³. 37, Ac 10³⁶, Ro 4¹¹. 18 7¹³ 8¹⁶. 29 11⁶, 1 Co 12²⁷ 16¹⁵ 2 Co 5²¹ 6¹⁶, Ga 4³¹, 1 Th 4³, 1 Pt 5¹², Heb 11¹. Paul is the most significant breaker of Colwell's rule.

CHAPTER THIRTEEN

ATTRIBUTIVE RELATIONSHIP: ADJECTIVES AND NUMERALS

§ 1. The Adjectival Attribute¹

As in class. Greek, nouns appear instead of adjs. in an attributive sense: ἀνὴρ Lk 24¹⁹ Ac 11⁶ 31⁴ ἄνδρα φονέα, 22³; ἄνθρωπος Mt 18²³; πύθων Ac 16¹⁶ SBAC*D* (gen., not adjectival, in p⁴⁵ C³ D² E). Sometimes a noun will assume the form of an adj. by coining a fem. or neuter: δούλη Lk 13⁸. 4⁸ Ac 21⁸, δοῦλα neut. pl. Ro 6¹⁹, ὄμηρα neut. pl. LXX 1 Mac 13¹⁶; Rev 4³ λίθω ἰάσπιδι καὶ σαρδίῳ.

Three relative positions are possible for the art. and noun with attributive adjs., ptcs., or numerals: I. Classical ὁ ἀγαθός ἀνὴρ. II. ὁ ἀνὴρ ὁ ἀγαθός (the ptc., especially with additional adjuncts, is liable to be placed in this position). III. Hellenistic ἀνὴρ ὁ ἀγαθός: much more frequent in the pap. than in class. Greek (Mayser II 2, 57f); the adj. is a kind of limiting after-thought² to a noun which originally was more vague. E.g. Lk 23⁴⁹ γυναῖκες αἱ συνακολουθοῦσαι women, viz. those who . . . , Jn 14²⁷ εἰρήνην ἀφίημι ὑμῖν, εἰρήνην τὴν ἐμὴν δίδωμι ὑμῖν, 2 Tī 1¹³ ἐν πίστει καὶ ἀγάπῃ τῇ ἐν Χ.Ι. This happens especially with the ptc.: Ac 7³⁵ ἐν χειρὶ ἀγγέλου τοῦ ὀφθέντος αὐτῷ, Ro 21⁴ ἔθνη τὰ μὴ νόμον ἔχοντα³.

Thus the attribute participates in the force of the art. either by taking an intermediate position or, if placed in the post-position, by assuming its own art. There are occasions however when the adj. is not in the intermediate position and has no art. of its own. In these circumstances, it is predicative⁴ (see last ch. for nouns used predicatively); Mk 7⁵ κοινᾶς ταῖς χερσίν DW (rest om. art.) *with hands unwashed*, 8¹⁷ πεπωρωμένην

¹ K-G I §§ 404–405. Gildersleeve II §§ 608–613. Mayser II 2, 51–59.

² K-G I 613f. Radermacher² 115. Zerwick § 145.

³ For the further significance of this word-order, see above (Introduction, p. 8). Cp. BU 46 (A.D. 193) ὄνους τέσσαρες τοὺς καλλίστους, Mk 15⁴¹ Ac 10⁴¹ 19¹¹. 17 26²² 1 Pt 1⁷.

⁴ But the odd variant τὸ γὰρ πνεῦμα ἅγιον Lk 12¹² must be a slip; also 1 Jn 5²⁰.

ἔχετε τὴν καρδίαν ὑμῶν, Jn 5³⁶ ἔχω τὴν μαρτυρίαν μείζω *I have a witness which is greater*, Ac 14¹⁰ εἶπεν μεγάλη τῇ φωνῇ, Lk 6⁸ τῷ ξηρὰν ἔχοντι τὴν χεῖρα, 1 Co 11⁵ ἀκατακαλύπτω τῇ κεφαλῇ, Heb 7²⁴ ἀπαράβατον ἔχει τὴν ἱερωσύνην *has a priesthood which is inalienable*, 9¹ τὸ ἅγιον κοσμικόν. More difficult to translate is ὁ ὄχλος πολὺς Jn 12⁹ (as scribes found : AB³D om ὁ ; W adds ὁ το πολὺς),¹². It ought to mean *the crowd is great*, but evidently = ὁ πολὺς ὄχλος (Mk 12³⁷); it is probably done on the analogy of πᾶς and ὄλος. Cp. πολλῇ τῇ ἐμφορεῖᾳ Plut. etc. in Radermacher² 112; ὁ φόνος πολὺς Arr. An. I 9, 6. Also Isocr. *Philipp.* 56 τὸ σῶμα θνητὸν ἅπαντες ἔχομεν (Jn 5³⁶).

§ 2. The Article with Several Attributes

Where in class. Greek there are several attributes, the art. may or may not be repeated (Gildersleeve II § 669). Moreover, it often becomes clumsy to insert all the attributes between the art. and noun (as in 1 Pt 3³ ὁ ἐξῶθεν ἐμπλοκῆς τριχῶν καὶ περιθέσεως χρυσίων ἢ ἐνδύσεως ἱμάτιον κόσμος), and there is a tendency to divide them so that some stand before the noun and some after it. Clauses placed after the noun do not always require repetition of the art. (e.g. Plato *Rpb* 532c πρὸς δὲ τὰ ἐν ὕδασι φαντάσματα θεῖα) and may be translated predicatively. The art. is repeated where the defining clause implies a contrast or if the meaning would be ambiguous, and also where the defining words are emphatic, as in Rev. 2¹² τὴν ξομφαίαν τὴν διστομον τὴν δξειαν Heb 11¹² ἡ ἄμμος ἢ παρὰ τὸ χεῖλος . . . ἡ ἀναρίθμητος.

There is nothing particularly emphatic about the following, but the numeral is thought of as part of the noun and there is but one real attribute: Jn 6¹³ Jas 1¹ Rev 21⁹. Predicative additions of an adj. etc. in NT:—Mt 24⁴⁵ ὁ πιστὸς δοῦλος καὶ φρόνιμος, 1 Co 10³ τὸ αὐτὸ βρῶμα πνευματικόν S^cDEFG (p⁴⁶ A om αὐτό; S*BA πν. βρ.), 16²¹ τῇ ἐμῇ χειρὶ Παύλου, Ga 1⁴ τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος αἰῶνος πονηροῦ S^cDEFG (p⁴⁶ S*BA τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος πονηροῦ), 1¹³ τὴν ἐμὴν ἀναστροφὴν ποτε ἐν τῷ Ἰουδαίῳ, Col 1⁸ τὴν ὑμῶν ἀγάπην ἐν πνεύματι, 1 Pt 1¹⁸ τῆς ματαίας ὑμῶν ἀναστροφῆς πατροπαράδοτου (not C).

Moreover, an adj. or ptc. which follows a gen. always takes the art., unless it be understood predicatively: Mt 3¹⁷ ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, 2 Co 6⁷ τῶν ὄπλων τῆς δικαιοσύνης τῶν δεξιῶν καὶ ἀριστερῶν, Eph 6¹⁶ τὰ βέλη τοῦ πονηροῦ τὰ (om BD*FG) πεπυρωμένα, Heb 13²⁰ 1 Pt 5¹⁰; predicatively Ti 2¹¹ ἐπεφάνη ἡ χάρις

(and) *seven*, not *70 times seven* (an error still perpetrated by NEB, without so much as a footnote) Mt 18²². D* rightly interprets it as ἑβδομηκοντάκις ἑπτάκις, and Vulg. as *septuagies septies*. The same principle applies with ἑπτάκις ἕπτα *14 times* (not *seven times seven*) T. Benj. 7⁴. So δώδεκα for δωδεκάκις in Rev 22², δύο for δίς in 9¹². Semitic speech has ambiguous numerals.

In Mk 4⁸. ²⁰ B reads εἰς . . . ἐν . . . ἐν, S reads εἰς . . . εἰς . . . εἰς (a correction), ADWQ εν . . . εν . . . εν (= ἐν . . . ἐν . . . ἐν) correct. "Εν is a sign of multiplication = ἑκατονταπλασίονα (an Aramaism).

CHAPTER FOURTEEN

ATTRIBUTIVE RELATIONSHIP: PRONOUNS AND PRONOMINAL ADJECTIVES

§ 1. **Attributive Pronouns**

1. *Possessive pronouns: unemphatic*¹

It was a tendency of the NT as well as the Koine to prefer the gen. of the pers. pronoun (μου) to the nom. possessive pronoun (ἐμός). The rule for word-order in the Koine generally seems fairly close to the class. model. The genitives of the pers. pronouns μου, σου, ἡμῶν, ὑμῶν, αὐτοῦ, αὐτῆς, αὐτῶν stand without an art. of their own with an articular noun, either (a) after the noun, or (b) before its art., in the LXX, NT and Hell. generally; (c) where the noun has an attribute the gen. pers. pronoun follows the attribute. But if they are very emphatic, we may expect to find the 1st and 2nd pres. pronouns between the art. and the noun, even without this attribute². (d) The 3rd pers. pronoun in this position is not necessarily emphatic in Hell. Greek. With anarthrous nouns it is immaterial whether the gen. pronoun precedes or follows the noun (Mayser II 2, 66).

Exx. :—

(a) Very commonly, e.g. ὁ πατήρ μου Jn 15¹ etc., and abundantly frequent esp. with 3rd p. in the pap.³

(b) Less commonly, and special attention should be paid to the variant readings: Mt 2² αὐτοῦ τὸν ἀστέρα, 7²⁴, 8⁸ ἴνα μου ὑπὸ τὴν στέγην, 16¹⁸ 17¹⁵ 23⁸.—Mk 5³⁰ 9²⁴.—Lk 6⁴⁷ 12¹⁸ 15³⁰ 16⁶ 19³⁵ etc.—Jn 12⁷ 22³ 31⁹. 21. 33 44⁷ 91¹. 21. 28 11³². 48 12⁴⁰ 13¹ etc.—Ro 14¹⁶ 1 Co 8¹² Ph 2² 41⁴ Col 2⁵ 4¹⁸ 1 Th 2¹⁶ 3¹⁰. 13 2 Th 2¹⁷ 3⁵ Phm 5 1 Ti 4¹⁵ 2 Ti 1⁴.—1 Jn 3²⁰.—Rev 3¹. 2. 8. 15 10⁹ 14¹⁸ 18⁵ etc.—PSI IV 372. 12 (250 B.C.)

¹ K-G I 619, 4; 627, 3. Schwyzer II 202ff. Mayser II 2, 64ff. Winer-Schmiedel § 22, 14–17. Radermacher² 72f, 111. A. Wifstrand, *A Problem concerning Word Order in the NT*, Studia theol., Lund 1951. *Internat. Zeitschriftenschau f. Bibelwiss.*, 1951–2, 180f. Helbing *Kasus-syntax* 178.

² K-G I 619, 2. UPZ 113. 12 (156 B.C.) τῆς ὑμῶν ἀγωγῆς. Moulton *Einl.* 59, 1. In NT, apparently only Pauline, and almost confined to ὑμῶν.

³ NT uses ἐμοῦ and σοῦ only in connection with another gen., e.g. Ro 11² ὑμῶν τε καὶ ἐμοῦ, 16¹³ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐμοῦ.

ἀ καταβεβόσκηκέ σου τὰ πρόβατα. Before two nouns to save repetition: Lk 12³⁵ ὑμῶν αἱ ὀσφύες . . . καὶ οἱ λύχνοι, Jn 11⁴⁸ ἡμῶν καὶ τὸν τόπον καὶ τὸ ἔθος.—Ac 21¹¹.—1 Th 1³ 2¹⁹ 2 Ti 3¹⁰ Ti 1¹⁵.—Rev 2¹⁹.—Diod. Sic. 11. 16. The above are unemphatic pronouns, but they may be inserted in this pre-position for special emphasis: Lk 12³⁰ 22⁵³, 1 Co 9¹¹ εἰ ἡμεῖς ὑμῶν τὰ σαρκικὰ θερίσομεν, Eph 2¹⁰ αὐτοῦ γὰρ ἔσμεν ποιήματα, Ph 3²⁰.

(c) Mt 27⁶⁰ ἐν τῷ καινῷ αὐτοῦ μνημείῳ, 2 Co 4¹⁶ ὁ ἔξω ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπος, 5¹ ἡ ἐπίγειος ἡμῶν οὐκία, 1 Pt 1³ 2⁹ 5¹⁰ etc.

(d) The 3rd p. αὐτοῦ = *his* is found in the middle position of the attributive, not merely when emphatic, as in class. Greek, but in NT and Koine also when unemphatic (Mayser II 2, 66): Ro 11¹¹ τῶ αὐτῶν παραπτώματι ἡ σωτηρία τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, 3²⁴ τῇ αὐτοῦ χάριτι, 1 Th 2¹⁹, Ti 3⁵ κατὰ τὸ αὐτοῦ ἔλεος *emph.* (D*EFG τὸ ἐλ. αὐτοῦ), Heb 2⁴ τὴν αὐτοῦ θέλησιν, 7¹⁸ διὰ τὸ αὐτῆς ἀσθενές καὶ ἀνωφελές (no *emph.*), 1 Pt 1³ τὸ πῶλυ αὐτοῦ ἔλεος, 5¹⁰ τὴν αἰώνιον αὐτοῦ δόξαν, 2 Pt 1⁹ τῶν πάλαι αὐτοῦ ἀμαρτιῶν, LXX 2 Mac 7⁸, Herm. M. VI 2, 2, Clem. Hom. 17. 11 3⁸ and often. But *emphatic*: Ro 3²⁶ τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι. For 3rd p. ἐκείνου, see Jn 5⁴⁷ 2 Co 8⁹. 14 2 Ti 2²⁶ etc. (but Ro 6²¹ τὸ τέλος ἐκείνων). For 3rd p. τούτου: Ro 11³⁰ 2 Pt 1¹⁶ (but contrary to rule: Ac 13²³ Heb 13¹¹ Rev 18¹⁵)

Possessive pronouns: emphatic.

On the other hand, the genitives ἐμαυτοῦ, σεαυτοῦ, ἑαυτοῦ, τούτου, ἐκείνου usually have the position of an attribute, not a predicate, both in class. and in Hell. Greek (Mayser II 2, 65). As a possess. gen. with a noun, ἐμαυτοῦ is found in NT only at 1 Co 10³³ τὸ ἐμαυτοῦ συμφέρον, while σεαυτοῦ is never found like this. In NT also, esp. in Paul, the *emph.* ὑμῶν is found in attributive position (cp. Soph. Oed. Rex 1458 ἡ μὲν ἡμῶν μοῖρα) thus making ὑμέτερος almost superfluous in all NT writings (not ten instances, and none in Mt-Mk). The attributive ὑμῶν: 1 Co 16¹⁷ τὸ ὑμῶν ὑστέρημα (BCD ὑμέτερον), 2 Co 1⁶ 9² (vl. ἐξ ὑμῶν), 12¹⁹ 13⁹, 1 Th 3⁷, Clem. Hom. 10¹⁵ (but the predicative position in Ph 3²⁰ ἡμῶν γὰρ τὸ πολίτευμα for greater emphasis; and Heb 10²⁵ τὴν ἐπίσυναγωγὴν ἑαυτῶν, for ὑμῶν αὐτῶν; reflexives: Lk 19¹³ δέκα δούλους ἑαυτοῦ *of his*, Ac 21¹¹ δῆσας ἑαυτοῦ τοὺς πόδας, Ga 6⁴. 8 (D*FG αὐτοῦ), Eph 4¹⁶ (SD*G αὐτοῦ), Herm. S. II 5; S. IV 5 (P. Mich. αὐτῶν); V 4, 3A (P. Mich. αὐτοῦ) (Mayser II 2, 70). Where the emphatic pronoun occurs in predicative position, there is often a variant reading created by scribes who correct it to unemph. pronoun, for which this position would be normal.

Possessive adjectives ¹.

Ἐμός, σός, ἡμέτερος, ὑμέτερος had been used in class. Greek as emph. possessives, but they are out of vogue now, being replaced by the gen. (or dat.: σοι ἦσαν Jn 17⁶) of the pers. pronoun or by ἴδιος. Still ἐμός is frequent in Jn, and occurs in 1 Co ten times (e.g. 11²⁴ τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν 16¹⁸), but often there is no emphasis: Lk 22¹⁹ Ro 10¹ Ga 1¹³ Ph 1²⁶; it = μου. But ἐμός and σός may be reflexive, as occasionally in class. Greek (K-G I 568f): Mt 7³ 2 Co 1²³ Phm¹⁹ (ἔγραψα τῇ ἐμῇ χειρὶ), 3 Jn⁴ τὰ ἐμὰ τέκνα, Herm. S I 11 τὸ σὸν ἔργον ἐργάζου. Ἡμέτερος and ὑμέτερος are rarer: Ro 11³¹ 15⁴ 1 Co 15³¹ 16¹⁷ (ὕμῶν p⁴⁶ SA).

Word-order: in Jn about 30 times in post-position (unemphatic): ἐμός 3²⁹ (ἡ χάρὰ ἡ ἐμή), 5³⁰ 30 6³⁸ 7⁶ 8 8¹⁶ 31. 37. 43. 51. 56 10²⁸ 27 12²⁶ 14¹⁵ 27 15⁹ 11. 12 17¹³ 24 18³⁶ (4); σός 17¹⁷ (ὁ λόγος ὁ σός), 18³⁵; ὑμέτερος 7⁶ 8¹⁷. In pre-position, only three times (emphatic): 4⁴² τὴν σὴν λαλίαν, 5⁴⁷ τοῖς ἐμοῖς ῥήμασιν, 7¹⁶ ἡ ἐμὴ διδασχά.—In Mt Mk Lk only emphatic; therefore pre-position (e.g. Mt 7²² τῷ σῶ ὀνόματι bis).—With no art. Ph 3⁹ μὴ ἔχων ἐμὴν δικαιοσύνην τὴν ἐκ νόμου (predicatively: *which is my own*). In Jn 4³⁴ ἐμὸν βρῶμα, 13³⁵ 15⁸ (attrib.); predicative 14²⁴ 16¹⁵ 17⁶ 9. 10. 10, also Mt 20²³ Mk 10⁴⁰ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐμὸν τοῦτο δοῦναι.

Ἰδιος as simple, possess. pronoun, or reflex. adjective ².

With the old class. meaning *peculiar, private*: Mk 15²⁰ τὰ ἴδια ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ (⊙ om αὐτοῦ; BD om ἴδια), Ac 1¹⁹ τῇ ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ αὐτῶν (B*SD lat om ἰδίᾳ), 4³², 1 Co 3⁸ 7² (ἕκαστος τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα ἔχεται, καὶ ἕκαστη τὸν ἴδιον ἄνδρα ἔχεται. Is this simply variety in style? Or is ἴδιος class.?), 7⁷ (certainly the class. use: *his own private gift*), 12¹¹ ἰδίᾳ ἕκαστω, 15³⁸ (*its own peculiar body*), Ti 1¹² ἴδιος αὐτῶν *their own poet* (i.e. not another nationality), Heb 7²⁷ (individual sins, as oppos. to the people's; cp. 4¹⁰). However, in the post-class. period there enters the meaning = ἑαυτοῦ (class. οἰκεῖος): Pap. Rev. Laws 52, 13, 23 (258 B.C.) εἰς τὴν ἰδίαν χρεῖαν. Moreover, the LXX, NT, Josephus, Plutarch, etc. use it not only as a reflexive, but even as a mere possessive, differing little if at all from αὐτοῦ. Reflexive: Mt 14¹³ etc. καθ' ἰδίαν = class. καθ' ἑαυτόν, Lk 2³ (vl. ἑαυτοῦ), Jn 1¹¹ εἰς τὰ ἴδια ἦλθεν, 4² τὸν ἀδελφὸν τὸν ἴδιον, Ac 24²³

¹ Mayser II 2, 67f, 68, 71ff. Moulton Einl. 59. G. D. Kilpatrick, "The Possessive Pronoun in the NT." *JThS* 42, 1941, 184-186 (for Mk and Lk). Cuendet 40 (for word-order).

² Mayser I² 2, 65; II 2, 73f. Meisterhans-Schwyzer 235. E. L. Green, "Ἰδιος as a possessive in Polybius," *Proc. Amer. Philol. Assoc.* 34, 4. Schwyzer II 205⁵.

τῶν ἰδίων, 2 Co 5¹⁰ p⁴⁶ lat τὰ ἴδια, 2 Pt 3³.¹⁶ Wi 19¹³ P. Oxy. I 37 τὸ ἴδιόν μου τέκνον. Possessive: Mt 22⁵ τὸν ἴδιον ἀγρόν, 25¹⁴, Ti 2⁹ ἰδίοις δεσπόταις, 1 Pt 3¹.⁵ τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν, 2 Pt 2¹⁶ ἰδίας παρανομίας. *Word-order* (Cuendet 41): in Syn. Gosp. pre-position (e.g. Lk 6⁴¹ ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ ὀφθαλμῷ, emph.), in Jn usually post-position.

2. *Attributive demonstrative pronouns*

"Οὗδε¹.

It no longer forms part of the living language; it is rare in NT and papyri but occurs attributively in Jas 4¹³ εἰς τήνδε τὴν πόλιν, and hardly correctly even here² as it appears to mean τὴν καὶ τὴν *such and such*, as in popular Attic and Hell.: LXX Ru 1¹⁷. MGr ὁ τάδε(ς) = ὁ δεῖνα: *Mr So-and-so*; Wackernagel II 107f., and literature.

Οὗτος and ἐκεῖνος³.

Whereas in the Ptol. pap. we hardly ever find them used attributively but only predicatively, on the the other hand in both the LXX and NT the attributive is by far the greater use. It is only in books like 2-4 Mac and Wi, and the writings of John and Paul that there is any approach to normal contemporary usage in this respect.

The omission of the art.⁴ is possible where conceivably the noun is regarded as a predicate of the pronoun, which is quite in accord with class. Greek. In the Ptol. pap. it is frequently omitted where ordinal numerals are concerned: Zen. pap. (258 B.C.) ἡδὴ δ' ἐστὶν ἔτος τοῦτο δεύτερον, UPZ (163 B.C.) ἔτος τοῦτο δέκατον *this is the tenth year*; cp. Lk 1³⁶ *this is the sixth month*, 2² *this was the first census*, 12 *this shall be a sign to you*, Jn 2¹¹ ταύτην ἐποίησεν ἀρχὴν τῶν σημείων *he did this as a beginning of the miracles*, 2 Pt 3¹ *this is the second letter*. So also Achilles Tatius 7. 11. 2 (iv/A.D.) τρίτην ταύτην ἡμέραν, Menander *Epirr.* 26f (iv/B.C.), Lucian *dial. mort.* 13. 3. But even Hdt 5, 76

¹ See above, p. 44. K-G I § 467 pp. 641ff. Gildersleeve II § 665. Meisterhans-Schwyzler 231-232. Τοιαῦδε only in 2 Pt 1¹⁷.

² It is correctly used in 1 Clem 50³ 63².

³ K-G I 627ff, 645ff. Maysen II 2, 79-82. N. Turner, "The Unique Character of Biblical Greek," *Vet. Test.* 5, 1955, 2, pp. 208-213.

⁴ J. E. Harry, "The omission of the article with substantives after οὗτος, ὅδε, ἐκεῖνος in prose," *Trans. Amer. Phil. Assoc.* 29, 1898, 48-64. Bauer⁴ col. 1087. Winer-Schmiedel § 23, 12. L.S.s.v. οὗτος B I 4. Maysen II 2, 81.

τέταρτον δὴ τοῦτο, and LXX Ge 27³⁶ δεύτερον τοῦτο. Nu 14²² Jg 16¹⁵. However, the real difficulty occurs where there is no copula, real or understood, but a main verb which excludes the possibility of supplying the verb *to be* and taking the noun as a predicate of the demonstrative pronoun. The difficulty is that in an attributive sense the art. is always present in earlier Greek (with the negligible exception of the Epic poets and sometimes in the tragedians). Yet in NT there are clear instances of omission: Mk 16¹⁷ σημειᾶ δὲ τοῖς πιστεύουσιν ταῦτα παρακολουθήσει *these miracles* (but ταῦτα may be construed as obj. of the ptc.), Ac 1⁵ οὐ μετὰ πολλὰς ταύτας ἡμέρας (οὐ reverses the meaning of πολλὰς: thus *after these few days*), 24²¹ περὶ μιᾶς ταύτης φωνῆς ἧς ἐκέκραξα (*this single utterance*). The def. art. was being carelessly used, as time went on, in these connections. Radermacher notes its absence, where it would have been inevitable at an earlier period (πᾶς βίωτος *the whole life* on a Galatian inscription, and Dionysius of Halicarnassus has καθ' ἕναστον ἐνιαυτόν) and there is little doubt of the attributive sense in the phrases τούτου πράγματος, ταῦτα ἀδικήματα, τοῦτο μνημα, ὀνόματα ταῦτα, τούτῳ δικαίῳ, τόδε σῆμα (p. 113). In the imperial period therefore the usage was already established and we should not strive to render the anarthrous demonstrative in NT in a predicative way unless the copula (actual or understood) makes this necessary.

The position of the attributive pronoun, like that of the adj., is either before the art. or after the noun. The post-positive position may in part be due to Hebrew influence, for in LXX Ge 7¹ (and thus in Syn. Gosp. and Heb 3¹⁰) הָיָה רִיבָה becomes ἡ γενεὰ αὐτῆ, and it was probably the later Hebrew הָיָה עוֹלָם (*this world-time*) that produced ὁ καιρὸς οὗτος (Mk 10³⁰ Lk 12⁵⁶ 18³⁰) and ὁ κόσμος οὗτος (Jn, Paul), which Paul more correctly terms ὁ νῦν καιρὸς, and אֲנִי עוֹלָם accounts for ὁ αἰὼν ἐκεῖνος Lk 20³⁵ (in Pastorals ὁ νῦν αἰὼν 1 Ti 6¹⁷ Ti 2¹²). There are a few examples of pre-positive position in NT (Mt 12³² 11²⁵ 12¹ 14¹ Ac 12¹) but not usually in the Heb. sense of *world-time*.

Τοιοῦτος and τοσοῦτος ¹.

Τοιοῦτος is occasionally preceded by the art. (when referring

¹ K-G I 630, 5. Meisterhans-Schwyzler 232. Gildersleeve II § 586. Mayser II 2, 82ff.

to individuals or individualizing a class): e.g. Mk 9³⁷ ABDLNW τῶν τοιούτων παιδίων (SC παιδ. τούτων), 2 Co 12³ τὸν τοιοῦτον ἄνθρωπον, Jn 4²³ τοιούτους ζητεῖ τοὺς προσκυνοῦντας (predicative). Τοσοῦτος has the art. only Rev 18¹⁷ ὁ τοσοῦτος πλοῦτος.

Αὐτός = *self* as attributive ¹.

It is in general agreement with class. and Koine usage. It is found in the predicative position, e.g. αὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦμα Ro 8²⁶ = *the Spirit himself*; but attributive τὸ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα 2 Co 4¹³ = *the self-same Spirit*. The art. however does not belong to αὐτός but to the noun, and is therefore sometimes omitted, as in Jn 2²⁴ αὐτός Ἰησοῦς. It is found in connection with the pers. pronoun (αὐτός ἐγὼ *I myself*) where it is to be distinguished from the reflexive (*I do this to myself*): Ac 20³⁰ ἐξ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν, 1 Co 5¹³ ἐξάρατε τὸν πονηρὸν ἐξ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν *yourselves* (not reflexive), Ga 4¹⁷ ἵνα αὐτοὺς ζηλοῦτε = αὐτοὺς αὐτοὺς (in 3rd p. αὐτός is not repeated) *the men themselves*.

It is a debatable point whether in the Ptol. papyri αὐτός can stand in demonstrative sense for οὗτος or ἐκεῖνος ²; it is any way almost restricted to the official style of writing. If so, it appears again abundantly in NT in Luke, especially in certain phrases (and even where Semitic sources are not in question, e.g. Ac 16¹⁸ 22¹³) ³. This significantly affects the exegesis of certain passages, where the translation is *this* or *that*, but not *the same*, or even *that very*, e.g. Lk 10⁷ ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ οἰκίᾳ, Lk 13¹ ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ καιρῷ (ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ κ. Mt 11²⁵) LXX To 3¹⁷; (ἐν) αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ, ἡμέρᾳ Lk 2³⁸ (= ἐκείνῳ in 7²¹) 10²¹ 12¹² (ἐκεῖνος Mk 13¹¹) 13³¹ 20¹⁹ 24¹³ etc., P. Teb. I 411³ (ii/A.D.) αὐτῇ ὥρᾳ, P. Oxy III 528. 14 (ii/A.D.) αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ, inscr. Ditt. Syll.² 1173¹ (ii/A.D.) αὐταῖς ταῖς ἡμέραις, T. Abr. 113²⁹ 116²⁷ (αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ); αὐτῇ τῇ νυκτί Herm. V. III 1, 2 S; 10, 7; ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ νυκτί LXX To 2⁹. It appears to be synonymous with ἐκεῖνος in the otherwise puzzling sentence, 2 Ti 2²⁶ ἐζωγραφημένοι ὑπ' αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ ἐκείνου θέλημα.

¹ K-G I 627, 4. Gildersleeve II §§ 654-655. Ljungvik BSSV 8f. Mayser II 2, 75ff.

² Moulton says it can (Proleg. 91), but Black doubts this (AAGA² 72); the latter prefers the hypothesis of the influence of Aramaic proleptic pronoun (see p. 41).

³ Moulton-Howard, App. p. 432.

3 Indefinite pronouns in attributive use¹

τις.

As to word-order, though they are enclitics, τις and τι occasionally, when used adjectivally, stand before their noun, as long as they are not first word in the sentence (and even first word in Soph. *Trach.* 865, *Oed. Rex* 1471 Plato *Theaet.* 147c., Plutarch *Tranqu.* c. 13): Ac 3² καί τις ἀνὴρ, Ro 1¹¹. But τινές² may now stand first in the sentence: Mt 27⁴⁷ τινές δὲ τῶν, Lk 6² idem, Jn 13²⁹ τινές γάρ, 1 Ti 5²⁴ τινῶν ἀνθρώπων. Attributive τις, often with adjs. and numerals (*about*) in class. Greek, is now largely used in the sense of *quidam* = *so to speak*: Jas 1¹⁸ ἀπαρχήν τινα, Heb 10²⁷ φοβερὰ τις ἐκδοχή; but τινα in Ac 8⁹ (εἶναί τινα ἑαυτὸν μέγαν) is not an instance, but is *a person of importance* (like Ga 2⁶ 6³), with μέγαν inserted for emphasis. With numerals also in Lk 7¹⁸ δύο τινάς, Ac 23²³ τινὰς δύο: not *about two* but *a certain pair*; so also Lk 22⁵⁰ Jn 11⁴⁹ εἷς τις *a certain one*.

As substitutes for τις there are ἄνθρωπος: Mt 12¹⁰, 13²⁸ ἐχθρὸς ἄνθρωπος, ⁴⁵ ἀνθρώπω (BS* om) ἐμπόρω CDΘ, ⁵² 18²³. Mk 1²³ etc. and ἀνὴρ (in Lk, e.g. 9³⁸ Ac 3¹⁴) like Aram. שָׂרִי³ but also = Heb שָׂרִי *each, anyone* (Thackeray OT Gr. 45). We find ἀνὴρ and ἄνθρωπος = τις in Homer and class. Greek (K-G I 272; Svensson op. cit. 136-140). Also γυνή: Mt 15²².

εἷς.

Another post-class. substitute for τις is the numeral εἷς⁴, as also in the Ptol. papyri, in the sense of *aliquis* or *quidam*, with analogies in modern languages (*one, ein, un*). In Luke it does not seem to be a Semitism; he always follows εἷς with a gen. (e.g. 15¹⁵ ἐνὶ τῶν πολιτῶν; same phrase in Hyperides *Lycophr.* 13 (iv/B.C.), which makes it conform closely to Greek usage: pap. Mayser II 2, 86 ἀποστείλας τῶν οἰκοδόμων ἕνα. In Mk also in three places (5²² 14¹⁰. 6⁶) we have gen.; whereas in Mt 9¹⁸ 26⁶⁹

¹ K-G I 662, 663. Mayser II 2, 84ff. On confusion of relative and interrogative pronouns, including their attributive form (i.e. τις and ὅστις, πόσος and ὅσος, πῶς and ὡς) see pp. 4, 49f.

² Also τινές (substantivally) stands at the beginning of the sentence Ac 17¹⁸ τινές δέ, 19³¹, Jn 7⁴⁴ etc., especially where there is a contrasted clause Ph 1¹⁵ τινές μὲν . . . τινές δέ (classical).

³ Wellhausen Einl.² 20. Moulton-Howard 433 (Epict. 3, 23, 15). Black AAGA² 248-52.

⁴ Schwyzer II 27. Mayser II 2, 85. Lagrange *S. Matth.* XCVIII. Winer-Schmiedel § 26, 5. Radermacher² 76. Moulton Einl. 154.

there is no gen. after εἰς or μία. Mt (e.g. εἰς γραμματεὺς 8¹⁹) thus comes closer to Semitic than do Mk or Lk, and is probably influenced by Heb. **תַּיִן** or Aram. **תַּיִן**. In 21¹⁹ he has **συκῆν μίαν**, where Mk 11¹³ has no μίαν (except SKM for harm.). Mt 18²⁴ 19¹⁶ Mk 10¹⁷ have εἰς for τις, where Lk has τις. Εἰς is more likely to reflect Semitic influence on the rare occasions when it is in post-position Mt 9¹⁸ ἀρχῶν εἰς S^bB lat syr^{pe}. h1 (S*^c C* DWΘ fam¹ 700 copt om εἰς), Jn 6⁹ παιδάριον ἐν ΑΓ, LXX Da 7⁸ ἄλλο ἐν κέρασ ἀνέφυῖ, 1 Esd 4¹⁸ γυναῖκα μίαν, but even here we have papyrus precedent (PSI IV 571, 15 ἄλλον ἕνα *a further one* παρατρέφω, 252 B.C.). The use with τις is class.: Lk 22⁵⁰ εἰς τις, Mk 14⁴⁷ (SA om τις), Jn 11⁴⁹ (Schwyzer II 215 b. 1).

-ουν and -ποτε¹.

These additions form an indef. pronoun, e.g. ὅστισοῦν, ὅστις δήποτε, but rarely if at all in NT. There is Ga 2⁶ ὅποιοι ποτε ἦσαν *whatever kind of persons they were* (ποτε is not a separate word, *at one time.*) Ac 19²⁶ D ὁ Παῦλος οὗτος τις ποτε (not τότε): *gig hic Paulus nescio quem.*

οὐ . . . πᾶς.

This peculiarly Biblical Greek² phenomenon should be included among negative indef. pronouns. The Hebraistic οὐ (μὴ) . . . πᾶς = **לֹא . . . כֻּלֹּ**, as also πᾶς . . . οὐ = **כֻּלֹּ . . . לֹא**³. Mt 24²² Mk 13³⁰ οὐκ ἂν ἐσώθη πᾶσα σάρξ, Lk 1³⁷ οὐκ . . . πᾶν ῥῆμα (*nothing*), Jn 12⁴⁶ πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων . . . μὴ μείνη, Ac 10¹⁴ οὐδέποτε ἔφαγον πᾶν κοινόν, Ro 3²⁰, 1 Co 12⁹, Eph 4²⁹ 5⁵ πᾶς πόρνος . . . οὐκ ἔχει, 2 Pt 1²⁰, 1 Jn 2²¹ 3¹⁵, Rev 7¹. 16 9⁴ 18²² 21²⁷ 22³, LXX Ps 142 (143)² etc., Da O' θ 2¹⁰ πᾶς βασιλεὺς . . . οὐκ ἐπερωτᾷ, 2¹¹, O' 5⁹ 6⁵ etc., θ 4⁶ etc., Acta Pionii 11⁴ μὴ σύμπασαν for μηδεμίαν. As in class. Greek, οὐ πᾶς with nothing intervening: Mt 7²¹ 1 Co 15³⁹ *not everyone*. The harshness is mitigated where a positive

¹ K.G II 410, 3. Schmid Attiz. I 184, 426; IV 553. Wackernagel II 116, 121f, 317. Mayser I³ 2, 70; II 2, 86f. Radermacher² 76f.

² Extra-biblical exx. are rare: Dion. Halic. (*de Plat. ad Pomp.*) 756 οὐκ ἀπὸ τοῦ βελτίστου πάντα περὶ αὐτῶν γράφων. P. Ryl. II 113¹² (A.D. 133) μὴ ἔχοντας πᾶν πρᾶγμα πρὸς ἐμέ. Apoll. Disc. *de Syn.* I 14 πᾶς λόγος ἀνευ τούτων οὐ συγκλείεται (where however one could join οὐ closely with συγκλ., as in the French *toute autre doctrine ne leur plaît pas* = all other . . . displeases).

³ Wackernagel II 273f. Ljungvik BZSSV 18ff. Moulton Einl. 126f. Radermacher² 219f.

clause with ἄλλα follows, containing the main point of the sentence: Jn 3¹⁶ ἵνα πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων μὴ ἀπόληται, ἀλλὰ ἔχη *that every believer may have . . . , and not perish*, 6³⁹.

§ 2. Attributive Pronominal Adjectives

ἄλλος and ἕτερος ¹.

For the position of ἄλλος with another attribute see p. 187 and Cuendet 112f.

Ἐτερος is not in wide use in the NT and does not occur in Mk (16¹² only), Jn (19³⁷ only), Peter, Rev. It is chiefly found in Lk, and to some extent in Mt and Paul. It is correctly used in 1 Co 10²⁴ τὸ ἑαυτοῦ . . . τὸ τοῦ ἑτέρου, Ph 2⁴ τὰ τῶν ἐτέρων D*FG. In Lk 19²⁰ ὁ ἕτερος apparently = *the third* (A om ὁ). But in all writers it has largely lost its sense of duality by this time ². Mt 16¹⁴ οἱ μὲν . . . ἄλλοι δέ . . . ἕτεροι δέ (in the last two clauses Mk 8²⁸ Lk 9¹⁹ have ἄλλοι twice). Lk 8^{6ff} καὶ ἕτερον three times (D ἄλλο, as in Mt 13^{5ff} Mk 4^{5ff}). 9⁵⁹ πρὸς ἕτερον *to another*. 6¹ εἶπεν δὲ καὶ ἕτερος *another said*. 1 Co 12^{8f} ᾧ μὲν . . . ἄλλω δέ . . . ἐτέρω—then four times ἄλλω δέ . . . ἐτέρω . . . ἄλλω δέ. Ἄλλος and ἕτερος are found together for variety, showing there is little difference between them: 2 Co 11⁴ ἄλλον Ἰησοῦν . . . πνεῦμα ἕτερον . . . εὐαγγέλιον ἕτερον, Ga 1⁶. 7 εἰς ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον, ὃ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλο εἰ μὴ . . . (but ἄλλο probably serves to introduce the εἰ μὴ-clause. Papyri, e.g. UPZ I 42³². 33 (162 B.C.) καὶ ἄλλοι . . . καὶ ἕτεροι. Heb 11³⁶ ἕτεροι = *others*. Mt 15³⁰ καὶ ἐτέρους πόλλους. So also Lk 3¹⁸ πόλλα μὲν οὖν καὶ ἕτερα, Ro 8³⁹ οὔτε τις κτίσις ἕτερα, 13⁹ εἴ τις ἕτερα ἐντολή, 1 Ti 1¹⁰ εἴ τι ἕτερον. In class. Greek ὁ ἕτερος is never used for anything but a definite division into two parts, as it is in e.g. Mt 10²³ ἐν τῇ πόλει ταύτῃ . . . εἰς τὴν ἑτέραν SBW (DCE corr. to ἄλλην, leaving the incongruous art.), Lk 4⁴³ ταῖς ἐτέραις πόλεσιν—the *remaining cities*. But ἄλλος too appears to mean *the next*, as in Hom. Clem. 15⁴ 19¹ τῆς ἄλλης ἡμέρας. Thus ὁ ἄλλος will usurp the province of ὁ ἕτερος and denote a division into only two parts: Mt 5³⁹ (Lk 6²⁹) τὴν ἄλλην (of a cheek), 12¹³ ἢ ἄλλη (of a hand), Jn 18¹⁶ 19³² 20³¹ etc. There

¹ K-G I 635, 275n. Meisterhans-Schwyzler 250, 5. 6. Gildersleeve II 587-593 (ἕτερος); 594-599 (ἄλλος). Mayser II 2, 87ff. Radermacher² 77. Moulton Einl. 125. 128. Winer-Schmiedel § 26, 6.

² Hom. Clem. 19⁹ a striking alternation: πολλούς . . . ἄλλους δέ . . . ἐτέρους δέ . . . ἄλλους δέ (ἄλλους = ἐτέρους).

were isolated examples of this in class. Greek¹. Papyri: Mayser II 1, 57; Corp. Pap. Rain. 22¹⁵ (ii/A.D.) τὸ ἄλλο ἡμισυ. The concentrated phrasing ἄλλοι ἄλλο is class. (*one one thing . . . one another*): Ac 19³² 21³⁴.

ἕκαστος ².

In Attic inscriptions until 318 B.C. without exception, ἕκαστος with a noun and art. is in the predicative position; the rule is observed also in Attic writers except in prepositional expressions and genitive expressions of time. However, popular speech dispenses with the art., and the proportions in the Ptol. papyri are (with: without) 1:3 in iii/B.C. and 1:4 in ii-i/ B.C.; and in popular speech ἕκαστος is used only rarely in an attributive position; we have intensive εἰς ἕκαστος, and (Heb 3¹³) ἕνα ἐκάστην ἡμέραν, (Rev 22²) μῆνα ἕκαστον. It is added to a plural subject without affecting the construction (class. and Koine): Winer § 58, 4, K-G I 286ff, Mayser II 2, 115, II 3, 373^{7ff}. Jn 16³² (εἰς in same way: 1 Co 4⁶) ἵνα σκορπισθῆτε ἕκαστος . . . καὶ μὲ μόνον ἀφῆτε.

Καθ' εἰς is a colloquialism which does not occur widely in NT: Mk 14¹⁹ εἰς κατὰ εἰς (C εἰς ἕκαστος, harm. with Mt 26²²), Jn 8⁹, Ro 12⁵ τὸ δὲ καθ' εἰς (pap. Mayser I² 3, 205^{38ff} τὸ καθ' ἕν; LXX 3 Mac 5³⁴ ὁ καθελὶς τῶν φίλων), Rev 21²¹ ἀνά εἰς ἕκαστος. Its origin lies in the compression of καθ' ἕνα ἕκαστον *each one by one* into καθ' ἕνα ἕκαστον and the next step was to invent καθ' εἰς when a nominative was needed (ἀνά εἰς appears by the same principle: distributive ἀνά). A further step was an addition to produce the pleonastic *one one by one* εἰς κατὰ εἰς.

In the NT ἐκάτερος does not survive.

ἀμφοτέροι.

This is substantival ³ in the NT, as in the papyri, except for Lk 5⁷ ἀμφοτέρα τὰ πλοῖα.

¹ Eurip. Iph T. 962f: θάτερον . . . τὸ δ' ἄλλο. Plato Leg. 629D τὸ μὲν . . . τὸ δ' ἄλλο, but probably corrupt.

² K-G I 634. 7. Meisterhans-Schwyzler 232. 38. Gildersleeve II 660, 661, 662. Mayser II 2, 90ff. Radermacher² 113, 117.

³ Ac 23⁸ Eph 2¹⁴ τὰ ἀμφοτέρα. Eph 2¹⁶ τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους, 2¹⁸ οἱ ἀμφοτέροι. See Mayser II 2, 94.

ὅλος¹.

Whole. Usually anarthrous in NT, whereas always articu- lar in Ptol. papyri: Mt 22³⁷ BS*⊕ (vl. +art.), Mk 12³⁰. 33 BD* (vl. + art.), Lk 5⁵ δι' ὅλης νυκτός SABWL (CD + τῆς), 10²⁷ B* (vl. + art.), Jn 7²³ ὅλον ἄνθρωπον *a whole man*, Ac 11²⁶ ἐνιαυτὸν ὅλον. With anarthrous city-names: Ac 21³¹ ὅλη Ἱερουσαλήμ (= πᾶσα Ἱεροσόλυμα Mt 2³). With art., always predicative: Mt 16²⁸ τὸν κόσμον ὅλον, 26¹³ ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ κόσμῳ.

ἅπας.

Only found in Lk-Ac with any frequency, and σύμπας is lacking altogether. Outside Lk: Mt 6³² 24³⁹ (D πάντες) 28¹¹ (A πάντα), Mk 8²⁵ (DW πάντα) 11³² 16¹⁵ (D om), Ga 3²⁸ ASB³; Eph 6¹³, Jas 3². Even Luke does not always observe the not invariable class. rule of πᾶς after a vowel and ἅπας after a consonant (1³ ἄνωθεν πᾶσιν); but ἅπας generally occurs after a consonant, as in papyri (see Mayser I¹ 161f; II 2, 96 n. 3). The MSS vary with πᾶς. Word order, like πᾶς.

πᾶς².

(1) In the interests of exegesis it is important to ask how much is involved in the Hellenistic deviation from class. standards as to the def. art. with πᾶς. First of all, πᾶς before an anarthrous noun means *every* in the sense of *any*; not every individual, like ἕκαστος, but any you please³. Similarly, the negative is *none*, *no*, as in Mt 24²² οὐκ ἂν ἐσώθῃ πᾶσα σὰρξ (Semitic, see pp. 7, 196f).

Mt 3¹⁰ πᾶν δένδρον *any tree*, Lk 3⁹ *any tree*, not *every tree*, 2 Ti 3¹⁶ πᾶσα γραφή *whatever is Scripture*.

On the other hand, this anarthrous πᾶς also means *all, the whole of*, just as it does when it has the art. It may be that is

¹ K-G I 631. 6. Mayser II 2, 95f, 568. Meisterhans-Schwyzler 234, 45. Winer-Schmiedel § 20, 12.

² K-G I 631, 6. Gildersleeve II 642-52. Meisterhans-Schwyzler 233ff. Mayser II 2, 96f. Winer-Schmiedel § 20, 11. Radermacher² 112, 113, 117.

³ This is important for the correct interpretation of Mt 19³ κατὰ πᾶσαν αἰτίαν, which is not *for every cause*, but *for any cause* you like to single out among those in the Law, i.e. *for any cause at all*. Jesus was not being asked for his opinion on the varying merits of each Mosaic ground for divorce, but whether he rejected all grounds.

due to Hebraic influence: for $\eta\psi\zeta-\lambda\zeta$ becomes $\pi\alpha\sigma\alpha$ $\sigma\acute{\alpha}\rho\zeta$ *all flesh, everything fleshly* (Mt 24²² Lk 3⁶ Ro 3²⁰ 1 Co 1²⁹). Mt 3¹⁵ $\pi\alpha\sigma\alpha$ $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\eta$ *the whole of*; Ac 2³⁶ $\pi\alpha\sigma\alpha$ $\omicron\iota\kappa\omicron\varsigma$ $\text{'I}\sigma\rho\alpha\eta\lambda$ *whole*, 4²⁹ $\mu\epsilon\tau\grave{\alpha}$ $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\eta\varsigma$ $\pi\alpha\rho\rho\eta\sigma\iota\alpha\varsigma$ *complete*, 23¹ $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\eta$ $\sigma\upsilon\nu\epsilon\iota\delta\eta\sigma\epsilon\iota$ $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\theta\eta$; Ro 11²⁶ $\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ $\text{'I}\sigma\rho\alpha\eta\lambda$ *the whole of Israel*; Col 1²³ (S^cD^e add $\tau\eta\eta$), 1¹⁵ $\pi\rho\omega\tau\acute{o}\tau\omicron\kappa\omicron\varsigma$ $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\eta\varsigma$ $\kappa\tau\iota\sigma\epsilon\omega\varsigma$; Eph 2²¹ $\pi\alpha\sigma\alpha$ $\omicron\iota\kappa\omicron\delta\omicron\mu\eta$ (but S^aACP have art.) prob. not here as class. *whatever is built*, but (under Semitic infl.) *the whole building*; 1 Pt 2¹³ $\pi\alpha\sigma\alpha$ $\kappa\tau\iota\sigma\iota\varsigma$ *the whole creation*.

It is more likely, however, that $\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ with this meaning will have the art: Ac 12¹¹ $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\eta\varsigma$ $\tau\eta\varsigma$ $\pi\rho\omicron\sigma\delta\omicron\kappa\iota\alpha\varsigma$ *the whole*, Ro 8²² $\pi\alpha\sigma\alpha$ η $\kappa\tau\iota\sigma\iota\varsigma$ (cp. 1 Pt 2¹³), 1 Co 13² $\pi\alpha\sigma\alpha\sigma\alpha\tau\eta\eta$ $\gamma\iota\nu\omega\sigma\iota\varsigma$ and $\pi\alpha\sigma\alpha\sigma\alpha\tau\eta\eta$ $\pi\iota\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$ *all that exists*; Eph 2²¹; 4¹⁶ $\pi\alpha\tilde{\nu}$ $\tau\acute{o}$ $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$; Ph 1³ $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota$ $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\eta$ $\tau\eta\eta$ $\mu\upsilon\epsilon\iota\alpha$ (DE om $\tau\eta\eta$) *the whole*.

But sometimes a distinction can be traced between $\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ with and without the art. in the same passage: 2 Co 1⁴ \acute{o} $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\kappa\alpha\lambda\omega\tilde{\nu}$ $\eta\mu\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota$ $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\eta$ $\tau\eta\eta$ $\theta\lambda\iota\psi\epsilon\iota$ $\eta\mu\acute{\omega}\tilde{\nu}$ *in all our affliction*, $\acute{\epsilon}\iota\varsigma$ $\tau\acute{o}$ $\delta\upsilon\tilde{\nu}\alpha\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ $\eta\mu\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\kappa\alpha\lambda\epsilon\tilde{\nu}$ $\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ $\acute{\epsilon}\tilde{\nu}$ $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\eta$ $\theta\lambda\iota\psi\epsilon\iota$ *in any affliction*.

If $\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ is placed after a noun with the art., special stress is laid upon the noun, e.g. 1 Co 15⁷ $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\iota\tau\alpha$ $\text{'I}\alpha\kappa\omega\beta\omega$, $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\iota\tau\alpha$ $\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma$ $\acute{\alpha}\pi\acute{o}\sigma\tau\omicron\lambda\omicron\iota\varsigma$ $\pi\alpha\sigma\iota\tilde{\nu}$. A frequent use is that of $\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ with ptc., even without the art., e.g. Mt 3¹⁰ $\pi\alpha\tilde{\nu}$ $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\delta\rho\omicron\nu$ $\mu\eta$ $\pi\omicron\iota\omicron\upsilon\tilde{\nu}$, 13¹⁹ $\pi\alpha\tilde{\nu}\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ $\acute{\alpha}\kappa\omicron\upsilon\omicron\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$, Lk 11⁴.

Nevertheless the distinction of an anarthrous and articular noun with $\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ is not very clear in NT, even to the extent that $\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ with an articular noun can approach the meaning of *any*: Mk 4¹³ $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha\varsigma$ $\tau\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\beta\omicron\lambda\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ *any parables*, not *all the parables*.

(2) The plural (*all*) does not require the art., any more than $\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ does at this period, and much depends on the noun itself which accompanies $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$: Ac 17²¹ $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ $\text{'A}\theta\eta\nu\alpha\iota\omicron\iota$ and 26⁴ $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ $\text{'I}\omicron\upsilon\delta\alpha\iota\omicron\iota$ are class., for people-names do not require the art. (see p. 169). With $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ $\acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\iota$ *everybody* (Ac 22¹⁵ Ro 5^{12.18} 12^{17.18} etc.) and $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\omicron\iota$ (Heb 1⁶ OT) the meaning is weakened and the art. is omitted because no totality is really involved: so also Ga 6⁶ $\pi\alpha\sigma\iota\tilde{\nu}$ $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\theta\omicron\iota\varsigma$, 1 Pt 2¹ $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha\varsigma$ $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\lambda\alpha\lambda\iota\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ (S* sing.). When however totality is involved the art. is still needed: Eph 3⁸ $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\omega\tilde{\nu}$ $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\iota\omega\tilde{\nu}$ (P + $\tau\omega\tilde{\nu}$; p⁴⁶ om $\tau\omega\tilde{\nu}$ $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\iota\omega\tilde{\nu}$). Its omission in Lk 4²⁰ is unclassical ($\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\omega\tilde{\nu}$ $\acute{\epsilon}\tilde{\nu}$ $\tau\eta\eta$ $\sigma\upsilon\nu\alpha\gamma\omega\gamma\eta$) and that may have caused the MSS to change the position of $\acute{\epsilon}\tilde{\nu}$ $\tau\eta\eta$ σ . in various ways.

(3) Sometimes, however, the art. occurs before $\pi\tilde{\alpha}\varsigma$, and then $\delta\ \pi\tilde{\alpha}\varsigma$ and $\omicron\iota\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ contrast the whole with the part: ¹ Ac 19⁷ $\omicron\iota\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\delta\rho\epsilon\varsigma$ the sum total of the men (which is different from the predicative *men as a whole* $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma\ \omicron\iota\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\delta\rho\epsilon\varsigma$, see Zerwick § 142), 20¹⁸ $\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha\ \chi\rho\acute{\omicron}\nu\omicron\nu$ all that time, 27³⁷ $\alpha\iota\ \pi\tilde{\alpha}\sigma\alpha\iota\ \psi\upsilon\chi\alpha\iota$ we were in all . . . , Ga 5¹⁴ $\delta\ \pi\tilde{\alpha}\varsigma\ \nu\acute{\omicron}\mu\omicron\varsigma$ = "universa lex" as opposed to $\pi\tilde{\alpha}\varsigma\ \delta\ \nu\acute{\omicron}\mu\omicron\varsigma$ = "integra lex nullo praecepto excepto" (Zerwick § 142), 2 Co 5¹⁰ $\tau\omicron\delta\varsigma\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha\varsigma\ \eta\mu\tilde{\alpha}\varsigma$ the sum total of us.

The non-attributive substantival use of $\omicron\iota\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ is frequent in Paul: Ro 11³² 1 Co 9²² 10¹⁷ 2 Co 5¹⁵ Eph 4¹³ Ph 2²¹; and $\tau\acute{\alpha}\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha$ Mk 4¹¹ vl., Ac 17²⁵ Ro 8³² 11³⁶ 1 Co 12⁶.¹⁹ 15^{27f} (pap. Mayser II 2, 101f).

(4) In relation to its noun, various positions are possible for $\pi\tilde{\alpha}\varsigma$: ² 1. $\pi\tilde{\alpha}\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\varsigma$, 2(a) $\pi\tilde{\alpha}\varsigma\ \delta\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\varsigma$, 2(b) $\delta\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\varsigma\ \pi\tilde{\alpha}\varsigma$, 3. $\delta\ \pi\tilde{\alpha}\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\varsigma$, and the plurals respectively. Mayser (II 2, 102) shows that the Koine has developed the emphatic form 2(b), at the expense of 2(a) which incidentally is extremely popular in Biblical Greek (LXX NT). Hebrew influence has brought this about. The entry of a demonstrative pronoun may be between $\pi\tilde{\alpha}\varsigma$ and its noun or outside: 2(a) $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha\ \tau\acute{\alpha}\upsilon\tau\alpha\ \tau\acute{\alpha}\ \pi\omicron\nu\eta\rho\acute{\alpha}$ Mk 7²³, $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha\ \tau\acute{\alpha}\ \beta\acute{\eta}\mu\alpha\tau\alpha\ \tau\acute{\alpha}\upsilon\tau\alpha$ Lk 16⁵, 2(b) $\tau\eta\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\xi\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\acute{\alpha}\nu\ \tau\acute{\alpha}\upsilon\tau\eta\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\pi\alpha\sigma\alpha\nu$ Lk 4⁶. Only Lk has the order $\tau\acute{\alpha}\upsilon\tau\alpha\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha$.

The following tables prove the essential unity of Biblical Greek against that of the Ptolemaic papyri, especially when the second table (percentage proportion) is examined. Types 2(b) and 3 occur scarcely at all in Biblical Greek, but occur strongly in secular. Type 2(a) is very strong in Biblical Greek, but only average in the papyri.

¹ Class. exx. e.g. Thuc. 1, 60, in K-G I 632f, Gildersleeve II 309ff. Papyri: Mayser II 2, 100f.

² See N. Turner op. cit. 211f; Cuendet 131f).

ACTUAL OCCURRENCES

	<i>Type 1</i> s. pl.		<i>Type 2(a)</i> s. pl.		<i>Type 2(b)</i> s. pl.		<i>Type 3</i> s. pl.	
Papyrus iii/B.C.	17	2	14	40	18	56	22	5
Papyrus ii-i/B.C.	23	11	11	20	5	90	19	13
LXX								
Ge	58	12	69	160	2	1	1	-
Ex	99	1	64	105	1	1	-	-
Le	109	6	57	56	-	-	5	-
Nu	93	21	83	113	-	2	1	-
Dt	80	15	64	154	-	-	2	-
Pentateuch	439	55	337	588	3	4	9	-
Jo 1-12	28	3	43	33	1	-	1	1
Jo 13-24	9	3	16	38	-	-	-	-
Joshua	37	6	59	71	1	-	1	1
Jg Ru B	31	6	36	36	-	1	1	3
Jg Ru A	25	8	42	41	-	-	-	1
E. Kms	104	24	102	162	-	-	3	1
L. Kms	73	18	91	124	-	-	-	-
1 Chr	53	21	24	43	-	1	7	3
2 Chr	79	13	62	100	1	2	1	3
Chronicles	132	34	86	143	1	3	8	6
1 Esd (para- phrase)	18	5	19	46	-	4	1	1
2 Esd-Ne	32	9	33	31	-	-	2	4
Ps 1-77	17	4	22	105	-	-	-	-
Ps 77-151	23	8	20	120	-	-	-	-
Psalms	40	12	42	225	-	-	-	-
Pr	33	10	4	20	-	-	-	-
Eccl	20	2	9	12	-	-	2	-
Ca	-	7	-	1	-	-	1	2
Jb	31	2	3	16	-	2	-	1
Wi	11	2	2	1	-	3	1	-
Si	112	10	11	24	-	2	-	-

	<i>Type 1</i>		<i>Type 2(a)</i>		<i>Type 2(b)</i>		<i>Type 3</i>	
	s.	pl.	s.	pl.	s.	pl.	s.	pl.
Est	26	1	10	28	-	1	-	2
Jdt	38	7	57	68	2	-	-	-
To S	12	6	11	50	1	2	1	-
To B	16	2	4	37	-	-	-	-
Min. Proph.	20	9	36	110	-	-	-	-
Isa	67	9	26	75	1	6	-	1
Je α	38	4	35	73	-	-	1	-
Je β	28	5	44	102	-	1	1	-
Je γ	2	-	1	6	-	-	-	2
Ezk α	50	10	20	86	-	-	-	-
Ezk β	21	6	23	59	1	1	-	-
Da O'	35	3	19	56	-	1	-	-
Da θ	32	4	21	43	-	-	-	-
1 Mac	39	30	2	86	3	5	-	-
2-4 Mac	44	12	17	38	3	2	16	2
NT								
Mt. Mk	29	3	21	46	2	5	-	-
Lk	18	2	28	47	-	3	-	-
Ac	26	6	24	45	-	4	1	2
Jn	4	-	15	3	2	2	-	-
Jn. Epp	8	-	16	1	-	-	-	-
Rev	29	1	2	18	1	1	-	-
Ro. Co.	39	8	20	20	-	9	-	1
Ga. Th	12	2	3	9	-	1	1	1
Eph. Col. Ph	45	2	9	13	-	1	-	1
Past	21	5	1	7	-	2	-	-
Heb	13	1	2	7	-	-	-	-
1 Pt	9	-	2	1	-	-	-	-
Jas	7	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
2 Pt	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
Jude	1	-	1	3	-	-	-	-
T. Abr. A	17	1	13	18	-	2	-	-
B	4	3	3	3	-	2	-	-
Ps. Sol.	11	2	7	3	-	-	-	-

PERCENTAGE OF TYPE WITHIN EACH BOOK

	Type 1		Type 2(a)		Type 2(b)		Type 3	
	s.	pl.	s.	pl.	s.	pl.	s.	pl.
Papyrus iii/B.C.	10	1	8	23	10	32	13	3
Pap. ii-i/B.C.	12	6	6	10	2	46	10	7
LXX								
Ge	20	$\frac{4}{4}$	22	55	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	-
Ex	33	$\frac{1}{4}$	23	39	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	-	-
Le	46	2	24	24	-	-	2	-
Nu	30	7	26	36	-	$\frac{3}{4}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	-
Dt	25	5	20	49	-	-	1	-
Pentateuch	30	4	25	40	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{3}{4}$	-
Jo 1-12	25	2	39	30	1	-	1	1
Jo 13-24	13	5	24	57	-	-	-	-
Joshua	22	3	33	40	1	-	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$
Jg. Ru B	27	5	32	32	-	1	1	2
Jg. Ru A	21	7	36	36	-	-	-	1
E. Kms	26	6	26	41	-	-	$\frac{3}{4}$	$\frac{1}{4}$
L. Kms	24	6	30	40	-	-	-	-
1 Chr	35	14	15	28	-	-	5	2
2 Chr	30	5	23	40	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{3}{4}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$1\frac{1}{4}$
Chronicles	32	8	21	35	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{3}{4}$	2	1
1 Esd (paraphrase)	19	6	20	47	-	5	$1\frac{1}{2}$	$1\frac{1}{2}$
2 Esd-Ne	29	8	30	28	-	-	2	4
Ps 1-77	11	3	15	71	-	-	-	-
Ps 77-151	13	5	12	70	-	-	-	-
Psalms	13	3	13	70	-	-	-	-
Pr	49	15	6	30	-	-	-	-
Ecc1	44	4	20	27	-	-	4	1
Ca	-	70	-	10	-	-	10	20
Jb	56	4	5	29	-	4	-	2
Wi	55	10	10	5	-	15	5	-

	Type 1		Type 2(a)		Type 2(b)		Type 3	
	s.	pl.	s.	pl.	s.	pl.	s.	pl.
Si	70	6	7	15	—	1	—	—
Est	38	1	15	41	1	1	—	3
Jdt	22	4	33	40	1	—	—	—
To S	14	8	13	60	1	3	1	—
To B	27	4	6	63	—	—	—	—
Min. Proph.	11	5	21	63	—	—	—	—
Isa	37	5	14	40	$\frac{1}{2}$	3	—	$\frac{1}{2}$
Je α	26	3	22	48	—	—	1	—
Je β	15	$2\frac{1}{2}$	24	56	—	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	—
Je γ	20	—	10	60	—	—	—	20
Ezk α	30	6	12	51	—	—	—	—
Ezk β	20	$5\frac{1}{2}$	21	54	1	1	—	—
Da O'	30	$2\frac{1}{2}$	17	49	—	1	—	—
Da θ	32	4	21	43	—	—	—	—
1 Mac	23	1	18	52	2	3	—	—
2-4 Mac	33	9	13	28	2	2	12	2
NT								
Mt. Mk	27	3	20	43	2	5	—	—
Lk	18	2	28	47	—	3	—	—
Ac	25	5	23	44	—	3	1	1
Jn	15	—	59	11	7	7	—	—
Jn. Epp	32	—	64	4	—	—	—	—
Rev	57	2	3	35	2	2	—	—
Ro. Co	40	8	21	21	—	9	—	1
Ga. Th	41	7	10	31	—	$3\frac{1}{2}$	$3\frac{1}{2}$	$3\frac{1}{2}$
Eph. Col. Ph	63	3	13	18	—	1	—	1
Past	58	14	3	16	—	6	—	—
Heb	56	4	9	30	—	—	—	—
1 Pt	75	—	17	8	—	—	—	—
Jas	87	—	—	12	—	—	—	—
2 Pt. Jude	$37\frac{1}{2}$	$12\frac{1}{2}$	$12\frac{1}{2}$	$37\frac{1}{2}$	—	—	—	—
T. Abr. A	$33\frac{1}{2}$	2	$25\frac{1}{2}$	34	—	4	—	—
B	25	19	19	19	6	12	—	—
Ps. Sol.	48	9	30	13	—	—	—	—

CHAPTER FIFTEEN

ATTRIBUTIVE RELATIONSHIP: SUBSTANTIVES

§ 1. In the same case: Apposition¹

A substantival attribute placed either before or after another noun, or a pers. pronoun, is said to be in apposition. This will occur with a proper noun, and the apposition then has the art. to distinguish that person from others of the same name: Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτιστής, Σίμων ὁ Καναναῖος, Ἰάκωβος ὁ τοῦ Ἀλφαίου, Σαῦλος ὁ καὶ Παῦλος, ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἡρώδης (or Ἡρώδης ὁ βασιλεὺς), Φίλιππος ὁ εὐαγγελιστής, Τιμόθεος ὁ συνεργός μου. The proper noun itself is generally anarthrous; and so the readings τῆς (SABD) Μαρίας τῆς μητρός (Ac 12¹²) and τὸν Ἰωάννην (D*) τὸν ἐπικληθέντα Μάρκον (12²⁵) are probably incorrect. There are some exceptions to the use of the art. with the apposition: Ac 7¹⁰ Φαραὼ βασιλέως Αἰγύπτου, 10⁶ Σίμωνι βουρσεῖ, 13¹ Μαναὴν Ἡρώδου τοῦ τετραάρχου σύντροφος, 21¹⁶ Μνάσωνι τινι Κυπρίῳ. Col 1³ v1. 1² v1. 2² 3¹⁷ ὁ θεὸς πατὴρ², 1 Pt 5⁸ ὁ ἀντίδικος ὑμῶν διάβολος (ἀντιδ. adjectival?). The proper noun usually comes first; hence D corrects ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ Μαρία to Μαρία ἡ Μαγδ. Lk 24¹⁰. Sometimes ὁ (ἐπι)καλούμενος or ὁ καὶ c. gen. precedes the surname. The latter is rare in the nominative in pre-Christian papyri (Mayser I² 2, 69; II 1, 60ff; II 3, 56); instead ὅς καί. In rather formal wording, as in the opening of an epistle, κύριος or θεός will occur without art., followed by an anarthrous appositional phrase: Ro 1⁷ ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ κύριος . . ., Ph 3²⁰ κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν 1 Th 1¹ ἐν θεῷ πατρὶ καὶ κυριῷ Ἰ. Χ., 1 Ti 1¹ θεοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν. On Jn 8⁴⁴, see above p. 40, but note that to be predicative (*the devil is your father*) πατρός ought not to have the art.; τοῦ διαβόλου is therefore in apposition or else possessive genitive. A phrase in apposition with a pers. pronoun requires the art. in class. Greek: so Mk 7⁶ ὑμῶν τῶν ὑποκριτῶν, Lk 6²⁴ ὑμῖν τοῖς πλουσίοις, Ac 13³³ C² EHLP τοῖς τέκνοις αὐτῶν ἡμῶν.

¹ K-G I § 406, pp. 281ff. Mayser II 2, 103ff. Radermacher² 116.

² But variants make it easier; e.g. in Col 1³: τῷ πατρὶ D*G Chrys, καὶ πατρὶ SA.

§ 2. In a different case:

1. ADJECTIVAL GENITIVE¹

I. True Genitive

This is a large subject, as the genitive is so hard worked a case in Greek. The adjectival is the commonest way the case is used, and Luke is particularly fond of it. The relationship expressed by the gen. is so vague that it is only by means of the context and wider considerations that it can be made definite. For practical purposes perhaps the only real division among the genitives is that between subjective and objective (Zerwick § 25). The sole question which the translator and exegete need ask is whether the relationship is directed outwards from the noun in the genitive to some other person or from some other person to the noun in the genitive; or, to put it differently, whether or not the action implied by the independent noun is carried out by the noun in the genitive. Obviously, ἡ πτώσις αὐτῆς Mt 7²⁷ is subjective: the house *falls*; so is Ac 6¹ γογγυσμὸς τῶν Ἑλληνιστῶν: the Hellenists *murmur*; so also 2 Co 6⁷ *the armour of righteousness* is probably that which the divine righteousness provides.² Clearly οἱ εὐλογημένοι τοῦ πατρὸς μου and τὸν ἀγαπητὸν μου, like the LXX ἐκλεκτοὺς κυρίου, are subjective. But Ph 1³ is quite ambiguous: ἐπὶ πάσῃ τῇ μνηίᾳ ὑμῶν may be (a) subjective: *whenever you remember me*, or (b) objective: *whenever I think of you*.

(a) *Possessive Genitive*. In class. and Koine Greek the relationship of parents to children is expressed in this way, with or without υἱός (see above, pp. 168f): but in the latter case the phrase is ὁ τοῦ δεῖνος, contrary to class. usage which omits the second art. The frequent addition of υἱός is Semitic rather than typically Greek, and even in the papyri this and θυγάτηρ are added only for clarity (Mayser II 2, 9): Lk 3² Ἰωάννη τὸν Ζαχαρίου υἱόν. The only exception to the use of υἱός with the sons of Zebedee (Mt 26³⁷ 27⁵⁶ Mk 10³⁵ Lk 5¹⁰) is Jn 21² οἱ τοῦ Ζ. ABL (SD οἱ υἱοὶ Ζ.). Figuratively υἱός is used with a noun in the genitive in order to express a certain quality. It

¹ K-G I § 414-421. Schwyzer II 89-137. Mayser II 2, 118ff. Eakin 335ff.

² Kittel WB, English translation, *Righteousness*, 1951, 53.

would seem to be a Semitism; it is rare in pre-Biblical Greek and is there confined to such phrases as υἱὸς Ἑλλάδος *a son of Greece*. It is very common in LXX: Ps 88²³ 2 Km 7¹⁰ 1 Mac 2⁴⁷ 4², and Hebrew uses the words *man, son, daughter, mother, father, lord*, in this sense.¹ In the NT: Mk 3¹⁷ υἱοὶ βροντῆς *thunderbolts*, Mt 5⁹. 4⁵ *sons of God*, 9¹⁵ περὶ τῶν φίλων τοῦ νυμφίου *bridegroom's friends*, 13³⁸ *men of the kingdom . . . of evil*, Lk 10⁶ *man of peace*, 16⁸ *men of this age*, 20³⁶ *of the resurrection* (= those who will rise), Jn 17¹² 2 Th 2³ Ap. Pet. 2 τῆς ἀπωλείας, Jn 8³⁹. 4⁴ Ga 3⁷ *children of Abraham*, Ac 13¹⁰ *of the Devil*, Eph 2² Col 3⁶ TR *of disobedience* (= disobedient), 1 Th 5⁵ υἱοὶ φωτός ἐστε καὶ υἱοὶ ἡμέρας (and then without υἱοί), Ap. Pet. 3 Herm V. III 6, 1 υἱοὶ τῆς ἀνομίας, Ac 3²⁵ Ps. Sol. 17¹⁵ τῆς διαθήκης, Ac 4³⁶ υἱὸς παρακλήσεως (Bauer s.v. υἱός 1 c.δ). Vulg. inserts *fili* in Heb 10³⁹ where Greek has simple gen. In the same sense as υἱός we have τέκνον in Lk 7³⁵ Ga 4²⁸ Eph 2³ 1 Pt 1¹⁴ 2 Pt 2¹⁴ etc. In ecclesiastical Greek, e.g. Epiph. Haer. 43, 2.

(b) *Partitive Genitive*². This is the gen. of a whole which is divided. It is still in use in the Koine, but since class. times it has been more and more displaced by the use of the prepositions ἀπό, ἐκ, ἐν³. This ἐν is rare in the papyri (Mayser II 2, 352f), and ἀπό is more frequent than ἐκ. This ἐκ is not common in class. Greek but we do find μόνος ἐξ ἀπάντων. Partitive ἀπό is even rarer there; it abounds in LXX and prevails in MGr (Mayser II 2, 348f.; Johannessohn DGKPS 17).

There is a construction which is not widely acknowledged in NT: the partitive ἀπό and ἐκ introducing a phrase which can stand independently of a noun as subject or object of a verb, with something like τινές suppressed, a substantival phrase in fact.⁴ It may be either subj. or obj. :—(a) subject: Mt 27⁹ ὃν ἐτιμήσαντο ἀπὸ υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ OT, Lk 8³⁵ D παραγενομένων ἐκ τῆς πόλεως (sc. *some people from*), Jn 3²⁵ ἐγένετο ζήτησις (sc. ἐν τοῖς) ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν, 7⁴⁰ ἐκ τοῦ ὄχλου . . . ἔλεγον (v).

¹ Thackeray OT Gr. 41f. Deissmann *Bibelstudien*, 1895, 162-166. Johannessohn DGKPS 32. Lagrange *S. Matth.* 166.

² K-G I § 414, 5. Mayser II 2, 121ff.

³ Esp. in LXX, through Heb. *pa* partitive. E.g. Ex 9⁴. 6. 7 (οὐκ ἐτελεύτησεν ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν κτηνῶν οὐδέν), 1 Mac 4¹⁵ ἔπεσαν ἐξ αὐτῶν εἰς ἀνδρας τρισχιλίουσ.

⁴ K-G I 345. Mayser II 2, 351f, 195f. Johannessohn DGKPS 18f. Schwyzer II 102.

πολλοί, to improve), 16¹⁷ εἶπον ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν *some of his disciples*, Ac 19³³ ἐκ δὲ τοῦ ὄχλου συνεβίβασαν (*some of the crowd*), 21¹⁶ συνῆλθον δὲ καὶ τῶν μαθητῶν (*some disciples*), Rev 11⁹ 15⁷ p⁴⁷ ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων ἔδωκαν (*some of the four*). LXX 1 Km 14⁴⁵ 2 Km 14¹¹ τῆς τριχός, 4 Km 10²³ τῶν δούλων, 1 Mac 7³³ ἐξῆλθον ἀπὸ τῶν ἱερέων, 10³⁷ κατασταθήσεται ἐξ αὐτῶν (*let some of them be stationed*). (b) object: Mt 23³⁴, Mk 2²¹ *some of it*¹, 6⁴³ ἀπὸ τῶν ἰχθύων *some fish*, 12² ἀπὸ τῶν καρπῶν *some fruit*, 14²³ ἐξ αὐτοῦ (drink) *some of it*, Lk 11⁴⁹, 2 Jn⁴, Rev 2¹⁰, Herm. S. VIII 6, 5 ἐξ αὐτῶν, Mk 9³⁷ WΘ ἐκ τῶν τοιούτων παιδίων Lk 21¹⁶ θανατώσουσιν ἐξ ὑμῶν (*some of them*). LXX Ge 27²⁸ δώη σοι ὁ θεὸς ἀπὸ τῆς δρόσου τοῦ (*may God give you some dew from heaven*), 2 Km 11¹⁷ ἔπεσαν ἐκ τοῦ λαοῦ (*some of the people fell*). This is a Bibl. Greek construction, not unknown but rare in class. Greek, really originating in LXX, and is parallel to similar constructions in Heb., Syriac and Arabic. Scribes felt the need to correct the construction in 1 Mac 6⁴⁸ καὶ ἐκ τῆς παρεμβολῆς τοῦ βασιλέως ἀνέβαινον A (SV οἱ δέ) *some soldiers of the king's army went up*. There is much further evidence: Ge 3¹² 4⁴ 33¹⁵ 45²³ Ex 17⁵ 1 Mac 8⁸.

With τις it is usually the simple genitive; but Ac 7⁵² Heb 15. 13 are interrogative τις. Thus Mt 9³ τινες τῶν γραμματέων, Lk 7³⁶ τις τῶν Φαρισαίων. The exceptions are John's Gospel and the LXX (e.g. Ex 16²⁷ τινες ἐκ τοῦ λαοῦ). Partitive gen. without preposition appears to be the rule with ἕκαστος (e.g. Ro 14¹²), and usually so with εἷς (e.g. Mt 5²⁹. 30 10⁴²)². Other exx. are: Mk 2¹⁶ οἱ γραμματεῖς τῶν Φαρισαίων (v) *among?*, Lk 18¹¹ Rev 9²⁰ οἱ λοιποὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, Ro 15²⁶ τοὺς πτωχοὺς τῶν ἀγίων *among*. However, ἐκ is usually found with πᾶς (Lk 14³³, Le 21²¹ πᾶς ἐξ ὑμῶν) in spite of the class. πᾶς Ἑλληνῶν, and with τις³: Mt 6²⁷ τις ἐξ ὑμῶν, 27²¹ τίνα ἀπὸ τῶν δύο (syr^{11a} only τίνα),

¹ The best reading from a syntax point of view in Mk 2²¹ is εἰ δὲ μὴ, αἰρεῖ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ (*some of it*) τὸ πλήρωμα τὸ καινὸν (*the new fulness*) ἀπὸ τοῦ παλαιοῦ (*namely, some of the old*). The prepositional phrase immediately follows the verb, which is good Bibl. Greek word-order. The MS variants are probably afterthoughts to remove the Aramaic construction of a proleptic pronoun followed by a noun. (For Proleptic Pronouns, see p. 41. See also Black AAGA² 37, 251; Moulton-Howard 461.) The suggestion is given to me verbally by Dr. G. D. Kilpatrick, and adopted by him in the (privately circulated) *Mark: a Greek-English Diglot for the use of Translators*, B. and F.B.S., 1958, 6.

² But ἐκ in LXX Ge 3²² εἷς ἐξ ἡμῶν, etc., Mt 10²⁹ 18¹² etc.

³ But gen. only in Ac 7⁵² Heb 15. 13. Some texts are uncertain: Mt 22²⁸ τίνος τῶν ἐπτά, Mk 12²³ τίνος αὐτῶν (Δ c k om αὐτῶν), Lk 7⁴² τίς αὐτῶν (D om αὐτῶν), 14⁵ τίνος ὑμῶν (D ἐξ ὑμῶν), 20³³ τίνος αὐτῶν (S* e ff² om αὐτῶν).

Lk 11¹⁵ Jas 2¹⁶. Against the apparent Semitism (א or ב, as in Le 11³. 2⁶) we must set the class. precedent for a partitive ἐν, as in Ac 5²⁴ τις ἐν τῷ συνεδρίῳ (D ἐκ), 1 Co 15¹², Jas 5¹³. 14. 19 τις (τινες) ἐν ὑμῖν. Probably we have a true Semitism from the Hebrew superlative in Rev 5¹¹ μυριάδες μυριάδων καὶ χιλιάδες χιλιάδων (from 1 Enoch: Rev ICC in loc.). The partitive gen. may be used predicatively as well as attributively: Lk 22⁵⁸ Jn 18¹⁷ 1 Co 12¹⁵. 18 ἐκ, Ac 21¹⁶ 1 Ti 1²⁰ (ὧν ἐστὶν Ὑμέναιος). It is debatable whether we have partitive gen. in Col 1¹⁵ (πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως) and Rev 3¹⁴ (ἡ ἀρχὴ τῆς κτίσεως) = *among*, or whether the idea is not rather that of rule and supremacy.

We have πάντων in Mk 12²⁸ without preposition: ποία ἐστὶν ἐντολὴ πρώτη πάντων (only πασῶν M*; om πάντων DW lat etc.); πάντων however may belong to the next verse: πάντων πρώτων. "Ακουε Ἰσραὴλ (Euseb. minusc.). Without preposition are also the Hebraic superlative constructions τὰ ἄγια τῶν ἁγίων and εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων.

After an indication of quality we have one NT example of a phenomenon which has class. precedent, namely the assimilation of gender and number of a neuter substantival adj. to that of its dependent gen.; this occurs in Lk 19⁸ τὰ ἡμίσεια τῶν ὑπαρχόντων (for ἡμισυ, sc. μέρος), which reminds us of the class. ἡ ἡμίσεια τῆς γῆς (K-G I 279; Mayser II 2, 123; Abel § 44 d). Otherwise the neuter adj. is properly used: Mk 6²³ ἕως ἡμίσεος τῆς βασιλείας, LXX Est 5³, Rev 11¹³ τὸ δέκατον τῆς πόλεως, 12¹⁴ ἡμισυ καιροῦ.

The geographic gen. is partitive. It indicates the country within which a town lies and is class. and Koine. We may translate *in*. Mt 21¹¹ Mk 1⁹ Ναζαρεθ τῆς Γαλιλαίας, Jn 2¹ Κανὰ τῆς Γαλιλαίας, Ac 16¹² ἥτις ἐστὶν πρώτη μερίδος τῆς Μακεδονίας πόλις = *a city in*, Ac 22³, ἐν Ταρσῷ τῆς Κιλικίας (Mayser II 2, 126; K-G I, 334).

(c) *Objective and subjective genitive.*¹ A noun in the gen. may be the object of the action implied in the noun on which it depends. There is much ambiguity here in NT interpretation. Often a gen. might equally well be subjective or objective: it is moreover important not to sacrifice fullness of interpretation to an over precise analysis of syntax. There is no reason why a gen. in the author's mind may not have been both subjective and objective. *The love of Christ constrains us* is not to be so strictly analysed, if the author thought of Christ's love to us and our love to him as a compelling force.² But it is always an

¹ K-G I 335ff. Mayser II 129.

² Zerwick § 25.

objective gen. which depends on *gospel* in the following instances: the good news *about* τῆς βασιλείας Mt 4²³ etc. (which is the same thing as the dir. obj. in Lk 8¹ εὐαγγελίζεσθαι τὴν βασιλείαν), *about* Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ Mk 1¹, *about* τοῦ Χριστοῦ 1 Co 9¹² (= dir. obj. in Ac 5⁴²). It may be indirect object: Ga 2⁷ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς ἀκροβυστίας, *good news for the uncircumcised* (like the indir. obj. in Ac 14²¹ εὐαγγελίζεσθαι τὴν πόλιν). Also indirectly objective are the following expressions: Ro 3²² Jas 2¹ etc. πίστις Ἰησοῦ Χ. (but πίστις εἰς τὸν κύριον Ἰ. Χ. Ac 20²¹ 24²⁴ etc., and ἐν Χ. Ἰ Col 1⁴, especially where there is close proximity with a subjective genitive, e.g. 1 Th 1⁸ ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν ἡ πρὸς τὸν θεόν, Col 2⁵ ἡ εἰς Χριστὸν πίστις ὑμῶν), ὑπακοή τοῦ Χριστοῦ or τῆς πίστεως or τῆς ἀληθείας (Ro 1⁵ 2 Co 10⁵ 1 Pt 1²² etc.), which are parallel to the indir. obj. with the verb in Ac 6⁷ ὑπήκοον τῇ πίστει. But 2 Co 7¹⁵ πάντων ὑμῶν is subjective. Lk 4¹⁹ LXX ἐνιαυτὸν κυρίου δεκτὸν possessive? But Moule, 40, suggests that it is tinged with the subjective idea: *the year when the Lord will accept (man)*.

Either subjective or objective or both may be phrases like πίστις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ Ro 3²², ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ (Χριστοῦ) Ro 8³⁵ 2 Co 5¹⁴ (subj.) Lk 11⁴² 2 Th 3⁵ (obj.). But δικαιοσύνη τοῦ θεοῦ Ro 1¹⁷ 3²², τῆς πίστεως 4¹¹, 13, indicates the source, and is therefore subjective, as shown by the phrases ἡ ἐκ θεοῦ δικαιοσύνη Ph 3⁹, ἡ ἐκ πίστεως Ro 9³⁰ and ἡ διὰ πίστεως δικαιοσύνη Ph 3⁹. Actually Ro 3⁵ (Ps 97 (98)²) is more like a possessive gen.: *the justice which God dispenses*. Other instances of a subjective gen. of origin or cause are Ro 1¹ 15¹⁶ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ (since the obj. is said to be περὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ³), and the phrase τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου (ἡμῶν) where the gen. is the preacher, although κατὰ also occurs for this in the titles (Ro 2¹⁶ 16²⁵ 2 Co 4³ 1 Th 1⁵ 2 Th 2¹⁴ 2 Ti 2⁸). That is doubtless the way to regard Mk 1⁴ βάπτισμα μετανοίας; it does not lead to, but springs from, repentance. So also Col 2² πληροφορία τῆς συνέσεως: *conviction which is the result of insight (or intelligence)*; 1 Th 1³ τῆς ὑπομονῆς τῆς ἐλπίδος: *the sustaining patience which hope brings*; it is parallel to τοῦ ἔργου τῆς πίστεως and τοῦ κόπου τῆς ἀγάπης, *work done from faith and love*.

It is not easy to decide in 2 Co 13¹⁸ (ἡ κοινωνία τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος) between subjective and objective (Hauck in Kittel WB, s.v. κοινωνία). In 1 Co 2¹³ οὐκ ἐν διδασκατοῖς ἀνθρωπίνης σοφίας λόγους ἀλλ' ἐν διδασκατοῖς πνεύματος the context requires subjective genitive: *which human wisdom teaches* (cp. Jn 6⁴⁵ Isa 54¹³); but in 1 Mac 4⁷ διδασκατοὶ πολέμου is the very reverse, *masters of warfare*, unless it means *taught by war*.

The following are objective genitive: Mt 13¹⁸, 36 *the parable about*, 24⁶ ἀκοάς πολέμων *about wars* (Lk 21⁹ ἀκούσθε πολέμους), Mk 6⁷ etc. ἐξουσία c. gen. = *authority over* (Foerster in Kittel WB II 563), Jn 7¹³

20¹⁹ for fear of, Ac 4⁹ εὐεργεσία ἀνθρώπου *help given to a sick man* (NEB), Ro 2⁷ ὑπομονὴ ἔργου ἀγαθοῦ *perseverance in* (2 Th 3⁵ ὑπομονὴ τοῦ Χριστοῦ *steadfast loyalty to Christ?* or subjective?), 7² νόμος τοῦ ἀνδρός *the law about the husband* (Le 14² ὁ νόμος τοῦ λεπροῦ *the law about the leper*; class. ὁ νόμος τῆς βλαπῆς; Abel § 44 g), 1 Co 1¹⁸ ὁ λόγος τοῦ σταυροῦ, 1 Pt 3¹⁴ φόβον αὐτῶν (context decides for objective: *fear of them*), Col. 3¹⁴ σύνδεσμος τῆς τελειότητος *the bond producing perfection*, Heb 9⁸ τὴν τῶν ἁγίων ὁδόν, 10¹⁹ εἰς τὴν εἰσοδὸν τῶν ἁγίων *for entering the Holy Place* (Michaelis in Kittel WB V 109. 54ff.) This is perhaps the explanation of ὁδὸς ἔθνῶν (*a way leading to*) Mt 10⁵; ὁδὸν θαλάσσης Mt 4¹⁵; ἡ θύρα τῶν προβάτων Jn 10⁷ (or subjective: *where the sheep enter?*); ἡ θύρα πίστεως Ac 14²⁷ (*leading to faith?* obj., or *where faith enters?* subj.); ἡ θύρα τοῦ λόγου Col 4³ (same); μετοικεσία Βαβυλῶνος Mt 11. 12 *leading to*; ἡ διασπορά τῶν Ἑλλήνων Jn 7³⁵; κῶμαι Καισαρίας Mk 8²⁷ (or possessive). The question of Semitism may be raised in view of LXX Ge 3²⁴ ἡ ὁδὸς τοῦ ξύλου τῆς ζωῆς *leading to*, Ps 44 (43)²² πρόβατα σφαγῆς = פְּהַיִּם יָצְאָה *destined for* (Ro 8³⁶), Am 8¹⁰ πένης ἀγαπητοῦ ἦν? לְבָבָא *towards, concerning*. Moreover, there seems to be a gen. of place—where: Col 1²⁰ αἵματος σταυροῦ (blood) *shed on the cross*, 2 Co 11²⁶ κινδύνους ποτάμων, ληστῶν *in rivers, among robbers*; and a gen. of time duration: Lk 24⁴ ἦλθον ἡμέρας ὁδόν *a day's journey* (class.).

(d) *Genitive of relationship.* Often θεοῦ and Χριστοῦ in Paul are used to express an ill-defined relationship which may be called “mystical” (Deissmann *Paulus*, 1925, 126f), especially after ἐκκλησία, since it seems to be interchangeable with Deissmann’s “in”-formula: see especially 1 Th 2¹⁴ *the churches OF God which are in Judea IN Christ Jesus*, Ga 1²² *IN Christ*, Ro 16¹⁶ αἱ ἐκκλησίαι πᾶσαι τοῦ Χριστοῦ *OF Christ*. Indeed, so rich is Paul’s compression of language with genitives that the attempt to define too narrowly the various types of genitive is vain; they all denote a relationship which is amplified by the context. We might even be tempted to borrow Paul’s own comprehensive way of speech and render δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ simply *divine grace*.¹ Perhaps some genitives which we have taken as subjective or objective may come under this “mystical” genitive: 2 Th 3⁵ τὴν ὑπομονὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ *steadfast loyalty in the Body of Christ*; Ro 3²². 26 *faith exercised within the Body*.

(e) *Genitive of quality.*² This is a feature of Biblical Greek which has been handed down to MGr, e.g. καρὰβι τοῦ πολέμου

¹ Zerwick § 28: genetivus “generaliter” determinans.

² Schwyzler II 122. Mayser II 2, 135f; II 3, 168. Johannesohn DGKPS 27f. Radermacher² 108f. Nachmanson, Eranos 9, 63ff. Wackernagel, *Mélanges de Saussure* 135.

battleship. With the help of Heb. influence the Bibl. Greek gen. often provides an attribute which normally would be supplied by an adj. The adj. was nearly non-existent in Heb., and so the LXX introduces such phenomena as πύργος ισχύος Ps 60 (61)⁴ (from טַבַּיִם-לְחַיִּים) and ἡ στολή τοῦ ἀγίου Ex 29²⁹ (from שְׂרָפָה יָגִבָּ). There may be class. parallels, but they are poetic (Eurip. *Bacch.* 389 ὁ τᾶς ἡσυχίας βίωτος = ἡσυχος βίωτος: Jebb's note. Soph. *Ajax* 464f. K-G I 264). There may be Koine parallels, but they are few.¹

Combinations with σῶμα are especially common in Paul: Ro 6⁶ 7²⁴ τοῦ θανάτου (= adj. θνητός in 6¹² 8¹¹), Ph 3²¹ Col 1²² 2¹¹; with ἡμέρα Ro 2⁵ 2 Co 6² 1 Pt 2¹². Other exx. Mt 5²² etc. γένηνα τοῦ πυρός, Mk 1⁴ etc. βάπτισμα μετανοίας (?), Lk 2¹⁴ ἐν ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκίας S*AB*DW among approval-men (i.e. "among men of whom God approves"); the Heb. would be וְיִצְרָח בְּיָדָא (εὐδοκία = וְיִצְרָח, as in Si 15¹⁶ 39¹⁸); supply αὐτοῦ as in the opposite instance in Eph. 2³ (τέκνα ὀργῆς).² Lk 4²² οἱ λόγοι τῆς χάριτος, 16⁸ οἰκονόμος τῆς ἀδικίας, 9 ὁ μαμωνᾶς τῆς ἀδικίας (= ὁ ἀδικος μαμωνᾶς 16¹¹), 18⁸ κριτὴς τῆς ἀδικίας, Ac 1¹⁸ 2 Pt 2¹⁵ μισθὸς (τῆς) ἀδικίας, Ac 6¹¹ ῥήματα βλασφημίας S*D (Rev 13¹ 17³ ὀνόματα βλασφημίας), 7³⁰ ἐν φλογὶ πυρός (2 Th 1⁸ ἐν πυρὶ φλογός) = LXX Ex 3² ἐν πυρὶ φλογός, 8²³ χολὴ πικρίας, 9¹⁵ σκεῦος ἐκλογῆς (Ro 9²². 23 σκεὺ ὀργῆς . . . ἐλέους), Ro 1²⁶ πάθη ἀτιμίας, 6⁴ ἐν καινότητι ζωῆς new life, 7⁶ ἐν καινότητι πνεύματος καὶ οὐ παλαιότητι γράμματος in a new spirit and not according to an out-of-date literalness, 8²¹ δουλείας τῆς φθορᾶς, Col 1⁵ λόγῳ τῆς ἀληθείας τοῦ εὐαγγελίου of the true Gospel (or apposition: the Truth which is the Gospel?), 2 Ti 4⁸ ὁ τῆς δικαιοσύνης στέφανος (or apposition?), 1 Pt 1⁴ τέκνα ὑπακοῆς, 5⁴ τῆς δόξης στέφανον, Heb 3¹² καρδία πονηρὰ ἀπιστίας, 5¹³ ἀπειρος λόγου δικαιοσύνης incapable of understanding correct speech (Schrenk in Kittel WB II 200^{6f}), 12¹⁵ ῥίζα πικρίας, Jas 1¹² Rev 2¹⁰ στέφανον τῆς ζωῆς (or apposition: that crown which is life), Jas 1²⁵ ἀκροατὴς ἐπιλησμονῆς, 2⁴ κριταὶ διαλογισμῶν πονηρῶν judge by false standards (NEB) (better than Schrenk op. cit. II 98; Büchsel in Kittel WB III 944 n. 3), 1 Jn 2¹⁶ ἡ ἐπιθυμία τῆς σαρκός (or subjective?), Rev 14¹⁰ etc. ὁ οἶνος τοῦ θυμοῦ LXX Ezk 14⁴ 44¹² κόλασις (τῆς) ἀδικίας. On the Heb. pattern, ἡμέρα is used in this connection: Mt 10¹⁵ κρίσεως, Lk 1⁸⁰ ἀναδείξεως, Ro 2⁵ ὀργῆς, 1 Pt 2¹² ἐπισκοπῆς, LXX Ezk 22²⁴ (= עֲיָר עֲיָרָה), Soph 2⁸.

¹ P. Tebt. 105 (ii/b.c.) ἀκίνδυνος παντός κινδύνου ἀνυπόλογον πάσης φθορᾶς, and ἀνυπέθονοι παντός ἐπιτίμου. Etc. See Moulton Einl. 113 n. 1. The gen. of quality may be used predicatively however, as in normal Greek: ἦν ἐτῶν δώδεκα Mk 5⁴² Lk 2⁴² (not D). See Preisigke, s.v. ἔτος.

² See the discussion by Schrenk in Kittel WB II 245-8; C. H. Huntzinger, ZNW 44, 85ff.

A further Semitism¹ is the addition of the personal (or demonstrative) pronoun to the gen. of quality when properly it belongs to the first noun, e.g. his throne of glory (= *his glorious throne*) becomes "the throne of his glory" (Mt 19²⁸); this body of death (= *this dead body*) becomes "the body of this death" (Ro 7²⁴), our body of humiliation (= *our humble body*) becomes "the body of our humiliation" (Ph 3²¹); his son of love (= *his beloved son*) becomes ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ (Col 1¹³);² his word of power (= *his powerful word*) becomes "the word of his power" (Heb 1³); his plague of death (= *his mortal wound*) becomes "the plague of his death" (Rev 13³). This is because the Semitic rule adds the suffix in composite expressions to the second member, although the suffix pertains to the whole phrase.

(f) *Genitivus materiae, and epezegeticus.*³ The appositive genitive. This gen. represents more than an adj.; it represents a second noun in apposition to the first, or indicates the material of which the first noun consists. It conforms to class. and Koine usage but is incidentally Hebraic: cp. class. πλοῖα σίτου, papyri οἴνου κεράμια and Heb. נְבִל-לֶחֶם (ἀσχὸς οἴνου) Ge 40¹⁶ 1 Sam 10³.

Mt 12²⁹ Lk 11²⁹ τὸ σημεῖον Ἰωνᾶ *the sign which was Jonah*, Mt 24³⁰ ambiguous, either *the sign which is the S.M.* (appos.), or *the sign which the S.M. will give* (possess.), see Feuillet in Rev. Bibl. 56, 1946, 354; very prevalent in Mark:—1⁴ *baptism involving repentance?*, 2⁸ *the region Galilee*, 4³¹ *a grain consisting of mustard seed*, 3⁷ *a storm involving wind*, 5¹¹ *a herd consisting of swine*, 25. 2⁹ *a fount containing blood*, 8⁸. 2⁰ *an abundance consisting of broken pieces*, 15¹ *leaven consisting of the Pharisees*, 9⁴¹ *a cup containing water*, 10¹⁴ τῶν γὰρ τοιούτων ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ not necessarily possessive (as Mt 18³ and Jn 3³. 5 understood it); but *consists of such*; children are the very nature of the kingdom. 14³ ἀλάβαστρον μύρου, 13 κεράμιον ὕδατος, 15²⁶ *an inscription consisting of his accusation*, Jn 2²¹ τοῦ ναοῦ τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ, Ac 2³⁸ *the gift which is the Spirit*, Ro 4¹¹ σημεῖον περιτομῆς (-μήν is a correction by AC*) which is circumcision, 5¹⁸ *justification which is life* (Zerwick § 33), 2 Co 3³ ἐν πλαξὶ καρδίας σαρκίνας FK lat syr^p arm Iren Orig Eus (rest καρδίας), 5¹ ἡ οἰκία τοῦ σκήνους, 5 τὸν ἀρραβῶνα τοῦ πνεύματος *the guarantee consisting of the Spirit* (cp. 1²²), Ga 5⁵ either (appos.) *the*

¹ Zerwick § 30.

² Which makes it more likely that ὁ υἱὸς ὁ ἀγαπητός is *beloved son*, not *only son*, being a parallel phrase.

³ K-G I 333. Mayser II 2, 122f. NT examples in U. Holzmeister, *Verb. Dom.* 25, 1947, 112-117.

thing hoped for, which is righteousness (as ICC Ga p. 279) or (subj. gen.) the thing which the righteous hope for, Eph 1¹⁴ εἰς ἀπολύτρωσιν τῆς περιποιήσεως: either (appos.) till our redemption which is our purchase by God (or which is our possession, if active), or (obj. gen.) till the redemption of those whom God has acquired (interpreting abstract noun by concrete), 2¹⁴ τὸ μεσότηχον τοῦ φραγμοῦ, 4⁹ τὰ κατώτερα τῆς γῆς: may be partitive, or appositive (Zerwick § 33) the lower regions, that is, the earth (it might also be comparative gen.: regions lower than the earth; Büchsel in Kittel WB III 641f), Col 2² πλοῦτος τῆς πληροφορίας a wealth consisting of conviction, Heb 6¹ θεμέλιον . . . μετανοίας, Jas 3¹⁸ καρπὸς δικαιοσύνης the harvest of a life devoted to the will of God (Kittel WB II 203, ET), cp. Pr 3⁹ 11³⁰ Am 6¹², Rev 14¹⁸ the grapes which are the earth (Zerwick § 33). LXX Isa 38¹⁴ τὸ ὕψος τοῦ οὐρανοῦ.

The gen. with πόλις, of city-names, which is like Latin, occurs almost only in poetry in class. Greek; it has one example in Ptol. papyri (Mayser II 2, 117) but appears more frequently in later Greek, and is attested only at 2 Pt 2⁶ for certain: πόλις Σοδόμων καὶ Γομόρρας, because πόλεως Θυατείρων may be gen. of πόλις Θυάτειρα (Ac 16¹⁴). However, names of festivals with gen.: Jn 13¹ (Ex 34²⁵) τῆς ἑορτῆς τοῦ πάσχα, 7² (Dt 31¹¹) τῆς σκηνοπηγίας, Lk 22¹ (Dt 16¹⁶) τῶν ἀζύμων, class. Greek.

II. Ablative Genitive ("Genitivus separationis").

For replacing of this by means of ἀπό and ἐκ, see below pp. 235f.

(a) With adjectives and adverbs (much rarer now than in class. Greek, and κοινός and ἴδιος are never used with gen.):

(i) with adjectives having the idea of sharing: Mt 23³⁰ 1 Co 10¹⁸. 20 Heb 10³³ substantival κοινωνός c. gen. of person (an associate of). 1 Pt 5¹ 2 Pt 1⁴ Paul: (συγ-)κοινωνός c. gen. of thing. Eph 3⁶ συνκληρονόμα . . . συμμετοχα τῆς εὐαγγελίας. Ro 8²⁹ σύμμορφος τῆς εἰκόνας. Heb 1⁹ OT μέτοχος.

(ii) adjectives of fullness and emptiness: Mt 23²⁸ etc. μεστός, Lk 4¹ etc. πλήρης (κενός and ἐνδεής c. gen. never, although κένος ἀπό in Herm.) LXX Johannessohn DGKPS 43.

(iii) adjectives of worthiness and guilt: Mt 3⁸ 1 Co 6² etc. (ἀν-)άξιος. With ἔνοχος LXX has gen. and dat. (Johannessohn DGKPS 43). Mt 26⁶⁶ etc. Ge 26¹¹ Isa 54¹⁷ Si prol⁹ (dat. Jb 15⁵).

(iv) adjectives of strangeness (class.): Eph 2¹² ξένος. Jas 1¹³ ἀπείραστος inexperienced in (class. ἀπείρατος; for pap. Moulton Einl. 113 n.); but this may not be its meaning here. 2 Pt 2¹⁴ ἀκατάπαυστος ἀμαρτίας not ceasing from sin (but vl.-παστος perhaps unfed). Paul has created the phrase ἄνομος θεοῦ—ἐννομος Χριστοῦ (1 Co 9²¹)¹. The following always have ἀπό: Mt 27²⁴ ἀθῶος, Ac 20²⁶ καθαρός (Bauer s.v., Mayser II 2, 353, 570), Ro 7³ ἐλεύθερος independent of (pap. in Preisigke Arch. f. P. III 419³¹ vi/A.D. (ἐκ in 1 Co 9¹⁹), Jas 1²⁷ (CP ἐκ)

¹ The nearest parallels are Soph. Ant. 369, Eurip. Med. 737, and MGR ἄφοβος τοῦ θεοῦ (Thumb² § 45, 3).

ἄσπιλος. For LXX see Johannessohn DGPS 282. Very rare is *δμοιος ὑμῶν* Jn 8⁵⁵ SCLX (ὑμῖν ABDW); it is invariably the dat. (9⁹, 1 Jn 3² etc.); Barn 10³ *δμοιοι χοίρων*, Did. 3¹ *ὁμοίους ἐκείνου*, Aelian Hist. An VIII 1 (K-G I 413). Latin infl?. The gen. with *δμοιος* in LXX Isa 13⁴ may not be an instance: *φωνῆ . . . ὁμοία ἔθνῶν πολλῶν a voice like [the voice] of a great multitude.*

(v) adverbs. Unlike LXX (Ge 45¹⁰ and often), *ἐγγύς*¹ never has gen. (Johann. DGKPS 43): dat. Ac 9³⁸ 27^{8?} Mt 4²⁵ etc. *πέραν*, 5⁴³ etc. *ὁ πλησίον*, 21³⁹ etc. *ἔξω*, 23²⁵ *τὸ ἔξωθεν τοῦ ποτηρίου*, Mk 15¹⁶ *ἔσω τῆς αὐλῆς further into the palace* (DP *ἔσω εἰς τὴν αὐλήν*), Lk 7⁶ SD *μακράν* (ABCL μ. *ἀπό*), 8²⁶ *ἀντιπέρα*, 17²¹ *ἐντός*, Jn 4⁵ *πλησίον*, 1 Co 6¹⁸ etc. *ἐκτός*, 2 Co 10¹⁶ *ὑπερέκεινα*, Ph 2²⁷ *παραπλήσιον* (v.l. dat.). Also see pp. 276ff.

(b) *Genitive of comparison.* In the latter part of the class. period it was still being used much more often than *ἤ*. But as in class. Greek and pap. (Mayser II 2, 140ff), *ἤ* is used chiefly in instances where the gen. would not have been sufficiently clear: Mt 10¹⁵ 19²⁴ Ac 4¹⁹ *ὑμῶν μᾶλλον ἢ τοῦ θεοῦ*, 5²⁹ 20³⁵ Ro 13¹¹ 1 Ti 1⁴ *ἐκζητήσεις παρέχουσιν μᾶλλον ἢ οἰκοδομίαν θεοῦ*, 2 Ti 3⁴ *φιλήδονοι μᾶλλον ἢ φιλόθεοι*. But sometimes there is *ἤ* without such good reason: Jn 3¹⁹ 4¹ 1 Co 14⁵ 1 Jn 4⁴.

The class. gen. of comparison² occurs still in e.g. Mt 3¹¹ *ἰσχυρότερός μου*, Lk 12⁷ *πολλῶν στρουθίων διαφέρετε*, Ac 23¹³. 21 24¹¹ 25⁶ *πλείων* c. gen., Mk 14⁵ 1 Co 15⁶ *ἐπάνω* (= *πλείων* in colloqu. Greek) c. gen., 1 Ti 5⁹ *ἔλαττον* c. gen. There is an abbreviated comparison, omitting a gen. art (Mt 5²⁰ *ἐὰν μὴ περισσεύσῃ ἡ δικαιοσύνη ὑμῶν πλείων τῶν γραμματέων*, Ac 4²² *ἐτῶν . . . ἦν πλείονων τεσσαράκοντα: of more years* (gen. of definition) *than forty* (gen. of comp., indeclinable), see Moule 42), which can cause ambiguity at times: Jn 5³⁶ *ἐγὼ ἔχω τὴν μαρτυρίαν μείζω τοῦ Ἰωάννου (greater than John had or greater than John)*, 21¹⁵ *ἀγαπᾷς με πλέον τούτων (more than these or more than these do)*. The NT uses *παρα* and *ὑπέρ* in place of both gen. and *ἤ*. There are a few class. exx. (*ὑπέρ* rarer than *παρα*), and in MGr *παρα* or *ἀπό* is the regular substitute for gen. of comp. Lk 3¹³ *πλέον παρα τὸ διατεταγμένον*, 16⁸ *φρονιμώτερον ὑπέρ*, 18¹⁴ D *μᾶλλον παρ' ἐκεῖνον* (SBL om μ.; W *ἢ ἐκεῖνος*), Jn 12⁴³ *μᾶλλον ὑπέρ* (ABD *ἤπερ*), Heb 4¹² Barn 5⁹ *ὑπέρ*. LXX Ge 49¹² *ὑπέρ* and *ἤ* together (Johannessohn DGKPS 45).

¹ K-G I 352, 5. Meisterhans-Schwyzler 213, 11. Mayser II 2, 528. Radermacher² 144.

² What is not class. is *πρῶτός μου*, *πρῶτον ὑμῶν* Jn 1¹⁵. 30, because *πρότερος* would occur here.

III. *Position of Attributive and Partitive Genitive.*¹

The attributive gen. very rarely stands first either in class. or Koine Greek, but it does so, e.g. in Mt 1¹⁸ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χ. ἡ γένεσις, obviously for emphasis on Jesus. The usual order in class. Greek was either (a) οἱ τῆς χώρας νόμοι, or (b) οἱ νόμοι οἱ τῆς χώρας. But increasingly more common in Hell. Greek, especially in NT, was (c) οἱ νόμοι τῆς χώρας. Mayser's figures for the pre-Christian papyri² are:

	(a)	(c)	Proportion		(a)	(c)	Proportion
iii/B.C.	32	44	3 : 4	ii-i/B.C.	45	94	1 : 2

It is doubtful whether any LXX books have a large proportion of (a) and (b), whereas in the first two chapters of Ge (c) occurs at 1¹⁰. 14. 17. 26. 28. 30 29. 12. 18. 18. 19. 19. 20. In the pap. (b) is extremely rare except in the attribute of proper nouns (e.g. Μαρία ἡ τοῦ Ἰακώβου in NT). In Mk the relative position of the articular noun and its gen. is striking: it is almost invariably position (c), never (a) as is regular in the papyri; and (b) occurs twice with personal relationship and once (11³⁰) τὸ βάπτισμα τὸ Ἰωάννου. Thus, possessive 2 (b) : 35 (c), objective 0 (b) : 5 (c), subjective 1 (b) : 4 (c), content 0 (b) : 5 (c), partitive 0 (b) : 7 (c). In any case, the partitive gen. (as in class. Greek) must take this position, outside the art. and noun, either before or after, without repetition of the art. In the rest of NT, although (b) is still infrequent, (a) is more common than in Mark: e.g.

(a)	Jn 18 ¹⁰ BAC 2 Co 8 ⁶ . 19 (ten in Paul), 1 Pt 3 ¹ 4 ¹⁷ 5 ¹ . 1 2 Pt 1 ⁸ 2 ⁷ 3 ²
(b)	Jn 6 ³³ SD ὁ ἄρτος ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ, 7 ²³ S ὁ νόμος ὁ Μ., Ac 15 ¹ τῷ ἔθει τῷ Μωϋσέως (DEHLP om 2nd τῷ) ³ , 1 Co 1 ¹⁸ ὁ λόγος ὁ τοῦ σταυροῦ, 2 Co 4 ¹¹ ἡ ζωὴ ἡ (p ⁴⁶) τοῦ (but 4 ¹⁰ ἡ ζ. τοῦ), Ti 2 ¹⁰ τὴν διδασκαλίαν τὴν τοῦ σωτῆρος . . .

¹ K-G I 617. 3. Mayser II 2, 143ff.

² This is based on the following for iii/B.C.: P. Hib. nos. 27-121; Zen. P. I and II, nos. 59001-59297; ii-i/B.C. UPZ I; P. Teb. nos. 5-124.

³ But with Μωϋσέως the position is that of (c), i.e. anarthrous: Mk 12²⁶ Lk 2²² 24⁴⁴ Ac 13³⁹ 15⁵ 28²³.

A frequent construction is the appearance, as a kind of afterthought, of the art. with an attribute after an anarthrous noun: Ac 1¹² ἀπὸ ὄρους τοῦ καλουμένου ἑλαιῶνος, 26¹² καὶ ἐπιτροπῆς τῶν ἀρχιερέων, Jas 1²⁵ εἰς νόμον τέλειον τὸν τῆς ἐλευθερίας.

IV. *The Joining together of several different Genitives*

Characteristic of Paul and often ambiguous or obscure. Rather rarely two genitives depend on the same noun, which then usually stands between them: Ac 5³² αὐτοῦ μάρτυρες τῶν ῥημάτων τούτων *his witnesses for these things*, 2 Co 5¹ ἡ ἐπίγειος ἡμῶν οἰκία τοῦ σκήνους (possess. and appos.), Ph 2³⁰ τὸ ὑμῶν (subj.) ὑστέρημα τῆς πρὸς με λειτουργίας (obj.), 2 Pt 3² τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑμῶν ἐντολῆς τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σωτῆρος perhaps *of the commandment of the Lord and Saviour transmitted by the apostles to you*, Rev 7¹⁷ ἐπὶ ζωῆς πηγᾶς ὑδάτων (scribes attempted to remove the obscurity: ζώσας).

More commonly, especially in Paul, but also in the papyri ¹ one gen. is dependent on the other, the result being sometimes a clumsy accumulation. We can usually assume in such circumstances that the governing gen. will precede the dependent one ²:

LXX Wi 13⁵ ἐκ γὰρ μεγέθους καλλονῆς κτισμάτων, 2 Co 4⁴ τὸν φωτισμὸν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου (gen. of origin: *light from the Gospel*) τῆς δόξης τοῦ Χριστοῦ (obj.). Note that the last of the genitives is usually a possessive. Eph 1⁶ εἰς ἔπαινον δόξης ³ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ *for the praise of his grace* (DE τῆς δόξης, which would be *praise of the glory of his grace*; cp. Eph 1^{12.14}), 1¹⁸ ὁ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τῆς κληρονομίας αὐτοῦ, 1¹⁹ κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ κράτους τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ, 4¹³ εἰς μέτρον ἡλικίας τοῦ πληρώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, Col 2¹² διὰ τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ θεοῦ, 1 Th 1³, Rev 14⁸ 16¹⁹ 19¹⁵. Note the order of words in 1 Pt 3⁸ ὁ . . . ἐμπλοκῆς τριχῶν . . . κόσμος.

¹ Abel § 44, Mayser II 2, 143, 144.

² There are exceptions: Mt 24^{31B} μετὰ σάλπιγγος φωνῆς μεγάλης, 2 Co 3¹⁸ ἀπὸ κυρίου πνεύματος (assuming it = *the Sp. of the Lord*), Heb 6² βαπτισμῶν διδαχῆς (p^{40B} prob. rightly: διδαχῆν) *teaching concerning baptisms*.

³ To be taken very closely together, as in Ph 1¹¹ εἰς δόξαν καὶ ἔπαινον.

V. *Attributive and Partitive Genitives in Mark*

TRUE GENITIVE

Possessive	Partitive	Objective Subjective	Quality	Content	Price
18. 7. 15. 16. 16	19. 28 26	11. 4. 14. 17	14 229	14. 28 411	637 837
19. 24. 29. 30	16. 21 322	228 419 67.	44. 19	31. 37 511	
210. 18. 26. 28	51. 22 615	48 74. 35	51. 42	25. 29 724.	
35. 17. 27. 28. 34	28 71. 2	935 1044	621. 48	31 88. 15.	
537. 38. 40. 41	810. 27. 28	113. 22 129.	833 1113	20 941 101.	
63. 17. 24. 56	91. 37 111.	27 137. 8	1538	14 1216	
73. 5. 27. 28. 31	5 1213. 28	144. 9 152. 9		142. 3. 13	
823. 38 924. 31. 41	1410. 12.			1526	
1025. 35. 46. 47. 48	43. 47. 66	subj.			
1110. 15	1535	78. 9. 13			
1214. 17. 26. 35. 40		1130 1224			
1335 143. 47. 54					
1521. 40. 43. 46					

ABLATIVAL GENITIVE

With adjectives	Comparison
329 647 819 936 1464	17 431 935 1222. 28. 31. 33. 43 145. 12 162

One gospel has been chosen in order to illustrate the variety and difficulty of interpreting the genitive.

2. ADJECTIVAL DATIVE¹

(a) *With nouns.* It occurs in class. and Koine Greek with a verbal noun, but in NT only 2 Co 9^{11. 12} εὐχαριστία τῷ θεῷ. With other nouns: 1 Co 7²⁸ θλίψις τῆ σαρκί, 2 Co 2¹³ ἀνεσις τῷ πνεύματι, 12⁷ σκόλοψ τῆ σαρκί. Many apparent instances display not an attributive, but a predicative, use of the dat. (ATR, 536f). However, Col 2¹⁴ may be an example of a noun with a dat. attribute: τὸ . . . χειρόγραφον τοῖς δόγμασιν *sub-*
scription to the ordinances.

¹ K-G I § 424. Meisterhans-Schwyzler 209ff. 26-31. Schwyzler II 137-173. Radermacher² 110. J. Humbert, *La Disparition du Datif (du I^{er} au X^e siècle)*, Paris 1930. Mayser II 2, 145-151.

(b) *With adjectives.* Mk 6⁴⁸ etc. ἐναντίος (πρός Ac 26⁹) Ac 41⁶ 71³ 1 Ti 41⁵ (vl. ἐν) ἀρκετός, ἰκανός, φανερός, Ac 7³⁹ ὑπήκοος, 10⁴⁰ Ro 10²⁰ ἐμφανής, Ac 16¹⁵ πιστός, 26¹⁹ etc. ἀπειθής, Ti 2¹¹ σωτήριος, 3⁸ ὠφέλιμος. These correspond to a cognate verb which has the dat. Then there are adjectives of likeness: ὁμοίος frequent (in the "abbreviated" construction: Rev 9¹⁰ ἔχουσιν οὐράς ὁμοίας σκορπίου, 13¹¹ εἶχεν κέρατα δύο ὁμοία ἀρνίῳ), Mt 20¹² Ἰσοῦς . . . ἡμῖν, 1 Co 11⁵ ἐν καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ τῆ ἐξυρημένῃ, Ph 3²¹ σύμμορφος, Ro 6⁵ σύμφυτοι τῷ ὁμοιώματι τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ (unless instr. dat., in which case the gen. goes with συμφ., but this is unnatural), 2 Pt 1¹ (Jude 7) τοῖς ἰσότημον ἡμῖν λαχοῦσιν πίστιν ("abbreviated"), Heb 11¹¹ αὐτῇ Σάρρα = class. *together with Sarah* (better sense than αὐτῇ Σάρρα).

(c) *Dative of respect.* The dat. of respect (e.g. ὀνόματι by name) in NT has almost displaced the class. accus. of respect, and as in the papyri (Mayser II 2, 149f, 285) it becomes almost an adverb, and is especially used when contrast is involved, e.g. φύσει . . . νόμῳ, λόγῳ μὲν . . . ἔργῳ δέ.

Mt 5³ πτωχὸς τῷ πνεύματι, ⁸ καθαρὸς τῇ καρδίᾳ, 11²⁹ ταπεινὸς τῇ καρδίᾳ, Ac 4³⁶ etc. τῷ γένει *by birth* (and pap.), 7⁵¹, 14⁸, 16⁵ τῷ ἀριθμῷ (BU II 388 III⁸ ii-iii/A.D.), 18⁵⁻²⁵, Ro 5¹⁷ πολλῷ μᾶλλον, 12¹⁰⁻²² (several), 1 Co 7³⁴, 14²⁰, 2 Co 7¹¹ difficult: συνεστήσατε ἑαυτοὺς ἀγνοῦς εἶναι τῷ πράγματι (ἐν would make better sense than εἶναι; D^bEKLP read εἶναι ἐν), Ga 2⁵ εἴξαμεν τῇ ὑποταγῇ *yield submissively*, ¹⁵ Ph 2⁷ (Philo Byz. σχήματι or σχήμασι 69¹²), 3⁵ *with respect to circumcision*, Heb 5¹¹ νωθροὶ γεγονάτε ταῖς ἀκοαῖς, 10²⁹ πόσῳ . . . χείρονος *by how much . . . worse*. Diog. 12¹⁶ 13⁸⁹ προβεβηκῶς τῇ ἡλικίᾳ, UPZ II 161⁶¹ (119 B.C.), 162 VII 29 (117 B.C.) τοῖς ἔτεσιν. With this dat., ἐν is often used: Lk 1⁷ προβεβηκότες ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις αὐτῶν (1¹⁸ 2³⁶), but προβεβηκῶς (ταῖς) ἡμέραις LXX Jo 23¹⁻² 3 Km 1¹ (accus. τὴν ἡλικίαν is atticistic 2 Mac 4⁴⁰ 6¹⁸), Ditt. Syll ³ 647¹⁷ (ii/B.C.). There is both dat. and accus. of respect in LXX: 2 Mac 5¹¹ τεθρηωμένος τῇ ψυχῇ (accus. in Lucian: atticistic), Johannessohn DGKPS 69-71.

3. ADJECTIVAL ACCUSATIVE.¹

During the Hell. period the accus. of respect (or specification, or general reference) yields to the dat. of respect, as we have just seen, or to a prepositional phrase, as in the pre-Christian papyri and LXX, as well as in NT. Sometimes the two cases appear side by side: Mt 27³² (τῷ) ὀνόματι, 27⁵⁷ τοῦνομα.

¹ K-G I 315ff. Mayser II 2, 151. Schwyzer II 67-88 (part).

But NT uses τῷ γένει for the class, τὸ γένος (Mk 7²⁶ Ac 4³⁶), and where Diod. Sic. (20, 1) has τὴν ψυχὴν, Heb 12³ has τῇ ψυχῇ.

Jn 6¹⁰ τὸν ἀριθμὸν *as to number*. But in Ac 17²⁸ ἐκ τοῦ γὰρ γένος ἐσμέν the translation is *we are his offspring* (because of v. 29), although in Aratus Phaenom. 5 γένος is an accus. of general reference. Ac 18³ v.l. σκηνοποιὸς τὴν τέχνην (but better reading is τῇ τέχνῃ), cp. P. Oxy. I 40 (ii-iii/A.D.) ἰατρὸς ὑπάρχων τὴν τέχνην, Heb 2¹⁷ 5¹ πιστὸς ἀρχιερεὺς τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεόν (same phrase is adv. accus. in Ro 15¹⁷). For δεδεμένος τοὺς πόδας see p. 247. For τὸ λοιπὸν see p. 336.

§ 3. Attributive Prepositional Phrases¹

In the same way that adjectives, pronouns, pronominal adjectives, and nouns in gen. or dat. or accus., may be employed as attributive phrases defining a noun, so also may a prepositional expression be used. The class. arrangement is still found: Ac 26³ τῶν κατὰ Ἰουδαίους ἔθῶν, Ro 11²¹ τῶν κατὰ φύσιν κλάδων, ²⁷ ἢ παρ' ἐμοῦ διαθήκη, 16¹⁵. If this prepositional expression stands in post-position, the repetition of the art. is necessary for the sake of clarity, e.g. Ac 3¹⁶ ἡ πίστις ἣ δι' αὐτοῦ, Ro 3²⁴ τῆς ἀπολυτρώσεως τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, Ga 1²² ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις ταῖς Ἰουδαίαις ταῖς ἐν Χριστῷ, Ph 3¹¹ τὴν ἐξανάστασιν τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν, 1 Th 1⁸ ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν ἣ πρὸς τὸν θεόν. For this very reason we hardly ever find a prepositional clause used as attribute to an anarthrous noun: in 1 Co 12³¹ εἴ τι for ἔτι is read by p⁴⁶ D*F, making καθ' ὑπερβολὴν no longer an attribute of the anarthrous ὁδόν. The only real exceptions appear to be: Mk 1²³ ἄνθρωπος ἐν πνεύματι ἀκαθάρτῳ, Ro 14¹⁷ χαρὰ ἐν πνεύματι ἀγίῳ, 2 Co 12² ἄνθρωπον ἐν Χριστῷ, and with the art. before the attribute: Ac 16²³ ἀδελφοῖς τοῖς κατὰ τὴν Ἀντιόχειαν (an address), 26¹⁸ πίστει τῇ εἰς ἐμέ, ²² ἐπιουρίας . . . τῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ, Ro 9³⁰, Ph 3⁹, 1 Ti 1⁴, 2 Ti 1¹³.

In NT, as opposed to class. Greek, a considerable number of instances of omission of the second art. appear to exist, apart from those cases where the noun has additional defining clauses: Mk 6⁶ τὰς κόμας κύκλω (but κύκλω may define the verb περιῆγεν; it is used with a verb in Ro 15¹⁹; Swete takes it so), Lk 16¹⁰ ὁ πιστὸς ἐν ἐλαχίστῳ = ὁ ὢν . . ., Ro 6⁴ διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος

¹ K-G I 594. 6. Schwyzer II 417ff. Mayser II 2, 152ff. Winer-Schmiedel § 20, 1-6. Radermacher² 112. 117. Johannesson DGPS 365.

εἰς τὸν θάνατον, 10¹, 1 Co 10¹⁸, 11²⁴ 12¹², 2 Co 1¹¹, 9¹³ Ph 1¹⁴ (unless ἐν κυρίῳ is taken with πεποιθότας), Col 1², 1 Th 4¹⁶, Eph 2¹¹, 4¹, 6⁵ SAB, Col 3²² p⁴⁶ S, 1 Ti 6¹⁷.

It is not surprising that we find the types δικαιοσύνη ἡ ἐκ πίστεως and τὸ χάρισμα διὰ πολλῶν fairly frequently in NT, and there is no need to explain away the construction or adopt a more orthodox variant reading, for these types appear (less regularly than the other two) in the Koine. Thus, for pre-Christian papyri:—

	iii/B.C.	ii-i/B.C.
1. ἡ ἐκ πίστεως δικαιοσύνη	98	210
2. ἡ δικαιοσύνη ἡ ἐκ πίστεως	74	6
3. δικαιοσύνη ἡ ἐκ πίστεως	16	66
4. ἡ δικαιοσύνη ἐκ πίστεως	10	5

See Mayser II 2, 161.

In conclusion we may note that attributive adverbs¹, though found already in class. Greek, occur much less frequently in NT than other attributives. Nevertheless they do occur sometimes, e.g. Ro 3²⁶ ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ, cp. PSI IV 402, 7, ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ (iii/B.C.); Ac 20²⁶ ἡ σήμερον ἡμέρα (Ro 11⁸ 2 Co 3¹⁴); 2 Pt 3⁶ ὁ τότε κόσμος.

¹ K-G I 594, 6; 809. Mayser II 2, 168–171. Winer-Schmiedel § 20, 7.

PART III

WORD-MATERIAL WHICH DEFINES A VERB

This page intentionally left blank

CHAPTER SIXTEEN

PREDICATIVE USE OF ADJECTIVES AND ADVERBS

§ 1. Adjectives

The predicative use of adjectives, participles and pronouns has already been discussed in connection with the definite article. When the predicate occurs before the articular noun it tends to be emphatic. For papyrus examples, see Mayser II 2, 172f. For class. Greek, K-G I 273, 2.

Μέσος and ἄκρος were used in this predicative way in class. Greek, but more rarely now: Mt 25⁶ μέσης δὲ νυκτός Lk 23⁴⁵ ἐσχίσθη δὲ τὸ καταπέτασμα τοῦ ναοῦ μέσον, Jn 19¹⁸ μέσον δὲ τὸν Ἰησοῦν, Ac 26¹³ ἡμέρας μέσης. But elsewhere τὸ μέσον with partitive gen. We never have the class. περι μέσας νύκτας, but κατὰ μέσον τῆς νυκτός (Ac 27²⁷) or κατὰ τὸ μεσονύκτιον (16²⁵); for class. τὸ δάκτυλον ἄκρον we have τὸ ἄκρον τοῦ δακτύλου (Lk 16²⁴), like τὸ ἄκρον τῆς ῥάβδου αὐτοῦ (Heb 11²¹). We may take Mt 24³¹ (ἀπ' ἄκρων οὐρανῶν) and Mk 13²⁷ (ἀπ' ἄκρου γῆς) in the class. predicative sense, but they may equally well be intended for the gen. of τὰ ἄκρα and τὸ ἄκρον.

In class. Greek a predicative adj., especially a temporal numeral ending in -αῖος, may correspond to an adverb, since it defines a verb. Although this idiom is rare in NT, yet in the neuter gender it became increasingly popular in post-classical Greek and eventually became the regular way of forming adverbs in MGr.

Mk 4²⁸ αὐτομάτη ἡ γῆ καρποφορεῖ, Lk 21³⁴ αἰφνίδιος, 24²² γενόμεναι ὄρθρηναι ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον (cp. Herm. S.V 1, 1 ὄρθρινός ἐλήλυθας), Jn 4¹⁸ τοῦτο ἀληθές εἶρηκας (SE ἀληθῶς) class., 13³⁴ καινὴν δίδωμι I give you *it* απεω, Ac 12¹⁰ αὐτομάτη, 14¹⁰, 20⁶ D πεμπτῆταιοι, 28¹³ δευτεραῖοι ἦλθομεν *on the second day*, Ro 10¹⁹, 1 Co 9¹⁷, Heb 11²³ p⁴⁶ ἐκρόβη τρίμηνος, 2 Mac 10³³ V ἄσμενοι περιεκάθισαν.

There is therefore not surprisingly some confusion of μόνος with the adv. μόνον: Mk 6⁸ μηδὲν εἰ μὴ ῥάβδον μόνον (D μόνην), Ac 11¹⁹ μηδενὶ εἰ μὴ μόνον (D μόνοις) Ἰουδαίοις, Heb 12²⁶ ΟΤ

(φιλῶ τὰ ἀγάματα . . . ὀρᾶν). We mention here¹ the Hebraistic προστίθεμαι c. infin.: in Hebrew the verb which represents the adv. may be joined syntactically with the verb which represents the main verbal idea (הִלְשֵׁף הִשָּׁי *he sent again*) but sometimes both verbs are finite (Ge 25¹); the first method is more common and is imitated in Lk 20^{11f} (not D) προσέθετο πέμψαι, Mk 14²⁵ D οὐ μὴ προσθῶ πεῖν. The question for the translator is whether the meaning is *he did something AGAIN* or *he ALSO did something*. Lk 20^{11f}, by the parallel Mk 12^{4, 5} (πάλι), would mean *he sent again*. But Ac 12³ appears to mean *he also arrested Peter*. It is one of the very few Hebraisms in the atticistic Josephus (Ant. 6, 287; 19, 48), but here the meaning must be *to attach oneself to, acquiesce in* (Thackeray *JThS* 30, 1929, 161-370). 1 Clem 12⁷ καὶ προσέθεντο αὐτῇ δοῦναι σημεῖα *also gave*, P. Grenf. I 53²⁹ (iv/A.D.) (see Moulton-Howard 445). LXX Ge 4² προσέθηκεν τεκεῖν *also bore*, Ex 10²⁸ προσθεῖναι ἰδεῖν *see again* 14¹³ Dt 3²⁶ 18¹⁶ Jo 7¹² etc. Similarly there is προσθεῖς εἶπεν: LXX Ge 25¹ προσθέμενος Ἀβραὰμ ἔλαβε γυναῖκα *took another*, 38⁵ προσθεῖσα ἔτι ἔτεκεν *bore again*, Jb 27¹ 29¹ 36¹ προσθεῖς εἶπεν *again spoke*, Lk 19¹¹ προσθεῖς εἶπεν παραβολὴν *another parable?* or *he also told a parable?* Polyc. 31, 7, 4, Apoc. Pet. 4, Acta Phil. 10.

For *beforehand*, προλαμβάνω c. inf. Mk 14⁸, προυπάρχω c. ptc. Lk 23¹². For *willingly* θέλω (fin. and ptc.), unless it involves a definite act of will, Mk 12³⁸ Lk 20⁴⁶ τῶν θελόντων περιπατεῖν *who love to*, Jn 6²¹ ἤθελον οὖν λαβεῖν αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ πλοῖον, 8⁴⁴ *you gladly do his will* (so in class. Greek with ἐθέλω; Origen contra Marc., ed. Wetst. 35, with βούλομαι). For *from the beginning* ἀρχομαι Ac 1¹ ὧν ἤρξατο (= ἀ ἐποίησεν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς). So also the adverbial use of τυγχάνω, φθάνω, φάνερός εἰμι.

§ 4. Position of the Adverb

An adverb usually follows the adj. or verb which it determines, in NT. Mt 2¹⁶ ἐθυμώθη λίαν, 4⁸ ὑψηλὸν λίαν, Lk 12²⁸ ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ τὸν χόρτον ὄντα σήμερον *which exists to-day* not *which is in the field to-day*. Exceptions: Mk 16² λίαν πρῶτ (D om λίαν), 2 Ti 4¹⁵ λίαν γὰρ ἀντέστη, P. Par. 42³ λίαν σοι χάριν μεγάλην

¹ W-M § 54, 5. Thackeray OT Gr. 52f. Lightfoot on Clem. 1 Co. 12. Moulton Proleg. 67, 233. Deissmann BS 67. MM Vocab. s.v. Moulton-Howard 445.

ἐσχήκαμεν. Therefore, in Col 1³ it will be more natural to take παντότε with the former verb εὐχαριστοῦμεν than with the subsequent ptc. προσευχόμενοι. Occasionally the adv. is given great emphasis by its divorce from its verb: e.g. Lk 7⁶ at the beginning of the clause. But in Lk 15¹ the adverbial phrase διανοία καρδίας goes closely with ὑπερηφάνους (i.e. *haughty in heart*) and not with διεσκόπισεν which is furthest from it.

To what does μόνον refer in 1 Co 15¹⁹ εἰ ἐν τῇ ζωῇ ταύτῃ ἐν Χριστῷ ἠλπικότες ἐσμέν μόνον? Not to *this life*, but *we have done no more than hope in Christ*.

Mt has the peculiar habit, in the imperative, of giving second place to adverbs which in other moods he puts first:

Imperative	Other moods
31 ⁵ ἄφες ἄρτι	91 ⁸ ἄρτι ἐτελεύτησεν 26 ⁵³ ἄρτι παρακαλέσαι ADCW
181 ⁶ παράλαβε . . . ἔτι	192 ⁰ ἔτι ὕστερῶ 26 ⁶⁵ τί ἔτι χρεῖαν ἔχομεν;
274 ² καταβάτω νῦν, 4 ³ ῥυσάσθω νῦν	26 ⁶⁵ νῦν ἠκούσατε

In the exception, 51³ ἰσχύει ἔτι, it should be observed that DW omit ἔτι.

However, in the Ptol. pap. the normal position of adverbs in the simple sentence increasingly tends to be before the verb to which they belong. Even in the class. period a considerable flexibility obtained, under the influence of rhythm or emphasis, and the conversational style differed markedly from the rhetorical.

	Conversational style		Rhetorical		Ptol. pap.	
	Plato: Apol	Xen. Hell. I	Thuc. II	Demosth. I	iii/ B.C.	ii-i/ B.C.
Pre	171 (5)	77 (3-5)	2-5	2-1	30	40
Post	35 (1)	22 (1)	1	1	28	25

(Mayser II 2, 181f.)

In the language of Ptol. documents the normal pre-positive adverbs and those which for a rhetorical purpose are post-positive are fairly evenly distributed. In many documents, such as official acts, the tendency to emphasize the adverb in post-position is very strong. Conversely certain adverbs are always pre-positive, others always post-positive; others again are both.

In Mark *πάλιν* is used both as an adv. and as a conjunction. When, like *εὐθύς*, it occurs at the beginning of its phrase, it may be reasonable to take it as a mere conjunction.¹ Usually, however, it occurs either just before or just after its verb: i.e. 23 out of 29 instances. This close proximity with the verb suggests that here we should treat it as a true adverb (before verb 4¹, 7³¹ 8²⁵ 10¹. 24 12⁴ 14³⁹. 40 vl. 70 15⁴. 12. 13; after verb 21. 13 31. 20 71⁴ vl. 81³ 10¹. 32 11²⁷ 14⁶⁹). But the text is doubtful at 5²¹ where we have both *πάλιν εἰς τὸ πέραν* and *εἰς τὸ πέραν πάλιν*, and perhaps the fact that Mark usually has *πάλιν* near its verb sways the balance in favour of the latter.

Nevertheless Mark uses *εὐθύς* only five times near the verb, i.e. as an adverb (viz. 1²⁸ 5¹³ vl. 36. 42 6²⁵ 7²⁵ 13¹ vl. 36 vl.); elsewhere it is probably merely a connective conjunction, occurring at the beginning of its clause (viz. 1¹⁰. 12. 18. 20. 21. 23. 29. 30. 31 vl. 42. 43 2² vl. 8. 12 3⁶ 4⁵. 15. 16. 17. 29 5². 29. 30. 42 6²⁵. 27. 45. 50. 54 7²⁵. 35 8¹⁰ 9⁸ vl. 15. 20. 24 10⁵² 11². 3 14⁴³. 45. 72 15¹). Some thirty of these instances are *καὶ εὐθύς*: *and so* (consecutive, like the Heb.), like *καὶ ἰδοὺ* in Matthew. But it must be said that sometimes, as at 6²⁵, *εὐθύς* has rather stronger adverbial force: *she went in immediately*.²

¹ 5²¹ 8¹ vl. 10¹⁰ 11³ vl. 12⁵ vl. 14⁶¹.

² For *πάλιν* and *εὐθύς* I owe much to private communications from Dr. G. D. Kilpatrick.

CHAPTER SEVENTEEN

CASE ADDITIONS TO THE VERB: WITHOUT A PREPOSITION¹

§ 1. Nominative²

(a) *The nominative "ad sensum"*: Eph 3¹⁷ κατοικῆσαι τὸν Χριστὸν . . . ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν, ἐν ἀγάπῃ ἐρριζωμένοι, 4¹⁻² παρακαλῶ οὖν ὑμᾶς . . . ἀξίως περιπατῆσαι . . . , ἀνεχόμενοι, Col 2² ἵνα παρακληθῶσιν αἱ καρδίαι αὐτῶν, συνβιβασθέντες, 3¹⁶ ὁ λόγος τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐνοικεῖτω . . . , διδάσκοντες.

(b) *Proper nouns without syntax*³. Proper nouns usually fit syntactically into the construction (e.g. Mt 12¹⁻²⁵ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν, Mk 3¹⁶ Πέτρον, vl. Πέτρος, Ac 18² εὐρών τινα . . . ὀνόματι Ἀκύλαν, 27¹ ἑκατοντάρχη ὀνόματι Ἰουλίῳ), but sometimes they are introduced independently in the nominative: Lk 19²⁹ 21³⁷ τὸ ὄρος τὸ καλούμενον Ἐλαιῶν (unless this is ἐλαιῶν, like 19³⁷), Jn 13¹³ φωνεῖτέ με ὁ κύριος . . . Rev 9¹¹ ὄνομα ἔχει Ἀπολλών, P. Par. 18. 3 (Abel § 42 (a)).

The divine name (ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος Rev 1⁸) is used in nom. after ἀπό: Rev 1⁴. There is some LXX history behind this name, which is based on Ex 3¹⁴ ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ὢν . . . ὁ ὢν ἀπέσταλκέ με. Jeremiah has ὁ ὢν δέσποτα κύριε (4) and Hos 1⁹ οὐκ εἰμι ὑμῶν (Ziegler *Duodecim Prophetae*, Göttingen 1943, in loc., and *Beitr. z. Ieremias-LXX*, 1958, 40). It may have been regarded as indeclinable in Greek.

(c) *Nom. is found in parenthesis (class.)*: ὄνομα αὐτῶ (= ἰησῴ), LXX Jg 13², Jn 1⁶ (but S*D*W add ἦν); 3¹ (but S* ὀνόματι) adds ἦν, however. More common are the phrases ᾧ (ῥ, οὔ) ὄνομα, and ὀνόματι. Zen. pap. 59037, 7 (258 B.C.) ὄνομα δ' ἐστὶ αὐτῶι Ἡδύλος, 59148, 2 (256 B.C.) ᾧ ὄνομα Ὀνήσιμος.

¹ K-G I 44-51 (nom. voc.), 250-448 (acc. gen. dat.). Schwyzer II 52ff. Gildersleeve I §§ 3-25 (nom. voc.). Johannessohn DGKPS. R. Helbing, *Die Kasusyntax der Verba bei den LXX*, Göttingen 1928. A. Jannaris § 1242ff (MGr). L. D. Brown, *A Study of the Case Construction of Words of Time*, New York, 1904. Wackernagel I 14f, 17-20, 294-312.

² K-G I 44ff. Meisterhans-Schwyzer § 84, 1-5. Gildersleeve I §§ 3-13. Radermacher² 21, 111, 219, 223. Mayser II 2, 185-187.

³ Thackeray OT Gr 23. Johannessohn DGKPS 7. Abel § 42 a. Mayser II 2, 185ff. Moulton-Howard 154. Kittel WB II 342f.

(d) *The nom. with time-designation.* Here we expect accus. It may be an instance of ellipsis and we are to supply a main verb (e.g. εἶσιν) with καί. Class.: ὅσαι ἡμέραι *daily*. LXX Jo 1¹¹ Ἄ ἔτι τρεῖς ἡμέραι ὑμεῖς διαβήσεσθε (true text has καί before ὑμεῖς), Eccl. 2¹⁶ ἤδη αἱ ἡμέραι ἐρχόμεναι τὰ πάντα ἐπελήσθη, Mt 15³² ὅτι ἤδη ἡμέραι (S accus.) τρεῖς (D adds εἶσιν καί) προσμένουσίν μοι, Lk 9²⁸ 13¹⁶(?), Ac 5⁷ Acta Paul. Thecl. 8 (P. Oxy. I 6. 3) ἡμέραι γὰρ ἤδη τρεῖς καὶ νύκτες Θέκλα καὶ ἐγγήγερται, and fairly often in post-Ptolemaic papyri. Adverbial nom.: Mk 6^{39f} συμπόσια συμπόσια, πρασιαὶ πρασιαί.

Nom. pendens is a nom. standing at the head of a clause without construction. See p. 316.

Ἴδε with nom. as object is explained by the fact that, like ἰδοῦ, ἴδε has become a stereotyped particle of exclamation. So have ἄγε and φέρε: Jn 1²⁹ ἴδε ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, 19²⁶. 27 ἴδε ὁ υἱὸς σου . . . ἴδε ἡ μήτηρ σου.

§ 2. Genitive¹

(a) *True Genitive*

1. *A possessive² gen.* may be used predicatively with εἶναι *to belong to*, e.g. Jn 17⁶ W σοῦ ἦσαν (rest dat.), Ac 27²³, 1 Co 11² 3⁴ 6¹⁹, 3⁹ *fellow-workers belonging to* (not *with*) *God*, 3²¹, 14³⁷ DFG κυρίου ἐστίν (but p⁴⁶ S*BA add ἐντολή), Heb 5¹⁴ 12¹¹. With γίνεσθαι, e.g. Ac 20³ ἐγένετο γνώμη.

2. *With verbs and verbal adjectives.* The gen. with verbs like *accuse* denotes the ground of accusation: only Ac 19⁴⁰ ἐγκαλεῖσθαι στάσεως. The construction is so rare³ that one is tempted to take the gen. closely with σήμερον, and thus construe in the usual way περὶ τῆς σήμερον στάσεως. Elsewhere in Ac we have the class. περὶ after ἐγκαλεῖσθαι and κρίνεσθαι, 23⁶. 29 26⁷.

Gen. with μεταδίδωμι (Helbing 252, Mayser II 2, 197) is not found in the NT; instead we have accus. (Ro 11¹ 1 Th 2⁸) and elsewhere the dative. With μεταλαμβάνω (Helbing 136, Mayser II 2, 197f) *to receive a share of* always the gen., e.g. Ac 2⁴⁶ 27³³ Heb 6⁷. With μετέχω (Helbing 136, Mayser II 2, 198) ἐκ is found only 1 Co 10¹⁷, elsewhere gen. (1 Co 9¹² Heb 2¹⁴). But

¹ Schwyzer II 89-137. Mayser II 2, 118-145, 187-240.

² K-G I 372, 1 b. Mayser II 2, 188f. Radermacher² 124.

³ But see Dio Cass. 58. 4. 5. ἀσεβείας.

with the last two verbs, the gen. is limited to Luke, Paul and Hebrews. With *κοινωνέω* gen. occurs only ¹ at Heb 2¹⁴.

To *touch* still has gen., never accus. in NT (Mayser II 2, 199, Helbing 123), but *ψηλαφάω* has accus. (Lk 24³⁹ Ac 17²⁷ 1 Jn 1¹) and in passive Heb 12¹⁸. To *take hold of* (*ἐπι-*) *λαμβάνομαι* regularly has gen., especially the part grasped, in LXX, NT and papyri (Mayser II 2, 202, Helbing 127): in Lk 14⁴ Ac 9²⁷ 16¹⁹ 18¹⁷ *ἐπιλαβόμενος ἴασατο αὐτόν* the accus. goes with the main verb (but see Delling in Kittel WB IV 9, n. 3), in Lk 23²⁶ SBCDL have accus. but WA have gen., Mk 8²³ D *λαβόμενος τὴν χεῖρα τοῦ τυφλοῦ* (unusual Greek), in LXX Ezk 16⁴⁹ *χεῖρα . . . οὐκ ἀντελαμβάνοντο* (but accus. is rare in class. and Hell. Greek). But *κρατέω* has surrendered to the accus., as in Hell. Greek, only the part grasped being in the gen.: Mt 9²⁵ Mk 13¹ 5⁴¹ Lk 8⁵⁴ Mk 9²⁷ SBD. But if it means to *hold fast to* (Ac 27¹³ Heb 4¹⁴ 6¹⁸), or like *ἔχομαι hold sway over*, more literary works have gen. (Ac 27¹³ Heb 4¹⁴ 6¹⁸) but Rev 2¹⁴.¹⁵ accus. If it means to *arrest*, NT has accus. (but Luke avoids). Gen. with *ἄλω* Mt 22¹³ D lat syr, and with the figurative uses of (*ἀντ-*) *ἔχομαι* (Helbing 128f, Mayser II 2, 200, Nägeli 54).

Gen. (class.) is still used with *desire, reach, obtain* (Helbing 136–144, Mayser II 2, 203ff), but there is a tendency towards the accus. in Hell. Greek. Thus *ἐπιθυμέω* c. gen. Ac 20³³ 1 Ti 3¹ LXX Ex 34²⁴ Pr 21²⁶; c. accus. often in LXX (Helbing 138; Johannessohn 40) Ex 20¹⁷ Dt 5²¹, Mt 5²⁸ BDWE (S* gen.). Accus. *δικαιοσύνην* after *πεινάω* and *διψάω* Mt 5⁶ (class. gen.; LXX Ex 17³ *διψάω ὕδατι*). But with the following verbs of *reaching, obtaining*, there are relics of the gen. in the more cultured authors: *τυγχάνω* Lk 20³⁵ Ac 24³ 2 Ti 2¹⁰ Heb 8⁶, *ἐπιτυγχάνω* Heb 6¹⁵ 11³³ (but accus. Ro 11⁷, and pap. 161 v.c. UPZ I 41²⁵). Phrynichus protests against the Hell. accus. with *κληρονομέω inherit*, but it occurs Mt 5⁵ 19²⁹ Lk 10²⁵ Heb 6¹² LXX Si 4¹³ 6¹.

While the gen. with *to fill, be full of*, is still apparent, the accus. is encroaching on the gen. already in LXX (Ex 31³; Johannessohn DGKPS 37, Helbing 144–150) and Koine (K-G I 354, Mayser II 2, 205, Völker *Pap. gr. synt. spec.* 14): Ph 1¹¹

¹ Dative: Ro 12¹³ 15²⁷ 1 Ti 5²² 1 Pt 4¹³ 2 Jn 1¹¹; ἐν Ga 6⁶ Barn 19⁸ and papyri; εἰς Ph 4¹⁵.

πεπληρωμένοι καρπὸν δικαιοσύνης, Rev 17³ γέμοντα ὀνόματα βλασφημίας.

We may include here the difficult gen. in 2 Pt 2¹⁴ καρδίαν γεφυρμασμένην πλεονεξίας (vl. dat.) *trained in extortion?* (it may be gen. of quality, giving further definition: *a heart trained and greedy*).

Although *to eat, drink, of* (= $\pi\alpha$ LXX) have partitive preposition or the accus.¹, nevertheless gen. is found in NT with the meaning *satiated, eat one's fill*, chiefly where we may suspect the influence of literary style (class. authors would have used the gen. often where accus. is found in NT): Ac 27³⁸. With γεύομαι occurs θανάτου and other genitives, on the Aram. model: Mt 16²⁸ Mk 9¹ Lk 9²⁷ 14²⁴ Jn 8⁵² Ac 23¹⁴ Heb 6^{4†}; the accus. is not class. (e.g. Jn 2⁹ τὸ ὕδωρ, Heb 6^{5 2}) and is a Hebraism³, perhaps influenced by the construction with נֶאֱמַר (sifre Num. on 11⁴ יְהִי־נֶאֱמַר), and it is fairly common in LXX: 1 Km 14⁴³ 2 Km 19³⁵ Jb 12¹¹ 34³ Si 36²⁴ To BA 7¹¹ Jon 3⁷.

The partitive gen. occurs in NT with verbs of perception⁴, especially with a personal object. For ἀκούω, the class. rule is that the person whose words are heard is in the gen. (sometimes with παρά) but the thing (or person) about which one hears is in the accus., and ἀκούω c. accus. may mean *to understand*. In NT, ἀπό is also found with the person (Ac 9¹³ 1 Jn 1⁵) as in Heb. (see especially ἀπὸ τοῦ στόματός τινος Lk 22⁷¹ Ac 14^D 22¹⁴). NT breaks the class. rule with τὴν βλασφημίαν Mt 26⁶⁵ Mk 14⁶⁴ DWAG, τὸν ἀσπασμόν Lk 14¹, λαλοῦντας Ac 2^{6D}. We have to ask whether the class. distinction between gen. and accus. has significance for exegesis in NT. There may be something in the difference between the gen. in Ac 9⁷ (the men with Paul heard *the sound*) and the accus. in Ac 22⁹ (they did not *understand* the *voice*): Zerwick § 50. On the whole, the accus. is used of the hearing of speech in NT (except Lk 6⁴⁷, which corrects Mt 7²⁴,

¹ ἀπό Mt 15²⁷ Mk 7²⁸ Lk 22¹⁸ LXX Le 11⁸ 22⁶; ἐκ Jn 4¹⁴ 6²⁶ 1 Co 11³⁸ Rev 14¹⁰ LXX Ge 9²¹. Accus.: Mt 15² Mk 1⁶ 1 Co 8¹⁰ 10¹⁸. 25. 27.

² But Moule (36) suggests that καλὸν θεοῦ ῥῆμα is virtually a substantival clause = καλὸν εἶναι θεοῦ ῥῆμα (cp. the ὅτι-clause 1 Pt 2³). Moulton (Proleg. 66) however had found the variation from gen. in 6⁴ to accus. in 6⁵ "subtle and suggestive."

³ Behm in Kittel WB I 675 n. 7. There are one or two secular parallels: see Mayser II 2, 206 (οἱ συμπόσιον γεύομενοι) but the Aristotelian instance to which Mayser refers is conjectural.

⁴ Helbing 150-159. Mayser II 2, 207ff.

Jn 7⁴⁰ 12⁴⁷ 19¹³ vl.), whereas the gen. would be class. (unless it means *understand*). In Jn it seems possible to trace a distinction between the gen. (*obey* 5²⁵. 28 10³. 16 etc.) and accus. (mere perception 3⁸ 5³⁷) with ἀκούω and φωνή, but there is no such discrimination in Ac or Rev or LXX (Ac 9⁴. 11 11⁷ (p⁴⁵ D accus.) 22⁷. 9. 14 (E gen.) Rev 1¹⁰ 4¹ 10⁴ (p⁴⁷ SCP) 14¹³ 16¹ 21³: Johannessohn DGKPS 36, Mayser II 2, 207). In class. Greek αἰσθάνομαι = *understand* if it has accus. as Lk 9⁴⁵ (NT = συνίημι elsewhere).

So also with *remember* and *forget* the accus. is now encroaching on the gen. Gen. with μιμνήσκω Heb 2⁶ 13³ (as usually LXX: Johannessohn DGKPS 37, Helbing 108). But gen. (usually e.g. Lk 17³²) and accus. (e.g. Mt 16⁹, Jn 15²⁰ SD (rest gen.), 1 Th 2⁵, 2 Th 2⁸, 2 Ti 2⁸, Rev 18⁵) with μνημονεύω.

Gen. with ἐπιλανθάνομαι, only Heb 6¹⁰ 13². 16, accus. Ph 3¹³ Heb 13² S*, and papyri. Gen. with ὑπομιμνήσκω Lk 22⁶¹, accus. Jn 14²⁶ 3 Jn¹⁰, but he may have had ἔζω in mind, and Hom. Clem. 13¹⁶ has μύρου δὲ πνέει, τῆς ἀγαθῆς φήμης, and Stobaeus (v/A.D.) ἐμπνεῖν Ἀραβίης ὀσμῆς (Schwyzer II 2, 128).

The verbs of emotion ὀργίζομαι, θαυμάζω, ἐλεέω, no longer have gen. of cause, but ἀνέχομαι *bear with* retains it: Mt 17¹⁷ Col 3¹³ (not gen. in Mt 18²⁷ with σπλαγχνίζομαι, but with δοῦλος). The gen. has survived in LXX and NT with verbs meaning *to care for*, but ἐντρέπομαι has only accus. in NT and nothing of the former gen. survives. Verbs meaning *to rule* or *surpass* also still have gen., but καταβραβεύω has accus.

The gen. of price occurs with *to buy, sell, and agree on* (συμφωνέω), in addition to ἐκ. Moule (39) suggests classifying Jude¹¹ here: μισθοῦ ἐξεχύθησαν *they went headlong for a reward*.

The substantivized verbal adjective, as a passive, has the gen. to designate the agent, e.g. Mt 11¹¹ Lk 7²⁸ γεννητοὶ γυναικῶν, Mt 24³¹ ἐκλεκτοὶ θεοῦ *chosen by God*, Ro 1⁷ ἀγαπητοὶ θεοῦ *beloved of God*, Jn 6⁴⁵ διδασκτοὶ θεοῦ, 1 Co 2¹³ οὐκ ἐν διδακτοῖς ἀνθρωπίνης σοφίας λόγοις *words dictated by wordly wisdom*. Hebrew influence is apparent here. The θεο- in θεοστυγεῖς (Ro 1³⁰) may be a gen. (= θεοῦ), and so we should take the word passively in a subjective, not an objective sense: *out of favour with God*. With a passive ptc.: Mt 25³⁴ οἱ εὐλογημένοι τοῦ πατρὸς, Lk 2²⁷ τὸ εἰθισμένον τοῦ νόμου (D ἔθος).

3. *Local and temporal.* Very little trace of local gen. remains, and it was rare and poetical in Attic¹. It survives in ποῦ, αὐτοῦ, etc. LXX To B 10⁷ οἶακ ἀπῆλθεν, Lk 5¹⁹ ποῖακ εἰσενεύρωσι, 19⁴, Ac 19²⁶?, 1 Pt 1¹ *sojourners in the Diaspora* (E. G. Selwyn, *The First Epistle of St. Peter*, London 1955, 118).

The class. gen. of time-within-which still occurs: Mt 2¹⁴ νυκτόκ *during the night*, Mk 5⁵ Lk 18⁷ Ac 9²⁴ ἡμέρακ καὶ νυκτόκ, Mt 24²⁰ Mk 13¹⁸ χειμῶνοκ, Mt 24²⁰ D σαββάτου, Lk 2⁸ 9³⁷ p⁴⁵ Rev 21²⁵. Class. is τοῦ λοιποῦ (like τὸ λοιπόν) *henceforth*: Ga 6¹⁷ Eph 6¹⁰ p⁴⁶ S*BA. A distributive gen. occurs with numerals, e.g. class. δικ τῆκ ἡμέρακ *twice a day*, Lk 18¹² δικ τοῦ σαββάτου, Heb 9⁷ ἅπαξ τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ. But the gen. of point of time is not class.: Mt 25⁶ μέσηκ νυκτόκ *at midnight*, Mk 13³⁵ μεσονυκτιοῦ and ἀλεκτοροφωνιακ (SBC μεσονύκτιον), Lk 24¹ ὄρθου βαθέωκ, Jn 11⁴⁹. 5¹ 18¹³ τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ ἐκεῖνοῦ *that year*, Ac 26¹³ ἡμέρακ μέσηκ; it occurs in the Ptol. pap. ὥρακ ἐωθινῆκ and the like (Mayser II 2, 225), and in MGr τοῦ χρόνου *next year*.

(b) *Ablatival Genitive*²

The gen. (or ablative) of separation has been largely replaced by ἀπό or ἐκ which, in addition to the regular gen., were both found in class. Greek; LXX and Koine also often use ἀπό (Johannessoohn DGKPS 38f, Helbing 159–181, Mayser II 2, 227ff, 234ff), as well as later Greek. The verbs concerned are ἐλευθερώω, καθαρίζω, λούω, λυτρόω, λύω, ῥύομαι, σφίζω, χωρίζω. In NT, also with gen. ἀπαλλοτριώω *separate* Eph 2¹² 4¹⁸, ἀποστερέομαι 1 Ti 6⁵, μεθίστημι Lk 16⁴ AW (SBD ἐκ; L ἀπό), καθαιρέομαι Ac 19²⁷ SBAE (HLP accus.), κωλύω τινά τινοκ Ac 27⁴³ (as normally), but τι ἀπό τινοκ *to refuse someone something* (Semitism, LXX Ge 23⁶) Lk 6²⁹, φεῖδομαι (class. always gen.: as in Ac 20²⁹ Ro 8³² 2 Pt 2⁴. 5) LXX has prepositions (Abel § 44k); also ἀπέχομαι, ὑστερέω, βραδύνω, παύομαι (ἀνα-, κατα-), ἀφίσταμαι, λείπομαι, ἀστοχέω 1 Ti 1⁶ (but περί τι, 1 Ti 6²¹ 2 Ti 2¹⁸).

The gen. may also depend to some extent on prepositions in compounds; here it is mainly κατά (*against* or *down upon*) which concerns

¹ K-G I 384. 2. Meisterhans-Schwyzzer 205. 14. Mayser II 2, 223ff.

² K-G I §§ 420f. Meisterhans-Schwyzzer 207, 18. 19. Mayser II 2, 227ff. Radermacher² 123ff. Helbing 159–178.

us, and the more usual compounds, which in class. Greek had gen., have now tended to go over to accus. (e.g. καταδικάζω Mt 12⁷ Jas 5⁶; κατακρίνω): Helbing 182ff., Mayser II 2, 237ff.

§ 3. Dative¹

The case tended to disappear in later Greek, but the process has scarcely begun yet; in the NT there is not much to choose between the comparative frequency of accus., gen., or dat., but the special popularity of ἐν makes the dat. more frequent than it would normally be. Besides this encroachment of ἐν, there is the growth of διὰ, σύν and μετά in the post-classical period at the expense of the simple dat. There are in NT already traces of the process which ended in the complete disappearance of the simple dat. in MGr; Zerwick (§ 36) points to Mk 8¹⁹ (εἰς = *for*), Ac 24¹⁷ (εἰς = *for the benefit of*), 1 Pt 1⁴ (εἰς = *for*). It is the more remarkable, therefore, that in Hell. Greek the dat. does sometimes oust the class. accus. (e.g. Rev 2¹⁴ ἐδίδασκεν c. dat.), and in NT the dat. is still retained in a large range of meanings, notwithstanding the constant tendency to add ἐν (even with instrumental dat.).

The dat. indicates the person more remotely concerned:

(a) *As indirect object.*

To give: dat. as well as εἰς c. acc., (ἐπι-)χορηγέω, ἐπαγγέλλομαι *promise* Jas 2⁵ dat. *To serve*: διακονέω, δουλεύω, λατρεύω, ὑπηρετέω always dat., but προσκυνέω has dat., accus., and (Hebraistic) ἐνώπιον c. gen.; and ἀρέσκω has dat. and (Ac 6⁵) ἐνώπιον c. gen. *To show, reveal, appear*: always dat. (verb *to be* in this sense 1 Co 14¹¹ ἔσομαι τῷ λαλοῦντι βάρβαρος).

Verbs of *speaking, writing, etc.* The following have dat.: ἔδω and ψάλλω Eph 5¹⁹ Col 3¹⁶ (LXX Je 20¹³), ἀνέω Rev 19⁵, ἀπολογέομαι *make a defence before* Ac 19³³ 2 Co 12¹⁹ Hell., ἀποτάσσομαι *say farewell to* Mk 6⁴⁶ etc. Hell., ἔξ-, ἀνθ- ομολογέομαι Mt 11²⁵ Lk 23⁸ 10²¹ Ro 14¹¹ 15⁹, εὐχομαι Ac 26²⁹ (but πρὸς 2 Co 13⁷), καυχάομαι *boast to* 2 Co 7¹⁴ 9², ὁμολογέω *praise* Heb 13¹⁵, *confess before* Mt 7²³ Ac 24¹⁴ (+ ἐν also), *promise* Mt 14⁷ Ac 7¹⁷ vl., προσεύχομαι dat. only, ψεύδομαι c. accus. Ac 5³ *deceive by lying* (class.), 5⁴ c. dat. *lie to*. In class. Greek κλέω usually has accus., as in NT (but dat. Mt 15³⁵ EFG); class. dat. = *summon*. Other verbs for *censure and command*: dat. (but ἐγκαλέω κατὰ c. gen. Ro 8³³).

¹ K.-G I 406-448. Meisterhans-Schwyzler 208ff. 23-40. Mayser II 2, 240-297. Radermacher² 126ff. Helbing 191-319. Schwyzler II 137-173 (part). J. Humbert, *La Disparition du Datif en Grec*, Paris 1930. A. Green, *The Dative of Agency. A Chapter of Indo-European Case-Syntax*, Diss. New York, 1913.

Λέγω πρὸς, which is common in Luke (Gosp. 99, Ac 52), absent in Mt, Mk 5, Jn 19 times, Paul twice, is part of the Hellenistic tendency to use prepositions in place of the simple case.

	λέγω	εἶπον	κατηγορέω	ἀποκρίνομαι	λαλέω
John	2 ⁸ , 3 ⁴ 41 ⁵ . 33. 49 6 ⁵ , 7 ⁵⁰	4 ⁴⁸ , 6 ²⁸ vl. 3 ⁴ 7 ⁸ . 35, 8 ⁵⁷ vl. 11 ²¹ , 12 ¹⁹ 16 ¹⁷ , 19 ²⁴	5 ⁴⁵	8 ³⁸ vl. Otherwise always dative	Always dative

It is mainly with the reflexive that πρὸς occurs after verbs of *saying* in Mk and Jn. Representative figures from other books written in Biblical Greek show a large proportion of πρὸς c. accus.

	πρὸς or dat. after verbs of speaking: λαλέω, λέγω, εἶπον									
	Lk	Ac	Heb	Rev	Gen. 1-25	26-50	4 Mac	T. Abr. A	B	Ep. Barn
πρὸς	99	45	4	-	27	31	-	31	32	10
dat.	187	48	4	28	75	154	4	30	36	15
μετά				6						

But the reversal of technique half way through LXX Genesis is remarkable; either different translators divided the LXX books between them, or the books were subsequently revised piecemeal.

Besides the dat., πέποιθα and πιστεύω have also ἐν, ἐπί (dat., acc), εἰς; and πειθάρχω has accus. (class.). Dat. occurs with πείθομαι, ὑπακούω, ἀπιστέω, ἀπειθέω. When πιστεύω has dat., it may mean *believe in*: Ac 5¹⁴ 16³⁴ (D ἐπί c. accus.) 18⁸ (D εἰς); same meaning with εἰς (e.g. εἰς τὸ ὄνομα) and ἐπί c. accus. (Mt 27⁴² SBL Ac 9⁴² 11¹⁷ 16³¹ 22¹⁹ Ro 4²⁴), ἐπί c. dat. only with ref. to LXX (according to J. Jeremias in Kittel WB IV 275f): Ro 9³⁸ 10¹¹ 1 Pt 2⁶ ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ' αὐτῷ, but this is not true, because of 1 Ti 1¹⁶ and Lk 24²⁵ *slow of heart* τοῦ πιστεύειν ἐπὶ πᾶσιν οἷς ἐλάλησαν (but this might mean *on the basis of*, not *in*¹), and Mt 27⁴² WEF (SBL ἐπί c. accus.; D⊕ αὐτῷ). When πιστεύω is followed by ἐν, the meaning may be *believe absolute*, and the prepositional phrase taken separately, viz. in Mk 1⁵ *believe, in the sphere of the Gospel*, in Jn 3¹⁵ B ἐν αὐτῷ to be taken closely with ἐχρηζώην (Bauer s.v.).

¹ A. Schlatter, *Der Glaube im NT*⁴, 1927, 591f.

But LXX has ἐν: Ps 77²² 105¹².²⁴ Si 35²¹.²³ Je 12⁶, Johannessohn DGKPS 60f. According to Bultmann in Kittel WB VI 204, πιστεύω εἰς = *to believe that Jesus is the Christ, or that J. died and rose, etc.*

The dat. with ἐλπίζω *to hope in* (instead of ἐπί c. gen. or dat., or εἰς) occurs only in Mt 12²¹ (D + ἐν) = Isa 42⁴ (ἐπί c. dat.). Jude¹¹ τῇ πλάνῃ τοῦ Βαλαάμ . . . ἐξεχύθησαν *abandon themselves to?*

(b) The dat. of advantage and disadvantage¹ (or “*dativus commodi*”) marks out a person whose interests are much less remotely concerned than in the previous section.

Mt 13¹⁴ ἀναπληροῦνται αὐτοῖς (D + ἐπί) ἡ προφητεία, 23³¹ Lk 4²² Jn 3²⁸ Ro 10² etc. μαρτυρῶ *bear witness to* someone, Mt 27⁷ εἰς ταφὴν τοῖς ξένοις, Lk 18³¹ τελεσθήσεται πάντα τὰ γράμματα . . . τῷ υἱῷ (D περί c. gen), 1 Pt 5⁹ τῇ ἀδελφότητι ἐπιτελεῖσθαι, 2 Co 2¹ ἔκρινε ἑμαυτῷ τοῦτο, also Mt 6²⁵ Lk 12²² μεριμνάω, Lk 1⁵⁵ ἐλάλησεν πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας ἡμῶν, τῷ Ἀβραάμ καὶ τῷ σπέρματι . . . (dat. can hardly be in appos. to accus., and may be dat. commodi: *he spoke to our fathers in favour of Abraham*; Zerwick § 40), LXX 1 Esd 4⁴⁹ ἔγραψεν πᾶσι τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις. The dat. commodi is probably “*the curious dative*” (Moule, 43) in Rev 8⁴ ἀνέβη ὁ καπνὸς ταῖς προσευχαῖς *in favour of their prayers*, although it may be temporal dat. (BGU 69, A.D. 120, ἀς καὶ ἀποδώσω σοι τῷ ἔργιστᾳ δοθησομένῳ ὀψωνίῳ *which I will pay you with the next wages that are paid*). For dat. of disadvantage see Rev 2⁵.¹⁶ ἔρχομαι σοι; advantage 21² κεκοσμημένην τῷ ἀνδρὶ αὐτῆς. See also: Mk 10¹² 1 Co 7³⁹ γαμέομαι, Ro 14⁴ τῷ ἰδίῳ κυρίῳ στήκει ἢ πίπτει, 14⁶ κυρίῳ φρονεῖ . . . κυρίῳ ἔσθιτε *in honour of*, 11²⁵ ἑαυτοῖς φρόνιμοι p⁴⁶ FG (AB + ἐν, SCD + παρ³), 6²⁰ ἐλεύθεροι . . . τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ, 8¹² ὀφειλέται . . . τῇ σαρκί, 1 Co 7²⁸ θλιψὴν τῇ σαρκί (D*FG + ἐν), 2 Co 10⁴ δυνατὰ τῷ θεῷ, 2¹³ ἀνεσιν τῷ πνεύματι μου, Jas 3¹⁸ καρπὸς . . . σπείρεται τοῖς ποιοῦσιν εἰρήνην.

(c) *Reference*. Paul has various loose combinations: Ro 6¹⁰ τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ἀπέθανεν . . . ζῆ τῷ θεῷ, 2 Co 5¹³ εἶτε γὰρ ἐξέστημεν, θεῷ εἶτε σωφρονοῦμεν, ὑμῖν, *for God's sake . . . in your interest*. This is aptly named a dat. of reference, in so far as the idea of personal interest is so diminished as to be no more than a vague reference. Jas 2⁵ τοὺς πτωχοὺς τῷ κόσμῳ, Jude¹⁴ ἐπροφήτευσεν . . . τούτοις (J. B. Mayor in loc. *he prophesied for these*, but better sense in the context is provided if this is the dat. of vaguer reference: *as to these*, although περί c. gen. would be more natural, like Mt 15⁷ Mk 7⁶).

(d) “*Dativus relationis*” is very similar (see p. 220). Where class. Greek tended to have accus. (even in NT at Mt 27⁵⁷

¹ K-G I 417, 17. Mayser II 2, 270ff.

ἄνθρωπος . . . τοῦνομα Ἰωσήφ), the dat. now occurs in an adverbial sense:

Mt 5^{3, 8} πτωχὸς τῷ πνεύματι, καθαρὸς τῇ καρδίᾳ, Mk 5²² Lk 1⁶¹ Ac 18²⁴ etc. ὀνόματι, Mk 7²⁶ Ac 4³⁶ 18²⁴ τῷ γένει, Ac 16⁵ στερεοῦσθαι τῇ πίστει περισσεύειν τῷ ἀριθμῷ, Ro 12¹⁰ τῇ φιλαδελφίᾳ . . . φιλόστοργοι, 1 Co 14²⁰ νηπιᾷζειν τῇ κακίᾳ, 2 Co 7¹¹ ἄγνος τῷ πράγματι (if text is sound), Ph 2³⁰ παραβολευσάμενος τῇ ψυχῇ, 3³ οἱ πνεύματι θεοῦ λατρεύοντες, Col 2⁵ τῇ σαρκί *physically*.

(e) *Ethical dative*. Perhaps Mt 21⁵ OT ἔρχεται σοι and Rev 25. 16 (Hebraisms) (see under (b)), 2 Pt 3¹⁴ ἄσπιλοι καὶ ἀμώμητοι αὐτῷ (God) εὑρεθῆναι. The ethical dat. in Ac 7²⁰ ἄστεϊος τῷ θεῷ (*in God's eyes*) is a Hebraism, reminding us of LXX Jon 3³ πόλις μεγάλη τῷ θεῷ **עִתָּהָהָרְבֵּל** (an elative; i.e. *very big* according to D. W. Thomas in *Vet. Test.* III, 1953, 15ff, as the LXX fail to appreciate that **עִתָּהָהָרְבֵּל** or **הָרְבֵּל** sometimes express a superlative). The dat. in Lk 2¹¹ ἐτέχθη ὑμῖν σήμερον σωτήρ may be described as "sympatheticus"; see SIG 1240. 25 (ii/A.D.) πληθῆοι αὐτῷ οἴκος παίδων γοναῖς (Schwyzer II 147f; J. Weber, *Der sympathetische Dativ bei Herodot.* diss. Münster 1915).

(f) Where εἶναι with dat. forms part of the predicate it usually carries the idea of credit (or discredit) in the person's eyes:

Mt 18¹⁷ ἔστω σοι ὡσπερ ὁ ἐθνικός, Lk 5¹⁰ κοινωνοὶ τῷ Σίμωνι (D gen.) *Simon had in them partners*, Ac 9¹⁵ σκευὸς ἐκλογῆς ἐστίν μοι οὗτος *I have in him*, 19³¹ ὄντες αὐτῷ φίλοι (but gen. Jn 19¹² etc.), Ro 1⁴ ἀνοήτοις ὀφειλέτης εἰμί, 8¹² (but 15²⁷ gen.), 1 Co 1¹⁸ τοῖς μὲν ἀπολλυμένοις μωρία ἐστίν *serves as folly*, 2¹⁴, 11^{14, 15} ἀτιμία αὐτῷ, 15³² τί (μοι) τὸ ὄφελος, 2 Co 2¹⁵ Χριστοῦ εὐωδία ἐσμέν τῷ θεῷ, Ga 5¹³ μὴ τὴν ἐλευθερίαν εἰς ἀφορμὴν τῇ σαρκί (ellipse of verb), 1 Th 2¹⁰ ὁσίως . . . ὑμῖν ἐγενήθημεν (but adverbs are rare in this construction), LXX To 3¹⁵ μονογενῆς εἰμι τῷ πατρί μου.

(g) There is also more obviously a dat. of possession (K-G I 416, 15; Mayser II 2, 269f), in which the personal interest, which is always latent in the dat. is strengthened to the point of ownership, and the class. distinction between the gen. for emphasis on the possessor and dat. for emphasis on the object possessed is often preserved: Mt 19²⁷ 18¹² Ac 21²³. Exceptions: Lk 12²⁰ ἄ ἡτοιμάσας, τίνι ἐσται; (D corrects to τίνος), Ac 2³⁹ ὑμῖν ἐστίν ἡ ἐπαγγελία, Ro 7³, 7⁴ (cp. Heb. **שָׂאֵל לְהַגִּן**). Besides

εἶμι and γίνομαι, ὑπάρχω is used like this (Lk 8³ Ac 28⁷ 2 Pt 1⁸).

(h) In addition, εἶμι c. dat. occurs with the meaning to *happen to*: Mt 16²² οὐ μὴ ἔσται σοι τοῦτο, and with ellipse of the verb: Mk 1²⁴ τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί, Lk 1⁴³ πόθεν μοι τοῦτο; 1 Co 5¹² etc. τί γάρ μοι; Epict. 1, 22, 15 τί μοι καὶ αὐτῶ, εἰ οὐ δύναται μοι βοηθῆσαι (see 1, 27, 13).

(i) *Dat. of Agent*¹. In NT there are very few exx. of dat. with passive = ὑπό c. gen. Lk 23¹⁵ ἐστὶν πεπραγμένον αὐτῶ (D + ἐν, c in); however, it could be taken as *in his case*, Ro 8¹⁴ πνεύματι θεοῦ ἄγονται, Ga 5¹⁸ πνεύματι ἄγεσθε, LXX Ge 14¹⁹, Jos. Ant. 11, 206 ἡμῖν δεδήλωται, Gosp. Pet. 11 τοῖς ἀγαπωμένοις αὐταῖς, Clem. Hom. (atticistic) 3⁶⁸ 9²¹ 19²³.

(j) *Instrumental dat.* Jas 3⁷ δαμάζεται καὶ δεδάμασαι τῇ φύσει τῇ ἀνθρωπίνῃ, 2 Pt 2¹⁹ ᾧ τις ἠττηται, Jude¹ τοῖς . . . Ἰησοῦ Χριστῶ τετηρημένοις κλητοῖς. It is the instrumental ἐν which is more used than plain dat. in Biblical Greek; it occurs only occasionally in secular Greek (see pp. 252f). Without the preposition: Lk 21²⁴ στόματι μαχαίρης, Ac 12² μαχαίρῃ. There are phrases like *to season with* Mk 9⁴⁹ Col 4⁶, *to burn with* Mt 3¹² Lk 3¹⁷ Rev 8⁸ 17¹⁶ (SBP) 21⁸ (with ἐν 14¹⁰ 16⁸ 17¹⁶ vl. 18⁸), LXX with and without ἐν, *to baptise with* usually ἐν but ὕδατι Lk 3¹⁶ (D + ἐν) Ac 1⁵ 11¹⁶, χρίω πνεύματι 10³⁸, *to vindicate by* Ro 3²⁸ (also ἐν and ἐκ), *to mix with* Rev 15² (also ἐν and μετὰ), *to measure with* Lk 6³⁸ Rev 21¹⁶ (also ἐν).

This instrumental dat. is sometimes used where the class. rule expects the gen. construction: Eph 5¹⁸ LXX Pr 4¹⁷ μεθυσκομαι οἴνω, Mt 20¹⁸ Mk 10³³ κατακρινουσιν αὐτοῦ θανάτω, (Hellenistic: Büchsel in Kittel WB III 953 n. 1) 2 Pt 2⁶ καταστροφῇ κατέκρινεν.

Other exx. of instrumental dat. are probably: Ro 1²⁰ τοῖς ποιήμασιν νοούμενα *perceived by means of his works*, 5^{15.17} τῶ . . . παραπτώματι *by the transgression*, 8¹³ πνεύματι . . . θανατοῦτε *by the Spirit*, 8¹⁴, Ga 5^{5.16.18.25}, Ro 12² μεταμορφοῦσθε τῇ ἀνακαινώσει τοῦ νοῦς *transformed by*, Eph 2⁵ χαριτί ἐστε σεσωσμένοι *by grace*.

(k) *Associative dat.* which, when used with verbs is often known as “*dativus sociativus*” or “*comitativus*”, expresses the “*means by which*”, but with strong emphasis on physical

¹ Moulton-Howard 459.

accompaniment or nearness. E.g. ἀκολουθέω often has dat., but also μετά and the Biblical ὀπίσω; συνέπομαι Ac 20⁴; ἐγγίζω Lk 7¹²; κολλάομαι Lk 15¹⁵ etc.; κοινωνέω Ro 12¹³ etc.; ὀμιλέω Ac 24²⁶; and other verbs of this kind. However, μάχομαι (class. dat.) has only πρὸς (Jn 6⁵²), πολεμέω (class. dat.) only μετά (Rev 21⁶ 12⁷ 13⁴ 17¹⁴).

But this dat. may be more loosely connected with the verb to describe accompanying circumstances or manner, and it is then often designated "dativus modi". NT adds ἐν with the former:

Mt 16²⁸ ἐρχόμενον ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ αὐτοῦ, Mk 1²³ 7²⁵ p⁴⁵ ἐν πνεύματι ἀκαθάρτῳ, Lk 14³¹ ἐν δέκα χιλίοις ὑπαντᾶν, 23⁴² ὅταν ἔλθῃς ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ σου (BL correct to εἰς), Ac 7¹⁴ πᾶσαν τὴν συγγένειαν ἐν ψυχαῖς ἐβδ. πέντε, 1 Co 4²¹ ἐν ῥάβδῳ ἔλθω, Heb 9²⁵ εἰσέρχομαι ἐν αἵματι, Jude¹⁴ ἦλθεν . . . ἐν ἀγίαις μυρίασιν αὐτοῦ. Of clothing: Lk 4³² 24⁴, Ac 1¹⁰ ἐν ἐσθήσεσι λευκαῖς, Col 2¹⁵, LXX 1 Mac 11⁵⁸ 3 Mac 1⁶. Of manner (dat. alone): Mt 8¹⁶ ἐξέβαλεν τὰ πνεύματα λόγῳ, Mk 5⁴ πέδαις καὶ ἀλύσεσιν δεδεσθαι, 14⁶⁵ ῥαπίσμασιν αὐτὸν ἔλαβον (a Latinism? see Cicero Tusc. 2, 34 verberibus accipere. But Acta Joan. 90 τί εἰ ῥαπίσμασιν με ἔλαβες; pap. c. A.D. 100, Blass-Debr. § 198 κονδύλους ἔλαβεν), Lk 2³⁷ νηστειαῖς καὶ δεήσεσιν λατρεύουσα, Ac 2⁸. 11. 40 τῇ ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ, 16³⁷ δημοσίᾳ, 24⁴ ἀκούσαι . . . τῇ σῆ ἐπιεικείᾳ with your clemency, Ro 8²⁴ τῇ ἐλπίδι . . . ἐσώθημεν in hope but not actually, 1 Co 10³⁰ χάριτι with thankfulness, 11⁵, 14¹⁵ προσεύξομαι τῷ πνεύματι . . . τῷ νοῖ (or local dat.?), Ph 4⁶ τῇ προσευχῇ καὶ τῇ δεήσει μετὰ εὐχαριστίας (NB. both dat. and μετά), Col 3¹⁶ ψαλμοῖς etc., Heb 6¹⁷ ἐμεσίτευσεν ὄρκῳ (but μετά in Mt 26⁷² and pap.).

Then there are various stereotyped phrases (e.g. παρρησίᾳ): Ph 1¹⁸ παντὶ τρόπῳ. But μετά and ἐν are found in such phrases in both LXX (Johannessohn DGPS 209ff) and NT, and papyri (e.g. μετά βίας). Some are almost peculiar to Biblical Greek, e.g. ὀδῶ, ἴχνεσιν, with πορεύομαι, περιπατέω, στοιχέω: Lk 10³¹ B, Jas 2²⁵ ἑτέρα ὀδῶ ἐκβαλοῦσα, but usually figuratively in NT: Ac 9³¹ πορεύομαι τῷ φόβῳ τοῦ κυρίου, 14¹⁶ ταῖς ὁδοῖς αὐτῶν, 21²¹ τοῖς ἔθεσιν περιπατέω, Ro 4¹², 13¹³ Ga 5¹⁶ Jude¹¹ Hom. Clem. 10¹⁵ τῷ ὑμῶν στοιχεῖτε παραδείγματι.

(l) The Hebrew infinite absolute shows its influence in the use of the cognate dat. of verbal nouns in LXX and NT (Thackeray OT Gr 48f, Johannessohn DGKPS 56f), e.g. Ge 2¹⁷ Mt 15⁴. There was already some class. precedent (Schwyzer II 166), but Biblical Greek has a wealth of ex: Lk 22¹⁵ ἐπιθυμία ἐπεθύμησα, Ac 2¹⁷ ἐνυπνίους ἐνυπνιαζέσθαι, 4¹⁷ ἀπέλιγ ἀπειλησώμεθα vl., 5²⁸

παραγγελία παρηγγείλαμεν, 23¹⁴, 28²⁶ LXX, Ga 5¹ τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ . . . ἡλευθέρωσεν, Jas 5¹⁷. However, the addition of an attribute almost always results in the substitution of the accus. of content: so Jn 3²⁹ χαρᾶ χαίρει becomes Mt 2¹⁰ ἐχάρησεν χαρὰν μεγάλην; but not always, because we find Mk 5⁴² ἐξέστησαν ἐκστάσει μεγάλη 1 Mac 14²⁹ δόξῃ μεγάλη ἐδόξασαν.

(m) *Cause*. This dat. is extraordinary ¹. Ac 15¹ περιτμηθῆτε τῷ ἔθει τῷ Μωϋσέως (not D) may be *because of the Law* (for according to we would expect κατά). Most exx. are in Paul: Ro 4²⁰ οὐ διεκρίθη τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ, ἀλλ' ἐνεδυναμώθη τῇ πίστει, 11²⁰ τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ ἐξεκλάσθησαν, ^{30. 31.} 14¹⁵ μὴ τῷ βρώματί σου ἐκείνον ἀπόλλυε, 2 Co 2⁷ τῇ περισσοτέρᾳ λύπῃ καταποθῆ (or local?), 2¹³ τῷ με εὑρεῖν με *because I did not find*, Ga 6¹² ἵνα τῷ σταύρῳ τοῦ Χρ. μὴ διώκωνται, Col 2¹⁴ (transposing τοῖς δόγμασιν after δ ἦν) *which was against us because of the decrees* (but Eph 2¹⁴ adds ἐν, suggesting that this is a dat. of attendant circumstances, even instrumental; i.e. take the phrase closely with the verb implied in χειρόγραφον *written in . . .*), Ph 1¹⁴ πεποιθότας τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου *confident because of my imprisonment*, Heb 13¹⁶ τοιαύταις εὐαριστεῖται, 1 Pt 4¹² μὴ ξενίζεσθε τῇ, Jude¹¹ τῇ ἀντιλογίᾳ τοῦ Κόρυ ἀπώλοντο *because of the contradicting of*. More commonly a preposition takes the place of dat. at this period.

(n) *With compound verbs* ². Here the dat. is frequent, but is often supplemented by a preposition, and increasingly so in Hell. Greek. The construction with the dat. is often figurative e.g. ἀνατίθεμαι Ac 25¹⁴ etc. The dat. predominates with verbs compounded with ἀντι-, and πρός is rare. But compounds with εἰς- always take a preposition. Compounds with ἐν- in a literal sense always have a preposition; but these figurative meanings always have a plain dat.: ἐγκαλέω, ἐμμαίνομαι, ἐμπαίζω, ἐνέχω, ἐντυγχάνω (Ro 11², Wi 8²¹, BUI 246¹² ii-iii/A.D.). With ἐπι- the practice fluctuates, but usually the plain dat. is figurative. With παρα- it is almost only the dat., and Ac 15¹⁹ has dat. where Hell. Greek has usually accus. (Mayser II 2, 299f); the same is true of περι- and προσ- and συν-.

(o) *Locative* ³. This is the "in-" case, the case of position. The predominant use is now with prepositions, e.g. ἐν Ἀθήναις, not

¹ K-G I 438, 11. Mayser II 2, 284.

² K-G I 431 n. 1; 443 n. 1. Helbing 268-319. Mayser II 2, 285ff.

³ K-G I 441ff. Schwyzer II 154ff. Mayser II 2, 295f.

Ἀθήναζε, and even in the class. period the plain dat. was extremely limited. It is doubtful whether there are any more than these exx. in NT: πάντη, πανταχῆ; Jn 21⁸ οἱ μαθηταὶ τῷ πλοιαρίῳ ἦλθον; Ac 23³ 53¹ τῇ δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ ὕφωθεις. For pap. see Mayser, and also Vettius Valens 181, 22, and Herm. V. IV 3, 7.

(p) *Temporal.* (i) Of time-when¹. Still in NT, but ἐν often enters to clarify the meaning, as class. The dat. is used for only point of time, strictly speaking, but p⁴⁶ in Ro 13¹³ has ἡμέρα for *in the day* (the rest add ἐν). Normally, the dat. alone (or with ἐν) indicates a specific day or night, e.g. Mk 14³⁰ ταύτη τῇ νυκτί; it is useless to multiply examples. There is the Hebraism ἡμέρα καὶ ἡμέρα *every day* 2 Co 4¹⁶. It is usual to add ἐν when ἐκείνη and ταύτη are used. Φυλακὴ *night watch* and ὥρα are used like ἡμέρα, but ἔτει only has ἐν (Lk 3¹). The temporal dat. is still used with names of festivals: Mt 14⁶ γενεσίους δὲ γενομένους SBDL is apparently a dat. absolute², Mk 6²¹ (p⁴⁵ + ἐν), Mt 12¹ etc. τοῖς σάββασιν *on the sabbath*, Lk 24¹ ἡ ἑορτῇ τοῦ πάσχα (D + ἐν). Other instances: Ac 13³⁶ ἰδίᾳ γενεᾷ, Ro 11³⁰ τῇ τούτων ἀπειθείᾳ *at the time of their disbelief*, Eph 2¹² τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ p⁴⁶ (2nd hand) SBAD*FG (p⁴⁶ D^cEKLP + ἐν), 3⁵ ἑτέραις γενεαῖς *in other generations*, 1 Ti 6¹⁵ καιροῖς ἰδίῳ.

(ii) Of duration of time. Class. usage has accus.; Hell. Greek uses dat. (even Josephus) mainly with transitive verbs: Lk 1⁷⁵ πάσαις ταῖς ἡμέραις ἡμῶν (cp. Mt 28²⁰ πᾶσας τὰς ἡμέρας), 8²⁹ πολλοῖς χρόνοις συνηρπάκει αὐτόν (unless it means *on many occasions*), Ac 8¹¹ ἰκανῶ χρόνῳ, 13²⁰ ὡς ἔτεσιν . . . ἔδωκεν *for 450 years*, Ro 16²⁵ χρ. αἰωνίους σεσιγημένου. Examples abound in Hellenistic sources; and since they are usually with transitive verbs, it may be that there was some reticence felt at placing a second accus. alongside a verb which already had an accus. of dir. object. Textual variants in NT illustrate the uneasiness of scribes about the use of the dat.: Mk 8² ἤδη ἡμέραις τρισίν B

¹ K-G I 445, 2. Schwyzer II 158f. Moulton Einl. 116f. Mayser II 2, 296f.

² There may be instances in Greek of dat. absolute. See C. C. Tarelli on Plutarch (Moule 45). In the NT: Mk 9²⁸ p⁴⁵ (SB CDLWΘ fam¹ fam¹⁸ 700 have gen. absol.) εἰσελθόντι αὐτῷ, Ac 28¹¹ παρασήμῳ Διοσκουροῖς *with the Dioscuri as ship's insignia* (inscriptional precedent, W. M. Ramsay, *St. Luke the Physician*, London 1908, 36f).

(some have nom. ; some accus.), Lk 8²⁷ χρόνῳ ἰκανῶ (some have gen.), Jn 14⁹ τοσοῦτῳ χρόνῳ SDLWQ (BA corr. to accus.), Ac 28¹² B ἡμέραις τρισίν (some nom. ; some accus., as Mk 8²).

§ 4. Accusative¹

(a) *The simple accus.* of external object occurs also with verbs which were originally intransitive, as a characteristic of Hell. Greek. The absol. ἐνεργέω *to be at work* is increased to *to be at work at something* in literary Koine (1 Co 12⁶ Ph 2¹³ etc.), by the simple addition of an accusative.²

Similar words in NT are: ἐμπορεύομαι *defraud* 2 Pt 2³ (Bauer s.v.), ἐνεδρεύω Lk 11⁵⁴ Ac 23²¹, εὐσεβέω Ac 17²³ 1 Ti 5⁴, θριαμβεύω 2 Co 2¹⁴ Col 2¹⁵ (Kittel WB III 160, n. 2), ἰεουργέω Ro 15¹⁶, καρτερέω Heb 11²⁷ (Bauer s.v.), πλεονεκτέω Paul, συνεργέω Ro 8²⁸ BA, τρίζω Mk 9¹⁸, ὑβρίζω, χορηγέω 2 Co 9¹⁰ 1 Pt 4¹¹. The same process has occurred with verbs of emotion: ἀπορέομαι Ac 25²⁰ SBAHP; ἐλέεω Mt 9²⁷ etc. Ptol. pap. (Mayser II 2, 308); εὐδοκέω Mt 12¹⁸ (OT) S*B, Heb 10⁶.⁸, LXX Ps 50¹⁸ etc.; θέλω with same meaning Mt 27⁴³ ῥυσάσθω νῦν εἰ θέλει αὐτόν, LXX Ps 21⁹ 40¹² To 13⁸; θαυμάζω Lk 7⁹ (D om αὐτόν) Jn 5²⁸ Ac 7³¹ Jude¹⁶; ἱλάσκομαι *propitiate* Lk 18¹³ (pass.), *expiate* Heb 2¹⁷, LXX, Philo; κλαίω Mt 2¹⁸ (not LXX) Lk 23²⁸ D; κόπτομαι class. Lk 8⁵²; πενθέω 2 Co 12²¹, LXX (only dat. in Ptol. pap.). The same tendency to accus. in Hell. Greek appears with verbs which (in class. Greek) would have governed the (partit.) gen.: Mt 5⁵ κληρονομέω τὴν γῆν,⁶ πεινάω διψάω,²⁸ ἐπιθυμέω γυναῖκα, Jn 6⁵³ ἐσθίω πίνω; if the writer wishes to emphasize the *part* he often uses prepositions (Mt 15²⁷ 1 Co 11²⁸). Hellenistic addition of an object sometimes changes the entire meaning, as appears in μαθητεύω: cp. Mt 27⁵⁷ B with 28¹⁹ Ac 14²¹.

The accus. also accompanies verbs of fearing, fleeing, swearing, guarding from; but NT does have ἀπό c. gen. in addition, under strong Semitic influence (occasionally class.). Thus φοβέομαι has accus. except at Mt 10²⁸ = Lk 12⁴ (ἀπό), LXX has accus. and ἀπό c. gen., whereas Ptol. pap. has only accus. Jas 5¹² δυνουμι c. accus., while elsewhere there is a preposition as in LXX; but (ἐν-) ορκίζω *adjure* still has accus. Φεύγω ἀπό *shun* 1 Co 10¹⁴, *flee from* Mt 3⁷ = Lk 3⁷, Mt 23³³, Rev 9⁶ (in class. Greek ἀπό was only local, as in Jn 10^{5f} Jas 4⁷), ἀπό προσώπου

¹ K-G I 293-331. Schwyzer II 67ff. Meisterhans-Schwyzer 204-6-12. Mayser II 2, 151, 297-336. Johannessohn DGKPS 67. Rader, macher² 120-122.

² F, Krebs *Zur Rection der Kasus*, 1887-90, *passim*. Moulton Proleg. 63ff.

(ἡμῶν οὖν) Rev 20¹¹. Before Plutarch, ἐντρέπομαι usually has gen., but accus. in Mt 21³⁷ Lk 18² Heb 12⁹.

On the other hand, the dat. is sometimes used instead of, or besides, the class. accus.: καλῶς ποιέω (class. accus.) has the Hellenistic dat. Lk 6²⁷, and so does εὖ ποιέω Mk 14⁷ (A corrects to accus.), but accus. still in LXX (Schwyzer II 144; Mayser II 2, 263f). In addition to class. accus. προσκυνέω has dat. about 150 times in LXX (against about ten times with accus.), also in Dio Cassius, Jos., Aristaeas, Lucian, 2 Clem. 3¹; so NT e.g. Mt 22.¹¹ Jn 4²¹ Ac 7⁴³ 1 Co 14²⁵ Heb 1⁶ Rev 4¹⁰ 7¹¹ 13⁴. 15 14⁷ 16² 19⁴. 10. 20 22⁸. 9; with acc., only Mt 4¹⁰ = Lk 4⁸, Lk 24⁵² (D om), Jn 4²². 22. 23 (S* dat.) 24 9³⁸ D. Rev several times (9²⁰ 13⁴. 8. 12 14⁹. 11 20⁴) in addition to dat. The dat. in LXX is due to influence of ἡ, and in order to avoid the interpretation *kiss*¹. Of human superiors: c. dat. Mt 22. 8 8² 9¹⁸ 14³³ 15²⁵ 18²⁸ 28⁹ Mk 15¹⁹ Jn 9³⁸: c. accus. Mk 5⁶ vl.

The accus. has usurped the place of class. dat. with verbs meaning *censure, revile, blaspheme, curse* (Helbing 1-23): ἐπηρεάζω (Lk 6²⁸ 1 Pt 3¹⁶; not in LXX); ὀνειδίζω (Wi 2¹² is only ex. of dat. in LXX); καταράομαι (the dat. in Mt 5⁴⁴ D* and Lk 6²⁸ EHL is an atticistic correction; the rare dat. in LXX is also probably atticistic: 4 Km 2²⁴ Ep. Je⁶⁵); φθονέω Ga 5²⁶ p⁴⁶ BG (SACD dat.). As well as class. εἰς NT (Hell. Greek) has plain accus. with βλασφημέω like LXX (4 Km 19⁴. 6. 22), Jos., Vett. Val., Babrius (ii/A.D.): Lk 23³⁹ Ac 19³⁷ Rev 13⁶. Whereas class. Greek has dat. of person with εὐαγγελίζομαι, NT has accus. as well. With ἐγκόπτω *hinder* (class. dat.), NT has accus.: Ac 24⁴ Ga 5⁷ 1 Th 2¹⁸ (Stählin in Kittel WB III 855). Some NT exx. of accus. gaining over gen.: Mt 1²⁰ 9⁴ ἐνθυμέομαι (gen. in P. Par. 63 vii 9, ii/B.C.), Mt 12⁷ Jas 5⁶ καταδικάζω, Ro 2¹⁰ προηγέομαι Ph 1¹¹ πληρόομαι.

(b) *Content, or internal object* ("cognate accusative"). This follows a Semitic principle, and may consist of a noun with an attribute: Mt 2¹⁰, 2 Co 6¹³ τὴν δὲ αὐτὴν ἀντιμισθίαν πλατύνθητε, perhaps pregnant for τὸν αὐτὸν πλατυσμὸν ὡς ἀντιμισθίαν (or adverbial: *with the same reward*, or accus. in apposition to a sentence, Moule 35f), 1 Pt 3¹⁴ τὸν φόβον αὐτῶν (of them) μὴ φοβηθῆτε, Rev 16⁹ ἐκαυματίσθησαν καῦμα μέγα, Jn 7²⁴ κρίνω with τὴν δικαίαν κρίσιν, Mk 10³⁸ τὸ βάπτισμα, ὃ ἔγω βαπτίζομαι, βαπτισθῆναι, Jn 17²⁶ ἡ ἀγάπη ἣν ἠγάπησάς με (D ἦ), Eph 2⁴. No attribute: Lk 2⁸ φυλάσσω φυλακάς, Jas 5¹⁸. It may consist of

¹ Kittel WB VI 762f.

an adj. or pronoun: Lk 12^{47f} δαρήσεται πολλάς, ὀλίγας; the neuters of certain pronouns (τοῦτο, τί, οὐδέν, πάντα) are less frequent than in class. Greek but they still appear: Lk 4³⁵ μηδὲν βλάβας (or accus. of respect?), Mt 19²⁰ τί ὑστερῶ, Mk 7³⁶ ὅσον *as much as* (W 700 dat.), Ac 10²⁰, Ro 6¹⁰, 1 Co 9²⁵, 10³³, 11², 2 Co 12¹¹, 12¹³, 12¹⁴·13¹ τρίτον, Ga 2²⁰ ὁ νῦν ζῶ, 5² ὑμᾶς οὐδὲν ὠφελήσει, Ph 1⁶ πεποιθὼς αὐτὸ τοῦτο *in just this confidence* (= *I am sure*), 2¹⁸ Mt 27⁴⁴ τὸ δ' αὐτό *in the same way*. We might take & like this in Col 2¹⁸ & ἐώρακεν ἐμβατεύων, εἰκῆ φυσιοῦμενος *upon what he vainly imagined in the vision of his initiation* (making the conjectural emendations unnecessary). Papyri of 145 and 118 B.C.: πολλὰ χαῖρε and χαίρειν (Mayser II 2, 319).

(c) *Double accusative*¹. The NT conforms mainly to class. usage, with certain verbs: e.g. *teach* and *remind* Mk 6³⁴, Jn 14²⁶, Ac 21²¹, 1 Co 4¹⁷, Heb 5¹² τοῦ διδάσκειν ὑμᾶς τινα τὰ στοιχεῖα (but διδάσκω c. dat. Rev 2¹⁴); *enquire* and *entreat* Mk 6²². 23 Lk 12⁴⁸ Mt 21²⁴ Mk 4¹⁰, LXX has both single and double accus.; *dress* and *undress* Mt 27³¹ Mk 15¹⁷. 20 (ἐγδύω τινα τι in pap.), Lk 19⁴³, LXX περιβάλλω τινα τι, τί τινη, ἔν τινη. Causatives are more popular than in class. Greek and have double accus.: *porting* Mk 9⁴¹ 1 Co 3², *fortifying* Lk 11⁴⁶ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους φορτία. We find the double accus. of both external and internal object: Lk 4³⁵, Jn 17²⁶, Ac 13³² ἡμεῖς ὑμᾶς εὐαγγελιζόμεθα τὴν . . . ἐπαγγελίαν, Ga 4¹², 5², Eph 2⁴, Rev 14⁷ p⁴⁷ δοξάσατε αὐτὸν δόξαν. An accus. of object and a predicative accus. (without the help of a ptc. or a particle like ὡς, such as would be needed with other cases) occurs in the class. manner: *to reckon as* Ac 13⁵ (but with ὡς Mt 21²⁶, with εἰς 21⁴⁶ vl.); *to receive as* Jas 5¹⁰; *to make to be* Lk 19⁴⁶ ὑμεῖς δὲ αὐτὸν ἐποιήσατε σπηλαῖον, Jn 6¹⁵, Ro 4¹⁷ LXX πατέρα . . . τέθεικά σε, Lk 12¹⁴ Heb 1²; *to do something to* Mt 27²² τί οὖν ποιήσω Ἰησοῦν, Herm. S. I 4 τί ποιήσεις τὸν ἀγρόν, LXX Nu 24¹⁴ τί ποιήσεις . . . τὸν λαόν σου; *to designate as*, Mk 10¹⁸, Lk 1⁵⁹, Jn 9²² (D + εἶνάι), 10³⁵, Ro 10⁹, 1 Jn 4² (B accus. c. inf.), 2 Jn⁷, and Semitism καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰωάννην etc. Mt 1²¹. 23. 25 Lk 11³. 31 2²¹; *to consider as* Lk 14¹⁸. 19 ἔχω, Ac 20²⁴ ποιούμαι, Ro 6¹¹ p⁴⁶ DAIEFG λογίζομαι, Ph 3⁷ ἔγγημαι (cp. Lat. *habeo*); *to prove to be* 2 Co 6⁴ Ga 2¹⁸. To this predicative accus. we may add 1 Co 9⁵ ἀδελφὴν γυναῖκα after περιάγω (it is not attributive:

¹ K.-G I 318ff. Mayser II 2, 320-323. Helbing 38-68. Radermacher² 121.

a wife who is a sister, but predicative: a sister as a wife); Lk 11¹¹ which of you shall the son ask as the father (τὸν πατέρα predicative of τίνα); 1 Pt 1¹⁷ if you invoke as father the one who judges (πατέρα a predicate of τὸν . . . κρίνοντα). In a Semitic way, εἰς (like normal Greek ὡς) may be added to this predicate: Mt 21⁴⁶ εἰς προφήτην (v.l. ὡς), Ac 13²² εἰς βασιλέα, ⁴⁷ (= Isa. 49⁶), 7²¹, 1 Clem. 42⁴ εἰς ἐπισκόπου, BGu 1103¹¹ (13 B.C.) δ εἶχεν εἰς φερνάριον which he has received for dowry.

(d) *Accus. with passive.* This occurs with the passive of verbs which have double accus. in the active, and is classical: e.g. μουσικὴν διδασθεῖς. 1 Co 12¹³ ἐν πνεῦμα ἐποτίσθημεν, 2 Th 2¹⁵, Heb 6⁹, Lk 16¹⁹ ἐνεδιδύσκετο πορφύραν. In the Koine, and actually already in LXX, occurs accus. instead of gen. with *fill, be full*: Ph 1¹¹ πεπληρωμένοι καρπὸν δικαιοσύνης, Col 1⁹ πληρωθῆτε τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν *filled with knowledge*. The person which appears in dat. with active voice may become the subject with the passive, and therefore such a passive will have accus. of the thing (as in English: "I am given a book"): Lk 12⁴⁷ δαρήσεται πολλάς, Ga 2⁷ πεπίστευμαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, 1 Th 2⁴, 1 Co 9¹⁷.

(e) *Adverbial accus.* (i) *Manner*: for τὸ λοιπὸν see p. 336. Also δωρεάν *gratuitously* and μακράν have become simple adverbs. Mt 15¹⁶, Heb 5¹³ D* E* ἀκμήν (Hellenistic, not LXX). This accus. is often formed by a superfluous article: Lk 11³ 19⁴⁷ Ac 17¹¹. ²⁸D 19⁹ D τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν *daily* (class.); Ac 5²¹ D τὸ πρῶτ, Ro 1¹⁵ τὸ κατ' ἐμέ, ⁹⁵, 12⁵. ¹⁸, 15²², 16¹⁹, 1 Co 14²⁷, 1 Pt 3⁸. For Jn 8²⁵ τὴν ἀρχήν see pp. 49f. Lk 11⁴¹ τὰ ἔνοντα may be attributive accus. (*alms relating to what is within*) or accus. of respect (*as for what is inside, give alms*), but neither makes as good sense as adverbial accus. (*give alms from the heart*). Other instances: ἐν τρόπῳ Mt 23³⁷ 2 Ti 3⁸ etc. (LXX often) (pap. Mayser II 2, 329), τὸν ὅμοιον τρόπον Jude⁷, Mt 13³⁰ LXX Δ δῆσατε αὐτὰ δεσμάς (SBCEF add εἰς; D om αὐτὰ), Lk 9¹⁴ κατακλίνατε αὐτοὺς κλισίας. Cp. adverbial nom., p. 231.

(ii) *Extent.* In Mt 4¹⁵ ὁδὸν θαλάσσης (in LXX Isa 8²³ perhaps a harmonization with the NT) is a literal translation of Heb. מַן אֶרֶץ = *seawards*, rather than a ref. to some road leading to the sea. Lk 22⁴¹ ὡσεὶ λίθου βολήν, ²³⁶ ζήσασα . . . ἔτη ἑπτὰ, Mt 28²⁰, Mk 4²⁷ Ac 26⁷ 2 Th 3⁸ ADE (SB gen.). Distributive: Mt 20² τὴν ἡμέραν *per day* (Mayser II 2. 333), Mk 9²⁶ πολλά

σπαράξας *fit after fit*. There is a Hell. Greek idiom for indicating duration of time by placing the preposition with the inappropriate noun: e.g. instead of *six days before the passover* Jn 12¹ reads *before six days of the passover*¹.

(iii) Point of time. This is not unclass. (e.g. Demosth. 54, 10 ἐκείνην τὴν ἑσπέραν *on that evening*), and is found in the Koine (Moulton Proleg. 63), LXX (e.g. Ge 43¹⁶ Ex 9¹⁸), and Church writers (e.g. Justin M. Apol. 1, 67, 8 τὴν δὲ τοῦ ἡλίου ἡμέραν; but 67, 3 dative). In NT Jn 4⁵² ἐχθὲς ὥραν ἑβδόμην, Ac 10³ ὥραν ἐνάτην, 10³⁰ (unless τὴν ἐνάτην = *the ninth-hour prayer*, cogn. accus.), 20¹⁶ τὴν ἡμέραν τῆς πεντηκοστῆς (D + εἰς), Rev 3³ ποίαν ὥραν.

(iv) For the accus. in apposition to a clause, see pp. 220f.

¹ Moulton Proleg. 100f.

CHAPTER EIGHTEEN

CASE ADDITIONS TO THE VERB: WITH A PREPOSITION¹

§ 1 Preparatory Note on Prepositions in NT

This study is important for the exegete, provided he is aware that class. niceties must not be pressed too far. In the search for a theology of prepositions it is straining credulity for instance to adopt a distinction between ἐκ and διὰ in Ro 3³⁰ (ICC Ro in loc.; Moule 195). In Hell. Greek there is a strong preference for the preposition against the simple case, and also a growing laxity which entails closer examination of the context. Thus the meanings of εἰς and ἐν tend to approximate to each other in Hell. Greek.

Although the NT has kept most of the old "proper" prepositions the number was decreasing until only seven were left in MGr, and ἀμφί and ὡς have been discarded as in LXX and pap.², while ἀνά and ἀντί have been much curtailed. The variety in the use of each preposition has also diminished. On the other hand, ἐν εἰς ἐκ are much more widely used. The dat. is beginning to wane at this period with all prepositions (except ἐν in NT) and has disappeared entirely with ἀνά μετά περί ὑπό, bringing to a close a development already present in the class.

¹ K-G I 448-555. Schwyzer II 417ff. Jannaris 365-399. Wackernagel II 153-248. Mayser II 2, 337-543. F. Krebs, *Die Präpositionen bei Polybius*, Würzburg 1882; *Die Präpositionsadverbia in der späteren historischen Gräcität*, 2 Teile, Munich 1884-5; *Zur Rection der Kasus in der späteren histor. Gräcität*, 1887-90. R. Helbing, *Die Präpositionen bei Herodot und andern Historikern* (B.z.h.S.dgr.Spr. 16), 1904. W. Kuhring, *De praepositionum Graecarum in chartis Aegypt. usu quaestiones selectae*, Bonn 1906. C. Rosberg, *De praepositionum Graecarum in chartis Aegypt. Ptolemaeum aetate usu*, Jena 1909. P. F. Regard, *Contributions à l'étude des prépositions dans la langue du NT*, Paris 1919. J. Waldis, *Die Präpositions-Adverbien mit der Bedeutung "vor" in der Septuaginta*, Lucerne 1921-2. M. Johannesson, DGPS, Berlin 1926. R. F. Rickelson, *The Ablative after διὰ*, Diss. S-W. Bapt. Sem., 1944. P. Southern, *The NT Use of the Preposition KATA*, *ibid.* 1949. B. Blackwelder, *Causal Use of Prepositions in the Greek NT*, *ibid.* 1951. Kittel WB VI 11, 1958, 683ff. (πρό); VI 12, 1958, 720-725 (πρός).

² Rosberg 11. Regard Prép. 683f. Mayser II 2, 338.

period. There is now a preference for the accus. In the LXX the dative is used with *περί* four times only, and with *ὑπό* in Job 12⁵ A only. In NT the only prepositions which still have all three cases are *ἐπί* and *παρά*¹. In MGr only the accus. is used with prepositions.

The niceties of class. Greek in the precise use of cases after prepositions are obliterated in Hellenistic; the distinctions in the cases after *διά ἐπί πρός*, for example, are becoming less clear.

Because of the tendency of the language towards fuller forms, the "improper" prepositions begin to gain ground in Hell. Greek: in the NT there are 42, against 18 "proper". These are adverbs or nouns in various cases which assumed the character of prepositions, but are not compounded with verbs. They now supplement the old stock of prepositions.

No distinct line of demarcation between adverbs and prepositions can easily be drawn and the combination of a preposition and adverb is common in the Koine;² e.g. in NT *ἀπό τότε* for *ἀφ' οὗ* Mk 8² D (popular), *ἐκ πάλαι* etc.³

The old adverbial meaning of the prepositions is not well attested in Hell. Greek, except of course when compounded with verbs, and it is doubtful whether all the instances suggested for the NT can be accepted, viz. *ὑπέρ* (accent?) 2 Co 11²³ *ὑπὲρ ἐγώ* *I more* (Wackernagel II 167), 11⁵ 12¹¹ *ὑπὲρ λίαν* (but perhaps a compound *ὑπερλίαν*, like *ὑπερεκπερισσοῦ* Eph 3²⁰ 1 Th 3¹⁰ 5¹³), Lk 16⁸ *φρονιμώτεροι ὑπέρ*; *ἐν* Mk 1²³ *ἐν πνεύματι ἀκαθάρτῳ* with an unclean spirit in him; Ph 3¹³ *ἐν δέ* but thereby, for *ἐν δέ*. The Ptol. pap. have *παρά* thus apparently only once (Mayser II 2, 339) and *ἐπί δέ* moreover, *ἐξ καὶ πρός* six and more (Pap. Oxy. I 68²⁴ A.D. 131). The LXX has *τὸ πρός* *πρωί* right early Ps. 45⁶, *πρός ἐπί* *τούτοις* moreover besides this Sir 29²⁵, and Cant 1¹⁶ has *πρός* moreover, and Aquila Deut 33³ has the same; Aquila Eccles. 1¹⁷ 7²³ (22) *πρός* (adv.). Symmachus in Eccles 9² has *πρός τε* (adv.).

In brief, the LXX and NT share the following innovations of the Hellenistic period in the use of prepositions: (a) the tendency to discard one of the cases where formerly a preposition was used with more than one. (b) Adverbs and adverbial prepositions now supplement the old stock of prepositions: thus

¹ On the other hand. the accus. is declining with *ὑπό ὑπὲρ περί*, while *μετά περί ὑπό* have ceased to take the dat., and *κατά* has lost its hold of the gen.

² Schmid, *Der Attizismus* IV 625. Hatzid. 213.

³ See also *ἀφ' ὅτε* Hermas, and *μέχρι ὅτε* (Blass-Debr. §§ 241, 2; 455, 3).

έναντίον, ένώπιον etc. for πρό; έπάνω for επί; άπάνωθεν, έπάνωθεν, ύπεράνω for ύπέρ; ύποκάτω for ύπό; άνά μέσον for μεταξύ; κύκλω, περικύκλω for περί; έχόμενος etc. for παρά. (c) There is a new use of ύπέρ and περί. (d) εις and έν are now confused in two ways: 1. έν is used after verbs of motion (= 3), 2. εις is used for έν after expressions denoting rest. (e) There is a change in the relative frequency of prepositions: e.g. άπό encroaches on έκ and ύπό.

§ 2. Prepositional Periphrases for the simple cases

This usage is greatly extended in Hell. Greek; e.g. εις and πρός c. accus. serve for the simple dat., έν c. dat. for the simple dat., and παρά is used after a comparative in place of the simple gen. In place of the simple gen., Polybius can write ή κατά τόν ήλιον πορεία.

(a) *For Genitive*: see pp. 207ff, 231ff. For partitive άπό, see pp. 208f; for gen. of separation, see pp. 258f; for άπό instead of accus. after verbs of fleeing, fearing, etc., see p. 244. Besides these, there is the Pauline use of άπό in the sense of alienation, where older Greek would have the simple case, e.g. Ro 9⁸ άνάθεμα . . . άπό τοϋ Χ., Col 2²⁰ άποθνήσκω άπό (for dat.). The following verbs are followed by άπό in the same way: παρερχομαι Mt 26³⁹ = Mk 14³⁵, παραφέρω Mk 14³⁶ = Lk 22⁴² (cp. MGr θά περάσω άπό τη Σύμωρη; we must not interpret άπό as *far from*), μετανοέω Ac 8²² (έκ in Rev 2²¹ etc.; noun in Heb 6¹), άφαντος γίνομαι Semitism Lk 24³¹, καταργέομαι Ro 7⁶ Ga 5⁴, φθείρω 2 Co 11³, εισακούω Heb 5⁷ (but the meaning is difficult; perhaps *on account of*).

(b) *For Dative*¹. For διά c. gen. in instrumental or modal use see p. 267. As a circumlocution for the simple case ένώπιον c. gen. Ac 6⁵ appears to render ܐܦܘܠ, ܐܢܘܢܐ, or ܩܘܝܐ; to a less extent also έμπροσθεν, έναντίον (Heb 13²¹ 1 Jn 3²²). Lk 15¹⁸. ²¹ άμαρτάνω ένώπιον, Mt 7⁶ βάλλω έμπροσθεν, Heb 4¹³ έμφανής ένώπιον.

The preposition έν, too, takes the place of plain dat. in instances where *in* is quite unsuitable as a translation.

¹ K-G I 436, n. 7; 483. Mayser II 2, 354ff. Johannessohn DGPS 239f. Radermacher² 127.

(i) In an adverbial sense, quite briefly stated. Thus in Ro we have: *powerfully* 14, *openly* 2²⁸, *secretly* 29, *patiently* 9²², *in this way* 14¹⁸, *in carnal things* 15²⁷, *joyfully* 32, *quickly* 16²⁰. Perhaps we may also include the six *exx.* in 12⁷⁻⁸: *liberally, zealously, cheerfully, etc.* In 1 Co we have *weakly, fearfully, tremblingly* 2³, 15^{42, 42, 43} *quat.*, ἐν πρώτοις 15³, *peacefully* 16¹¹, and perhaps *in love* 16¹⁴. Other NT *exx.* come to mind: the class. ἐν τάχει *quickly* Lk 18⁸, ἐν δικαιοσύνη = δικαίως Ac 17³¹ Rev 19¹¹), ἐν πάσῃ ἀσφαλείᾳ = ἀσφαλέστατα (Ac 5²³), *boldly* (Col 2¹⁵). The ἐν δόλῳ of Mk 14¹ shows how close we are to the instrumental sense: *by means of guile or guilefully.*

(ii) An ἐν of accompaniment is apparently the equivalent of μετά or σύν or simple dat. (= *with*), as in class. Greek. The idea of manner is often implied. There is in Mk 1²³ 5² the man *with* the unclean spirit, unless we may take this as *in the power of*; but in 5²⁵ the woman must be *with*, not *in the power of*, a flow of blood. *With* is also the way to translate Lk 14³¹ *with ten thousand* (especially as μετά occurs in the adjacent parallel phrase), Ro 1²⁷ relations *with* women, 15²⁹ to come *with* a blessing, 1 Co 4^{21, 21} come *with* a rod . . . *with* love (but this may be instrumental rather than of accompaniment), Heb 9^{23, 25} *with* blood, Jude¹⁴ *with* his saints. The method is classical enough and belongs to the Koine, but its use in the LXX to render ׀ seems to have suggested an increase of use in NT. Col 1⁵ ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τῆς ἀληθείας τοῦ εὐαγγελίου *by means of the Gospel* (or perhaps temporal ἐν: *when the true Gospel was preached.*

(iii) There is the relatively frequent instrumental use,¹ in the stricter sense: e.g. nineteen times in Mt 1-14, twenty-five in Ro, twenty-eight in 1 Co, and very common in Rev. It is least common in the second part of Ac. It is as old as Homer, who uses this preposition for seeing *with* the eyes, but it is comparatively rare before the LXX,² in which it is extremely common (on the model of ׀)—much more so proportionately than in the NT. Moreover, it is not very common in the Koine,³ where many apparent instances, as in NT, may be accepted satisfactorily in the strictly locative sense. We cannot rule out the possibility⁴ of *in water* Mt 3¹¹, nor of *in one mouth* Ro 15⁶, since words are certainly formed here, as thoughts were considered to be formed in the heart. Our own idiom is often *in* in these phrases: *in* God's will (Ro 1¹⁰), *in* the likeness (8³), to sum up *in* one word (13⁹), but usually we shall employ *with*. Semitic influence may be behind *swear by* (Mt 5³⁴),

¹ K-G I § 431, 3a. Kuhring § 30. Rossberg 28, 2. Mayser II 2, 357f. Deissmann BS 115f (against Hebraism). Johannesson DGKPS 52ff. N. Turner, "The Preposition EN in the NT," *Bible Translator*, vol. 10, no. 3, 1959. Lagrange S. *Matth.* XCIX.

² K-G I 464f. Helbing 146f. Radermacher² 130, n. 4.

³ ἐν μαχαίρῃ in the pap., but not combined with *kill*, etc. (Moulton Einl. 15f., Kuhring 43f, Rossberg 28, Mayser II 2, 358, 393). NT has ἐν μαχαίρῃ. ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ Mt 26⁵² Lk 22⁴⁹ Rev 2¹⁶ 6⁸ 13¹⁰ 19²¹.

⁴ Many readers will prefer a stronger word, even "certainty". But I hesitate because of the imminent parallel ἐν πνεύματι ἀγίῳ καὶ πυρί.

with his arm (Lk 1⁵¹), ransom by (Rev 5⁹), call with a loud voice (14¹⁵); and Semitic influence was probably at work in Mt 7² ἐν τῷ μέτρῳ (because Lk 6³⁸ avoids it), 7⁶ ἐν τοῖς ποσίν αὐτῶν, 22¹⁶ ἐν ἀληθείᾳ (because Mk 12¹⁴ Lk 20²¹ have ἐπ' ἀληθείας), 24⁴¹ ἐν τῷ μύλῳ (Lk 17³⁵ ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό). But Greek usage sufficiently accounts for salted with (Mt 5¹³), to be known by means of (Lk 24³⁶), mingle with (Rev 8³), burn with fire (18⁸). So also Mt 9³⁴ Ac 17³¹ Col 1¹⁶.

A causal sense is probably best included here. We must render *because of* at Mt 6⁷ 11⁶ 13⁵⁷ Jn 16³⁰ (= *propterea*) Ac 7²⁹ 24¹⁶ Ro 2¹⁷. 2³ 5³. 11 14²¹ 1 Co 2⁵. 5 4⁴ 10⁵ Col 1¹⁶, and *because* (ἐν ᾧ) at Ro 2¹ 8³ Heb 2¹⁸ 6¹⁷.

A curious instrumental dat. of price is found with ἐν, a distinctly Semitic construction literally rendering the *beth pretii*¹: Ro 3²⁵ 5⁹ Rev 5⁹ (*at the cost of his blood*).

Then there is a semi-forensic sense, suggested by 1 Co 6² 11¹³ and found in the Koine: *in your judgment*.

Probably εἰς, as in MGr, also occurs as a substitute for the dat. (or gen.): Ga 3¹⁴ ἵνα εἰς τὰ ἔθνη ἡ εὐλογία τοῦ Ἀβραάμ γένηται, unless we understand εἰς = *among*. Cp. γίνομαι εἰς in papyri (Mayser II 2, 406) *to fall to someone* as a possession.

(c) *The accus.* occasionally appears in place of the predicative nominative owing to the Hellenistic tendency towards greater expressiveness and this is assisted by the Semitic εἰς (= ל) ², although there are occasionally parallels outside Biblical Greek (Jannaris § 1552, Radermacher² 20f). (i) with γίνομαι and εἰμί: Mt 19⁵ = Ge 2²⁴, 1 Co 6¹⁶ ἔσονται εἰς σάρκα μίαν (but Mt 19⁶ has truer Greek predicative nom.), Mt 21⁴² = Ps 118²² ἐγενήθη εἰς κεφαλὴν, Lk 3⁵, 1 Co 15⁴⁵ = Ge 2⁷ ἐγένετο . . . εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν, 2 Co 6¹⁸ Heb 8¹⁰ LXX, and (outside of quotations) Lk 13¹⁹ ἐγένετο εἰς δένδρον, Jn 16²⁰ ἡ λύπη ὑμῶν εἰς χαρὰν γενήσεται, Ac 5³⁶ ἐγένετο εἰς οὐδέν, 8²³ εἰς γὰρ χολὴν . . . ὁρῶ σε ὄντα, 1 Th 3⁵, 1 Jn 5⁸, Rev 8¹¹, 16¹⁹. (ii) with λογίζομαι: ³ Ac 19²⁷, Ro 4³ = Ge 15⁶, 9⁸, 2²⁶, LXX Isa 40¹⁷ 1 Mac 2⁵² (A corrects to nom.).

(d) *For Accusative*: on εἰς for predicative accus. see pp. 246f.

¹ *Hebrew and English Lexicon*, ed. Brown, Driver, Briggs, Oxford 1906, s.v. ל, III. 3.

² Zerwick § 20. Johannessohn DGKPS 4f. Psichari 201f. Jannaris § 1552. Helbing 60–67. Moulton Proleg. 71f. Moulton-Howard 462f.

³ Helbing 66f. Bonaccorsi 603f. Mayser II 2, 362ff; 416ff. Heiland in Kittel WB IV 287, 288 n. 4.

§ 3. Anomalies in the use of Prepositions

(a) For ἀπό with nom. see p. 230.

(b) Εἰς for local ἐν¹.

Etymologically these two prepositions are related, and at this period, from c. 150 B.C., εἰς is used instead of ἐν in a local sense, for the distinction between motion and rest becomes obscured in Hell. Greek. The same approximation occurs between πρός c. accus. and παρά c. dat. In the Koine εἰς and ἐν are freely interchanged, until in MGr εἰς has absorbed ἐν completely, consistently with the disappearance of the dat. However, under Hebraic influence ἐν appears almost twice as often as εἰς in NT, and confusion between the two prepositions has already begun, εἰς often appearing for ἐν and more rarely ἐν for εἰς (see p. 257).

Even in the class. period we sometimes find εἰς for ἐν in a compressed or pregnant construction,² but no NT writer except Mt³ is entirely innocent of the replacing of ἐν by εἰς in a local sense; in Lk-Ac most of the exx. are found. Mk 1⁹ ἔβηππίσθη εἰς τὸν Ἰορδάνην (possibly pregnant, implying the notion of *coming*), Lk 9⁶¹ τοῖς εἰς τὸν οἶκόν μου (no idea of motion), 11⁷ (D ἐν), Jn 1¹⁸ εἰς τὸν κόλπον (Syr^c gen.): there is therefore nothing very profound here concerning mutual motion between Father and Son; nevertheless John (including Rev) does not usually blur the distinction between εἰς and ἐν, and except for Mt he has fewer exx. of εἰς = ἐν than any NT author. Mk 1³⁹ (EF ἐν) 2¹ (SBD ἐν), 8²⁶ μηδενί εἰπης εἰς τὴν κόμην, 10¹⁰ (AC ἐν), 13³ εἰς συναγωγὰς δαρήσεσθε (= Mt 10¹⁷ ἐν, D εἰς), 16 (= Mt 24¹⁸ Lk 17³¹ ἐν), Lk 4²³ (vl. ἐν), 9⁶¹, Jn 20⁷ τὸ σουδάριον . . . ἐντετυλιγμένον εἰς ἓνα τόπον (pregn?), Ac 2⁵ (S^cBDC E ἐν) 2⁷ Οἶ (motion impossible), 8²³ (or *destined for the gall of bitterness*), 9²¹ SA (rest ἐν), 9²⁸, 11²⁵ D, 12²⁵ SB (pregn.?), 14²⁵ (BCD ἐν), 17¹³ D, 18²¹ D, 19²² (D ἐν), 21¹³, 23¹¹, 25⁴, 26²⁰, 1 Pt 5¹² (a post-script?) τὴν χάριν . . . εἰς ἣν ἐστήκατε KLP. Especially Semitic are the following: Lk 1⁴⁴ ἐγένετο ἡ φωνὴ εἰς τὰ ὦτά μου, Ac 20¹⁶ 21¹⁷ 25¹⁵, Jn 17²³ 1 Jn 5⁸ εἰς (τὸ) ἐν. But εἰς = ἐν occurs in the secular Koine: P. Oxy VI 929¹² ταῦτα δὲ πάντα συνενῆμι εἰς τὸν χιτῶνα καρῶνον *inside the brown tunic*, see also Bauer s.v. εἰς.

¹ Mayser II 2, 371ff. Moulton Einl. 93. Rossberg 54. Radermacher² 140, 145. Johannessohn DGPS 330ff.

² As in NT Jn 9⁷ ὑπάγε νίψαι εἰς τὴν κολυμβήθραν, 20¹⁹. 26 ἔστι εἰς τὸ μέσον, 1 Pt 3²⁰ εἰς ἣν ὀλίγοι διεσώθησαν *by entering which* (pregn.).

³ C. H. Turner examined the use of εἰς for ἐν in Mk and pointed out that Matthew and Luke disliked the confusion, especially Matthew. See *JThS* 26, p. 14.

The Pauline and Johannine epistles and Rev (in spite of its Semitic character) do not often confuse local ἐν and εἰς. This is important for the exegete, because in Mt, the epistles, and Rev we can always presume that εἰς has its full sense even where one might suspect that it stood for ἐν (e.g. Mt 28¹⁹ baptism *into* the name, i.e. a relationship as the goal of baptism; also Mt 10⁴¹ receiving a righteous man εἰς ὄνομα of a righteous man, which is not the same as ἐν ὀνόματι, for it has the Semitic causal sense, εἰς being ל. See ׀ׁׂ׃ Jo 9⁹ Ezk 36²²: *because of* or *for the sake of* a righteous man's name. Cp. Mt 12⁴¹ they repented *because of* the preaching of Jonah. See Zerwick § 70a, 76. But in Mt 5³⁵ μὴ ὀμῶσαι . . . εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα, *by*).

In the LXX (e.g. Ge 31³³ Nu 35³³), Diodorus (e.g. 3, 44), and in Hermas (e.g. V, I 2, 2; II 4, 3; S. I 2), εἰς = ἐν is common. Note especially κρύπτω εἰς Jb 40⁸ (13), Pr 1¹¹ Isa 2¹⁰ Je 4²⁹ Ps 88⁴⁰ (Johannessohn DGPS 331f, Jannaris § 1548, Oepke in Kittel WB II 418f. n). There do not seem to be any papyrus exx. earlier than the Imperial period, e.g. P. Fay. 111¹¹ b (A.D. 95–100) ἐνετιλάμην σου εἰς Διονυσιάδα μῖνα *I have bid you remain at Dionysias*. The earlier examples are pregnant with the idea of motion (Mayser II 2, 371ff), but while it is true that some of the instances in NT (especially Lk 21³⁷ Jn 19¹³) may be the “pregnant” construction, the real explanation at this date lies not so much here as in the inevitable progress of the absorption of ἐν by εἰς¹.

(c) Interchange of εἰς and ἐν in a metaphorical (non-local) sense.

Polyb. V 13, 8 εἰς δὲ τὴν ὑστέραιον *on the next day*, Lk 1²⁰ εἰς τὸν καιρὸν αὐτῶν *at their proper time* (ἐν correctly Mt 21⁴¹ 2 Th 2⁶), 13⁹ εἰς τὸ μέλλον *in the future* (P. Oxy. I 36, iii 3), class. ἐς αὔριον, Ac 13⁴² εἰς τὸ μεταξὺ σαββάτου *on the next Sabbath*, 2 Co 13² Ph 1¹⁰ εἰς ἡμέραν Χριστοῦ, 1 Th 4¹⁵ εἰς τὴν παρουσίαν (P. Oxy. XIV. 1764. 9). In Ac 7⁵³ εἰς διαταγὰς ἀγγέλων may be a Hebraism (A. T. Robertson 482) or an Aramaism (*Beginnings* II 148). Also εἰς varies with ἐν in the formula which renders ׀ׁׂ׃ ׀ׁׂ׃ (1 Km 1¹⁷ etc., Mk 5³⁴ Lk 7⁵⁰ 8⁴⁸ εἰς; LXX Jg 18⁶B Jas 2¹⁶ Lk 7⁵⁰D 8⁴⁸D ἐν). We have εἰς in the baptismal formula Ac 19³ εἰς τὸ Ἰωάννου βάπτισμα. Corresponding to Heb 2, εἰς or ἐν occurs where the dat. would suffice, with πιστεύω, ἔμνομι, εὐδοκέω (e.g. with βαπτίζω: Ac 8¹⁶ 19⁵ εἰς τὸ ὄνομα, as well

¹ For this reason alone the argument of J. H. Greenlee seems mistaken in his article in *The Bible Translator*, vol. 3, Jan. 1952.

as Ac 10⁴⁸ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι). Variation occurs too with ποιέω and ἐργάζομαι (see pp. 236f.). In Jn 15²¹ ποιήσουσιν εἰς ὑμᾶς and Mt 26¹⁰ ἠργάσατο εἰς ἐμέ, εἰς occurs where one expects ἐν. With ἵστημι: Ro 5² ἐν ἧ ἐστήκαμεν, but 1 Pt 5¹² εἰς ἣν στήτε. But variation was possible in class. Greek also with verbs of public speaking; so in NT κηρύσσω Mk 13¹⁰ εἰς (D ἐν), 14⁹ εἰς (Mt has ἐν), Lk 24⁴⁷; 1 Th 2⁹ (S* dat.), and εὐαγγελίζομαι Ga 1⁶ ἐν, 1 Pt 1²⁵ εἰς; Ac 17¹⁵ D; "it is an Aramaic construction" (Black AAGA² 71).

But a distinction between the two prepositions may sometimes, especially in Paul, be intended. Ph 1⁵ κοινωνία εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον: Jerome (Vulg.) and other translators may have failed to appreciate that Paul is not prone to confuse εἰς and ἐν. A process may be envisaged therefore (Zerwick § 77). The Vulg. etc. may also be wrong at Ph 2¹¹: not *confiteatur quia dominus Iesus Christus in gloria est Dei Patris*, but *in gloriam* (confess to the glory of . . .), Zerwick § 78. Even more important theologically, the distinction between εἰς and ἐν has been missed in Col 1¹⁶: *omnia per ipsum et ipso* (εἰς αὐτόν) *creata sunt*; but to Paul Christ is the *efficient and the final* cause (§ 79). Probably the only instance where Paul does confuse them is Eph 3¹⁶ κραταιωθῆναι . . . εἰς τὸν ἕσω ἄνθρωπον (strangely, Vulg. has *in c. accus.*: §80).

(d) Sometimes also εἰς appears to stand for ἐπί and πρὸς. Except for mere stylistic variation there is no point in the change in Phm⁵ πρὸς τὸν κύριον Ἰ. καὶ εἰς πάντα τοὺς ἁγίους (so also 2 Ti 2²¹ 3¹⁷). In Mk 5³⁸ καὶ ἔρχονται εἰς τὸν οἶκον, the sequel εἰσελθὼν λέγει αὐτοῖς makes it clear that εἰς = πρὸς. In Mk the instances of πρὸς are limited and εἰς assumes much of the sphere of πρὸς and ἐν; the full meaning of εἰς and ἐν cannot be insisted on. So also Mt 12⁴¹ *repent c. εἰς* (class. πρὸς), 21¹, Mk 11¹, 8 (= ἐπί), Lk 9¹⁰ 18³⁵ 19²⁹, Jn 4⁵ εἰς πόλιν *to*, not *into*, 11³¹. 38 ὑπάγει (ἔρχεται) εἰς (D in 38 corrects *to ἐπί*) τὸ μνημεῖον *towards*, and in 20³ εἰς cannot be *into* (from the context). Ἀμαρτάνω *c. εἰς*: Mt 18²¹ Lk 15¹⁸ (cp. P. Eleph. I, 9 *κακοτεχνεῖν μηδὲν . . . εἰς Δημητρίαν*); βλασφημέω εἰς Lk 12¹⁰. There is the Hebraism (or Aramaism) in Lk 15²² *δοτε δακτύλιον εἰς τὴν χεῖρα* (for class. *περί*), and εἰς often directs to a part of the body *to*, or on, which an act is done: Mk 8²³ Mt 27³⁰ *ἔτυπτον εἰς τὴν κεφαλὴν*, 2 Co 11²⁰, cp. P. Tebt. III 798¹⁶ *λακτίσαντες εἰς τὴν κοιλίαν*, Acta Petr. et Paul. 187¹ *δραμῶν τῇ ἑξῆς ἡμέρᾳ Ἰουβενάλιος ἔρριψεν ἑαυτὸν εἰς τὰ ἕληνη τοῦ Πέτρου*. With verbs of seeing:

Mt 22¹⁶ βλέπω εἰς, cp. P. Oxy XIV 1680¹¹ βλέπων εἰς τὸ ἀσύστατον. With verbs of speaking: Jn 8²⁶ λαλῶ εἰς τὸν κόσμον.

It may be that πρὸς tends to be used with a personal object, εἰς with an impersonal: 2 Co 1^{16f} πρὸς ὑμᾶς, then εἰς Μακεδονίαν, εἰς τὴν Ἰουδαίαν; Mk 2¹³ πρὸς αὐτόν but 3⁷ a vl. gives εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν. Nevertheless εἰς αὐτόν Ro 11³⁶.

(e) Confusion of διὰ τινος and τινα. See pp. 267f.

(f) Confusion of παρά τινος and τινα. See p. 273.

(g) Use of ἐν for εἰς. This occurs often enough in the LXX and even in Imperial and later papyri (Johannesson DGPS 330ff; Mayser II 2, 372f).

Since there are 2,698 exx. of ἐν in NT it is not surprising that sometimes it bears the meaning of *into* or *into a state of* (especially ἐν μέσῳ). Mt 26²³ after δῖπ (but Mk 14²⁰ εἰς), Lk 11⁷ ἐπιστρέψαι . . . ἐν φρονήσει δικαίων (or instrumental ἐν?), 4¹ (SBDLW have ἐν after *was led*) but the parallel has εἰς (Mt 4¹); Ro 1^{23, 25} have ἐν after *change*, but 1²⁶ has εἰς. After ἰσχύει (tr.) and τιθέναι the use of ἐν is class.: Ac 5²⁷; Mt 27⁶⁰ (Mk 4³⁰ is instrumental), Mk 6^{29, 56} 15⁴⁶ Lk 1⁶⁶ 21¹⁴ 23⁵³ Jn 19⁴¹ Ac 1⁷ 5^{4, 18, 25} 7¹⁶ 9³⁷ Ro 9³³ 1 Co 12²⁸ 2 Co 5¹⁹ 1 Pt 2⁶. Sometimes after δίδωμαι the preposition is pleonastic and means no more than *to*, but not always: Lk 12⁶¹ (*bring into*), Jn 3⁵³ (*committed into*), 2 Co 1²², 8¹⁶ (*put into the heart*). After other verbs of motion of course the usage is more extensive in later Greek than in class., especially so in LXX. The usage is not class., after verbs of coming and going (e.g. Rev 11¹¹ A), but it is literary and non-literary Hellenistic.

However, ἐν, is not likely to be *to* or *into* after ἔρχομαι in Mk. Except for ἐπὶ c. accus. in two instances, Mark's rule is invariable for expressing motion after this verb: εἰς (22 times) or πρὸς (12 times); and so in 5²⁷ 8³⁸ 13²⁶ the prepositional phrase will not express motion from place to place, but rather the accompanying circumstances or the sphere in which motion occurs. Nor is there any support at all for the rendering *into* after πίπτω in Heb 4¹¹; never, except in the compound ἐν μέσῳ, does ἐν occur in NT in a pregnant sense after this verb, even in the more Semitic parts. In a work like Hebrews it is even less likely to occur in the LXX sense of a literal rendering of ז. Nor is Lk 7¹⁷ a case of constructio praegnans: the Word spread abroad *in* . . . (Nain is certainly away from Judaea, but the addition of "surrounding districts" makes *in* more natural than *to*.)

§ 4. True Prepositions¹

I. WITH ONE CASE

Hellenistic Greek tends to limit prepositions to one case each, preferably accus.

(a) Genitive

Ἄντι is represented by 318 exx. in LXX, but only 22 in NT. The class. ἀνθ' ὧν remains, and coincides with Heb. **בְּגִלְגָּל** etc. : *because* Lk 1²⁰ 19⁴⁴ Ac 12²³ 2 Th 2¹⁰; *therefore* Lk 12³. It alternates with ὅτι and διότι in Biblical Greek, and sometimes the two are combined: ἀνθ' ὧν ὅτι. For *therefore* there is also ἀντι τούτου. The class. ἀντί with a kind of gen. of price also remains: Mt 17²⁷ δὸς αὐτοῖς ἀντι ἑμοῦ καὶ σοῦ (class. ὑπέρ), 20²⁸ = Mk 10⁴⁵ λύτρον ἀντι πολλῶν (1 Ti 2⁶ ἀντίλυτρον ὑπέρ), Ro 12¹⁷ κακὸν ἀντι κακοῦ. Clearly in a substitutionary sense: Lk 11¹¹ ἀντι ἰχθύος ἔφιν, 1 Co 11¹⁵ κόμη ἀντι περιβολαίου (*instead of a wrap*), Jas 4¹⁵ ἀντι τοῦ λέγειν ὑμᾶς (*instead of saying*). It is more difficult to decide in the case of the atonement passages and of Jn 1¹⁶ χάριν ἀντι χάριτος ἐλάβομεν (substitutionary? i.e. the Spirit *in place of* Jesus' presence; or does it imply a *succession of graces?*)².

Ἄπο takes the place of ὑπό in a causal sense³. Mt 13⁴⁴ etc. ἀπο τῆς χαρᾶς, Lk 12⁵⁷ ἀφ' ἑαυτῶν κρίνετε *because of yourselves? for your own sake?*, 22⁴⁵ *for grief* (class. ὑπό), Ac 20⁹ κατενεχθεὶς ἀπο τοῦ ὕπνου, 2 Pt 1²¹ ὑπο πνεύματος ἁγίου φερόμενοι ἐλάβησαν ἀπο θεοῦ ἄνθρωποι (or perhaps for τὰ ἀπο θεοῦ?). The MSS vary greatly between ἀπο and ὑπό with the agent after passive verbs: Lk 1²⁶ angel sent ἀπο τοῦ θεοῦ, Lk 6¹⁸ 7³⁵ 8⁴³ Ac 10³³ 15⁴. 2 Co 7¹³ Jas 1¹³ 5⁴ Rev 12⁶ (all pregnant: *prepared and derived from?*). Note the variants: Mt 11¹⁹ B² CDEF ἀπο τῶν τέκνων, 16²¹ (D ὑπό), Mk 8³¹ AXW (1st hand), Ac 4^{9D} 3^{6B} (D ὑπό) 15⁴ BC (yet ὑπό in previous verse) 1 Pt 2⁴ C. Variants for ὑπό in LXX: Isa 11¹¹ (AQ ἀπό) etc.

Ἄπο stands for παρά c. gen. (rare in class. Greek): after ἀκούω

¹ K-G I § 428ff. Krebs, D. P. Polyb. Radermacher² 137ff. Moulton Einl. 158ff. Johannessohn DGKPS; DGPS. Mayser II 2, 373ff.

² J. M. Bover, "Χάριν ἀντι χάριτος", *Biblica* 6, 1925, 454-460. M. Black, *JThS* 42, 1941, 69f (*grace instead of disgrace*).

³ Imperial papyri, see Kuhring 35. See also Johannessohn DGPS 281f. Also MGr.

(see pp. 233f), *μανθάνω* (Ga 3² Col 1⁷), *παραλαμβάνω* (1 Co 11²³ etc.). After *coming* from a person: Jn 3² 16³⁰ *ἀπό* θεοῦ (Jn 8⁴² *ἐκ*, 16²⁷ *παρά*, ²⁸ *ἐκ*), Ga 21².

The confusion of *ἀπό* and *ἐκ* is common enough in Hell. Greek, and the process of incorporating *ἐκ* in *ἀπό* has begun already in NT; nevertheless *ἐκ* still outnumbers *ἀπό*: thus Rev has proportion 100:20. In a local sense the usage is still fairly accurate, except e.g. in Mk 16⁹ (C*DWL correct to *παρά*), Ac 13⁵⁰ 16³⁹ (E corrects to *ἐκ*, since they went *out of*, not *from*, the city), Heb 11¹⁵. But particularly in Lk, *ἀπό* is used with *ἐξέρχομαι* (going *out of*): 13 times, and never with *ἐκ*, in contrast to Mk who only once has *ἀπό* with *ἐξέρχομαι* (11¹²), but *ἐκ* 10 times (Zerwick § 62a). Nevertheless *ἐξέρχομαι* does have the sense of going *away from* in Lk 5⁸ (*ἔξελθε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ*). Similarly Ac 12⁷ has *ἐκ* where one expects *ἀπό* (*ἐξέπεσαν αὐτοῦ αἱ ἀλύσεις ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν*).

But to mark the place of origin, *ἀπό* appears as well as *ἐκ*: Mt 21¹¹, Jn 1⁴⁴ has both (*ἦν ὁ Φ. ἀπὸ Βηθσαιδά, ἐκ τῆς πόλεως Ἀνδρέου*), ⁴⁶ (but ⁴⁶ 4²² *ἐκ*), 11¹ has both (*ἀπὸ Βηθανίας, ἐκ τῆς κώμης Μαρίας*), Ac 10³⁸; *ἀπό* apparently occurs where *πόλις* or *κώμη* is not included. Always *ἀπό* for the country of origin (except in Jn): Ac 6⁹ 21²⁷ 23³⁴ 24¹⁸, papyri (Mayser II 1, 14ff; II 2, 377, 383.).

In the sense of *after* (class. *ἐκ*): Mk 7⁴ *ἀπ' ἀγορᾶς on return from market*, Heb 11³⁴ *ἀπὸ ἀσθενείας after weakness*. Temporal sense: *ἀπό τότε* Mt 16²¹ 26¹⁶ Lk 16¹⁶ (never *ἐκ*), *ἀπ' ἄρτι* Jn 13¹⁹ etc. (never *ἐξ*), but *ἐκ τούτου* Jn 6⁶⁶ 19¹² etc. (unless causal), *ἀπό δὲ τῶν ἡμερῶν Ἰωάννου* Mt 11¹², *ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου* Mt 25³⁴ Lk 11⁵⁰ Heb 4³ 9²⁶ Rev 13⁸ 17⁸, *ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου* Ro 1²⁰; but *ἐκ παιδιόθεν* Mk 9²¹, *ἐκ γενετῆς* Jn 9¹, *ἐκ κοιλίας μητρὸς μου* Ga 1¹⁵ (cp. LXX Isa 49¹), *ἐκ πολλῶν ἐτῶν* Ac 24¹⁰, *ἐκ τοῦ αἰῶνος* Jn 9³².

There cannot be much significance in the change in 1 Th 2⁶ οὔτε ζητοῦντες ἐξ ἀνθρώπων οὔτε ἀπ' ὑμῶν οὔτε ἀπ' ἄλλων. Vulg. ignores the distinction; in Mt 3¹⁶ ἀνέβη ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕδατος (after standing on the bank?) surely nothing different is intended from Mk's ἀναβαίνων ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος (Mk 1¹⁰).

Ἐκ: for partitive use, see pp. 208ff. As subjective gen. 2 Co 8⁷ τῇ ἐξ ὑμῶν ἐν ἡμῖν ἀγάπῃ, 9² (p⁴⁶ SBCP om *ἐξ*). One or two peculiarities confront us: it is used in a causal sense ¹ (= ὑπό):

¹ Mayser II 2, 388f. Abel § 46 b. MGr: Thumb² § 161, 5.

Mt 23²⁵ *they are full because of greed*, but perhaps *full of greed*, Jn 4⁶ *because of the journey*, 2 Co 7⁹ ζημιωθῆτε ἐξ ἡμῶν, 13⁴ ἐξ ἀσθενείας, 1 Pt 2¹² *because of good deeds*, 1 Jn 4⁶ ἐκ τούτου γινώσκομεν (or instr.), Rev 8¹³ οὐαὶ . . . ἐκ, 16^{10. 11. 12} *because of*. The instrumental use is similar: class. σωτηρία ἐκ τινος, θήσσω ἐκ τινος, and τὰ ἐξ Ἑλλήνων τείχεα; Lk 16⁹ *make friends ἐκ τοῦ μαμωνᾶ*, Jn 6⁶⁵ Rev 2¹¹ (like the class. δωρηθὲν ἐκ θεῶν, Ac 26²³ (or local?), Ga 3⁸ ἐκ πίστεως *by means of?*, 1 Jn 4⁶ (see causal), Rev 18³ ἐκ . . . ἐπλούτησαν; papyri in Abel § 46 b. Rev 15² τοὺς νικῶντας ἐκ τοῦ θηρίου is probably a compressed phrase (sc. *by separating themselves from or and delivered themselves from*). It is difficult to decide in Ro 1⁴ ὀρισθέντος υἱοῦ θεοῦ . . . ἐξ ἀναστάσεως whether ἐκ is causal or temporal. A frequent use in Paul is the sense *belonging to* (-ists, of a sect or school): ὁ ἐκ or οἱ ἐκ Ro 3²⁶ οἱ ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ *believers in Jesus* (the noun after ἐκ expresses the character or standards of these men), 4¹⁴ οἱ ἐκ νόμου *nomistae*, 16 *who share Abraham's faith*, Ga 3^{7. 9}, 3¹⁰ *believers in justification by works*. Outside Paul (without def. art.): Jn 8²³ etc. 1 Jn 3¹⁹ *God-ists, devil-ists, world-ists*, also Jn 8^{44. 47} 15¹⁹ 17¹⁴ 1 Jn 3^{8. 10. 12}. Indeed ἐκ in general is very common in the Johannine writings.

Πρό has 48 instances, mainly temporal, e.g. Mt 5¹² 8²⁹ Lk 2²¹ Jn 11⁵⁵ (D has πρὶν τὸ πάσχα in accordance with the general preference for accus. with prepositions in Hell. Greek), 1 Co 2⁷. It is local: Ac 5²³ vl., 12⁶ (vl. πρὸς c. dat.),¹⁴ Jas 5⁹. Preference: Jas 5¹² 1 Pt 4⁸, perhaps Col 1¹⁷ (or temporal). For the Hellenistic construction πρὸ ἐξ ἡμερῶν τοῦ πάσχα (Jn 12¹), πρὸ ἐτῶν δεκατεσσάρων (2 Co 12²) etc., see Wackernagel II 194f: like the Latin means of dating with *ante*, e.g. *ante diem tertium Nonas Maias* (the second day before the nones of May). But the earliest exx. are before the date of Latin influence: LXX Am 1¹ πρὸ δύο ἐτῶν τοῦ σεισμοῦ, Herm S. VI 5, 3, Hom. Clem. 9¹, 13¹¹, Did. 7⁴ (see also Jannaris § 1651, K-G I 391, Johannessohn DGPS 188f, Moulton Proleg. 100ff. See previous chapter, p. 248).

(b) Dative

'Ev. See pp. 254–7 for εἰς and ἐν confused. In spite of the substitution of εἰς by some authors, ἐν is the most popular

preposition in NT. J. H. Moulton described it as "a maid of all work" in late Greek and thought the increasing vagueness of its meaning contributed to its ultimate disappearance; in MGr it no longer survives in the spoken language. In the Koine all the prepositions become increasingly elastic and their sense has to be determined more often by the context than was earlier the case. This is notably so with εἰς, ἐν and ἐκ. Such elasticity makes it dangerous to press doctrinal distinctions as though our authors were writing class. Greek. For idiomatic translation, either the immediate context or else parallel usage of the prepositional expression in other contexts will be decisive. But *in* or *among* is still the primary meaning in Hell. Greek, even NT Greek.

Three factors contributed to the popularity and extension of usage in NT: first, the growing lack of clarity in the dat. case; then, the influence of the LXX, wherein ἐν had been widely employed to render the much-used D ; but equally important is the influence of Christian ideas, especially in phrases peculiar and vital to the Christian religion, like *in Christ*.

The meanings in NT may be classified: (1) Local: (a) *in* etc., actual and metaphorical, (b) *into* etc. (praegnans); see p. 257. (2) Temporal: *in*, *at*, *within*, *during*. (3) Peculiarly Christian usages, especially *in the Lord*, *in Christ*. After this we reach controversial meanings, where the idea of *within* is seldom satisfactory, and these together represent about one-third of all the NT instances: (4) Circumstance and instrument. (5) As a dat. of advantage or disadvantage. (6) Various occasional uses: reference, rate, etc.

(1) *Local*: (a) The meaning which still predominates in NT is *within*, *inside*, *on*, *at*, *among*, but a distinction must be made between those in a material sense and those in a metaphorical sense. Among the former are quotation-formulae: *in the book* (ἐν τῷ ᾠστῆί Ro 9²⁵), *in the Law*, *in David* (Heb 4⁷), ἐν Ἡλίᾳ *in the story of Elijah* Ro 11², of which there are class. exx. (K-G I 431, 462-6): as well as *among* and *in the house of* (ἐν τοῖς τοῦ Lk 2⁴⁹), and *at home* (Mk 2¹ 1 Co 11³⁴ 14³⁵), and the class. ἐν μέσῳ; there is also the notion of being *inside* clothing or equipment (Mk 12³⁸ Jn 20¹² Jas 2²) which is class. Among the metaphorical are phrases like *in the heart*, *in secret*, *in prayers*, *in thoughts*, *in the mortal body*, *on the right hand*, *in the mouth*, *in*

glory, in the vine, in a race, in the church. There are some borderline cases: 1 Co 7¹⁷ may be *in* or *to* the churches. Ac 17³¹ ἐν ἀνδρῶν may be *in the person of* or may be instrumental. There may be a causal ἐν in Ro 1²⁴ (*because of the lusts of their hearts*);¹ so also 1²¹.

The local sense is slightly extended to denote *in the sphere of*, especially of God, Christ, and the gospel, and probably also of the Spirit's sanctification (1 Pt 1²) and the Name. The following are some spheres *in* which individuals, Christians or not, are mentioned: the gospel, the Law, darkness, circumcision, uncircumcision, grace (but in Ro 5² it may be instrum.), new life, death, sin, the flesh, the spirit, a calling, Adam (for in 1 Co 15²² it is not instrumental; Adam is a representative man *in whom* all mankind is viewed), the Christian wife or husband (1 Co 7¹⁴ also representative). 1 Co 7¹⁵ might be *in the sphere of* (Christian) peace, or probably *into* peace. Ro has 23 exx. of this use, and 1 Co has 14.

(b) *into*: see p. 257.

(2) *Temporal meanings*: ἐν often reinforces the dat. of time, both point of time and duration. The first may be rendered *in*, *at*, or *on*; the second by *within* or *during*, e.g. *in one day* (1 Co 10⁶), and this may be the way to take ἐν ὀλίγῳ in Ac 26²⁸ (*in a short time*), although *by a short argument* (scil. λόγῳ) is not impossible. Note here also ἐν with the articular infin., especially with Luke; most NT exx. have the temporal significance, and sometimes it is the class. meaning: e.g. *in rowing* Mk 6⁴⁸, *in the abounding* Lk 12¹⁵, *in turning* Ac 3²⁶, and also Mt 13⁴ Mk 6⁴⁸ Ro 3⁴ 15¹⁸ Ga 4¹⁸. All these are present infin. and the meaning is usually *while*, but with aor. infin. *when* or *after* (e.g. Lk 9³⁶). However, this is not invariable, because the aor. construction in 1 Co 11²¹ must mean *while you are eating* or *in eating*.

(3) *Peculiarly Christian usages*: the phrases *in Christ, in the Lord*, difficult to define, occur in Ro, for instance, 21 times and in 1 Co 21 times. The inventiveness of Christian usage is seen also in their frequent resort to similar expressions, such as *in the truth, in the Spirit, in the Name*. Sometimes Paul says we are *in Christ* (or the Spirit), and sometimes that Christ (or the Spirit) is *in us*: once indeed he says both in the same sentence,

¹ H. A. A. Kennedy, *Exp. T.* xxviii, 322, argues for this.

Ro 8⁹ *you are not in the flesh but in the Spirit, if the Spirit of God dwells in you.* Such ideas seem to be mutually exclusive and it is tempting in view of contemporary Greek to translate the preposition simply *belongs to* or *with*. However, full weight must be given to the mystical conception of being *in Christ*¹, inside a new sphere of experience and spiritual existence, so that the early Christian could define it illogically and experientially as Christ being *in me*. In no other way is the ἐν of the Johannine epistle to be explained: *in* (not *with*) God is no darkness; men walk *in the sphere of* either darkness or light, truth or lies, love or hate; his word is *in us*, his love is made perfect *in us*, we abide *in God* and he abides *in us* (*with* is inadequate). It would be misleading to explain this as God *with us* or *for us*, and we *with him*; it is more profound. This applies to all other Christian experiences: hope, consecration, peace. It would not be safe to ignore the primary force of the preposition in any of these. They are states in which the believer moves. It is legitimate to take Eph 4⁴ 1 Th 4⁷ 1 Co 7¹⁵ as instances of *constructio praegnans*; but then the translation is *into*, not simply *to*. Paul carefully distinguishes ἐπί from ἐν in 1 Th 4⁷ and has a reason for the change from one preposition to the other. It is misleading in Col 3²⁰ to render *pleasing TO the Lord*; Paul means that obedience to parents is fit and proper *in that state of grace* in which the Christian now lives. In Paul, *to* after εὐάρεστος is simple dat., not ἐν, and we would expect only the dat. here if *to* is meant; moreover, the parallel with ἐν κυρίῳ, in the command to women just above, would be lost; for just above it can only mean *in the Lord*. We perceive then that it is from theology and Biblical syntax, and not from comparative syntax, that light is shed on this peculiar relationship expressed by ἐν; to compare non-Biblical parallels is largely irrelevant. Internal syntax-study reveals for the NT that πιστεύω is followed by εἰς or ἐπί or simple dat. when it means *believe in* someone or something; when the meaning is *believe someone*, it has the simple dat. The instances with ἐν are predicated of Christ or the gospel and mean *in the sphere of* Mk 1¹⁵ Jn 3¹⁵ vl. 2.

¹ A. Deissmann, *Die nt. Formel "in Christo Jesu"*, Marburg, 1892. Oepke in Kittel WB II 534 n. Zerwick § 88.

² The same is probably true of πιστις ἐν: Ro 3²⁵ Col 1². 4 Eph 1¹. 15 1 Ti 3¹³ 2 Ti 3¹⁵ either *the belief of those who are in Christ*, or *Christ's personal faith*. (In Eph 3¹² the object after πιστις is expressed by a gen.)

With καλέω in 1 Co 7¹⁸ the phrase does not mean *to uncircumcise* but *while he was uncircumcised*; and 7²⁴ *let each remain in the state he was in when he was called*. Therefore in 7²² (ἐν κυρίῳ κληθείς) it is the less likely that the meaning is called *to or by the Lord*. Moreover, the presence of another preposition besides ἐν in Col 3¹⁵ indicates that here ἐν cannot mean *to* but must denote membership *within* the Body. Elsewhere in NT εἰς is used with καλέω for inviting *to* weddings, fellowship, eternal life, and glory; and ἐπί with dat. for inviting *to* liberty and impurity (nine times in all). In Ro 6¹¹ there is the simple dat. as well as ἐν: ζῶντας δὲ τῷ θεῷ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. When Paul means *to live to*, and not *in the sphere of*, he uses the simple dat.: Ga 2¹⁹, Ro 6¹⁰, 14⁷. 8, 2 Co 5¹⁵; and when he means *to live by* he uses ἐκ: 1 Co 9¹⁴ 2 Co 13⁴. 4 and OT quotations. There can be no question about the meaning of ἐν with ζάω in Ga 2²⁰ Ph 1²² *in the flesh*, Col 2²⁰ *in this world*, Ti 2¹² *in the present age*. For *to* with φανερώω the dat. is used; ἐν means *in, in the sphere of*. So with παρρησιάζομαι.

(4) *Circumstance and instrument*: see pp. 241, 252f.

(5) *Advantage or disadvantage*. No doubt occasionally ἐν c. dat. stands pleonastically for the normal dat., *to or for*¹ (sometimes in Attic poetry): *did to him* Mt 17¹², *done to me* Mk 14⁶, *speak to the perfect* 1 Co 2⁶, *veiled to those* 2 Co 4³, *to me* (perhaps *through me*) Ga 1¹⁶. *To the churches* is possible in 1 Co 7¹⁷ 2 Co 8¹ 2 Th 1⁴, but *within* is not impossible; *among* is possible Lk 2¹⁴ Ac 4¹² (the sphere of activity is emphasized). *Among* is possible Ro 10²⁰, where the presence of the preposition depends on the variant readings; 1st time p⁴⁷ BDFG; 2nd time BD). It may well be that in 1 Co 14¹¹ ἐν (SBA) was inserted by Paul in order to prevent λαλῶν being taken closely with ἐμοῖ, but it is omitted by some good authorities (p⁴⁶ DFG Clem. Alx. Chrys.). Jas 5³. 5 ἐν not equivalent to a plain dat. (*treasure for the last days, for a day of slaughter*) but εἰς of Greek OT is deliberately altered to ἐν, since we are now *in* the last days. Jude¹ (difficult): the preposition may be displaced, but *beloved in God* in the Christian mystical sense is reasonable. Ac 20³² not simply a general statement that God's grace gives an inheritance *to* those who are sanctified, but that he will give to these

¹ Zerwick § 90.

particular saints at Ephesus, whose pastors Paul is addressing, an inheritance *among* all the sanctified, emphasizing the corporate nature of the Church *within* which these believers have their place¹.

(6) *Various occasional usages.* There are still a few phrases which elude classification. There is the *ἐν* which, as in the papyri, seems to mean *amounting to, at the rate of*, in the parable of the Sower: *sixtyfold, a hundredfold* Mk 4^{8, 20}, and the quotation at Ac 7¹⁴. A meaning *consisting in ordinances* Eph 2¹⁵ can be supported from the papyri, and this seems right at 1 Co 4²⁰: RSV *the kingdom . . . does not consist in talk*. For *ἐν* = occupied in (1 Ti 4¹⁵ Col 4²) we have papyrus support. It is permissible to classify a number of phrases as dat. of reference: *concerning or with reference to*. In Ro 8³⁷ we are said to be conquerors *with regard to* all these things: 11² *about Elijah*. So also 14²² 15¹³ 16² 1 Co 15. 5. 7. 10 32¹ 4² 7¹⁵ 9¹⁵ 12⁶ 15^{28, 41, 58}. A variety of interpretations is possible at Col 2¹⁵ (1) local *in him, or on it* (the cross), (2) instrum. *by means of him or by means of it* (the cross; cp. Eph 2¹⁶).

Σύν: *including* in Attic Greek (*μετά* *with*). Ionic and Hellenistic *with*, synom. for *μετά*. In NT, most frequent in Lk-Ac (but Ac 14⁴ οἱ μὲν ἦσαν σὺν τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις, οἱ δὲ σὺν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις has something of the inclusive meaning of *on the side of*). It is absent from Heb, 1 Pt, 2 Th, Phm, Past, Johann. Epistles, Rev², and almost absent from Jn (12² 18¹; without vl. only 21³; *μετά* very common). Only in Col does Paul make much use of it. It appears to be a synonym of *μετά*, e.g. Mt 26³⁵ σὺν σοὶ ἀποθνήσκω *in your company*, Lk 9³² Πέτρος καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ, 1 Th 4¹⁷ 5¹⁰ Ph 1²³ Jas 1¹¹.

(c) *Accusative*

This becomes the popular case with prepositions in Hellenistic Greek.

Ἀνά: ³ rare in class. Greek, only 13 times in NT and only in ἀνά μέσον, ἀνά μέρος *in turn*, and in distributive sense as a

¹ Luke does not in fact use *δίδωμι* with *ἐν* for *give to*. Out of 81 occasions when he uses this verb with a possible indirect object, 74 have simple dat., and of the seven others it is very doubtful whether the preposition means *to* in any instance: it more naturally introduces an adverbial expression and is not an indirect object.

² See Wackernagel II 154, who notes the fact that the "stylistic" Hebrews and the "vulgar" Rev. shares this aversion to *σύν*.

³ K.-G I 473f. Tycho Mommsen, *Beitr. z. Lehre von den griech. Präp.*, Berlin 1895, 381. Mayser II 2, 401ff. Krebs Polyb. 33f. Preisigke s.v. Moulton Einl. 170. Radermacher² 20, 72, 138, 140, 143, 145.

particle, *each*: ἕχων ἀνά πτέρυγας ἕξ Rev 4⁸, and as a distributive preposition: Mk 6⁴⁰ AL (but SBD κατά) Lk 9¹⁴ 10¹ Jn 2⁶ (Hellenistic).

Εἰς: ¹ “une des prépositions les plus riches en surprises” (Psichari 178). See pp. 253–256.

Its use is very extensive and it is encroaching on the functions of other prepositions, especially ἐν.

(1) In its normal local sense it is used with a variety of verbs of *coming, going, etc.*, when the verb indicates direction, and so is used of motion into a place or state. Mk 14⁵⁴ ἕως ἔσω εἰς τὴν αὐλήν. It occurs also with verbs like πέμπω ἀποστέλλω παραβάλλω ἀποδημέω καταλύω ἄγω (and compounds): so Lk 21¹² παραδιδόντες εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς, 2 Ti 4¹⁸ σώσει εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ, 1 Pt 3²⁰ εἰς ἣν ὄλιγοι . . . διεσώθησαν.

(2) Distributive εἰς with numbers = *fold, up to*: Mk 4⁸ εἰς τριάκοντα (v.l. ἐν or τὸ ἐν).

(3) Purposive εἰς, with τέλος ² (*with a view to the end, fully*) Lk 18⁵ Jn 13¹ LXX Barn Herm, P. Tebt. III 793 xi 8 τὸν (sic) Δωρίωνος δεξιὸν εἰς τέλος ἐξέτεμεν; with τὸ παντελές Lk 13¹¹; with κενόν Paul (class. διὰ κενῆς, as in LXX Jb and Ps) 1 Th 3⁵ Diodorus, LXX Pr; with μάτην (on analogy of εἰς κενόν). Otherwise purposive εἰς Mt 8³⁴ (εἰς ὑπάντησιν), 27⁷, Mk 14 Ac 2³⁸ etc. εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, Mk 14⁸, Lk 2³² LXX, 21¹³, Jn 9³⁹ εἰς κρίμα, Ro 5¹⁸ εἰς κατάκριμα . . . εἰς δικαίωσιν, 10¹, 4. 10, 13⁴ εἰς τὸ ἀγαθόν *for your good*, 1 Co 14²², Ph 1¹⁹ εἰς σωτηρίαν (LXX Jb 13¹⁶), Col 3¹⁰ εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν, ¹⁵ εἰρήνην . . . εἰς ἣν, Ti 3¹⁴, Heb 6⁶ εἰς μετανοίαν, 9²⁶, Jas 5³ εἰς μαρτύριον ὑμῶν, 1 Pt 1⁵, 2²¹, 3⁹; P. Ryl. II 174¹⁵ εἰς ἀθέτησιν καὶ ἀκύρωσιν *to be annulled and cancelled*; NB εἰς τοῦτο completed by ἵνα or ὅπως, or infn. clause: Jn 18³⁷ Ac 26¹⁶ Ro 9¹⁷.

(4) εἰς for Heb. לְ Mt 21⁴⁶, εἰς τί = τίς? Mt 14³¹.

(5) Some contexts would certainly suit a causal sense:³ Mt 3¹¹ *because of repentance* (so some modern translators); 10⁴¹; 12⁴¹ = Lk 11³² μετενόησαν εἰς τὸ κήρυγμα Ἰωνᾶ: they repented *because of* the preaching of Jonah (but *at* is sufficient); Ac 2³⁸ *be baptized εἰς ἄφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν on the basis of* (but *with a view to* is sufficient, if your theology is satisfied), Ac 7⁵³; Ro 4²⁰ *on account of* the promises of God, Abraham did not waver (but *looking to* is sufficient); 11³² God has imprisoned all *because of disobedience*; 2 Ti 2²⁶ God gave them repentance *because they knew the truth* (but purposive εἰς is better); Ti 3¹⁴ to maintain good works,

¹ K.G I 468ff. Krebs Polyb. 106. Rossberg 30ff. Johannessohn DGPS 293–305. Moulton Einl. 93ff. Radermacher² 20f, 122, 128, 135f, 140, 146.

² Bauer s.v. εἰς 3. Mayser II 2, 419, 570. Preisigke s.v. τέλος.

³ On the possibility of causal εἰς in NT, see J. R. Mantey in *JBL* 70, 1951, 45ff, 309ff, and Zorell's *Lexicon s.v.*

because of the compelling need of them; Heb 12⁷ you are enduring because of discipline (but as a discipline is sufficient); 1 Jn 5¹⁰. Mantey brought forward examples from Hellenistic Greek in support of a causal sense for εἰς, but some of them can be taken in a purposive way. By way of reply, R. Marcus observed that if Mantey is right to interpret these NT passages causally his support must come from theology rather than linguistics.¹ In Mt 14³¹ Mk 15³⁴ εἰς τί is not strictly = διὰ τί (Mt 9¹⁴ Mk 2¹⁸) but is in order to what rather than because of what. Hardly any of the Hellenistic parallels brought forward by Mantey are convincing, as Marcus has shown.

II. WITH TWO CASES: GEN. AND ACCUS.

Διά: ² c. gen.

Through, place Mk 9³⁰ διὰ τῆς Γαλιλαίας, time Lk 5⁵ δι' ἑλης νυκτός, Heb 2¹⁵ διὰ παντός τοῦ ζῆν, 1 Mac 12²⁷ 2 Mac 13¹⁰ 4 Mac 3⁷; unclass. is the meaning the period of time within which something takes place: Mt 26⁶¹ Mk 14⁶⁸ διὰ τριῶν ἡμερῶν within three days, Lk 9³⁷ D διὰ τῆς ἡμέρας in the course of the day, Ac 1³ during forty days (not continuously, but now and then). Of agency:³ Ro 11³⁶ δι' αὐτοῦ (creation), 1 Co 1⁹ 12⁸ Ga 1¹ Phm⁷ Heb 2¹⁰ 13¹¹ 1 Pt 2¹⁴. Of manner: 1 Ti 2¹⁵ σωθήσεται δὲ διὰ τῆς τεκνογονίας shall be kept safe throughout childbirth (temp.) or shall be saved by means of (Moule 56), 1 Pt 3²⁰ διεσώθησαν δι' ὕδατος (attendant circumstances or environment), Heb 3¹⁶ οἱ ἐξεληθόντες ἐξ Αἰγύπτου διὰ Μωϋσεως, Ac 15²⁷ διὰ λόγου openly (as opp. to by letter, ³² διὰ λόγου πολλοῦ at length, with much talk, Ro 2²⁷ with all your scripture and circumcision, 4¹¹ (Schrenk in Kittel WB I 765) believers for all their uncircumcision, 14²⁰ with offence, Ac 24², Ro 8²⁵, 1 Co 16³, 2 Co 2⁴, 3¹¹, 5⁷, 6⁸, 10⁹, Ga 3¹⁹, but not 4¹³ (not as vulg. per, but propter), Col 1²², Eph 6¹⁸ with all possible, 1 Ti 2¹⁰ 4⁵. 14 2 Ti 2² in the presence of, Heb 9¹², 13²², 1 Jn 5⁶ 2 Jn 1², 1 Th 4¹⁴ τοὺς κοιμηθέντας διὰ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ with Jesus. In an urgent petition = by (Latin per, Attic πρὸς c. gen.): Ro 12¹ παρακαλῶ ὑμᾶς διὰ τῶν οἰκτιρῶν τοῦ θεοῦ, 15³⁰, 1 Co 1¹⁰ 2 Co 10¹ διὰ τῆς πραότητος καὶ ἐπιεικείας τοῦ Χριστοῦ. Uncertain meaning: Ac 3¹⁶ ἡ πίστις ἣ δι' αὐτοῦ faith which is caused by him (author) or faith in him (circumstantial), 2 Pt 3⁵.

c. accus.

Through (local), only poetical in class. Greek, but Hellenistic prose: Lk 17¹¹ only, SBL, διήρχετο διὰ μέσον . . . : never Polyb. (Krebs 68f) or LXX (Johannessohn DGPS 241, n. 1). Elsewhere consecutive on account of, e.g. Mk 6²⁸ Ac 18² 28² Rev 12¹¹ 13¹⁴; but sometimes there

¹ JBL 71, 1952, 44.

² K.G I 480ff. Krebs Polyb. 65. Rossberg 37f. Mayser II 2, 419ff. Johannessohn DGPS 235. Radermacher² 135 (instrum.), 138 (διά ~ ἐνεκα), 142 (accus. instrum.). 145 (διά ~ ἐν). Moulton Einl. 169ff. Moule 54-58.

³ Mayser II 2, 421ff. Ljungvik BSSVS 29ff. Johannessohn 237.

are indications of a later final sense, denoting purpose (ἐνεκα in class. Greek)¹ = γιά MGr for: Mt 24²², Mk 2²⁷ τὸ σάββατον διὰ τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐγένετο, Jn 11⁴² 12³⁰, Ro 3²⁵ διὰ τὴν πάρεσιν τῶν προγεγονότων ἁμαρτημάτων *with a view to*, 4²⁵ δς παρεδόθη διὰ τὰ παραπτώματα ἡμῶν (*because of*) καὶ ἠγέρθη διὰ τὴν δικαίωσιν ἡμῶν (*with a view to*), 11²⁸ etc.

Κατά: ² more frequent c. accus. than gen.

c. gen.

Against (hostile) Mt 12³⁰, Mk 9⁴⁰, 14⁵⁵ κατὰ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, Lk 11²³ Ro 8³¹. Local, down from Mt 8³², Ac 27¹⁴ ἔβαλεν κατ' αὐτῆς ἄνεμος τυφωνικός (*down from Crete? or against the ship?* The first may be better topographically), 1 Co 11⁴ etc.; throughout (Hellenistic) Lk 4¹⁴ καθ' ὅλης τῆς περιχώρου, 23⁵, Ac 9³¹. 42 10³⁷. Special uses: 2 Co 8² ἡ κατὰ βάθους πτωχεῖα *profound poverty (from the depths or down to the depths)* Mt 26⁶³ Heb 6¹³. 16 with ὄμνυμι.

c. accus., various senses (generally as class.):

1. For possessive or subjective gen. (from local sense *spectans ad* to metaph. *pertinans ad*), frequ. in Hell. Greek: Ac 17²⁸ οἱ καθ' ὑμᾶς ποιηταὶ *your poets*, 18¹⁵ νόμου τοῦ καθ' ὑμᾶς *your law*, 16³⁹ D, 25¹⁴ τὰ κατὰ Παῦλον *Paul's case*, Ro 1¹⁵ τὸ κατ' ἐμὲ πρόθυμον *as far as I am concerned*, 9¹¹ ἡ κατ' ἐκλογὴν πρόθεσις τοῦ θεοῦ *God's purpose of choosing*. Perhaps the Gospel headings come under this category: i.e. of *Matthew*; this is found with the authorship of books (2 Mac 2¹³ κατὰ Νεσμῖαν). 2. But more probably *in accordance with*: Ro 8²⁶. 27 2 Co 7⁹. 11 κατὰ θεόν *in a godly way*, 11²¹ κατὰ φύσιν *in accordance with nature*, 1 Co 15³ κατὰ τὰς γραφάς 2 Co 10³ κατὰ σάρκα *in accordance with material standards*, Ga 3¹⁵ *in human fashion*, Eph 4²⁴ *in God's image*, Heb 9⁹. 3. Distributive: Mt 27¹⁵ Mk 15⁸ καθ' ἑορτὴν *at each feast*, Heb 7²⁷ *daily*, 9²⁵ *yearly*, Mk 6⁴⁰ κατὰ ἑκατὸν καὶ κατὰ πενήκοντα SBD *one hundred each*, 1 Co 14³¹ καθ' ἓνα *one by one*, Eph 5³³ οἱ καθ' ἓνα *individually*, Heb 9⁵ κατὰ μέρος *in detail*. The phrase κατὰ εἰς or καθεὶς (Mk 14¹⁹ Jn 8⁹ Ro 12⁵) has now become stereotyped as an adverb. More difficult to assess are: Mt 19³ κατὰ πᾶσαν αἰτίαν (*causal*), Mk 13⁸ κατὰ τόπους *in places*, Lk 1¹⁸ κατὰ τί *in view of what? whereby (or causal?)*, 15¹⁴ κατὰ τὴν χώραν ἐκείνην *throughout that land*, Ac 12¹ *at (temporal)*, 25²³ τοῖς κατ' ἑξοχὴν *eminent men (a stock phrase for par excellence)*, 1 Co 7⁶ *as a concession*, 2 Co 8³ κατὰ δύναμιν *according to their power*, 8¹² *in proportion to what one has*, 10⁷ τὰ κατὰ πρόσωπον *what is in front of you*, Heb 7¹⁶ κατὰ νόμον . . . κατὰ δύναμιν *by virtue of*.

Μετά: ³ c. gen.:

Its frequency relative to that of σύν:

¹ H. G. Meecham, *Exp. T. L.* no. 12, Sept. 1939, 564.

² K-G I 475ff. Krebs Polyb. 128. Mayser II 2, 427ff. Johannessohn DGPS 245ff. Radermacher² 139ff. Moulton Einl. 158 (frequency), 169f.

³ K-G I 505ff. Tycho Mommsen, *Beitr. z. Lehre von d. griech. Pap.* 256f. Krebs 58ff. Rossberg 8f. (frequency), 49-50 (use). Mayser II 2, 440ff. Johannessohn DGPS 202-216. Moulton Einl. 158 (frequency), 170, 172. Radermacher² 128, 138, 140f 145, 146.

	Ptol. texts (Rossberg)	Polyb. (Krebs)	Lucian	NT (Moulton)
μετά	1·5	6·7	7	3·5
σύν	1	1	1	1

Ionic influence accounts for the greater relative frequency of σύν in Ptol. pap. and NT. On the whole, μετά far outweighs σύν in NT, but in some individual books σύν holds its own (e.g. Ac). The accus. is on the decline: thus in Ptol. pap. gen.: accus. is 2·5:1 (iii/b.c.), 3:1 (ii/b.c.), 10+:1 (i/b.c.). The NT has 3·6:1 (361:100), LXX Ezek β 14·5:1, Ps 16:1.

(1) *amongst* Mk 1¹³ ἦν μετά τῶν θηρίων, 10³⁰ μετά διωγμῶν, Lk 22²⁷ μετά ἀνόμων ἐλογίσθη, 24⁵ μετά τῶν νεκρῶν, Jn 11⁵⁶, 1 Ti 4¹⁴ μετά ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν (impersonal for person: *among those who laid on their hands*), but perhaps (2), Heb 12¹⁴ 2 Ti 2²² εἰρήνην διωκέω μετά not *peace with*, but *in company with* (Foerster in Kittel WB II 412, 415), 1 Jn 4¹⁷ τετελειῶται ἡ ἀγάπη μεθ' ἡμῶν.

(2) *with*, of mutual participation (e.g. κρίνομαι 1 Co 6⁶, λαλέω Jn 4²⁷; also πολεμέω, εἰρηνεύω, συμφωνέω, etc.) or accompanying circumstances (e.g. μεθ' ὄρκου Mt 14⁷) or instrument (e.g. Lk 22⁶² ἐξήλθατε μετά μαχαίρων). In contrast to σύν, the meaning of μετά is never *in addition to*. In composition with a verb, when the meaning is *with*, συν- or ὁμο- is used, and not μετα- (except with μετέχω, μεταδίδωμι and μεταλαμβάνω).

c. accus., only *after* (temporal): an exception may be Heb 9³ μετά τὸ δεῦτερον καταπέτασμα. Ac 1⁵ etc.

Περί: ¹—*about*, literal or metaph.

c. gen. extremely common.

Esp. metaph. with such verbs as *think, care, etc.*: Mt 9³⁶ ἐσπλαγχνίσθη περὶ αὐτῶν, Mt 20²⁴ Mk 10⁴¹ ἠγανάκτησαν περὶ, Lk 21⁸ θαυμάζω, Jn 7¹³, 9¹⁷, 1 Th 5²⁶ προσεύχεσθε περὶ ἡμῶν, 1 Pt 5⁷ αὐτῷ μέλει περὶ ὑμῶν, Lk 24²⁷ τὰ περὶ ἑαυτοῦ, Ac 18²⁵ Ph 2²⁰. Absolutely, at the beginning of the sentence: 1 Co 7¹⁻²⁵ 8¹ 12¹ 16¹. Also *on behalf of, on account of* (= ὑπέρ) class. and Hell., in the debatable phrase Mt 26²⁸ τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης τὸ περὶ (D ὑπέρ) πολλῶν ἐκχυνόμενον (ὑπέρ in parallels of Mk, Lk, Paul), Heb 10²⁶ περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν (same sense 10¹²

¹ K-G I 491ff. Krebs 98ff. Rossberg 8f (frequ.), 41ff (use). Kuhring 15. Mayser II 2, 445ff. Johannessohn DGPS 219ff. Radermacher² 118, 125, 135, 139, 140, 141, 143, 145, 146. Moulton Einl. 158. 170. Moule 62f.

ὑπὲρ ἀμαρτιῶν); Heb 5^{1.3} ὑπὲρ . . . ὑπὲρ . . . : then περί . . . περί . . . περί . . . , Jn 17⁹, Ac 26¹ (B ὑπὲρ), 1 Co 1¹³ D*B p⁴⁶ ἐσταυρώθη περί ὑμῶν, Ga 1⁴ (S^cB ὑπὲρ). Perhaps with περισσός in mind, AV has *above all things* in 3 Jn² περί πάντων . . . εὐοδοῦσθαι (*in every respect*), but it may correspond to the salutation which occurs in papyrus letters: πρό μὲν πάντων εὐχομαί σε ὑγιαίνειν *before all*.

c. accus. rarer :

About literally (local and temporal), Mk 4¹⁰ Lk 22⁴⁹ οἱ περί αὐτόν *his disciples* or *those who were round him*, but οἱ περί Παῦλον (Ac 13¹⁸) includes Paul, as in class. idiom. But πρός τὰς περί Μάρθαν καὶ Μαρίαν (Jn 11¹⁹ p⁴⁵ ⊕ AC² Γ) denotes Martha and Mary only (as in later Greek; see Bauer s.v. 2 δ). Temporal: Mt 20³ etc. περί τρίτην ὥραν *about the third hour*. Also *concerning* with ἐπιθυμῆμαι (Mk 4¹⁹), περισπάομαι, θορυβάζομαι (Lk 10^{40f}), τοὺς περί τοιαῦτα ἐργάτας (Ac 19²⁵); the general tendency, culminating in MGr, was for the prepositions to be followed only by the accus., and already in Aristotle there are instances where περί c. accus. is used for the Attic περί c. gen. (Wackernagel II 215); so Paul, Ph 2²³ τὰ περί ἐμέ *my affairs*, exactly as 2²⁰ τὰ περί ὑμῶν *your affairs*, 1 Ti 1¹⁹ περί τὴν πίστιν ἐναυάγησαν, 6^{4.21}, 2 Ti 2¹⁸ 3⁸, Ti 2⁷ περί πάντα *in all respects*.

Πρίν :

= πρό, c. acc. Mk 15⁴² D πρὶν σάββατον, Jn 11⁵⁵ D πρὶν τὸ πάσχα; c. gen. (as Hell. Greek) Mt 26³⁴ p^{37.45} L fam¹ πρὶν (ῆ) ἀλεκτοροφωνίας; acc. or gen.? Jn 8⁵⁸ D lat πρὶν Ἀβραάμ.

Ὑπὲρ : ¹ = *over*, but not locally in NT (except Heb 9⁵ D* E* for ὑπεράνω); locally in papyri (Mayser II 2, 461). Comparatively rare in Ptol. pap. (13th place among true prepositions) and Herodotus (16th place) and NT (12th place). The accus. is comparatively rare: Ptol. 20 : 1, LXX 239 : 211 (1 : 1), NT 6 : 1. c. gen.

For, on behalf of (Mk 9⁴⁰ 1 Co 4⁶), often oppos. to κατά in the same passages; περί is often substituted, but there is also the reverse change of περί to ὑπὲρ for *concerning* (e.g. λέγω ὑπὲρ)², which is almost confined to Paul in NT: Jn 1³⁰ ὑπὲρ οὗ ἐγὼ εἶπον (corrected to περί S^cAC³L), Ac 8²⁴ *pray* ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ, 2 Co 1⁸ ἀγνοεῖν . . . ὑπὲρ τῆς θλίψεως, 8²³ ὑπὲρ Τίτου *as for Titus*, 12⁸ *about this*, 1 Th 3² παρακαλέσαι ὑπὲρ τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν *to encourage you concerning your faith*, 2 Th 2¹ ἐρωτάω ὑπὲρ, Ph 4¹⁰ φρονέω ὑπὲρ *think upon*; note the two prepositions together in the same sense Eph 6^{18f} προσευχόμενοι περί πάντων τῶν ἁγίων καὶ ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ. Etc.

¹ K-G I 486ff. Schwyzer II 518f. Krebs 40ff. Rossberg 8f, 40f. Kuhring §§ 19, 20. Johannessohn DGPS 216ff. Radermacher² 139 (ὑπὲρ = ἀντί), 140, 143 (frequency). Moulton Einl. 158 (relative frequ.) 170f. Mayser II 2, 456ff.

² Mayser II 2, 457ff. Johannessohn DGPS 217f.

in Paul. The boundary between *ἀντί* and *ὑπέρ* c. gen. is very narrow (substitution), necessarily so because what is done *on behalf of one* is often done *in one's stead*; the compound of *ἀντί* occurs closely with *ὑπέρ* in 1 Ti 2⁶ ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων; Mk 14²⁴ blood is shed ὑπὲρ (but ἀντί in 10⁴⁵), Jn 11⁵⁰, Ac 21²⁶, Ro 5⁷.⁸, 1 Co 15²⁹, 2 Co 5¹⁴. 15.²¹, Ga 3¹³, Phm¹³, 1 Ti 2⁶, Ti 2¹⁴. Adverbial ὑπέρ: 1 Co 4⁶(?) 2 Co 11²³.

III. WITH THREE CASES

Ἐπί: 1

	Polyb.	Ptol. pap.	NT	LXX Pent.	Isa.	LXX total	
gen.	1.5	4.5	1.2	2.5	1	1730	1.4
dat.	1	1	1	1	1	1219	1
acc.	3	2.5	2	3.7	2	4629	3.8

Even in class. Greek the distinctions between the cases with this preposition are difficult to define; all attempts to be dogmatic in Biblical Greek are doomed. Although all cases are largely represented, there is a tendency for the accus. to prevail, as is seen in Mk 4³⁸ (Wackernagel II 215) where D has an atticistic correction to the gen. ἐπὶ προσκεφαλαίου.

c. gen.

(1) Local, usually = upon: Mk 2¹⁰ etc. ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς; but also place to which: Mk 4²⁶ βάλῃ τὸν σκορὸν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς; Rev 14¹⁹ S (p⁴⁷ ἐπὶ c. acc.; ACP εἰς) etc.; at, by Mt 21¹⁹ ἐπὶ τῆς ὁδοῦ, etc.; in the presence of Mt 28¹⁴, Mk 13⁹ etc. (2) Metaph., over (authority, oversight), with καθίστημι and βασιλεύω, but ἐξουσία ἐπὶ c. gen. is exclusively Biblical. (3) Temporal:² Mk 2²⁶ ἐπὶ Ἀβιάθαρ ἀρχιερέως, Mt 1¹¹, Ac 11¹⁹ ΑΕ τῆς θλίψεως τῆς γενομένης ἐπὶ Στεφάνου at the time of Stephen's death (but vl. ἐπὶ c. dat. on account of), Heb 1² etc. ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν (Semitism). Mk 12²⁶ Lk 20³⁷ in the passage where.

c. dat.

(1) Local, not easy to distinguish from ἐπὶ c. accus. or gen.: before, upon Eph 1¹⁰ τὰ ἐπὶ τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς (interchangeable);

¹ K-G I 495ff. Meisterhans-Schwyzler 211, 36; 217, 29. Krebs 76. Rossberg 44f. Kuhring § 29. Johannesson DGPS 305ff. Radermacher² 125, 126, 128, 136. Moulton Einl. 173f. Moule 49f. Mayser II 2, 462ff.

² C. H. Turner, "Ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου (1 Tim. vi. 12, 13)", *JThS* 28, 1927, 270ff.

as also Ac 27⁴⁴ ἐπὶ σανίσι and ἐπὶ τινῶν τῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ πλοίου), Mt 24³³, Jn 4⁶, Mt 16¹⁸ (D acc.), Ac 8¹⁶ (D* acc.) etc. (2) More often to denote cause, especially with verbs expressing motion, and also Mt 4⁴ Lk 1⁵⁹ etc.; Ro 5¹² 2 Co 5⁴ ἐφ' ᾧ *because*,¹ Lk 5⁵ ἐπὶ δὲ τῷ ῥήματι σου. (3) Addition, Lk 3²⁰ 16²⁶ (SBL ἐν), Col 3¹⁴, Heb 8¹. (4) Condition Ro 8²⁰, 1 Co 9¹⁰, Ga 5¹³, 1 Th 4⁷, Ti 1². (5) Final Ga 5¹³ ἐπ' ἐλευθερίᾳ ἐκλήθητε, Eph 2¹⁰, Ph 3¹², 1 Th 4⁷. (6) Consecutive 2 Ti 2¹⁴. (7) Temporal Jn 4²⁷ ἐπὶ τούτῳ (S*D ἐν) *at this juncture*, 1 Co 14¹⁶, Ph 1³ ἐπὶ πάσῃ τῇ μείᾳ ὑμῶν, 2¹⁷, 4¹⁰ ἐφ' ᾧ *whereon*, Eph 4²⁶, 1 Th 3⁷, Heb 9²⁶ *at the close of the ages*, 11⁴.

c. accus. :

(1) In class. Greek it answers to question "whither", but also in Hellenistic it is interchangeable with gen. and dat. : Mk 4³⁸ (DW gen.), Mt 14²⁵ περιπατῶν ἐπὶ τὴν θάλασσαν SBW (CD gen.), but gen. in Mk 6⁴⁸ Jn 6¹⁹; Mt 14²⁶ WFG (SBDC gen.); Rev 13¹ ἐπὶ τῶν κεράτων . . . καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς κεφαλὰς; 13¹⁶, 14⁹ ἐπὶ τοῦ μετώπου . . . ἢ ἐπὶ τὴν χεῖρα (p⁴⁷ corrects to gen). Κάθηναι ἐπὶ c. accus. Rev 4², c. dat. 21⁶, c. gen 14¹⁶. (2) In metaph. sense: Lk 1³⁸ βασιλεύσει ἐπὶ; same interchange, e.g. Mt 25²¹ ἐπὶ ὀλίγα ἡς πιστός, ἐπὶ πολλῶν σε καταστήσω; it is used with σπλαγγνίζομαι *upon* (Mt 15⁸²), μοιχάομαι *with* (Mk 10¹¹, cp. LXX Je 5⁹ χρεμετίζω ἐπὶ) etc. (3) Temporal: Ac 16¹⁸ ἐπὶ πολλὰς ἡμέρας *for many days*; Mt 25⁴⁰? ἐφ' ὅσον ἐποιήσατε (vulg. *quamdium*), etc.; Ac 4⁵ ἐπὶ τὴν αὔριον (Hell. Greek: Krebs 17, Mayser II 2, 540).

Παρά ²

The most frequent after ἐν, εἰς, ἐπί in Ptol. pap. but in 12th place in NT.

The relative frequency of the cases reveals a sharp contrast between the NT and contemporary Koine.

	Hdt.	Ptol. pap.	Mk	Lk-Ac	Ro Co Ga	NT	Pent	Isa	Ps.	LXX
gen.	1.8	22.5	6	1.6	0.2	1.6	2	8	1.6	501 2.
dat.	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	191 1
acc.	3.5	2.5	7	1.5	1.3	1.2	2	1.3	1	293 1.

¹ ICC Ro. 5 p. 349. But cf. S. Lyonnet, "Le sens de ἐφ' ᾧ en Rom 5: 12 et l'exégèse des pères grecs", *Biblica* 36, 1955, 436-456.

² K-G I 509ff. Meisterhans-Schwyzler 207, 17; 219, 40. Krebs 51ff. Rossberg 51ff. Mayser II 2, 482ff. Radermacher² 126, 136, 139, 141f, 225. Moulton Einl. 158, 173. Johannesson DGPS 226-35.

c. gen. :

In class. Greek *from the side of* (so Lk 14⁵); unclass. with κατηγορέομαι Ac 22³⁰ HLP (rest ὑπό), and Mk 3²¹ οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ *his kinsfolk*.

c. dat. :

In all NT writers except Heb and Jude (but Mt 13⁵⁶ has αἱ ἀδελφαὶ πρὸς ἡμᾶς εἰσι, instead of class. Attic παρ' ἡμῖν, marking the Hellenistic preference for accus. : Wackernagel II 215); rarest of the cases: *by, beside* (nearly always personal), not of immediate neighbourhood: Jn 19²⁵; *in the house of* Lk 19⁷ Jn 14⁰ Ac 10⁶, *amongst* Rev 2¹³. Figurative: Lk 1³⁰ *with*, etc. The local παρά c. dat. has almost disappeared in NT.

c. accus. (never occurs in Johannine writings, incl. Rev, or in Cath. epistles):

Beside, in answer to questions where? and whither? But not, as frequently in class. Greek, with personal names (πρὸς instead), oppos. of κατά (metaph.) *contrary to, beyond* Ro 12⁶ 11²⁴ 1 Co 3¹¹ 2 Co 8³; *more than* Lk 13². 4 παρὰ πάντα, Ro 12⁵ 12³ 14⁵; *minus or except* Lk 5⁷ D παρὰ τι *almost*, 2 Co 11²⁴ 40 *minus one*, Herm. S VIII 1, 14; IX 19, 3; *because* 1 Co 12^{15f} οὐ παρὰ τοῦτο οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκ τοῦ σώματος *that is no reason for its not being*. Mt Mk have παρά c. accus. only in local sense.

Πρὸς¹

In 8th place of frequency in the Ptol. papyri. With regard to the use of the cases, NT and LXX are decidedly *sui generis*.

	Hdt.	Polyb.	Ptol. pap.	NT	LXX
gen.	2	0.2	0.02	0.16	23 (0.2)
dat.	1	1	1	1	104 (1)
acc.	6	15	4	116	<i>passim</i>

c. gen. :

In class. Attic πρὸς, like ὑπό, was used with all three oblique cases. But πρὸς c. gen. is found only three times in Polyb., rarely in inscriptions and in the Ptol. pap. (Mayer II 2, 493f). It occurs only 23 times in LXX

¹ K-G I 515ff. Meisterhans-Schwyzler 220. 43; 45. Wackernagel II 208. Mayer II 2, 492ff. Krebs 113ff. Rossberg 54ff. Kuhring 17, 29, 31. Johannesohn DGPS 259-71. Radermacher² 135, 136, 141, 145, 146. Moulton Einl. 173.

(Moulton Proleg. 106); in NT, only at Ac 27³⁴ τοῦτο πρὸς τῆς ὑμετέρας σωτηρίας ὑπάρχει *advantageous to* (very close to Thuc. 3, 59, 1 οὐ πρὸς τῆς ὑμετέρας δόξης τάδε).

c. dat. :

By, at (class.). Six times in NT (accus. instead): Mk 5¹¹ πρὸς τῶ δρει, Lk 19³⁷ (D acc.), Jn 18¹⁶ 20¹¹ (vl. acc.)¹² Rev 1¹³.

c. accus. : abundantly used.

In accordance with (class.): Mt 19⁸ Mk 10⁵ Lk 12⁴⁷ 1 Co 12⁷ 2 Co 5¹⁰. With verbs of saying, it illustrates the Hellenistic tendency to use prepositions in place of the simple case (pp. 236f, 251). So with verbs of coming, sending, etc. Also taking the place of παρά after εἰμι etc.: e.g. Mt 13⁵⁶ πρὸς ὑμᾶς εἰσιν, 26¹⁸.⁵⁵ vl, Mk 6³ Jn 1¹, especially Mk 9¹⁰ ἐκάρτησαν πρὸς αὐτούς, 11³¹ διελογίζοντο πρὸς αὐτούς (op. Mt 21²⁵ παρ' αὐτοῖς), Mt 21¹ πρὸς τὸ ὄρος (vl. εἰς), Mk 1³³, 2², 11¹. 4. Temporal: *about*, such phrases as πρὸς ἑσπέραν, καιρὸν, ὄραν, ὀλίγας ἡμέρας, Lk 8¹³ 24²⁹ Jn 5³⁵ Heb 12^{10f} etc. Relationship, hostile or friendly: Mt 27⁴ Jn 21²².²³ Mk 12¹² Lk 20¹⁹, Ac 28²⁵ ἀσύμφωνος, 1 Co 6¹ πρᾶγμα ἔχω πρὸς, Heb 4¹³. Purpose, result: 2 Co 10⁴ Eph 4²⁹ 1 Ti 4⁸.

ὑπό¹

In the Ptol. papyri, 12th place : in NT 10th place.

PROPORTIONS :

	Hdt.	Polyb.	Ptol. pap.	NT	Pent	Mi. Pr.	2-4 Mac	1 Mac	Isa	LXX
gen.	10·8	61	60·4	3·3	0·5	4	5	3	6	(291) 1·4
dat.	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	*
acc.	1	25	10·6	1	1	1	1	1	1	(203) 1

* Only Jb 12⁵ A.

Whereas ὑπό still occurs with dat. about eleven times in Polyb., it never (ex. Jb 12⁵ A) occurs so in LXX or NT and there is the same tendency as with πρὸς.

¹ K-G I 521ff. Meisterhans-Schwyzler 222, 50. Mayser II 2, 509ff. Krebs 47ff. Roseberg 58ff. Kuhring § 25. Johannessohn DGPS 174ff. Radermacher² 139, 142, 145. Moulton Einl. 170.

c. gen. : *by* (agent), after passive and virtually passive verbs.
c. accus. :

Under (combining the old local use of ὑπό c. gen. and dat. : Mayser II 2, 371); never in Jn (except 1⁴⁸ ὑπὸ τὴν σικκῆν) or Rev (which has ὑποκάτω). In class. temporal sense (*circa*), only Ac 5²¹ ὑπὸ τὸν ἕρθρον.

§ 5. Repetition or Omission of the Preposition¹

Both repetition and omission of the preposition before two or more phrases connected by καί is found in Ptol. pap. and NT. Polyb. is fond of repeating the preposition, especially in quotations, sometimes three or four times. The omission can sometimes be rather harsh in NT : Mt 4²⁵ ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας . . . καὶ Ἰουδαίας καὶ πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου.

Actually, repetition is more usual when each of the united ideas has to be brought into emphatic prominence; but in by far the greater majority of instances in the Ptol. papyri, especially in the unofficial style of writing, the preposition is not repeated. Repetition in any large degree is a peculiar feature of Biblical Greek². In Thucyd. book I there are only six instances of repetition, out of 25 opportunities for its occurrence, and in these six instances there is an emphasis which makes repetition necessary. Let us compare this with Biblical Greek.

	Ezek. (B-text) *	Mk	Mt	Lk	Ac	Jn	Ro I Co	Eph	Past	Rev
opportunities	93	26	35	55	56	15	24	16	24	38
repetitions	78	10	11	9	16	8	14	6	4	24

* The result is even more remarkable, assuming the AQ readings.

§ 6. Improper Prepositions

"Ἄνευ³

Only three examples in NT : Mt 10²⁹ ἄνευ τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν

¹ K-G I 548. Mayser II 2, 515f. Krebs 10f. Black AAGA² 83. See also above, Introduction, p. 4, n. 7.

² See N. Turner, "An Alleged Semitism", *Exp. T.* LXVI 8, 1955, 252-254.

³ K-G I 402, 4. Kuhring 46f. Mayser II 2, 518ff. Johannessohn DGPS 337-339. Radermacher² 140.

without the knowledge of or without the permission of, like *ἀνευ θεῶν* in Ptol. pap. (Mayser II 2, 519f) 1 Pt 3¹ 4⁹. Usually *ἀνευ* has post-positive position only after interrog. and rel. pronouns, but 3 Mac 4⁵ and Aristot. *Metaph.* 1071^a 2 are among the exceptions (Wackernagel II 199).

**Ἐνεκα*, *ἐνεκεν* ¹

= *propter* and *διὰ* c. accus. Position nearly always pre-positive in NT, following Semitic model; but post-positive in Ptol. pap. and Polyb. more than twice as often as pre-positive.

**Ἔως* and *μέχρι* (*ἄχρι*) ².

In the Ptol. pap., although these prepositions will appear with the same meaning in the same phrase, *ἔως* is much more frequent than *μέχρι* both in its temporal and local meaning. Whereas the relationship in the Ptol. papyri is 1 : 8, in Polyb. it is only 1 : 1.7. Originally *ἔως* was a conjunction (see pp. 110f), becoming a preposition in the Hell. period. It is often combined with an adverb: *πότε*, *κάτω*, *ἄρτι*, *σήμερον*; and sometimes it receives strengthening from another preposition: *ἔως πρὸς* Lk 24⁵⁰, *ἔως ἐπί* Ac 17¹⁴, *ἔως ἔξω* Ac 21⁵, *ἔως καὶ εἰς* 26¹¹, *ἔως ἔσω εἰς τὴν αὐλήν* Mk 14⁵⁴.

**Ἀχρι*(ς) occurs in Mt 24³⁸, and Lk-Ac, Paul, Heb, Rev; *μέχρι*(ς) in Mt, and occasionally in Lk, Ac, Paul, Heb; they are also conjunctions (e.g. *ἄχρις οὗ* Ro 11²⁵, *μέχρις οὗ* Mk 13³⁰). All absent in Jn, except 8⁹ S.

§ 7. Prepositional Adverbs

**Ἄμα* ³

This adv. has the dat. only at Mt 13²⁹ *ἄμα αὐτοῖς τὸν σῖτον* (D *ἄμα καὶ τ.σ. σὺν αὐτοῖς*); elsewhere *ἄμα σὺν* 1 Th 4¹⁷ 5¹⁰. Cp. *ἄμα μετ' αὐτῶν* Ditt. Syll.³ 705⁶⁷ (112 B.C.).

**Ἐγγύς*

Very frequent in NT. See p. 216.

**Ἔσω* ⁴

Mk 15¹⁶ *ἔσω τῆς αὐλῆς* (v1. *ἔσω εἰς τὴν αὐλήν*). Only used as an adv. in the Ptol. papyri (Mayser II 2, 528).

¹ K-G I 462c. Meisterhans-Schwyzler 213, 12; 215, 23-27. Mayser II 2, 520ff. N. Turner, *Vet. Test.* 5, 1955, 210f.

² K-G I 346, 2. Meisterhans-Schwyzler 217, 30. Schwyzler II 549f. Mayser II 2, 522ff. Johannessohn DGPS 304f. Radermacher² 140.

³ K-G I 432, 2; II 82 n. 3. Mayser II 2, 526ff. Johannessohn DGPS 212, 322. Radermacher² 142.

⁴ Radermacher² 66, 224.

Ὅψέ

Literature in Bauer s.v. Mt 28¹ Mk 16¹ ὁψέ σαββάτων. A Latinism? *Just after.*

Πέραν¹

In pap. of 258 B.C. πέρα Μέμφεως. See p. 216.

Πλήν

Except: Mk 12⁸² Jn 8¹⁰ EGHK Ac 8¹ 15²⁸ 27²²; also as adv. and conjunction.

Χάριν²

Lk, Jn, Past. Cp. ἐνεκα. With one exception, post-positive. Hell. Greek favours the pre-positive position (but οὗ χάριν etc. in pap.).

	Polyb.	Ptol. pap.	LXX	NT
post-positive	76	18	8	8
pre-positive	100	32	13	1

Χωρίς³

Without. Hellenistic.

§ 8. Proper Prepositions combined with Adverbs

The tendency of the later language is towards fuller forms, and these are Hellenistic⁴. Ἐναντι Lk 1⁸ BD Ac 7¹⁰ S 8²¹ (vl. ἐνώπιον). Ἀπέναντι occurs three times only in Polyb., four or five times only in all the Ptol. pap. examined by Mayser (II 2, 538), but six times in NT alone and 80-90 in LXX: Mt 27²⁴ (vl. κατέναντι)⁶¹ Mk 12⁴¹ (vl. κατέναντι) Ac 3¹⁶ 17⁷ Ro 3¹⁸ OT. Κατέναντι occurs only once in the Ptol. papyri as a preposition, but 83 in LXX, 9 in NT (e.g. Mt 27²⁴ κατέναντι τοῦ ὄχλου *in the sight of*); see Mayser II 2, 541.

Ἐμπροσθεν⁵ is in NT the normal word for *before* in the spatial sense, as alternative to πρό which is seldom used in a local sense. In class. Greek and Ptol. pap. (Mayser II 2, 539) it is used more often as an adv. than with the gen. It is extremely rare outside

¹ K-G I 402, 4. Mayser II 2, 533.

² K-G I 461 n. Meisterhans-Schwyzler 222, 52. Mayser II 2, 535. Johannessohn DGPS 244. Radermacher² 144.

³ K-G I 402, 4. Mayser II 2, 536ff. Kuhring § 34. Johannessohn DGPS 337, 339. Radermacher² 140-144.

⁴ Mayser II 2, 538. Johannessohn DGPS 193, d. Radermacher² 140, 143, 144.

⁵ Johannessohn DGPS 189-198. Radermacher² 144, 145.

Bibl. Greek, and Semitic influence is obvious. Mt Mk Lk Jn Ac Past Rev; more frequent in Mt (e.g. 10³² 27¹¹). Rev 19¹⁰ (B ἐνώπιον) 22⁸ (A πρό). Temporal = πρό (also class.) perhaps Jn 1¹⁵. 30 (or = *ranks before me*). Adverbial: only Lk 19⁴. 28 Ph 3¹³ Rev 4⁶. Adjectivally: ἐμπροσθέν μου γέγονεν Jn 1¹⁵. 30.

Ἐπάνω¹. *On top of*. In place of simple ἐπί. Hell. Greek also uses ὑπεράνω: only Eph 1²¹ 4¹⁰ Heb 9⁵. Such compounds are already found in Attic, but the meaning is weakened by this time. The later language prefers the longer forms. Ἄνω and κάτω are always adverbs. Βάλλω ἔξω and βάλλω κάτω are always preferred to ἐκβάλλω and καταβάλλω (Mt 4⁶ 5¹³). Mt 5¹⁴ ἐπάνω ὄρους (for older ἐπ' ὄρους), 21⁷ ἐπάνω αὐτῶν. Adverbial: Mt 2⁹.

ὑποκάτω: an adv. and preposition from Plato on; still more frequent in Koine (Diodorus, Plutarch); only twice in Polyb. About 90 times in LXX as substitute for ὑπό (Johannessohn DGPS 183): very prevalent in Kms (19 against 17 ὑπό c. acc.) and MiPr (8 against 4) and Ezek (13 against 6), Isa (8: 4); but Pent only 16 against 42. Never in Est, 1 Esd, To, Wisdom literature or Mac (exc. Si once). In NT eleven times and only as a preposition. Lk 8¹⁶ ὑποκάτω κλίνης (for older ὑπὸ κλίνην). Rarely as adv. in Ptol. papyri.

§ 9. Biblical Circumlocutions by means of Nouns with Gen.

Πρόσωπον:² for Heb. אָנָפִי the LXX bequeathes ἀπὸ προσώπου c. gen. to Bibl. Greek (Thackeray OT Gr. 44) in place of the normal ἀπὸ or παρὰ. It occurs in Ac 3²⁰ 5⁴¹ (with *come, go*), 7⁴⁵ Rev 6¹⁶ 12¹⁴ 20¹¹ (with *drive, hide, flee*). So from אָנָפִי πρὸ προσώπου Mt 11¹⁰ Lk 1⁷⁶ (SB ἐνώπιον) Ac 13²⁴. So κατὰ πρόσωπον: Lk 2³¹ Ac 3¹³ 25¹⁶ 2 Co 10¹ (= אָנָפִי). So εἰς πρ. 2 Co 8²⁴ and Aquila Ge 17¹. Prepositional compounds of πρόσωπον are undoubtedly a Semitism in spite of their occurrence in the papyri of ii/A.D. and one of iv/A.D. (MM Vocab. 553).

¹ Mayser II 2, 539ff. Radermacher² 144. G. D. Kilpatrick, "Mark xiv. 5 Ἐπάνω," *JThS* 42, 1941, 181ff.

² Johannessohn DGPS, 184-186, etc. Cf. also 1 Clem 4⁸. 10 18¹¹ 28³ Barn. 6⁹ 11⁷ ἀπὸ προσώπου. Ign Pol 2² εἰς πρόσωπον. 1 Clem 35¹⁰ κατὰ πρόσωπον. 1 Clem 34³ Ign Eph 15³ πρὸ προσώπου. Aqu. 1 Km 22⁴ 2 Km 6¹⁴ πρὸ προσώπου, Aqu. Isa 7² ἀπὸ (ἐκ Q) προσώπου.

Χείρ: Heb. יָד becomes εἰς χεῖρας *in the power of* Mt 26⁴⁵ Lk 23⁴⁶ Jn 13³ Heb 10³¹ etc., or ἐν (τῇ) χειρὶ Jn 3³⁵ Ac 7³⁵ (vl. σύν), or διὰ χειρός, χειρῶν (Ge 39⁴ etc.) Mk 6² Ac 2²³ 5¹² and oft. Heb. יָד becomes ἐκ χειρός Lk 1⁷¹ Ac 12¹¹. (Johannessohn DGPS *passim*.)

Στόμα although Heb. influence has increased the usage, στόμα is used in many similar ways in class. Greek: διὰ (Lk 1⁷⁰ Ac 1¹⁶ etc.), ἐκ, ἐπί. (Johannessohn DGPS *passim*.)

CHAPTER NINETEEN

NEGATIVES

(especially the encroachment of MH upon the province of OY)

§ 1. General¹

The distinction between οὐ and μή is now far less subtle than in class. Greek. Broadly, in the LXX οὐ renders אֵין and μή לֹא, and οὐχί אֵין־לֹא (e.g. Ge 40⁸).

In his examination of the Ptol. pap., Mayser observes that the use of the two negative particles (οὐ as objective, μή as subjective), as handed down from the classical period, managed to hold its own in the Koine of the Hellenistic period as far as finite verbs are concerned. There are of course many deviations from classical standards. The infin. and ptc. play a special role in so far as here μή has won from οὐ the major part of its use (Mayser II 2, 543).

In post-classical prose, appreciation of the nice differences between οὐ and μή, which broadly speaking are like those between *non* and *ne*, has partially disappeared. It is not good to bring the difference between οὐ and μή under a definite rule, but doubtless there is a large increase in the use of μή in the later language. The same observations apply to the NT. There is sometimes no valid reason in favour of one particle against the other, and either may be used according to the author's own way of looking at things. There can be no difference between ἀμαρτίαν μή πρὸς θάνατον and ἀμαρτία οὐ πρὸς θάνατον 1 Jn 5¹⁶. Blass² made the rule that, in the NT, οὐ negatives the indicative (facts) and μή the remaining moods (ideas): this applies also to οὐδεὶς μηδεὶς, οὐδέ μηδέ, οὔτε μήτε,

¹ K-G II 178-223. Gildersleeve *AJP* 3, 202. O. Birke, *De particularum μή et οὐ usu Polybiano, Dionysiaeo, Diodoreo, Straboneo*, Diss. Leipzig 1897. E. L. Greene, "Mή and οὐ before Lucian," in *Studies in Honor of Gildersleeve*, 1902. Mayser II 2, 543-567. Radermacher² 210 (with literature).

² Blass-Debr. § 426.

οὐπω μήπω, οὐκέτι μηκέτι, οὐδαμῶς μηδαμῶς, οὐδέποτε μηδέποτε. There are exceptions where μή negatives the indic., and οὐ is used with infin. and ptc. With a few exceptions, Blass's rule applies to the Ptol. papyri (Mayser II 2, 552) for the infin., but with the ptc. οὐ maintains its position fairly constantly, although even here also μή finally prevailed.

In general it seems that οὐ stands its ground where a clause with ἀλλά follows it, and for the major part where the negative expressions form a single idea, like οὐκ ὀλίγοι, οὐ πολλοί, etc. (Mayser II 2, 550). Mt 9¹³ οὐ θυσίαν, Mk 9³⁷ οὐκ ἐμέ, Ro 9²⁵ τὸν οὐ λαόν μου, 10¹⁹ (LXX Dt 32²¹) ἐπ' οὐκ ἔθνει **אָפּ אֵל**. Like οὐ βούλομαι (*refuse to*) in Ptol. pap., we find in NT οὐ θέλω Mk 9³⁰ (*I am averse to*), οὐκ ἔχω Mt 13¹², οὐκ ἐάω Ac 16⁷ (*forbid*), οὐκ ἀγνοέω 2 Co 2¹¹ (*know well*). So also Lk 15¹³ Ac 1⁵ μετ' οὐ πολλὰς ἡμέρας, Jn 3³⁴ οὐκ ἐκ μέτρου, Ac 17⁴ οὐκ ὀλίγα, 20¹² οὐ μετριῶς, 21³⁹ οὐκ ἀσήμου, 27¹⁴ μετ' οὐ πολὺ, 1 Co 1²⁶ οὐ πολλοί, Eph 5⁴ τὰ οὐκ ἀνήκοντα. In LXX: 2 Mac 4¹³ οὐκ ἀρχιερεὺς. In the Ptol. pap. οὐκ ὀλίγοι = πολλοί, οὐκ εὖ ὦν = κάκος, and οὐχ ὁ τυχών = *unusual*. It should be observed that οὐ πᾶς is capable of two meanings, limiting and denying: (1) *not all*, i.e. *some*,¹ and (2) *not any*, i.e. *none at all* (οὐδεὶς).² Both senses appear in Jn. The similar use of μή in class. Greek³ does not appear in NT; in each instance the μή has another explanation.

§ 2. Main clauses

The prohibitive future has μή in NT (and οὐ μή Mt 16²²), whereas class. Greek sometimes has μή (as in Hom. Clem. 3⁶⁹ μηδένα μισήσετε). Mt 5²¹ 6⁵ 20²⁶ οὐχ οὕτως ἔσται ἐν ὑμῖν.

Both οὐ and μή are both found in questions: ⁴ οὐ or οὐχί or οὐδέ or οὐκοῦν ⁵ if a positive answer is expected (= *nonne*)

¹ E.g. Mt 7²¹ 19¹¹ 1 Co 15³⁹.

² E.g. Mt 24²² οὐ . . . πᾶσα σὰρξ = Heb, **לֹא כָל** or **כָּל לֹא**; Ac 10¹⁴ οὐδέποτε ἔφαγον πᾶν κοινόν.

³ Plato *Gorg.* 459, 6 ὁ μή ἰατρός, *Ant.* 5, 82 οἱ μή καθαροί, Thuc. 2, 45, 1 τὸ μή ἐμποδῶν.

⁴ K.-G. II 524. F. C. Babbitt, "Questions with μή," *Proc. Amer. Philol. Assocn.* 32, 43.

⁵ Jn 18³⁷ is difficult, because a neg. answer is expected; οὐκοῦν appears to be merely inferential (the stress on the οὐν). In Ac 2⁷ οὐχί ἰδοὺ is a Koine idiom, like the class. ἀρ' οὐ: *Beg.* in loc.

Mt 7²² 13²⁷. 55 Mk 14⁶⁰ Lk 12⁶ 17¹⁷ Ac 13¹⁰ 21³⁸ Ro 2²⁶ 1 Co 9¹ (οὐχί alongside οὐ) 14²³; μή or μήτι if a negative answer (*num*, *surely not*): Mt 7¹⁶ 26²⁵ (Judas's μήτι ἐγώ εἰμι *expects* a negative answer but receives a positive), Jn 5³⁸ (may be a question: *do you marvel at this?*), 7⁵¹ (Nicodemus is rather subtle in using μή), 21⁵, 6⁶⁷, 7³¹. 47, Ro 11¹ (μή ἀπόσατο is expressly answered in 11² with οὐκ ἀπόσατο), 1 Co 6³ (elliptical μήτιγε, as Demosth. 2, 23). Sometimes the difference is illustrated in a single verse: Lk 6³⁹ μήτι δύναται τυφλὸς τυφλὸν ὀδηγεῖν (answer no); οὐχί ἀμφοτέροι εἰς βόθυνον ἐμπεσοῦνται (answer yes); 1 Co 9⁸ μή κατὰ ἄνθρωπον ταῦτα λαλῶ, ἢ καὶ ὁ νόμος ταῦτα οὐ λέγει; 2 Co 12¹⁸ μήτι ἐπλεονέκτησεν ὑμᾶς Τίτος (no); οὐ τῷ αὐτῷ πνεύματι περιπατήσαμεν (yes); Jn 4³³⁻³⁵, Ro 9²⁰.

A positive answer will be expected if οὐ μή (= *nonne*) is found in questions: Lk 18⁷ Jn 18¹¹ Rev 15⁴.

Where μή negatives the whole sentence the verb alone may already be negatived by οὐ (Paul, as class.), and so μή . . . οὐ stands with a sentence which expects a positive answer: Ro 10¹⁷ μή οὐκ ἤκουσαν *surely you haven't not-heard it* (missed hearing it), 1 Co 9⁴ μή οὐκ ἔχομεν: 11²², 2 Co 12²⁰ μήπως . . . οὐχ . . . εὔρω.

In some passages the strength of μή is somewhat modified: Jn 4²⁹ μήτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ Χριστός *he must be* (or *perhaps he is*) *the Messiah*; hardly *num* here; it is more like οὐ; the distinction is sometimes difficult to draw for much depends on the tone of the speaker; it is here rather hesitant, as in 4³³. On the later μήτι = *perhaps*, see Abbott Joh. Gr. 2702 b 1. See also A. T. Robertson, "The NT Use of μή with hesitant question in the Indicative Mood," *Expos. Series VIII No. 152*, 1923.

In main clauses μή occurs with subjunctive (Mk 12¹⁴ Ga 6⁹), optative (only wish-opt. in NT., viz. Mk 11¹⁴ Ro 3⁴. 6. 31 Ga 6¹⁴ etc.), and imperative (Mt 6³ μή γνώτω, 24¹⁸ μή ἐπιστρεψάτω ὀπίσω, LXX Ex 34³ Ps 6²). But see 1 Co 5¹⁰, 1 Pt 2¹⁸ (οὐ μόνον), 3³ (ὦν ἔστω οὐχ ὁ . . . κόσμος), and we find οὐ and ἔστω in Ptol. pap. and οὐδενὶ ἐξέστω in inscr. cited by Radermacher (171).

§ 3. Dependent Clauses

The indicative with εἰ has οὐ in the NT and Koine, if the condition is "real", seldom the μή which was normal in

classical;¹ sometimes even class. Greek had οὐ if εἰ = ἐπεὶ or = *if, as you hope* (K-G II 189f), in which case always οὐ in NT and Koine. Lk 11⁸ εἰ καὶ οὐ δώσει, 16³¹ εἰ Μωϋσέως . . . οὐκ ἀκούουσιν, Jn 10³⁷ εἰ οὐ ποιῶ τὰ ἔργα . . . εἰ δὲ ποιῶ. So also Lk 14²⁶ 16¹¹ Jn 1²⁵ 3¹² Ro 11²¹ 1 Co 7¹¹ 15¹³ 1 Ti 3⁵ 5⁸ Jas 2¹¹ Rev 20¹⁵. Contrary to normal Greek usage, οὐ enters once with "unreal" indicative: Mt 26²⁴ Mk 14²¹ καλὸν αὐτῷ εἰ οὐκ ἐγενήθη. But μή is always found when εἰ = *nisi* (e.g. Mt 5¹³ Ac 26³² Ga 1⁷).

Relative clauses regularly have οὐ with indic., and μή on very rare occasions: Lk 8¹⁸ ὃς ἂν μὴ ἔχη (conditional), Ac 15²⁹ D, Col 2¹⁸ ἀ μὴ ἐώρακεν C vulg syr^p (p⁴⁶ S*ABD om μὴ), Ti 1¹¹ διδάσκοντες ἀ μὴ δεῖ (= 1 Ti 5¹³ τὰ μὴ δέοντα), 2 Pt 1⁹ ᾧ γὰρ μὴ πάρεστιν ταῦτα (correct according to literary style, as the speech is not about definite things: K-G II 185f), 1 Jn 4³ δ μὴ ὁμολογεῖ, Rev 14⁴ p⁴⁷ οἱ μὴ μετὰ γυναικῶν ἐμολύνθησαν (rest: οὐκ). See also Ac 3²³ Rev 13¹⁵, LXX Le 23²⁹ (πᾶσα ψυχὴ ἦτις μὴ ταπεινωθήσεται), Si 13²⁴.

In statement clauses with ὅτι and ὥς, and temporal and causal clauses with indic., although οὐ largely remains, μή is encroaching in the Koine.² Jn 3¹⁸ ὅτι μὴ πεπίστευκεν *because (such a person) would not have believed* (but οὐ in 1 Jn 5¹⁰), Heb 9¹⁷ ἐπεὶ μὴ ποτε ἰσχύει, B.U. 530³⁵ ἐπὶ μὴ ἀντέγραψας αὐτῇ (i/A.D.), Jos. c. Ap. 1, 217, Hom. Clem. 8¹⁴ etc. Blass-Debr. § 428, 5.

§ 4. Participles³

The post-classical language strongly tends towards μὴ (MGr only μή) with participles, whereas in class. Attic the decision to use μὴ depended on the meaning of the ptc. in each instance. NT follows the Hellenistic tendency and μὴ is the rule, especially with articular ptc., and even where the ptc. has

¹ Classical μὴ: Lk 6^{4D} εἰ δὲ μὴ οἶδας; 1 Ti 6³ εἰ τις ἑτεροδιδασκαλεῖ καὶ μὴ προσέχεται (yet οὐ in 3⁵ 5⁸).

² K-G II 188. Jannaris § 1818. Mayser II 2, 551. Moulton Einl. 271n. Radermacher² 211.

³ K-G II 198ff. Jannaris §§ 1815f. Mayser II 2, 556ff. G. E. Howes, "The Use of μὴ with the Participle, where the negation is influenced by the construction upon which the Participle depends," *Harvard Studies* 12, 1901, 277ff. A. G. Laird, "When is generic μὴ particular?" *AJP* 43, 1922, 124-45.

an "indicative" sense: 2 Co 6³ μηδεμίαν ἐν μηδενὶ διδόντες προσκοπήν, Ti 1⁶. 7 τέκνα ἔχων πιστά, μὴ ἐν κατηγορίᾳ ἀσωτίας. Indeed the use of μὴ in NT is wider than in the Ptol. papyri. The proportions for the latter are: iii/B.C. οὐ: μὴ = 4:1, ii-/B.C. οὐ: μὴ = 2:3 (Mayser II 2, 556, 562). However, the use of individual NT authors does vary to some extent. Thus in Mt and Jn οὐ is scarcely found at all apart from Mt 22¹¹ εἶδεν ἄνθρωπον οὐκ ἐνδεδυμένον ἔνδυμα γάμου (C³D μὴ), Jn 10¹² ὁ μισθωτὸς καὶ οὐκ ὢν ποιμὴν (μὴ more correct as it refers to no definite person; but καὶ μὴ is not liked in the Koine). But Lk-Ac is more classical in this respect: Lk 6⁴² αὐτὸς . . . οὐ βλέπων (not D), Ac 7⁵ οὐκ ὄντος αὐτῷ τέκνου, 19¹¹ 28² οὐχ ὁ τυχῶν (*no ordinary*; in Ptol. pap. with same meaning: BU 436⁹ καὶ ὕβριν οὐ τὴν τυχοῦσαν συνετέλεσαντο *committed a more than ordinary outrage*¹), 26²² οὐδὲν ἐκτὸς λέγων, 28¹⁷ οὐδὲν . . . ποιήσας, 1⁹ οὐχ ὡς ἔχων.

But Paul, Heb. and 1 Pt (with few exceptions) prefer the Hellenistic μὴ. The exceptions are Ro 9²⁵, 1 Co 9²⁶ ὡς οὐκ (but 2 Co 10¹⁴ ὡς μὴ where it is a conception only and not a fact), 2 Co 4^{8r} (p⁴⁶ μὴ), 5¹² CDEFG (p⁴⁶ SB μὴ). The fact that Paul almost invariably uses μὴ with participles does lead to ambiguity²: Ga 6⁹ μὴ ἐκλυόμενοι (which in class. Greek must be *if we do not faint*; but by Paul it is intended as a fact), Ro 8⁴ ἐν ἡμῖν τοῖς μὴ κατὰ σάρκα περιπατοῦσιν (it would be *IF we do not walk . . .* in class. Greek, but Paul probably means *us who DO not . . .*).

§ 5. Infinitive³

Here in general is μὴ, but there are traces of an older use of οὐ. It is simplifying too much to say that μὴ stands throughout; it occurs indeed even after verbs of feeling (Ac 25²⁵ 2 Co 11⁵), but there is Ac 19²⁷ εἰς οὐθὲν λογισθῆναι and 2 Ti 2¹⁴ μὴ λογομαχεῖν ἐπ' οὐδὲν χρήσιμον, even if with Blass in Mk 7²⁴ Jn 21²⁵ Ac 26²⁶ we rather perversely take the οὐ more closely with the main verb than with the infin. (Blass-Debr. § 429). A redundant μὴ appears with infin. sometimes depending on a

¹ Mayser II 2, 518, 546. Preisigke s.v. τυγχάνω 4. Bauer s.v. 2d.

² Zerwick § 307a.

³ Mayser II 2, 552ff, 564f. Jannaris § 1815. Moulton Einl. 271 n.

negative main verb (class. and Hell.), e.g. Lk 4⁴², 17¹ ἀνένδεκτόν ἐστιν τοῦ τὰ σκάνδαλα μὴ ἔλθεῖν, 20²⁷ WA (SBD etc. avoid it by harmonizing with Mt Mk), 22³⁴ (SB om μὴ), Ac 4²⁰ οὐ δυνάμεθα . . . μὴ λαλεῖν, Ga 5⁷, 1 Pt 3¹⁰, 1 Jn 2²².

§ 6. Double Negatives

These are of two types, self-cancelling and pleonastic. The self-cancelling is classical and appears rarely in NT: Lk 8¹⁷ οὐ γὰρ ἐστιν κρυπτὸν δὲ οὐ φανερόν γενήσεται; also Mt 24² Ac 4²⁰ 1 Co 9⁶ 12¹⁵. Sometimes however it is not so much that the negatives are self-cancelling as that both have their full force: Mt 10²⁶ Lk 12² οὐδὲν δὲ συγκεκαλυμμένον ἐστὶν ὃ οὐκ ἀποκαλυφθήσεται, Mt 24² etc. οὐ . . . δὲ οὐ, Ac 19³⁵ τίς ἐστὶν . . . δὲ οὐ.

Pleonastic negatives, which were frequent in class. Attic and well suited to the lively Greek temperament, are not as plentiful now. The negative was strengthened by sequences like οὐ (μὴ) . . . οὐδεῖς (μηδεῖς), e.g. Mk 5³ καὶ οὐδὲ ἀλύσει οὐκέτι οὐδεῖς ἐδύνατο αὐτὸν δῆσαι, 11² v1. οὐδεῖς . . . οὐπω, ¹⁴ μηκέτι . . . μηδεῖς, 15⁴. ⁵ (οὐ . . . οὐδὲν often in Ptol. pap.), Lk 4² 23⁶³ Jn 15⁵ 19⁴¹ Ac 8³⁹ (οὐκ . . . οὐκέτι in Ptol. pap.) Ro 13⁸ 2 Co 11⁹ 1 Ti 1⁷ μὴ . . . μηδέ . . . μηδέ is frequent in Ptol. pap.) Heb 13⁵. But two constructions are not classical: (1) the use of τις with the negative in the Koine (for οὐδεῖς), e.g. Mt 11²⁷ οὐδὲ τὸν πατέρα τις ἐπιγνώσκει, 12¹⁹, Jn 10²⁸ οὐχ ἀρπάσει τις, 1 Co 6¹², 1 Th 1⁸ μὴ . . . τι (in Ptol. pap. μῆθεν . . . τι, οὔτε . . . τι, and μηδέ . . . τινάς (Mayser II 2, 567); (2) the amalgam of οὐδὲ and οὐ μὴ to form a very strong but pleonastic οὐδ' οὐ μὴ, e.g. Mt 24²¹ (D οὐδὲ μὴ), Mk 14²⁵ οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ πῶα (SDWCL om οὐκέτι), Heb 13⁵ from LXX Dt 31⁶ where only A has οὐδ' οὐ μὴ (p⁴⁶ οὐδὲ μὴ), Mt 25⁹ BDC Did 4¹⁰ μήποτε οὐ μὴ, LXX Am 2¹⁵ Jb 32²¹, pap. Wilcken Chr. no. 122⁴ (A.D. 6) οὐδ' οὐ μὴ γένηται. On μὴ οὐ see p. 98. On οὐ μὴ see pp. 95-98.

§ 7. Yes and No

Yes ναί Mt 5³⁷ Lk 7²⁶ 2 Co 11⁷ Jas 5¹² and no οὐ or οὐχί (MGr ὄχι) Mt 13²⁹ Lk 1⁶⁰ etc. Note the contrast of objective and subjective negative in Mk 12¹⁴ ἔξεστι . . . δοῦναι ἢ οὐ; δῶμεν ἢ μὴ δῶμεν;

§ 8. Position of the Negative

As a rule the negative precedes what is negated, except that it may also (as in class. Greek) precede the preposition or ὡς if such occurs before a ptc. or adj.: Ac 1⁵ Lk 15¹³ D οὐ μετὰ

πολλὰς ἡμέρας, 2 Co 10¹⁴ p⁴⁶ μὴ ὡς (the rest correct to ὡς μὴ), Heb 11³ τὸ μὴ ἐκ φαινομένων. Often negative and verb are blended in one idea: οὐκ ἐάω (and more popular οὐκ ἀφίω) *prevent* Ac 19³⁰ etc. This may be altered to achieve emphasis, and in Ac 7⁴⁸ the position of οὐχ puts *the Most High* in relief, as μὴ in Jas 3¹ puts πολλοί in relief (also οὐδέν emphatic, away from λανθάνειν in Ac 26²⁶, and οὐ before the inappropriate verb in 1 Co 2²). So LXX Nu 16^{29b}. But a negative which is separated from its verb may affect the complement: Mk 9³⁷ οὐκ ἐμὲ δέχεται *it is not me that he receives*, 2 Co 3³ ἐνγεγραμμένη οὐ μέλανι *written not with ink*. The rule is several times broken with πᾶς: Ro 3²⁰ πᾶσα σὰρξ . . . οὐ, Eph 5⁵ 1 Jn 2²¹ πᾶς . . . οὐ, Eph 4²⁹ πᾶς . . . μὴ, 1 Co 15⁵¹ πάντες οὐ κοιμηθησόμεθα (*must*=οὐ πάντες). On the other hand, οὐ πάντως (Ro 3⁹) must be reversed or taken separately: *no! absolutely* or *certainly not* (*not in all cases* is scarcely possible); scribes felt the difficulty, too.

This page intentionally left blank

BOOK TWO
THE SENTENCE COMPLETE:
SYNTHETIC SYNTAX

PART I
THE ORDINARY SIMPLE SENTENCE

This page intentionally left blank

CHAPTER TWENTY

SUBJECT AND PREDICATE:

APPARENT ABSENCE OF SUBJECT¹

§ 1. Impersonal Verbs²

Hellenistic (Polyb.) βρέχει Jas 5¹⁷ for class. ὕει (Mayser II 3, 2; Abel § 39a); but personal at Mt 5⁴⁵ (as class., and LXX Ge 19²⁴). For βροντῆσαι Jn 12²⁹ has βροντὴν γεγονέναι. The problematic ἀπέχει Mk 14⁴¹ may be impersonal, for class. ἀρκεῖ: *it is receipted, the account is settled* (consistent with the meaning of the variant in DW ἀπέχει τὸ τέλος *it has its end, the matter is settled*); so in P. Lond. IV 1343³⁸ (709 A.D.), etc.³ Lk 24²¹ may not be impers., τρίτην ταύτην ἡμέραν ἄγει, but the subject is Jesus: *he has already allowed three days to pass* (see Bauer s.v., ἄγω, 4). In Mk 2² ὥστε μηκέτι χωρεῖν μηδὲ τὰ πρὸς τὴν θύραν, the last four words may be the subject of χωρεῖν (Moule 27). Impers. μέλει Mt 22¹⁶ Mk 12¹⁴ Jn 10¹³ 1 Co 9⁹ 1 Pt 5⁷. But in Mk 4³⁸ Lk 10⁴⁰ 1 Co 7²¹ a clause is the subject.

The impers. passive, quite common in Latin, is fairly so in NT but on the whole is very rare in Greek apart from some exx. of the perfect παρεσκευάσται *preparations are made*. The desire to avoid God's name enters into the picture in NT. Mt 7² μετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν (but a cognate noun μέτρον may be understood), Lk 6³⁸ δίδοτε καὶ δοθήσεται ὑμῖν (but further on μέτρον . . . δώσουσιν), 1 Pt 4⁶ νεκροῖς εὐηγγελίσθη; a cognate noun may be supplied here, but not in Ro 10¹⁰ πιστεύεται . . . ὁμολογεῖται, 1 Co 15^{42f} σπείρεται . . . ἐγείρεται.

Certain verbs are only apparently impersonal, since the clause which follows can be taken as subject, e.g. ἐρρέθη in Mt 5³¹ Ro 9¹²; and so also δεῖ, ἔξεστιν, ἐξόν, ἐγένετο, ἐνδέχεται,

¹ K-G I § 352, pp. 32ff. Gildersleeve I 68-82. Meisterhans-Schwyzler 195. Wackernagel I 113f. Mayser II 3, 1ff. Zerwiok §§ 1-4.

² For δέον, γρή, ἔδει see pp. 88, 90, 148, 322; for δοκεῖ p. 147.

³ Alternative suggestions: A. Pallis, *Notes on St. Mark*, new ed., Oxford 1932, 47ff; G. H. Boobyer *NTS* 2, 1955-6, 44ff.

γέγραπται, πρέπει, ὠφελεῖ, which have a following infin. as subject (e.g. Ac 7²³ ἀνέβη ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν, Semitic). Lk 17¹ has as subject τοῦ τὰ σκάνδαλα μὴ ἔλθεῖν (Moule 27); so with λυσιτελεῖ (only Lk 17²), πρέπειν ἔστιν, συμφέρει, συνέβη. In 1 Pt 2⁶ περιέχει ἐν γραφῇ, the quotation may be the subject. But in Mt 13¹² περισσευθήσεται is probably passive and impers., because of the parallel (not *he shall be made to abound*).

§ 2. Impersonal "they"

Much more usual than the impers. passive, and a characteristic feature of Mk's style, is the 3rd plural without subject, meaning *one* or *they*. Languages which lack any special indefinite subject like *man* (German) or *on* (French) tend to display this finite plural in verbs of speaking and narrating. The tendency of Aramaic to avoid the passive has exercised an influence extending to other verbs in NT, e.g. Lk 12²⁰ (ἀπαιτοῦσιν), and the same Aramaic tendency appears in words like ἀναβαίνω, said of the fish which is *taken up* Mt 17²⁷, or ἐξέρχομαι in place of ἐκβάλλομαι Lk 4⁴¹ 8²; see also ἀπελθεῖν εἰς τὴν γέενναν in place of βληθῆναι Mk 9⁴⁴; so Mt 5¹⁵ οὐδὲ καίουσιν λύχνον, 9² ἰδοὺ προσέφερον αὐτῷ παραλυτικόν, 17 οὐδὲ βάλλουσιν οἶνον. Dan 4²² Ο' and θ, 4²⁸ σοὶ λέγουσιν (Ο' λέγεται), 4²⁹ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων σε ἐκδιώκουσιν . . . χόρτον ὡς βοῦν ψωμιοῦσίν σε. In Mk 2¹⁸ the undefined plural may be impers. or it may refer to the subject of the preceding sentence; but ἔλεγον in 3²¹ is an example of the impers. pl. which C. H. Turner showed to be a special feature of Mark (*JThS* 25, 1924, 377-386). In at least two places this is of some importance to the exegete, for (1) at Mk 3²¹ we read *when his own people heard, they went out to take him, for THEY said . . . ἔλεγον γὰρ ὅτι ἐξέστη*. It is wrong to assume that his mother and brothers think that Jesus is mad, for the verb ἔλεγον can be considered an indef. plural: *rumour had it*, that he was mad. (2) Also Mk 14² becomes more intelligible if ἔλεγον is taken as an indefinite plural: the chief priests and scribes were plotting the death of Jesus with subtilty, *for* (true text of Mark) *THEY said, Not during the feast . . .* This γὰρ gives a reason for their decision, and *they* is therefore someone else, not the chief priests and scribes (C. H. Turner, *op. cit.* 384f).

Aramaic influence has enlarged the class of verbs which may be so used, since Aramaic avoids the passive, but Moulton and Milligan (Vocab. 52) cite a iii/A.D. papyrus with ἀπαιτοῦσιν, like Lk 12²⁰; so also P. Fay. III 14 λέγουσιν, P. Hib. 27. 167 κάουσιν. In class. Greek the construction was used primarily with verbs of saying, φασί, λέγουσι, καλοῦσι, ἔρχονται, but in NT we have also τεθνήκασιν (Mt 2²⁰), συλλέγουσιν (Mt 7¹⁶ Lk 6⁴⁴), προσέφερον (Mk 10¹³). In Heb 10¹ προσφέρουσιν and δύνανται may be in this class. The subject οἱ ἄνθρωποι is actually present in Mk 8²⁷ Lk 6³¹, and this may be the intermediate stage towards the impers. verb. The suppression of the subject seems to bring emphasis on the action. At times the 3rd pl. may be used circumspcctly for God's own action, and so his name rather than οἱ ἄνθρωποι is to be understood: Lk 6³⁸ δώσουσιν, 12^{20. 48} (ἀπ-)αἰτοῦσιν, 16⁹ (*that God may receive you into eternal dwellings*), 23³¹ (?). See Moulton-Howard 447.

§ 3. Scil. "the Scripture"

In the quotation formula λέγει, etc. a subject θεός or γραφή is understood: Ro 10⁸ λέγει p⁴⁶ SAB (DFG insert ἡ γραφή); λέγει also in 2 Co 6² Ga 3¹⁶ etc., φησὶν in 1 Co 6¹⁶ Heb 8⁵, εἶρηκε Heb 4⁴. We have something like a diatribe in 2 Co 10¹⁰ φησὶν *says my opponent*. See also Wackernagel I 113.

CHAPTER TWENTY-ONE

SUBJECT AND PREDICATE:

ABSENCE OF THE VERB "TO BE"

§ 1. The Copula¹

From the standpoint of class. Attic there is nothing remarkable about the extensive absence of the copula in NT, for this was the most common form of ellipse and, except where ambiguity threatened, was almost the rule. The NT is indeed nearer to Ionic Greek where "en dehors de quelques expressions consacrées, [Herodotus] n'exprime plus, dans la langue courante, un jugement en juxtaposant simplement le sujet et l'attribut. Il ajoute une copule." (Barbelenet 103). The pure nominal phrase is still a living thing in Herodotus, but very seriously limited (*ibid.* 18); it is commoner in the Ionic poets (*ibid.* 19). In NT the ellipse is not so general as in the earlier Attic Greek and is almost confined to ἐστίν and to these "expressions consacrées", viz. dead phrases of either an impersonal or stereotyped and epigrammatic character (incl. ὄνομα) or else very live phrases of a rhetorical and dramatic sort. It was the post-classical tendency to view the pure nominal phrase as an ellipse and to reserve it for poetic archaism, stylistic expressions and set formulae (Schwyzer II 623). The NT has gone further than class. Attic or contemporary literary Hellenistic in inserting the copula, but not so far as Herodotus, except in Mk and Jn. Semitic influence may have assisted the NT, but more probably

¹ K-G I § 354, pp. 40ff. Gildersleeve I 83-86. Meisterhans-Schwyzler § 80, pp. 195ff. Mayser II 3, 16ff. J. E. Harry, "On the omission of the copula in certain combinations in Greek," *Proc. Amer. Philol. Assocn.* 34, p. viii ff. J. Kinzel, *Die Kopula bei Homer und Hesiod*, Progr. Mährisch-Ostrau 1908, 1909. C. G. Wilke, *De ellipsi copulae verbi εἶναι in fabulis Euripideis*, Breslau 1877. D. Barbelenet, *De la Phrase à Verbe être dans l'Ionien d'Hérodote*, Paris 1913. E. Ekman, *Der reine Nominalsatz bei Xenophon*, 1938. P. F. Regard, *La Phrase nominale dans la Langue du NT*, Paris 1919. A. W. Mildner, "The possessive in the predicate in Greek", *Proc. Amer. Philol. Assocn.* 37, 24; "The article in the predicate in Greek", *ibid.* 40, 63.

it is a matter of literary standards.¹ Luke and Paul resort much less to the copula than Mark or John. In MGr it is not usual to omit the appropriate part of εἶναι unless oratorical effect is deliberately sought.

So side by side in Biblical Greek there are the Attic pure nominal phrase and the Ionic nominal phrase with the copula, both used by each Biblical writer with equal spontaneity; but the writers vary considerably in their preferences. In common with the Indo-Germanic languages in general, Greek was tending to replace the pure nominal phrase by the phrase with a copula, and some writers have taken the process further than others.

(a) *Fixed phrases*

In detail, the part of the verb which most usually is to be supplied is 3rd sing. pres. ind., as in class. Greek. This is seen in certain impers. phrases introduced by the neuter of an adj. (αἰσχρόν, ἀρκετόν, ἀδύνατον, δῶρον, δῆλον, εἰ δέον, εἰ δυνατόν, ἐξόν, κακόν, καλόν, μέγα, ὄφελον, (ἔτι) μικρόν (καί), οὐ μόνον, οὐχ οἶον, πρόδηλον, συμφέρον, φάνερον), or by a noun expressing possibility or necessity (ἀνάγκη, χρέη, ὥρα). This is so occasionally, even in Ionic (Hdt). It is true that πρέπον is never found without ἐστίν in NT (unlike 1 Mac 12¹¹; but ἦν in 3 Mac 7¹³), and neither are the impers. ἄξιον or δίκαιον found without ἐστίν, as they are in contemporary Hellenistic writers. But ellipse is frequent with the other words. There is however no regular pattern within the NT.

A similar archaic usage is the Ionic ἐν (= ἐν) as a kind of adverbial predicate without the copula. It is always negative in NT, not in Hdt. (Barbelenet 13).

A more frequent NT example of the survival of a lifeless formula is the pure nominal phrase containing *δομα*, whether as a parenthesis or as a main or subordinate clause. The formula may be Hebraistic, through the influence of *מִן* and *מִן־מִן* (LXX 1 Km 1¹ etc.), but it is not absent from class. and Hell. Greek and the papyri. The papyri and NT even here

¹ In the nearly exhaustive references at the close of this chapter not enough notice or discussion of text variants could be given. The student of the text will, however, gather the general principles behind each author's usage, and the exceptions, and ought thereby to be able to come nearer to a decision between the text variants.

sometimes insert a copula: Jn 18¹⁰ Lk 8³⁰, Zen. pap. 59037, 7 (258 B.C.).

Another antique survival of the pure nominal phrase is the stereotyped phrase at the beginning and end of letters. We may supply either the optative or imperative or fut. indic. (Mayser II 3, 19). The formulae are less stereotyped at the end than at the beginning of letters. No doubt Semitic influence assisted their survival in NT (cf. $\text{םִן־לְךָ} \text{ ׀ִלְךָ}$ Ge 43²³). See Büchsel in Kittel WB III 300f.

The survival of the pure nominal phrase is seen above all, as in class. Greek (even in Hdt.), in proverbial saws which abound in the NT. When we do occasionally find the copula it may be that special emphasis is intended.

(b) *Spontaneous or live expressions*

These on the contrary are not verbally the same phrases as in earlier Greek, which testifies to the originality and spontaneity of the method of using the pure nominal phrase in NT. Attic influence may explain it, since the corresponding phrase in Ionic Greek usually has the copula (Regard 45).

On the Semitic model, and occurring in an OT atmosphere, is ἰδοῦ (scil. pres. or impf. or even aor. or fut. of εἶμι and of πάρεμι and $(\text{παρα})\gammaίνομαι$), although there are secular parallels. Besides, interjections do not need a verbal predicate in normal Greek, as οὐά in Mk 15²⁹. Yet the copula does occur with ἰδοῦ in NT. On the Semitic model is οὐαί (׀ִן ׀ִא , etc.) and yet the copula appears here too.

Free of any suspicion of archaism are pure nominal phrases in the form of exclamations. They are very common in NT, even when we exclude direct LXX quotations, e.g. $\text{ἅγιον τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ}$ Lk 1⁴⁹, $\text{εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος}$ Mt 21⁹ 23³⁹ = Lk 13³⁵ 19³⁸ = Jn 12¹³, εὐλογητὸς κύριος Lk 1⁶⁸, εὐλογητὸς ὁ θεός 2 Co 1³, and $\text{μακάριοι ὄν, μακάριος ἀνὴρ ὅς}$ Ro 4⁷ Jas 1¹². Usually the order is attribute-subject. Again we are reminded of Semitic influence, but we should remember the class. and Hell. parallels. Moreover, there are many instances where the copula creeps in, even in the μακάριος phrase. In the doxologies, indic., imper., or optative might equally well be supplied. However, in spite of LXX precedent,¹ it is not the optative

¹ 3 Km 10⁹ γένοιτο εὐλ. , Jb 1²¹ εἴη εὐλ.

idea which is in mind, for God is thought of as being *already* blessed and glorious. Since there is no need to pray for it, the phrase is simply an exclamation.

Akin to this is the pure nominal phrase in a series of graphic clauses. The most outstanding instance is the series of exclamations in 1 Co 15³⁹⁻⁵⁶ and Ph 1²¹⁻²⁴. It is typically Pauline but it is found in the LXX and in contemporary Hell. authors. The statements are usually brief and vivid and abound in passages which rise to heights of oratory. One frequently finds it in the apodosis and protasis of conditional sentences. Yet sometimes in NT the copula is found in this kind of phrase, especially if the identity of the subject would otherwise be obscure. This literary tendency also appears when there is a striving after rhetoric in epigrammatic phrases and those which express general or abstract truths, especially in connection with the demonstrative pronoun; again there are exceptions. Some of these questions are stereotyped, but the majority are spontaneous. In the NT it is equally common to find the copula as the pure nominal phrase in questions.

The pure nominal phrase is found sometimes in indirect questions in Lk and Paul, as in literary Hell. Greek; also after $\delta\pi\omega\upsilon$, $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$, $\acute{\omega}\sigma\pi\epsilon\rho$, $\kappa\alpha\theta\acute{\omega}\varsigma$. Pernot (p. 53) notes the rather frequent absence of the copula in Jn after $\delta\tau\iota$ (although it is far more often inserted) and we find this ellipse all over the NT (Mt Mk Lk 1 2 Co Ph Ro Rev), as well as in class. and Hell. writers, and papyri.

(c) *Ellipse of other parts besides $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\nu$*

This is more rare, and the pers. pronoun is usually added to avoid ambiguity—though not always in Paul. Almost universally in NT, $\epsilon\iota\mu\iota$ is inserted. If there is ellipse of $\epsilon\iota$, there is usually a pronoun, but ellipse is rare. Only in Paul is both pronoun and $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\mu\epsilon\nu$ absent. The ellipse of $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\epsilon$ is also rare: Lk 6²⁰ has neither pronoun nor copula. Ellipse of $\epsilon\iota\sigma\upsilon\nu$ is much more frequent, especially when it closely follows that of $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\nu$. The fut. indic. never suffers ellipse in NT except for rare instances of $\acute{\xi}\sigma\tau\alpha\iota$. Almost the only kind of phrase in which $\tilde{\eta}\nu$ might be supplied is that with $\delta\nu\omicron\mu\alpha$; there are a few other instances, especially in vivid and interrogative phrases and the stereotyped $\epsilon\iota$ $\delta\upsilon\nu\alpha\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu$. It is all but impossible to

decide whether ἦν is a copula or something stronger. Other persons of impf. indic. are to be supplied very occasionally: ἦσαν or ἐγένοντο, and ἤμην.

There are but two or three places in NT (nearly all in Paul) where subjunctive ἦ and ὄσιν may be supplied. The ellipse after δς ἄν etc. is classical (K-G § 354e, n. 2c; Gildersleeve I § 86). As well as epistolary formulae and formal wishes, there is the spontaneous use of the pure nominal phrase where optative is expected, as with εἰρήνη (Hebraic). There is no ellipse of ἔστω except in χάρις τῷ θεῷ (class. and early papyri). There are some further exx. in NT and Koine vernacular. Imper. ἔστέ may be supplied with some participles in Peter and Paul. But the ptc. is perhaps in itself imperatival; the phenomenon, which may be a peculiarity of the "eastern" Koine, is frequent in the vernacular and in Malalas. Something like ἴσθι is presumably to be supplied with δεῦρο. There is never need to supply ἔσεσθε.

Some phrases have only an apparent ellipse, because they follow immediately upon a previous clause which has the copula, and the copula is to be understood of both phrases: Mt 22¹⁴ 25^{35f} 28³ Lk 19² Jn 15⁵ 20²⁶ 1 Co 14¹⁰. 22 11³ 2 Co 10¹¹ 1 Jn 3¹² Rev 10¹ etc.

§ 2. Stronger or Essential meaning of ἔστιν or εἶσιν

On occasion, when emphasis or feeling is more than normal, there is even ellipse where the meaning is *there is (are)* or *it is*, and stronger than a mere copula. This happens also in both class. and literary Hell. Greek, and even sometimes in the papyri. Something like ἔστιν is to be supplied *before* ἵνα at times in Jn, and to some extent in Mk, Lk, and Paul. We may compare the ellipse before οὐχ ἔστι in Jn and Paul.

§ 3. Individual writers

The books of Biblical and certain secular writers may be laid side by side and in a general way the relative tendency to introduce or omit the copula will be discovered. It will be seen that in the Gospels there is some considerable difference from secular usage. (The copula infin. and ptc. have been excluded.)

	Mt	Mk	Lk	Ac	Jn
Verb <i>to be</i>	257	174	318	213	395
Ellipse	81	37	91	27	47
Proportion	3:1	5:1	3:1	8:1	8:1

	Ro	1 Co	2 Co	Ga	Eph	Ph	Col	1 Th	2 Th	1 Ti	2 Ti	Ti	Ph
<i>To be</i>	67	133	48	48	38	11	24	9	6	20	13	8	2
Ellipse	105	90	72	19	19	29	5	10	7	16	7	5	2
Propn.	$\frac{3}{4}$:1	1:1	$\frac{3}{4}$:1	$2\frac{1}{2}$:1	2:1	$\frac{1}{2}$:1	5:1	1:1	1:1	1:1	2:1	$1\frac{1}{2}$:1	1:1

	Paul (non- Past)	Past	Heb	Jas	2 Pt Jude	Joh. Epp.	Rev 1-4, 21f	Rev 5-20	Rev tot	1 Pt
<i>To be</i>	386	41	35	27	15	105	48	44	92	8
Ellipse	358	28	60	16	4	2	39	52	91	28
Propn.	1:1	$1\frac{1}{2}$:1	$\frac{1}{2}$:1	2:1	5:1	50:1			1:1	$\frac{1}{4}$:1

	Strabo I 1 64 B.C.- A.D. 21	Diod. Sic. pt. 1 (c. 50 B.C.)	Dio Chrys. <i>Kingship</i> I, II (A.D. 40-120)	Philostr. <i>Vit. Apoll.</i> I (ii-iii/A.D.)	Hdt I-IV approx. *
<i>To be</i>	37	48 (some are essential)	51	70	381
Ellipse	54	27	55	83	70
Propn.	$\frac{3}{4}$:1	2:1	1:1	1:1	5:1

* For Hdt, the figures are based on Barbelenet; I take responsibility for the others.

this eloquent chapter: 40. 41. 46. 47. 48. 56. 56) 2 Co 17. 21 2⁶ 5⁵ 10⁴ Eph 5⁹. 23 Col 2¹⁷ 1 Th 2³ 4⁶ 2 Th 3² 1 Ti 4⁴ 5²⁵ 2 Ti 3¹⁶ Ti 1¹⁵ (Exceptions: Ro 1¹⁰ 1 Co 6¹⁸ 7²⁹ (periph. pf.) 1¹⁸ 2¹⁴ 3¹⁹ 4⁴ 6¹⁷. 19 9¹⁶ 11⁷. 8. 15. 25 (Lk's parallel 22²⁰ omits the copula; Cadbury remarks on the strangeness of this ¹, in view of Luke's regular practice of inserting the copula, esp. if he found it in his sources. It is probably not a Pauline phrase, but one which he inherited) 12¹⁴. 22 3⁷ 6⁷ 7¹⁴. 14 14¹⁵, Col 1¹⁸ και αὐτός ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλή τοῦ σώματος, 1 Ti 1⁵ τὸ δὲ τέλος τῆς παραγγελίας ἐστὶν ἀγάπη.)

Much emphasis (= *is certainly*) appears to be achieved by the insertion of ἐστὶν in πιστὸς δὲ ἐστὶν ὁ κύριος 2 Th 3³ (better text); so also Ro 1¹⁶ 2²⁸ 11²³ 1 Co 1²⁵ 3¹⁷. 21 11⁷ 14³³ 2 Co 3¹⁷ Ga 3¹² 4². 26 5¹⁹ Eph 5¹⁸. 32 6¹² 1 Ti 3¹⁶ 4⁸. 8 6¹⁰ 2 Ti 4¹¹. 11 Ti 1¹⁰. There is no subject expressed in ἐστὶν ἀπίστου χείρων 1 Ti 5⁸, ἐλευθέρα ἐστὶν Ro 7³ 1 Co 7³⁹, Ro 13⁴. 6 1 Co 7⁴⁰ Ga 5³, and therefore the verb *to be* is inserted for clarity's sake.

Demonstratives: there is sometimes ellipse when the attribute is a demonstrative adj. or adv. (οὕτως και τὸ χάρισμα, etc.) Ro 5¹⁵ 9⁶. 8. 9 1 Co 12¹² 14¹² 2 Co 10⁷ Eph 2⁸ 1 Th 5¹⁸ 1 Ti 2³. (Exceptions: Ro 8⁹. 14 1 Co 9³ 10²⁸ 11²⁴ 2 Co 1¹² 10¹⁸, Ga 3⁷ (emphatic however), 4²⁴ (εἰσιν = *represent*), Eph 4¹⁰ 6¹ Col 3²⁰ 1 Ti 5⁴ Ti 3⁸; and τοῦτ' ἐστὶν is a frequent idiom: Ro 1¹² 7¹⁸ 9⁸ 10⁶. 8 Phm¹².)

Interrogatives: τί γάρ μοι; 1 Co 5¹² etc., τί (μοι) τὸ ὄφελος 15³², τί οὖν; Ro 3⁹ 6¹⁵ 11⁷, τί γάρ; Ro 3³ Ph 1¹⁸. Questions introduced by τίς or τί: Ro 3¹ 8³¹ 1 Co 5¹² 2 Co 2². 16 6¹⁴ (sc. essential ἐστὶν) 14. 15. 16 Ga 3¹⁹ 1 Th 2¹⁹. By ποῦ: Ro 3²⁷ 1 Co 1²⁰ ter 12¹⁷. 17 15⁵⁵. 55 OT, 12¹⁹ (sc. ἦν), Ga 4¹⁵. By πόθεν: 1 Co 13⁵⁴. 56 15³³. Simple interrogative: ἦ Ἰουδαίων ὁ θεὸς μόνον; . . . Ro 3²⁹; also 4⁹ 7⁷ Ga 3²¹ 1 Th 2¹⁹ (sc. ἐστε). By μή: Ro 3⁵ 9¹⁴, in a series of five rhetorical questions 1 Co 12²⁹. 30. (Exceptions: τί οὖν ἐστὶν Ἀπολλῶς; 1 Co 3⁵ 9¹⁸ 14¹⁵ Ro 9²⁰ 14⁴ 2 Co 3⁸, 1 Co 10¹⁶. 16 (but = *represent*; stronger than copula), 2 Co 12¹³.)

Subordinate clauses: indir. questions: τί Ro 8²⁷ 12², τίς, τί Eph 1¹⁸ (but after ἐστὶν in the previous clause), τί τὸ πλοῦτος Col 1²⁷. (Exceptions: ὁποῖόν ἐστιν 1 Co 3¹³, τίς ἐστὶν Eph 1¹⁸, τί ἐστὶν 5¹⁰.) After ὅπου sc. ἐστὶν 1 Co 3³. In protasis of conditions: sc. ἐστὶν 1 Co 11⁶; sc. ἦν 1 Co 12¹⁷. 17; sc. essential ἐστὶν, *there is* Ro 3³⁰ 13⁹; sc. ἐστὶν or ἦν Ro 4¹⁴; sc. ἐστὶν 8³¹ 11⁶ 2 Co 3⁹ 5¹⁷ Eph 4²⁹; sc. ἦν? 2 Co 3¹¹. This is Lukan and Pauline practice, which accords with class. and Hell. usage. (Exceptions: ἐὰν ἦς Ro 2²⁵, εἴπερ εἰσιν 1 Co 8⁵, ἦν 1 Co 12¹⁹, ἐστε 2 Co 2⁹, ἐστὶν (periph. pf.) 4³, εἰμι 2 Co 12¹¹, εἴ τις ἐστὶν Ti 1⁶.) In relative clauses (see under Graphic, above): also Ro 9⁴ ὧν ἡ υἰοθεσία (sc. essential ἐστὶν), 14²³, 1 Co 5¹ (sc. ess. ἐστὶν), 8⁶ (do.), 2 Co 1²⁰, 8¹⁸ (do.); Ph 3¹⁵ 4³; confined to Luke, Paul, Heb. in NT, but more general in class. and Hell. (Exceptions: ἐστὶν Ro 1²⁵ 3⁸ 4¹⁶ 5¹⁴ 8³⁴ 16⁵ 1 Co 3¹¹ 4¹⁷ 2 Co 4⁴ Ga 1⁷ 4¹ 4²⁴ *constitutes* . . . *represents*, 4²⁶ difficult, as ἐστὶν is merely copula, 5¹⁹ *consists of*, Eph 1¹⁴. 23 3¹³; 4¹⁶ 5⁵ *constitutes*; 6². 17,

¹ *Style and Literary Methods of Luke*, 149.

Ph 4⁸, Col 1⁷. 15. 18. 24. 27 2¹⁰. 17. 22. 23 3⁵. 14 4⁹ 2 Th 2⁹ 3¹⁷; 1 Ti 1²⁰ 2 Ti 1¹⁵ 2¹⁷ *se trouve*; 1 Ti 3¹⁵ 4¹⁰ 2 Ti 1⁶ *ess. ἔστιν*; Ro 9⁴ 16⁷ 1 Ti 6¹ εἶσι; Ga 3¹⁰ εἶσι *se trouvent*; Ro 1⁶ ἔστε, 2 Co 11¹⁵ ἔσται.) After ὡς: Ro 5¹⁵ ὡς τὸ παράπτωμα, 2 Co 10⁷, Col 1⁶ (but ἔστιν in previous clause), Eph 5²². (Exceptions: copula after ὡσπερ 1 Co 8⁵; after καθὼς Eph 4²¹ (essential) Ph 1⁷ Col 1⁶ (periphr. pres.) 1 Th 2¹³ (ess. ἔστιν).) After καθάπερ: sc. essential ἦν 2 Co 8¹¹ (exception: 1 Co 12¹²). After ὅτι: Ro 7¹⁶ 8¹⁸ 11³⁶ 14¹⁴. 23 1 Co 8⁴. 4 2 Co 10⁷ 13⁵ Ph 2¹¹ (ὅτι κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός). Regard (p. 55) thinks that this emphasizes κύριος, since this type of phrase has the copula elsewhere, e.g. 1 Jn 4¹⁵. 1 Ti 1⁸ Eph 2¹¹ (sc. ἔστε). (Exceptions: Ro 1³² εἰσιν, 2² 4²¹ 7¹⁴ 8¹⁶ ἔσμεν 15¹⁴ ἔστε 1 Co 1¹¹ 6¹⁵. 16 10¹⁹. 19 11³ 15⁵⁸ (but emph.) 14³⁷ 16¹⁵ 2 Co 1¹⁸ 2³ 9¹² 13⁶ ἔσμεν Eph 4²⁵ ἔσμεν 5³⁰ (do.) 5¹⁶ εἰσιν 23 ἔστιν 2 Th 2⁴ (do.) 2 Ti 1¹² (do.).)

(c) *Ellipse of other parts besides ἔστιν*: Scil. εἰμι: Ro 7²⁴ (exclam.), κἀγὼ 2 Co 11²² *ter.* Not even the pronoun is present with πρόθυμος Ro 1¹⁵ *d e vulg* (2) Orig. Ambst. Ambr., and εἰ δὲ καὶ ἰδιώτης τῷ λόγῳ 2 Co 11⁶ (D*E add εἰμι), ἀλλ' οὐ τῇ γνώσει 11⁶, δς κατὰ πρόσωπον μὲν ταπεινός 10¹. (Exceptions: more often εἰμι, whether essential or copula, is present: Ro 1¹⁴ 7¹⁴ 11¹. 13 1 Co 1¹² 3⁴ 9¹. 2 12¹⁵. 15. 16. 16 13² 15⁹. 9. 10 2 Co 12¹⁰ Ph 4¹¹ Col 2⁵ 1 Ti 1¹⁵.)

Scil. εἰ even without pronoun: εἰ δὲ υἱός, καὶ κληρόνομος Ga 4⁷ (but the sense is made clear by εἰ in previous clause). See further under Interrogatives. (Exception: Ga 4⁷.)

Scil. ἔσμεν: with pronoun 2 Co 10⁷. No pronoun: εἰ δὲ τέκνά, καὶ κληρονόμοι Ro 8¹⁷ (but ἔσμεν in previous sentence), Ph 3¹⁵ 2 Co 4⁸ 7⁵ 11⁶; see also Graphic. (Exceptions: Ro 6¹⁵ 8¹² 14⁸ 12⁵ *vl.* etc.)

Scil. ἔστε: see Graphic. 2 Co 1¹⁴ Eph 2¹¹ (after ὅτι) 2¹³ (= *vous trouvez*). (Exceptions: Ro 6¹⁴. 16 8⁹ 1 Co 1³⁰ 3³ 1 Th 2²⁰ 4⁹ 5⁴. 5 etc.)

Scil. εἰσιν: in connection with ellipse of ἔστιν 2 Co 8²³. But not always: Ro 2¹³ 4¹⁴ 11¹⁶. 28. 28 1 Co 16⁹ 2 Co 8⁴ (*ptc.* as main verb) 10¹⁰. (Exceptions: Ro 2¹⁴ (*cp.* previous verse) 13¹ (periphr. *pf.*)³ 15²⁷ 1 Co 14¹⁰. 22 10¹⁸ 3⁸ 2 Co 11²² (question: Ἐβραῖοί εἰσιν; essential εἰσιν) Eph 5¹⁶ (ὅτι) 1 Ti 5²⁴ 6². 2 (ὅτι) 2 Ti 3⁶ (ess.) Ti 1¹⁰ (ess.) 3¹⁰ (ess.).)

Scil. fut. indic.: doubtful are 1 Co 15²¹ 2 Co 3¹¹. Apart from these possible instances of ἔσται the fut. never suffers ellipse in Paul (or indeed in NT). Scil. imperf. indic.: very rare; there is the stereotyped εἰ δυνατόν Ga 4¹⁵, also 1 Co 2⁴ Ph 2⁵ Ro 4¹³. There is ellipse of ἦσαν in καθὼς τινες αὐτῶν 1 Co 10⁷. Otherwise the impf. is always expressed.

Scil. subjunctive: this ellipse occurs only in Paul (and Heb 12¹⁶). 2 Co 8¹¹ ὅπως . . . καὶ τὸ ἐπιτέλεσθαι, 13 οὐ γὰρ ἔνα ἄλλοις ἀνεσις, ὑμῶν θλίψις (sc. *ess. ἦ*), 12²⁰ μὴ πως ἔρις (do.). It is probably subjunctive which has to be supplied in 2 Co 5¹⁰ (εἴτε . . . εἴτε . . .), and we may supply ὦσιν before ἐν τῇ διακονίᾳ Ro 12⁷; another instance is 2 Co 12²⁰ where ὦσιν is preferable to εὐρεθῶσιν. Also scil. the essential verb Ro 4¹⁶. In this respect Paul is nearer to class. practice than any other NT writer. However, the insertion of subjunctive is much more regular.

. Scil. optative: see epistolary formulae, above. Other wishes are: ἐπικατάρατος πᾶς ὁς . . . (ὁ . . .) Ga 3^{10, 13}, εἰρήνη ἐπ' αὐτοῦς καὶ ἔλεος 6¹⁶. Paul does not use opt. of εἰμι.

Scil. imperative: ἔστω is rarely omitted except in the formula χάρις τῷ θεῷ (see Exclamations), which is class. too (K-G § 354 n. 2e; Abel § 157) and occurs in the early papyri. There are also ἡ ἀγάπη ἀνυπόκριτος Ro 12⁹, ὁ λόγος ὑμῶν πάντοτε ἐν χάριτι Col 4⁶, and perhaps before κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν Ro 12⁶. (Exceptions: ἦτω 1 Co 16²², ἔστω 2 Co 12¹⁶ Ga 1⁸.) Ἔστέ may be supplied with the ptes. in Ro 12^{9f}. 16^{ter} Col 3¹⁶ 2 Co 9^{11, 13} 8²⁴ BD*G (against S) Eph 4², and Regard includes the ptes. at Eph 5¹⁵⁻²³ 6^{16, 18, 18} (pp. 211f). But the ptc. itself may be imperatival; in fact, ἐστέ imper. does not occur at all in NT (but there is ἔστε with γινώσκοντες Eph 5⁵, which may be intended for ἐστέ), 1 Ti 4¹⁵ ἔσθι.

(d) *Stronger meanings of ἔστιν and εἶπω*: even here there is ellipse in Paul, which is not confined to the copula; there is the meaning *there is (are)*, or *it is*; e.g. 1 Th 5³ εἰρήνη καὶ ἀσφάλεια, 2 Ti 1⁵ ὅτι καὶ ἐν σοί, Ro 2^{8, 9, 10} 4^{18, 18} 8¹ 9^{16, 32} 11¹¹ 1 Co 8⁶ 11³⁰ 13⁸ 15⁴⁰ 2 Co 1²⁰ 3¹⁷ 4⁶ 6² Ga 2²¹ 3^{4, 5} Eph 2^{8, 9} 4^{4, 5, 9}, a series of four in the vehement passage Ph 2¹, 1 Ti 2⁵. Something like ἔστιν is to be supplied before ἵνα 1 Co 7²⁹ 1 Ti 3¹⁵, and οὐχ ὅτι 2 Co 1²⁴ 3⁵ Ph 4^{11, 17} 2 Th 3⁹. Normally of course the verb *to be* is not absent.

It may be that we are to supply ἔστιν in 1 Co 10¹⁷ ὅτι εἰς ἄρτος (sc. ἔστιν), ἐν σῶμα οἱ πολλοὶ ἔσμεν: *because there is one bread, we the many are one body*, instead of the usual interpretation which is less intelligible.

Individual writers: the Fourth Gospel.

We find here almost the very opposite of Pauline usage: the pure nominal phrase and ellipse of the copula is the exception rather than the rule.

(a) *Fixed phrases*: (ἔτι) μικρὸν καὶ 14¹⁹ 16^{16, 17, 19}. (Exceptions: (τὸ) θαύμαστόν ἐστιν ὅτι 9³⁰.) Parenthetical ὄνομα αὐτῷ 1⁶ (ἦν S*D*W), 3¹ (ὀνόματι S*). (Exception: ἦν δὲ ὄνομα 18¹⁰.) Proverbial: πνεῦμα ὁ θεός 4²⁴. (Exc. 13¹⁶ 15³⁰.)

(b) *Spontaneous phrases*: ἰδοὺ 19⁶, ἴδε 12^{9, 36, 48} 19^{14, 26f}, μακάριοι οἱ 20²⁹ (Hebr. infl.?), but ἐστε 13¹⁷. In Jn even exclamations may retain ἔστιν: as σκληρὸς ἐστιν ὁ λόγος 6⁶⁰. Οὕτως with ἔστιν 3⁸, οὗτος with ἔστιν 1^{9, 30} etc. (22 times), ἐκεῖνος 5⁸⁹ etc. (5 times). But the copula is absent in the interrogative idiom τί ἐμοὶ (ἡμῖν) καὶ σοὶ Jn 2⁴ which has a parallel in Hebrew besides affinities with class. speech (K-G I 417). Another idiomatic phrase is τί πρὸς σε (ἡμᾶς) Jn 21^{22f}; there is the Latin *quid hoc ad te*, which has a class. Greek parallel in the proverb-like οὐδὲν πρὸς Διόνυσον, although normally there is ἐστι (cf. οὐδὲν ἐστι δήπου πρὸς ἐμέ Demosth. 18, 21) and parallels later in Epictetus (see Schenkl's Index, under πρὸς): τί (οὐδὲν)

πρὸς ἐμέ (σέ) and in a papyrus of 9 B.C. (BU IV 1158¹⁷). There is also the conversational formula τί οὖν 1²¹ (sc εἶ) and the interrogatives οὗτος δὲ τί 21²¹ (note the ch.) and τί πρὸς σε 21²² (do.). But much more, frequently ἔστιν appears in questions: 21²⁰ 6⁹ 7³⁶ etc.; this is true also of indir. questions 2⁹ 9²⁹. 30 7²⁷ etc., of the protasis of a condition 9²⁵, of relative clauses 1⁴¹ etc., after καθὼς 19⁴⁰ etc., after ἕως 9⁴. Ellipse is rather frequent after ὅτι: 4⁵³ (sc. ἦν), 10³⁸ (sc. ἔστιν and εἰμι) 14¹⁰ (sc. εἰμι), 11 (sc. εἰμι and ἔστιν), 20 (sc. εἰμι bis and ἔστε). But this is only nine instances, compared with sixty where the copula is inserted: 2¹⁷ 2²¹ etc. including ὅτι = because 1³⁰ 3²³. 33 etc.

(c) *Ellipse of other parts besides ἔστιν*: see above. There is also ellipse of εἰμι at 1²³ ἐγὼ φωνῆ βοῶντος, and of εἶ at 17²¹ (but συ appears), and of ἔσμεν at 17¹¹ (καθὼς ἡμεῖς), and of ἔστε 15⁵ (ὕμεις τὰ κλάσματα), and of ἦν 19⁴¹ (καὶ ἐν τῷ κήπῳ μνημεῖον καινόν). The subjunctive ᾧ may be understood at 17²⁶, but the ellipse occurs immediately after the insertion of ἦ. The opt. probably has to be supplied in the formal wish εἰρήνη (σοι) at 20¹⁹. 21. 26. Presumably ἔσθι is to be supplied with δεῦρο ἔξω 11⁴³. Against these ten instances of ellipse there are some 202 instances without it.

(d) *Stronger meanings*: there is no instance of ellipse here, but something like ἔστιν is to be supplied before ἔνα at 12³⁸ 18⁹. 32 19²⁴ and ἀλλ' ἔνα 9³ 13¹⁸ 15²⁵, and before οὐχ ὅτι 6⁴⁶ 7²². With ἔνα this may be a kind of imperative, as in the phrases which begin with γὰρ νά in good MGr. (Pernot 69). The presence of ἔστιν or εἰσιν is the rule with stronger meanings: 1⁴⁷ 4³⁵ etc. (12 times).

Individual writers: the Johannine Epistles.

(a) *Fixed phrases*: εἰρήνη σοι 3 Jn 15. But an exception to the NT practice is the presence of ἔσται in the formula at 2 Jn³. Regard ascribes this to inherited Ionic influence (p. 42). Proverbial expressions: ὁ θεὸς ἀγάπη ἔστιν 4⁸. 16 is an instance which in other parts of NT would be a pure nominal phrase, even in Jn, e.g. πνεῦμα ὁ θεός. So also ὁ θεὸς φῶς ἔστιν 1⁵, καὶ ἡ ἀμαρτία ἔστιν ἡ ἀνομία 3⁴, πᾶσα ἀδικία ἀμαρτία ἔστιν 5¹⁷.

(b) *Spontaneous*: ellipse 1³ καὶ ἡ κοινωνία δὲ ἡ ἡμετέρα μετὰ τοῦ πατρὸς. (Exceptions: copula ἔστιν 42 times, other parts 26 times.)

Individual writers: Luke—Acts.

Luke prefers the copula on every possible occasion, apart from set phrases, titles, and a few exclamations and questions.

(a) *Set phrases*: φάνερρον ὅτι Ac 4¹⁶, ἔξόν 2²⁹, σκληρόν 26¹⁴. Proverbial: Lk 10² (= Mt 9³⁷) ὁ μὲν θερισμὸς πολὺς, οἱ δὲ ἔργαται ὀλίγοι, 14²⁴ (= Mk 9⁵⁰) καλὸν τὸ ἔλας, 10⁷ (= Mt 10¹⁰ 1 Ti 5¹⁸), 18¹⁹ (= Mk 10¹⁸, as opp. to Mt 19¹⁷), 16¹⁵. 18. Also Lk 12⁶¹ 2²⁵ 8⁴¹ 24¹³ ᾧ (ἦ) ὄνομα (D

ὄνοματι, as elsewhere in Lk and almost always in Ac and class.) 24¹⁸ (SB ὄνοματι) Ac 13⁶ (p⁴⁵ ὄνοματι, D ὄνοματι καλούμενον). Lk 1^{5. 27} καὶ τὸ ὄνομα. Epistolary formulae: χαίρειν Ac 15²³ 23²⁶. (Exceptions: δέον with ἔστιν Ac 19³⁸, ὄνομα with ἔστιν Lk 1⁶³ 8³⁰ (as opp. to Mk 5⁹), εἰ δυνατὸν with εἴη Ac 20¹⁶; also ἔστιν with μακάριον Ac 20³⁵, καλὸν Lk 9³³, ἀνευδεκτὸν 17¹, ἱκανόν 22³⁸, εὐκοπώτερον 16¹⁷ 18²⁵ (= Mk 10²⁵ Mt 19²⁴), and so on Ac 2²⁴ 4¹⁹ 6² 12³ 10²⁸ 13⁴⁶ 25¹⁶ 28²². Proverbial: τὰ ἀδύνατα παρὰ ἀνθρώποις δυνατὰ παρὰ τῷ θεῷ ἔστιν Lk 18²⁷ (as opp. to Mt Mk).)

(b) *Spontaneous*: (καὶ) ἰδοὺ Lk 1³⁸ 5¹⁸ etc. (Exceptions Lk 2²⁵ 17²¹ etc.) οὐαί Lk 6²⁴ 10¹³ etc. Exclamations: εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος Lk 13³⁵ 19³⁸ (= Mt Jn); so also Lk 10²³ 12⁴³ (as Mt) etc., μακάριος 14⁵ 11²⁷ 14¹⁵, ὑμεῖς μάρτυρες Lk 24⁴⁸, οὐκ εὐθέως τὸ τέλος 21⁹ (sc. ἔσται?), ὑμεῖς δὲ οὐχ οὕτως 22²⁶ (sc. ἔστε), εὐλογημένη σύ 14^{2. 42}, τὸ σκότος πόσον 11³⁸ D, μεγάλη ἡ Ἄρτεμις Ac 19^{28. 34}. Doxology: δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις (sc. ἔστω or εἴη) Lk 21⁴. Verbal adj.: οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσχοῦς καινοῦς βλητέον Lk 5³⁸ (only instance in NT, but class. and Hell.). Other phrases (esp. rhetorical or declarative), e.g. οὐ τὸ πτύον ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ Lk 3¹⁷; also 11³⁴ 22²⁰. Demonstrative: ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων οὗτος Lk 23³⁸ (Mt-parall. has copula), οὕτως 12²¹, οὗτοι 24⁴⁴. Interrogatives: Lk 4³⁴ (Mk Mt Jn), 3⁶, 8^{28. 45}, 21⁷, 22²⁷, 24¹⁷, Ac 10²¹ etc. Indir. questions: Lk 7³⁹ 13²³ Ac 26²³ 17¹⁹. After ὅπου Lk 17³⁷ (but parall. Mt 24²⁸ adds ἐὰν ᾗ). In protasis of conditional (Lucan and Pauline habit): Lk 11^{35D} 3⁶. In a rel. clause there is ellipse after καθότι Lk 19⁹ S*. After ὅτι Lk 16¹⁵ (Lk sometimes avoids Mk's ellipse, by adding ἀνέστη 9^{8. 19}). But under this heading there are a very great many exceptions, and with spontaneous phrases in Lk-Ac the copula is the general rule.

(c) *Other parts besides ἔστιν.*

See above. Scil. ptc. ὄντα in WH of Ac 26²¹ (rest have it). Scil. εἰμι Ac 7³² OT (but not LXX, which adds εἰμι: Ex 3⁶) 10³⁹ 18⁶. But εἰμι inserted 28 times. Sc. ptc. ὄντες in WH of Lk 6³ (rest have it). Sc. εἶ: see Exclamations (usually inserted). Ἔσμεν always inserted (ten times). Sc. ἔστε indic.: ὑμεῖς μάρτυρες τούτων Lk 24²⁸, and see above (otherwise inserted). Sc. εἰσιν Lk 24¹⁷ and see above (but usually inserted). - Sc. ἔσται: Lk 21⁷ καὶ τί τὸ σημεῖον (no other ellipse of fut. indic.: inserted 48 times). Sc. ἦν Lk 1⁵ (*there was*) γυνὴ αὐτῷ 2^{25. 36. 37}; see also above. (But ἦν inserted 113 times; ἦσαν 43 times; ἦμεν 5; ἦμεν 2; ἦμεθα Ac 27³⁷). Scil. optative: Lk 10⁵ 24³⁶ εἰρήνη τῷ οἴκῳ τούτῳ, 1²⁸ ὁ κύριος μετὰ σοῦ; see also Subordinate Clauses. There is ellipse of either opt. or imper. in ἐν οὐρανῷ εἰρήνη καὶ δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις Lk 19³⁸, τὸ αἶμα ὑμῶν ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν ὑμῶν Ac 18⁶. Sc. ἔστε imper. Lk 12³⁶ ὑμεῖς ὁμοιοί, 24⁴⁷ with ptc. Sc ἴσθι: Ac 7³ δεῦρο εἰς . . .

(d) *Stronger meanings.*

Ellipse before ἵνα: Lk 18⁴¹ (but prob. imperatival ἵνα). Ellipse of ἔστιν if is: Ac 12²² θεοῦ φωνὴ καὶ οὐκ ἀνθρώπου (inserted 37 times).

Individual writers: Mark.

The ellipse here is usually confined to fixed phrases.

(a) *Fixed phrases*: ὄνομα 14³², 5⁹ (parall. Lk 8³⁰ adds ἔστιν). εἰ δὲ μὴ 2^{21f}. ἀδύνατον 10²⁷ (Mt adds ἔστιν). εἰ δυνατόν 13²² = Mt 24²⁴ (but ἔστιν is retained at Mk 14³⁶ Mt 26³⁹). καλόν 14²¹ BWL (others add ἦν; Mt's parall. has ἦν, also Lk 9³³; even in Mk the copula is retained at 7²⁷ 9⁵. 42. 43. 45. 47). (Exceptions 2⁹ 10²⁵. 40.) Proverbial expressions: καλόν τὸ ἄλλας Mk 9⁵⁰ = Lk 14³⁴, τὸ μὲν πνεῦμα πρόθυμον, ἡ δὲ σὰρξ ἀσθενής 14³⁸ = Mt 26⁴¹, οὐδεὶς ἀγαθός 10¹⁸ = Lk 18¹⁹ (Mt. 19¹⁷ adds the copula in εἰς ἔστιν ὁ ἀγαθός), παρὰ θεῶ πάντα δυνατά 10²⁷ = Mt 19²⁶.

(b) *Spontaneous expressions*: ellipse with ἴδε 3³⁴ 13¹. 21, οὐαί 13¹⁷ 14²¹, τί ἐμοί (ἡμῖν) καὶ σοί 1²⁴ 5⁷. In other less stereotyped forms of questions, the copula has also to be supplied: τίς ἡ σοφία 6², τίνος ἡ εἰκὼν αὐτῆ 12¹⁶ (parall. Lk 20²⁴ avoids the ellipse), πόθεν τοῦτω ταῦτα 6², simple interr. οὐ 4²¹. But there are exceptions: τί ἔστιν τοῦτο 1²⁷, τί ἔστιν εὐκοπώτερον 2⁹ = Lk 5²³, τίς ἔστιν ἡ μήτηρ μου 3³³, τίς ἄρα οὗτός ἐστιν 4⁴¹, ποῦ 14¹⁴ = Lk 22¹¹, πόθεν 12³⁷, ποῖος 12²⁸, πόσος 9²¹. Exclamations or simple declarations: 13⁷ (where Mt 24⁶ adds ἔστιν) οὕτω τὸ τέλος, 14³⁶ πάντα δυνατά σοι. But even these have ἔστιν: οὐχ οὕτως δὲ ἔστιν ἐν ὑμῖν 10⁴³ = Mt 20²⁸, even when impersonal: πῶς δύσκολόν ἐστιν 10²⁴. Other non-ellipses: ἐνοχός ἐστιν = 3²⁹, but here we have no subject expressed and the verb must be there to supply it (*he is*). The same applies to οὐκ ἔστιν θεός νεκρῶν 12²⁷ = Lk 20³⁸ (*he is*), and to οὐκ ἔστιν ὧδε 16⁶ = Mt 28⁶ = Lk 24⁶. Ἐρημός ἐστιν ὁ τόπος 6³⁵ = Mt 14¹⁵ (emph.?). Κύριός ἐστιν ὁ Ὑῖός . . . καὶ τοῦ σαββάτου 2²⁸ = Lk 6⁵ = Mt 12⁹. In οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶν τι κρυπτόν ἐάν 4²², it is the essential ἔστιν *there is*, as also most probably in 6⁴ = Mt 13⁵⁷, 9⁴⁰ = Mt 12³⁰ = Lk 9⁵⁰, 12³³. The copula is not omitted with οὕτως 4²⁸ 10⁴², nor with demonstratives 3³⁵ etc. (13 times). The copula is inserted in indir. questions: 5¹⁴ 9¹⁰ 13³³, and after ὅπου 5⁴⁰ (ἦν); in relat. clauses 2¹⁹ etc. (10 times). With two exceptions (6¹⁵) where the parall. Lk 9⁸ inserts ἀνέστη, 8²⁸ where the parall. Lk 9¹⁹ adds ἀνέστη, the copula occurs in clauses beginning with ὅτι: 2¹ 6⁴⁹. 55 12³⁵ 13^{38f}; of these exceptions, it looks as if προφήτης is direct speech, with ὅτι introducing a mere exclamation of the people, in 6¹⁵, and in the same way there is no need for ἔστιν in 8²⁸ if ὅτι is thought of as introducing the dir. speech εἰς τῶν προφητῶν. When Mark intends ὅτι to introduce indir. speech he has the copula, as ἀκούσας ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ὁ Ν. ἔστιν 10⁴⁷ (parall. Lk 18³⁷ has παρέρχεται). Thus the proportion in this section is striking: ellipse 15 or less, copula 56.

(c) Other parts.

Strangely enough there is sometimes the ellipse of εἰμι in Mk: ἐγὼ ὁ θεός Ἀβραάμ 12²⁶ = Ac 7³² (the LXX of Ex 3⁶ adds εἰμι), μὴτι ἐγὼ 14¹⁹. There is ellipse of ἦν with καλόν 14²¹ and at 1¹¹ (καὶ φωνὴ ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν), although BWA add ἐγένετο (and Lk's parall. 3²² adds

γενέσθαι), and 145 vl. The apparent ellipse of ἦν in καὶ αὐτὸς μόνος 647 is covered by ἦν in the previous clause. There is one instance of ellipse of ἦσαν, 1540 ἐν αἰς καὶ Μαρία . . . There is ellipse of ἔστω at 1436 = Mt 2640 (οὐ τί ἐγὼ θέλω), where the parallel Lk 2242 avoids it, and perhaps at 142 (μὴ ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ). Elsewhere the appropriate part of εἶναι fails to be inserted: again the proportion is striking, ellipse 7, verb 88.

(d) *Stronger meanings.*

Even here, when drama is present, there is ellipse: εἰς τῶν δώδεκα (*it is*) 1420. It is probably also so before ἀλλ' ἔνα 1449 (imperative) 210. Some read the opening of the gospel like this: scil. ἔστιν before καθὼς (*the beginning of the gospel is as it is written . . .*). But Mark's fondness for the verb *to be* is against this interpretation. The insertion of ἔστιν = *consists in* 715 1014 (or *belongs to*) 1229, 127 *means*.

Individual writers: Hebrews.

In avoidance of the copula Heb. is even more class. and literary in tendency than Paul; there is always good reason for the insertion of ἔστιν where it occurs.

(a) *Fixed phrases.* Ellipse with πρόδηλον 714 (but κατάδηλον has ἔστιν 715, emphatic), ἀδύνατον 64. 18 104 116, λόγος 511, ἔτι μικρόν ὅσον ὅσον 1037 (but LXX Isa 2620 has ἀποκρύβηθι μικρόν ὅσον ὅσον), ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν 79, ἀναγκαῖον 83, ἀνάγκη 916. 23, ἔθος 1025, φοβερὸν 1031, καλόν 139. Epistolary formula ἡ χάρις μετὰ 1325.

(b) *Spontaneous phrases.* Ellipse: 138 Ἰησοῦς X. . . ὁ αὐτός, 513 81 916 412. 13. 13 54 210. 11 68. 8. 10 917 1023. 30. Ellipse after ὡς 32 (sc. ἦν), πηλικός 74 (do.), τίς 711 (sc. ἔστιν), in relative sentences (unlike Paul) 99 1110, after ὅτι 1119, with demonstratives 920 (τοῦτο τὸ αἷμα, where LXX has ἰδοὺ τὸ αἷμα) 1317. In doxology ᾧ ἡ δόξα 1321. (Presence of εἰσιν in a question 114, ἔστιν with demonstratives 214 75 911 1020 1116 1315, ἔστιν = *he is* 513 86 915, = *belongs to* 514, after relative 72; presence of εἰσιν in periph. pf. 720. 23. Therefore the presence of ἔστιν at 111 (ἔστιν δὲ πίστις ἐλπίζομένων ὑπόστασις) is either very exceptional or is not a copula (= *represents*)).

(c) *Other parts.*

Th. Nissen (in *Philologus* 92, 1937, 248) conjectures at 1216 μὴ τις πόρνος <ἦ> ἢ βέβηλος. Otherwise ellipse of subjunctive in 1215 (the only other place in NT is Paul). 134 τίμιος ὁ γάμος (sc. ἔστω), 5 ἀφιλάργυρος ὁ τρόπος. Scil. ἔστε imperatival with ptc. 135 (as Paul, Peter, Luke). Ellipse of ἦν 35. 6 (and see stronger meanings); of εἶ 721 (σὺ ἱερεὺς, even when LXX inserts εἶ). (Exceptions: insertion of ἦσαν 215, of ἔσμεν 36 42 1010. 39, of ἔσται (after μήποτε) 312, of ἦν 710. 11 84. 4. 7 1138 1221, of εἶναι 1113 (but = *they are*), of ἔστε 128. 8.)

(d) Stronger meanings.

Ellipse of *ἔστιν there is* or *ἦν there was* 9^{2. 4. 5}. Scil. *ἔστιν* before οὐχ ἵνα 9²⁵; scil. *ἔστιν there is* 9¹⁶ ἔπου γὰρ διαθήκη, 27 μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο κρίσις, 10³, 10¹⁸ ἔπου δὲ ἀφ᾿ ἑσῶν τούτων, 18, 127. (No ellipse: 4¹⁸ 9⁶ (οὐκ ἔστιν *it is impossible*), 11⁶ *exists*.)

Individual writers: James.

On the contrary, Jas is not very fond of the pure nominal phrase, outside stereotyped expressions.

(a) Fixed phrases. χρῆ 3¹⁰, ἔν 1¹⁷. Epistol. formulae χαίρειν 1¹. Proverbial ἡ γὰρ κρίσις ἀνέλεος τῶ μὴ ποιήσαντι ἔλεος 2¹³.

(b) Spontaneous. Proportion of ellipse 9: copula 15. The idiomatic question τί τὸ ὄφελος 2^{14. 16}, ἰδοὺ 3⁴. Exclamations 1^{12. 26} 3^{2. 6}. Interrogative 3¹³ 4¹, 4¹⁴ ποία ἡ ζωὴ AKLP lat copt. Indir. question 4¹⁴ S*B 614 syrⁿ arm. (No ellipse 15 times.)

(c) Other parts. No ellipse (12 times).

(d) Stronger meanings. Ellipse *it is* 3⁸ ἀκατάστατον κακόν, *there is* 3¹⁶ ἔπου γὰρ ζῆλος καὶ ἐριθεία, ἐκεῖ ἀκαταστασία, *it is* 4¹ οὐκ ἐντεῦθεν. (No ellipse 4^{12. 14} L vulg 1⁷.)

Individual writers: 1 Peter.

He tends towards the ellipse.

(a) Fixed phrases. εἰ δέον 1⁶, κρεῖττον 3¹⁷. Epistol. formula εἰρήνη ὑμῖν 5¹⁴.

(b) Spontaneous. Doxology εὐλογητὸς ὁ θεός 1³, αὐτῶ τὸ κράτος 5¹¹ (but *ᾧ ἔστιν* [A om. *ἔστιν*] ἡ δόξα 4¹¹). Demonstrative 2^{19f}. Interrog. 2²⁰ 3¹³. (Exceptions: 1²⁵ 2¹⁵ 3^{4. 20. 22}.)

(c) Other parts. We may supply the imper. (2nd pl.) with adjs. and ptcs.: 1^{14. 32} 2¹⁸ 3^{1. 7. 8f} 4^{8ff} (but Moulton Proleg. 182f); *ἔστε* (pres. ind.) is absent: ὑμεῖς δὲ γένος ἐκλεκτόν 2⁹, οἱ ποτε οὐ λαός 1¹⁰, μακάριοι 3¹⁴ 4¹⁴. Impf. ἦν (perhaps *ἔστιν*) is to be understood in ἀρκετὸς γὰρ ὁ παρεληλυθὼς χρόνος 4³; scil. εἴμι in ὅτι ἐγὼ ἀγιος 1¹⁶ (LXX inserts εἴμι). (Exceptions: ἦτε inserted 2²⁵, *ἔστω* 3³.)

(d) Stronger meanings. Ellipse 4¹⁷ ὅτι ὁ καιρὸς τοῦ ἀρξασθαι, 1⁷ εἰ δὲ πρῶτον ἀφ' ἡμῶν, τί τὸ τέλος.

Individual writers: 2 Pt. and Jude.

Strangely the ellipse is never found except in the stereotyped doxology and with the Hebraic οὐαί. The ptc. is probably imperatival in itself, without the need to supply *ἔστε*. There is thus no instance of a spontaneous phrase containing the ellipse. Doxology 2 Pt 3¹⁸ Jude 2⁵; οὐαί Jude 11.

Individual writers: Matthew.

It is almost only in stereotyped phrases, proverbs, and exclamations that Matthew omits the copula, and even here (as with *πρέπον, ἀδύνατον, ἕξόν, καλόν*) he inserts the copula sometimes. The only exceptions are the Semitic *ἰδοῦ* and *οὐαί*, and the interesting case of *ὅτι* (ellipse with which is characteristic of Mt.).

(a) *Fixed phrases.* With *ἀρκετόν* 6³⁴ 10²⁵, *εἰ δυνατόν* 24²⁴ (= Mk 13²²), although *ἔστιν* is inserted at 26³⁹ (= Mk 14³⁵), *ἀνάγκη* 18⁷ BL 33 (but SDW insert *ἔστιν*). Semitic influence may explain *δῶρον* 15⁵, *ἰλεώς σοι* (scil. *ὁ θεός εἶη* or more prob. a homonym for *יְהוָה*) 16²². Proverbial expressions: *ὁ μὲν θερισμὸς πολὺς* 9³⁷ = Lk 10², so also 10¹⁰ = Lk 10⁷, 11⁸ (parall. Lk 7²⁵ has *εἶσιν*), 19²⁶ = Mk 10²⁷ (Lk 18²⁷ adds *ἔστιν*), 26⁴¹ = Mk 14³⁸. No ellipse: Mt adds *ἔστιν* in *εἰς ἔστιν ὁ ἀγαθός* 19¹⁷ (against Mk 10¹⁸ Lk 18¹⁹). (Exceptions: *πρέπον* has *ἔστιν* 3¹⁵, and so has *ἀδύνατον* 19²⁶ (against the parall. Mk 10²⁷); *ἦν* is inserted with *ἕξόν* 12⁴ and with *καλόν* 26²⁴ (against Mk 14²¹), *ἔστιν* with *καλόν* 15²⁶ 17⁴ 18^{8, 9}, with *οὐδέν* 23^{16, 18}, *εὐκοπώτερον* 19²⁴ = Mk 10²⁵ Lk 16¹⁷ 18²⁵; also *οὐκ ἔστιν θέλημα ἴνα* 18¹⁴.)

(b) *Spontaneous.* With *ἰδοῦ* 3¹⁷ 7⁴ 9¹⁰ 11¹⁹ 12^{10, 18, 42, 49} 17⁵ 24^{23, 26} 25⁶ (but copula 24²⁶). With *οὐαί* 18^{7, 7} 23^{13, 16, 23, 25, 27, 29} 24¹⁹ 26²⁴. Exclamations: *μακάριοι οἱ* 5³⁻¹⁰ 13¹⁶ = Lk 10²³, 24⁴⁶ (sing.) = Lk 12⁴³ (but the copula does occur in the same formula 5¹¹, 11⁶ = Lk 7²³, 16¹⁷), *τὸ σκότος πόσον* 6²³ = Lk 11³⁶ D, *μεγάλῃ σου ἡ πίστις* 15²⁸, *εὐδία* 16², *σήμερον χειμῶν* 16³, *δευτέρα ὁμοία αὐτῇ* 22³⁹ (but Mt adds *ἔστιν τὸ οὖπω τὸ τέλος* 24⁶, against Mk 13⁷, and retains *ἔστιν* in *οὐχ οὕτως δέ ἔστιν ἐν ὑμῖν* 20²⁶ = Mk 10⁴³, *οὐχὶ ἡ ψυχὴ πλεῖον ἔστι* 6²⁵). Graphic sentences: *οἱ ταῦροί μου καὶ τὰ σιτιστὰ τεθθυμένα καὶ πάντα ἔτοιμα* 22⁴ (the only place where there is ellipse with *ἔτοιμος* in NT¹). Rhetorical: *ἐχθροὶ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οἱ οὐρανοὶ αὐτοῦ* 10³⁶. Demonstrative: 24⁷ (but the copula is not normally omitted with demonstratives: 33 times). Interrogatives: the idiom *τί ἐμοὶ (ἡμῖν) καὶ σοὶ* 8³⁹, and *τί πρὸς σε (ἡμᾶς)* 27⁴; questions with *τίς* or *τί* 23¹⁹ 24³ 26³, *ποῖος* 22³⁶ (but more often the copula is inserted: 16 times). After *ὅτι* Mt often prefers the ellipse: 5¹² 7^{13, 14} 24³² (but 3³ and the Mk-parall. insert *ἔστιν*). Relative: 3¹². There is no ellipse where *ἔστιν = he is* (i.e. no subject expressed): 28⁶ = Mk 16⁶ = Lk 26⁶, 27⁴², 26⁶⁶. The verb is also inserted in emphatic phrases beginning with *οὐκ ἔστιν*: 13⁵⁷ = Mk 6⁴, 10²⁴ = Lk 6⁴⁰ = Jn 13¹⁶ 15²⁰. The position of the predicate and insertion of *ἔστιν* add emphasis in *κύριός ἔστιν ὁ υἱός . . . καὶ τοῦ σαββάτου* 12⁸ = Mk 2²⁸ = Lk 6⁵, *εἰς γὰρ ἔστιν ὑμῶν ὁ διδάσκαλος* 23^{8, 9, 10}, *ἐρημὸς ἔστιν ὁ τόπος* 14¹⁵. But this does not explain *ὁ καιρὸς μου ἐγγύς ἔστιν* 26¹⁸, and there are 30 other instances where the copula is inserted for no apparent reason.

¹ In class. Greek also it is only in elevated language that there is an ellipse with this word.—J. E. Harry, *Proc. Amer. Philol. Assocn.*, 1903, xxxiv, pp. viiiff.

(c) *Other parts (except as included above)*. Ellipse of εἰμι 22³² (but inserted 13 times); of εἶναι 11⁷ 10³⁶ (but inserted 12 times); of ἔσονται 24⁴¹ (but added in parall. Lk 17³⁵) (but fut. indic. is inserted 35 times); of ἦσαν or ἐγένετο in 24³⁷ ὡσπερ γὰρ αἱ ἡμέραι (but impf. indic. is inserted 26 times, subjunctive 6 times, imperat. 4 times). Ellipse of imperative: 27¹⁹. 25 26⁵. 39.

(d) *Stronger meanings*. No ellipse (10 times).

Individual writers: Revelation.

The occurrence of the copula is about half and half, the apparent lack of preference being due perhaps largely to the use of various sources.

(a) *Fixed phrases*. Ellipse in epistolary formulae: χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη 1⁴, ἡ χάρις μετὰ πάντων 22²¹; ὄφελον with finite verb 3¹⁵; εἰ δὲ μή 2⁵. 16; ὄνομα αὐτῶ 6⁸ 9¹¹.

(b) *Spontaneous phrases*. Ellipse in exclamations: μακάριος 1³ 16¹⁵ 20⁶ 22⁷, plur. 14¹³ 19⁹ 22¹⁴; ὁ γὰρ καιρὸς ἐγγύς 1³ (but cp. 22¹¹), ἅγιος κύριος 4⁸ (not LXX), μεγάλα καὶ θαυμαστά τὰ ἔργα σου 15³, δίκαιαι καὶ ἀληθιναὶ αἱ ὁδοὶ σου 15³, ὅτι ἰσχυρὸς κύριος 18⁸, ὅτι ἀληθινὰ καὶ δίκαιαι αἱ κρίσεις αὐτοῦ 19², οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι πιστοὶ καὶ ἀληθινοὶ 22⁶, καὶ ὁ μισθὸς μου μετ' ἐμοῦ 1² (Exceptions 5¹² 16²¹ 22¹¹). Doxologies: αὐτῶ ἡ δόξα 1⁶, τῶ ἄρνω ἡ εὐλογία 5¹², similarly 7¹², ἡ σωτηρία τῶ θεῶ 7¹⁰, similarly 19¹. Relative: 1⁴ 20¹⁰ (exceptions 2⁷ 5¹³ 20². 12 21⁸. 17 22¹²). Demonstratives: 17⁹ 20⁵ (exceptions 13¹⁰. 18 14¹² 17¹¹ 20¹⁴). Interrog. 5² 13⁴ 18¹⁸. Indir. quest. 2¹³. Καὶ ἰδοὺ 4¹ 6². 5. 8 7⁹ 12³ 14¹. 14 19¹¹, ἰδοὺ 21³, οὐαὶ 8¹³ 18¹⁰. 16. 19. Other ellipses: 2¹⁹ 19¹² 21¹⁸. 19. 21. 23. Other copulae 21¹⁶. 22 (but cp. next verse).

(c) *Other parts*. Scil. εἶναι 1¹⁴. 15¹¹ 14⁴ 16⁷ 17¹⁴ 21¹⁹. Scil. ἦν 1¹⁶ 4⁷ 10¹. 3. 8 9⁵. 9. 16 13¹⁸ 14² 20⁸ 21¹¹. 14. Scil. ἦσαν 7⁵ 9⁷. 17. 19. Scil. εἰμι 21⁶ (A adds εἰμι) 22¹³, εἶ 15⁴, ἔσται 22⁴. (No ellipse: εἰμι 18. 17 31⁷ 22³ 18⁷ 19¹⁰ 22⁹. 16, εἶ 2⁹ 31. 15. 16. 17 4¹¹ 5⁹, εἶναι 1¹⁹. 20 2². 9 34. 9 45 5⁶. 9 7¹³. 14. 15 11⁴ 14⁴. 5 16⁶ 17⁹. 9. 12. 15 19¹⁰ 21⁵, ἔσομαι 21⁷, ἔσται 10⁶. 9 21 3. 4. 7, ἔσονται 20⁶ 21³, ἦν 3¹⁵ 4⁸. 11 5¹¹ 10¹⁰ 13² 21²¹, ἦσαν 9⁸ 13²³.)

(d) *Stronger meanings*. Sc. ἦν there was 4⁶ 9¹⁰ 10¹, se trouve 11⁸; ἦσαν there were 9⁷; εἶναι there are 22¹⁵ (No ellipse 9¹⁹ 13¹⁸ 16¹⁴ 17⁸. 8. 10. 11. 14. 18 19⁸. 10 21¹. 12. 25 22². 3. 5. 14.)

CHAPTER TWENTY-TWO

CONGRUENCE OF GENDER AND NUMBER

§ 1. Incongruence in Gender

Whereas in class. Greek a discordant neuter of the *pronominal* predicate (τί, οὐδέν, ὅ, ἕν, πλείον, etc.) will appear (e.g. Plato *Civ.* 341e), as in Mt 6²⁵ Lk 12²³ (ἡ ψυχὴ πλείον ἐστὶ), Ac 12¹⁸ 1 Co 6¹¹ 11⁵ 13² 15¹⁰ Ga 6³, Hell. Greek exceeds classical usage by extending the practice to neuter *adjectival* predicates even where the subject is not abstract and does not represent a class, e.g. P. Rei. 11. 25 ἡ χεὶρ ἤδε κύριον ἔστω, Mt 6³⁴ ἀρκετὸν . . . ἡ κακία, Ac 12³ D ἀρεστὸν . . . ἡ ἐπιχειρήσις, 2 Co 2⁶ ἱκανὸν . . . ἡ ἐπιτιμία. Like the Koine, NT follows Latin (*quod est, id est, hoc est*) with the discordant explanatory neuter pronoun in ὅ ἐστὶν and τοῦτ' ἐστὶν (Mayser shows that ὅ ἐστὶν is vernacular, τοῦτέστιν literary: II 1, 75, 77): e.g. Mt 27³³ (exc. A) 4⁶ Mk 3¹⁷ 12⁴² 15¹⁶. 22 Jn 1⁴¹ Eph 5⁵ 6¹⁷ Col 1²⁷ p⁴⁶ BAFGIP 2¹⁰ p⁴⁶ BDEFG 2¹⁷ BFG 3¹⁴ vl. Heb 2¹⁴ 7⁵ 9¹¹ 1 Pt 2¹⁹ (exceptions: Ac 16¹² 1 Co 3¹⁷ Eph 3¹³ Ph 1²⁸ Col 2¹⁰ vl. 1⁷ vl.). We find assimilation of the gender of the pronoun to that of the antecedent, and not to that of the subject, in Col 3⁵ Rev 4⁵ 5⁶. 8. When an adj. agrees with two or more nouns differing in gender it is usually repeated, or else, if it precedes the first noun, it agrees with it (Lk 10¹ εἰς πᾶσαν πόλιν καὶ τόπον) and, if it follows, it takes the gender of the nearer noun (Heb 9⁹ δῶρά τε καὶ θυσίαι . . . μὴ δυνάμεναι); in Heb 3⁶ βεβαίαν (om. p¹³ p⁴⁶ B) is interpolated from 3¹⁴.

§ 2. "Constructio ad sensum" ¹

These good Greek constructions ² take the form of:—

(a) Collective noun with plural verb. In the Ptol. papyri, LXX, and NT, especially with ὄχλος, λαός, στρατία, οἰκία,

¹ K-G I § 359, pp. 52ff. Gildersleeve I 119–122. Wackernagel I 103. Mayser II 3, 25.

² There is in the NT nothing so blatant as LXX Ex 9⁷ where a subordinate clause is not syntactically connected with its main clause: ἰδὼν δὲ Φαραὼ . . . ἐβαρύνθη ἡ καρδία Φαραὼ.

πλήθος, σπέρμα. This is not too harsh if the verb occurs in a fresh clause (Jn 6² 1 Co 16¹⁵) but more noticeable when the collective noun is followed by a plural circumstantial ptc. (Lk 2¹³, Ac 21³⁶ where DHLP have corrected the ptc. to sing.) and when the plural verb follows in the same clause: Mt 21⁸ Jn 7⁴⁹ Ac 6⁷ (AĒ corr. to sing.) 25²⁴ (BHΨ corr. to sing.) Rev 8⁹ 9¹⁸ (p⁴⁷ corr. to sing.), Herm. S IX 1. 8 (pap. Mich. corr. to sing.), Evang. Thom. 15² ὄχλος δὲ πολὺς παρειστήκεισαν ἀκούοντες. In Mk at any rate the tendency is that if ὄχλος comes first the verb is plur.: if the verb comes first it is sing. The same tendency occurs in the Koine: PSI IV 402. 4 (mid. iii/B.C.) ὁ λαὸς ὁ ἐν τῇ πόλει τὰς κολυκύνθας ὀπτῶσιν, IV 380. 4 (249 B.C.) ἐπέθετο (sing. verb. first) ἡμῖν ὁ λαὸς καὶ τὰς χεῖρας ἐπενηρόχασιν (plur. verb follows) τοῖς ποιμέσιν.

(b) A masc. ptc. may follow a fem. or neut. personal collective noun like ἐκκλησία, ἔθνος or πλήθος: Lk 10¹³ (p⁴⁵ DEG corr. to fem.), Ac 5¹⁶, Ga 1²³, Eph 4¹⁷. In the same way a masc. pronoun may follow a noun in another gender: Mt 28¹⁹ ἔθνη . . . αὐτοῦς, Jn 6⁹ παιδάριον ὅς (vl. ὅ), Ga 4¹⁹ τέκνα οὖς, Ph 2¹⁵ γενεᾶς . . . ἐν οἷς, Co 2¹⁵ ἀρχαί . . . αὐτοῦς, ¹⁹ κεφαλή . . . ἐξ οὗ.

(c) A masc. ptc. may follow a neut. personal noun like πνεῦμα, βδέλυγμα: Mt 9²⁶ (AC³NX corr. to neut.), Mk 1²⁶ D, 9²⁰ 13¹⁴ (DAEF corr. to neut.), Lk 9⁴⁰ p⁴⁵, 11²⁴ p⁴⁵ minusc.

(d) ἕκαστος with plur. verb occurs eleven times in NT (Mt 2, Lk 1, Jn 2, Ac 2, Eph 1, Heb 1, Rev 2), the correct sing. 25 times (Lk 1, Jn 1, Ac 2, Ro 3, 1 & 2 Co 13, Ga 1, Eph 2, Jas 1, 1 Pt 1), which presents a contrast to the LXX where the plur. verb occurs 89 times (sing. 56). See Mayser II 3, 37.

§ 3. The "Schema Atticum" ¹

On many occasions the NT (and Hermas), LXX, and Koine break the classical rule of the "schema Atticum", whereby a neut. plur. subject has a sing. verb. MGr does not follow it at all. However, it is not quite true to say with Jannaris (§ 1171) that among the post-classical authors only Atticists keep the sing. verb, because like Biblical Greek the Ptol. papyri hold a middle course between the Attic and the later use (Mayser II 3, § 151).

¹ K-G I § 364, p. 64. Gildersleeve I 97-102. Mayser II 3, 28ff.

The NT usually keeps the rule when the subject is used in a non-personal sense (πρόβαρα, σώματα), especially with abstracts, or unless the subject is a pronoun: Mt 10² 18¹² Lk 12²⁷ Jn 10³. 4. 8 p⁴⁵ L 10. 12 p⁴⁵ SBA 27 vl. 28 vl. 177 vl. 19³¹ Ac 5¹² 1 Ti 5²⁵ vl. Rev 15⁴ p⁴⁷. But the following exceptions break the class. rule and conform to Koine standards: Mt 6²⁸ (as opp. to Lk 12²⁷), Lk 24¹¹, Jn 19³¹ (sing. immediately before), Rev 1¹⁹; there has been an attempt sometimes on the part of scribes to atticize, e.g. Jn 10⁸ p⁴⁵, 12. 27. 28 177, Ac 5¹² (note the parchment fragment of iv/A.D. init.: ZNW 26, 1927, 118), 1 Ti 5²⁵, Rev 15⁴ p⁴⁷. The NT usually breaks the class. rule with words used in a personal sense (ἔθνη, τέχνα, δαιμόνια) but there is a good deal of fluctuation with πνεύματα, and the Atticists have been at work on the MSS:—τέχνα Mt 10²¹ (exc. BΔ) = Mk 13¹² (exc. B); ἔθνη Mt 6³² (exc. EG) 12²¹ 25³² (exc. AE), Lk 12³⁰ (exc. p⁴⁵ AD), Ac 4²⁵ 11¹ (exc. D*) 13⁴⁸, Ro 2¹⁴ (exc. D^cE) 15¹². 27, 1 Co 10²⁰ vl., Ga 3⁸, 2 Ti 4¹⁷ (exc. KL), Rev 11¹⁸ p⁴⁷ S* 15⁴ 18³. 23 21²⁴ δαιμόνια Lk 4⁴¹ SC 8³⁰ CF 35^c 33 (exc. SU), Jas 2¹⁹; πνεύματα Mk 12⁷ 31¹ vl. 5¹³ (exc. B), Ac 8⁷, Rev 4⁵ 16¹⁴ vl. The following instances thus approach more nearly the class. style, and the variants may well be scribal atticisms, except perhaps in Paul:—τέχνα Mt 10²¹ BΔ = Mk 13¹² B, 1 Jn 3¹⁰, 2 Jn¹³, Ro 9⁸, 1 Co 7¹⁴; ἔθνη Mt 6³² EG 25³² AE, Lk 12³⁰ p⁴⁵ AD, Ac 11¹ D*, Ro 2¹⁴ D^cE 9³⁰, 1 Co 10²⁰ KL, Eph 4¹⁷, 2 Ti 4¹⁷ KL, Rev 11¹⁸ vl.; δαιμόνια Lk 4⁴¹ vl. 8². 30 vl. 35 vl. 38 33 SU 10¹⁷; πνεύματα Mk 3¹¹ vl. 5¹³ B, Lk 11²⁶ 10²⁰ vl., 1 Co 14³² (vl. πνεῦμα), Rev 16¹³ S 14 vl.

§ 4. Number of the Verb when there are several subjects¹

The rules as to sing. or plur. verb where several co-ordinate words form the subject were as lax in class. Greek as they are in the NT.

(i) The verb, if it stands first, usually agrees with the first subject: Mt 5¹⁸ Mk 2²⁵ Jn 2² 18¹⁵ 20³ Ac 11¹⁴ 16³⁰. 31 Ro 16²¹ 1 Co 13¹⁸ 2 Ti 1¹⁵ (variants: Lk 8¹⁹ Ac 17¹⁴ Ro 15²⁶ p⁴⁶ B). The exception is when the group which forms the subject has already been conceived as a whole (i.e. when all the subjects partake in the action expressed by the verb): Mk 10³⁵ Lk 23¹² Ac 5²⁴.

¹ K-G I § 370, pp. 77f. Gildersleeve II 468ff. Mayser II 3, 30ff.

(ii) The verb, if it stands between the subjects, agrees with the first subject: Lk 8²² Jn 4³⁶ etc.

(iii) If there are verbs on either side of the subject, the rule seems to be that the first verb (finite or ptc.) agrees with the first noun and the second verb with both (i.e. it is plural): Mt 17⁸ ὄφθη (SBD plur.) . . . Μωϋσῆς καὶ Ἡλίας συλλαλοῦντες, Lk 2³³, Jn 12²², Ac 5²¹. 2^o 13⁴⁶D 14¹⁴D.

(iv) If one of the subjects is 1st pers., the verb is 1st pers. plur. and modifying ptes. are masc. plur.: Lk 2⁴⁸ Jn 10³⁰ 1 Co 9⁶.

(v) Attributive adjectives and ptes. agree with the noun which is nearer: Lk 10¹ 1 Th 5²³ Heb 9⁹ (in Heb 3⁶ the adj. is interpolated from 3¹⁴).

(vi) When sing. words in the subject are connected by ἤ or οὕτε the verb, or an attribute, is usually sing.: Mt 5¹⁸ 12²⁵ 18⁸ 1 Co 14²⁴ Ga 1⁸ Eph 5⁵ (Jas 2¹⁵ is an understandable exception).

(vii) When the verb comes last, after two subjects Mk has plural verb (13³¹), which is altered by Mt to sing. (24³⁶); cf. LXX Da 3³³. But Mk has sing. verb. in 4⁴¹. Jn also (1¹⁷), and Mt (6¹⁹), and Paul (1 Co 15⁵⁰), have sing. verb.

§ 5. Solecisms in the New Testament

There are two varieties: those found only in Rev, which are severe, and those in the Johannine books and the rest of NT, which are largely excusable.

(a) Revelation

(i) Circumstantial ptes. and appositional phrases tend to be in the nom. instead of the necessary oblique case (see Allo, *Apocalypse* p. cxlv f): 1⁵ (but the nom. phrase is probably intended as a quotation or else as an indecl. divine title; in the next verse the appositional τῷ ἀγαπῶντι agrees with its antecedent αὐτῷ), 2¹³ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Ἀντιπᾶς ὁ μάρτυς μου ὁ πιστός μου, 2⁰, 3¹², 7⁴, 8⁹, 9¹⁴, 14¹², 20². 17⁴ is extraordinary: ποτήριον . . . γέμων βδελυγμάτων καὶ τὰ ἀκάθαρτα. Some of the OT translators also do this: 3 Km 1²⁰ καὶ συ, . . . οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ πάντος Ἰσραὴλ πρὸς σε; for papyri examples see Abel § 40 m.

(ii) Less often it is the accus. or gen. which is *pendens*: 11¹? 11⁵ ὅμοιοι χαλκολιβάνῳ ὡς ἐν καμίνῳ πεπυρωμένης (why fem. and why gen.? There are scribal corrections), 7⁹ (accus. following nom.), 21⁹ (gen. following accus.).

(iii) Quite often masc. is found mistakenly for fem. or neut.: 4⁸A (but S has indic., and 046 neut.), 5⁶S (BAP have neut.), 5⁶ (P neut.), 11⁴ (S^ccP have fem.), 14¹⁹ (S has fem),

17³ γυναῖκα . . . γέμοντα, ⁴ γέμων S*, 13¹⁴ (S neut.), ¹¹ p⁴⁷, 14¹, 9¹⁴ SA. On the reading ἄρσεν or ἄρρενα 12⁵, see Blass-Debr. § 136, 3. Examples of this solecism from late Greek in Jannaris § 1181 b; from a papyrus, Abel § 40 m.

(iv) λέγων, λέγοντες, appear as if they were indeclinable: 4¹ 5¹² 11¹ vl. ¹⁵ (p⁴⁷ SCP have fem.) 14⁷ (exc. p⁴⁷) 19⁶ vl. This results from a literal rendering of רַבִּי in the LXX, and appears also Ac 6¹¹ SD*A 1³ S. Extended to ἔχων: 10² 21¹⁴.

(v) Plur. (not neut.) subject with sing. verb: 9¹² ἔρχεται ἔτι δύο Οὐαί (but it may be a Semitic solecism of gender, and therefore neut. plur. Alternatively, δύο = *second*).

(vi) τέσσαρες for τέσσαρας Rev 4⁴ vl.; frequent in MSS of LXX and the papyri.

In all these types of solecism it is usually the ptc. which is involved (esp. the ptc. of λέγω), and this is interesting because in later Greek the use of ptc. developed along the same lines; the masc., especially in the nom. sing., is preferred—until in MGr the ptc. has but one indecl. form. An uneducated writer, like the author of Rev, is foreshadowing the language of the future. The tendency, reflected in the least educated writers of the NT, to neglect congruence of gender and case in appositions, is seen in the Koine: P. Ryl. II 112¹³ (A.D. 250) εἰδαμέν σε θυσιάζοντα (of a woman) and BU 1078⁵ (A.D. 39) εἰδότης σοῦ (a woman)—gender; P. Par. 51²⁵ (Milligan p. 21) ἐμέ λέλυκας πολιὰς ἔχων—case; P. Amh. II 111–113 (A.D. 128) ἀπέχω παρ' αὐτοῦ τὸν ὁμολογοῦντα—case. Moulton (Proleg. 60) gives instances from the papyri of breach of concord in gender and case, usually the ptc. being concerned.

(b) Rest of NT

For papyri, see Mayser II 3, 22.

(i) The indecl. πλῆρης,¹ which is indecl. only when followed by the gen., appears several times, but always with variants. It was commonly used in the Koine from i/A.D. onwards, and is found also in LXX (e.g. Jb 21²⁴): Jn 1¹⁴ (declinable in D) is important for exegesis because, if πλ is indecl. we may take it either with δόξαν or with αὐτοῦ; Ac 6⁵ (decl. in BC²) 6³ (decl. in

¹ Mayser I¹ 63f; I² 2, 58. Thackeray *OT Gr.* 177. Moulton-Howard 162. Deissmann *LO*⁴, 99f.

SBCD) 19²⁸ AEL (decl. in the rest), Mk 8¹⁹ (decl. in SBCL). When πλήρης is not followed by the gen. it is declinable, but there are indecl. variants to Mk 4²⁸.

(ii) No doubt εἰ τι might have been written throughout in Ph 2¹, instead of εἰ τις σπλάγγνα καὶ οἰκτιρμοὶ (Moulton Proleg. 59). In the papyri we find indecl. τι, and it is no cause for surprise if we find also indecl. τις (Zerwick § 5).

(iii) As in Rev, sometimes appositional phrases and circumstantial ptcs. are found in the nom. instead of oblique cases: Mt 10⁴¹ D, Lk 20²⁷ 21⁶ Jas 3⁸ (unless we punctuate with a semicolon before ἀκατάσχετον), Lk 24⁴⁷ (corr. in D), Ac 10³⁷ (p⁴⁵ LP corr. to ἀρξάμενον), Ac 7⁴⁰, 2 Th 1⁸ D*FG. Sometimes the nom. ptc. is without construction: Mt 4¹⁶D 5⁴⁰D 17²D 9^D 14^D Mk 7¹⁹ (D indic.). This is the only instance which is important for exegesis: πᾶν τὸ ἔξωθεν εἰσπορευόμενον . . . εἰς τὸν ἀφεδρώνα ἐκπορεύεται, καθαρίζων πάντα τὰ βρώματα. Some refer καθ. to Jesus, of course (Origen, Jülicher, A. Schlatter: see Zerwick § 8). Others however take it as false concord, meant to agree with ἀφεδρώνα, and translate: *the latrine which removes filth* (Zorell, Knabenbauer, Klostermann, Blass-Debr. §§ 126, 3; 137, 3.). Mk 9²⁰ 16¹⁴ W ὁ μὴ ἐῶν, Jn 7³⁸ (or place a stop after ἐμέ; see p. 320n), Ac 19³⁴. An accus. ptc. without construction: Ac 26³ (S^cAC corr. it)—which shows that lack of congruence in ptcs. is not confined to the least educated writers of the NT. For frequent papyri examples, see Mayser II 3, 190ff, and for i and ii/A.D. see Blass-Debr. § 137, 3; § 466; Radermacher² 219; Ljungvik BSSVS 6ff. The use of πᾶς with art. and ptc. which in itself is normal popular Greek is so frequent in Mt that it raises the question of Semitic influence (the phrase beginning with כִּי or, as in Da 6⁸, 7⁷ כִּי) in a legislative kind of style: 3¹⁰ 5²². 28. 32 7¹⁹. The same observation holds good of πᾶς δς and δστις: 7²⁴ 10³² 12³⁶ 19²⁹ 21²² 23³ (Lagrange *S. Matth.* XCVIIf). Luke is guilty too: Lk 12⁴⁸ παντὶ δὲ ᾧ . . . , παρ' αὐτοῦ, and John: 6³⁹ 15².

(iv) Masc. πάντων for fem. πασῶν: Mk 12²⁸, P. Giss. 23, 4 (early ii/A.D.). But Abel (§ 41 a) quotes Thucyd. 4, 52, 2. Acta Thomae 41³⁹ πάντων τῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν, 66¹⁷ πάντων γυναικῶν, 70³⁰ πάντων τῶν ἡδονῶν.

(v) Nom. for accus. (a slip): Ro 2⁸ ὀργὴ καὶ θυμὸς, obj. of ἀποδώσει! Cp. LXX 3 Km 5¹⁴ (28) καὶ ἀπέστειλεν αὐτοὺς εἰς

τὸν Λίβανον, δέκα χιλιάδες, ἐν τῷ μηνί, ἀλλασσόμενοι.

(vi) Remarkable changes in person and number, in: Lk 13³⁴ Ἰερουσαλήμ . . . ἡ . . . λιθοβολοῦσα τοὺς ἀπεσταλμένους πρὸς αὐτήν, ποσάκις ἠθέλησα ἐπισυνάξει τὰ τέκνα σου . . . καὶ οὐκ ἠθελήσατε Semitic? Cf. Moule 180.

(vii) Since, of the numerals 1-100, only the first four are declinable, it is not surprising to find a tendency even for these to be indecl., e.g. Mk 14¹⁹ Jn 8⁹ εἷς καθ' εἷς.

(viii) πᾶσα indecl. at Mt 2³; and πᾶν also seems to be indecl., as it is used of persons in Jn 17² πᾶν ὃ δέδωκας αὐτῷ, δώσει αὐτοῖς . . .

(ix) Grammatically we expect the nom., instead of ὑποδεδεμένους Mk 6⁹ and at 12⁴⁰ οἱ κατεσθίοντες . . . καὶ . . . προσευχόμενοι refers perhaps to the distant genitive ἀπὸ τῶν γραμματέων (12³⁸).

(x) πᾶς πόρνος . . . ὃ ἐστίν Eph 5⁵, τὴν ἀγάπην, ὃ ἐστίν Col 3¹⁴ (v.l. ἥτις ἐστίν). Such a solecism appears nowhere else in the Paulines. Is this important for authorship? See Moffatt *ILNT* 153ff.

CHAPTER TWENTY-THREE

THE SUBORDINATION OF CLAUSES

§ 1. Substantival Clauses ¹

They include clauses with infinitive, participle, *ὅτι*, *ὡς*, etc., and indirect questions. See pp. 134–149 (for verb and infin.), and pp. 325f (for problems of the Relative).

§ 2. Adjectival Clauses

See under Relative Pronouns, pp. 47f, 106–110.

§ 3. Adverbial Clauses

(a) Causal clauses ²

Subordination by *ὅτι* and *διότι* is often so loose that only the feeble translation *for* is possible (e.g. Ac 18¹⁰ *διότι ἐγὼ εἰμι μετὰ σοῦ*, Ro 11⁹. 21 3²⁰ 8⁷ 1 Co 12⁵ 4⁹ 10¹⁷ 2 Co 4⁶ 8⁸. 14). Strictly the meaning is *because*, *quoniam*, and *διότι* = *διὰ τοῦτο* *ὅτι*: e.g. Mt 5^{3–12} Ac 22¹⁸ Jas 4³ 1 Pt 1²⁴. Correspondence with *כִּי* has influenced the meaning of *ὅτι* somewhat in Biblical Greek, to an almost consecutive sense, *so that*: Mt 8²⁷ *ποταπὸς ἐστὶν οὗτος ὅτι . . .*, Mk 4⁴¹ Lk 4³⁶ 8²⁵ Jn 2¹⁸, Heb 2⁶ *τί ἐστὶν ἀνθρώπος ὅτι*. So in Hebrew 1 Sam 11⁵ *כִּי יִבְכוּ מִי יִלְעָל־מָה*.

Ἐπεὶ has a causal sense, but it too is weakened in Biblical Greek to *for otherwise*: Ro-3⁶ 11⁶. 22 1 Co 5¹⁰ 7¹⁴ Heb 10². Purely causal Jn 13²⁹ *ἐπεὶ τὸ γλωσσόκομον εἶχεν*, Lk 1¹ *ἐπειδὴπερ*. *Ἐπειδὴ* appears in the Ptol. papyri (BU 844¹⁵ *ἐπιδὴ χρίαν αὐτοῦ ἔχω because I need it*) but it is retreating gradually before *ἐπεὶ* (Mayser II 3, 82). *Καθότι* too in Hell. Greek may be little more than *for* (e.g. Lk 1⁷ *καθότι ἦν Ἑλισαβὲτ στείρα*, 19⁹ Ac 2²⁴ 17³¹, P. Par. 27, 23). *Δι'* ἦν αἰτίας 2 Ti

¹ See also K-G II pp. 354ff. Mayser II 1, 306ff. Moulton Einl. 335f.

² K-G II, § 569, pp. 460–463. Mayser II 3, 82ff. Martin P. Nilsson, "Die Kausalsätze im Griechischen bis Aristoteles," (*Beiträge zur historischen Syntax der griechischen Sprache*, 18, ed. M. v. Schanz, Würzburg), 1907. Zerwick §§ 297–299.

16. 12 etc., ἐφ' ᾧ (see p. 272), ἀνθ' ὧν (see p. 258), ὡς, καθὼς (see pp. 158, 320(2)), οὗ χάριν Lk 7⁴⁷—are also causal conjunctions.

(b) Conditional Clauses

There are four chief kinds of conditional clauses, and we have discussed them all under various heads in the chapters on the Mood of Verbs. For (i) εἰ with indic., representing the simple assumption, see pp. 92, 115. For (ii) εἰ with opt., representing the "potential" conception, see pp. 125ff. For (iii) εἰ with aor. or impf. indic., representing an assumption as not corresponding with reality, see pp. 91f. For (iv) ἐάν with subjunctive, indicating an expected result based on the present general or particular circumstances, see pp. 113f.

This is the class. norm. but in fact the opt. is now greatly reduced and in NT scarcely occurs at all in conditions, and never (as in class.) to express repetitions in past time. Moreover there is, according to classical standards, a misuse of εἰ with indic., and there is a liberal mixing in the various categories of conditional sentences. Whereas class. Greek had μή for negative in all conditions, the NT often has εἰ οὐ (but always ἐάν μή).

Besides the more orthodox method of a subordinate clause with εἰ or ἐάν, a plain statement in the form of a ptc. (see p. 157) or independent clause will serve as the protasis of a condition. Thus in Mt 12⁴⁴ καὶ ἔλθὼν εὕρισκει is *if he comes and finds*; it has always been obscure why the spirit necessarily returns. In 24^{40f} τότε ἔσονται δύο ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ . . . δύο ἀλήθουςαι is *if there are two in the field . . . , if there are two women grinding*. In Ro 13³ θέλεις δὲ μὴ φοβεῖσθαι τὴν ἐξουσίαν is *if you wish to be fearless of*. Such interpretation lends point to the context and is good Greek.

Under this head note the strong Hebraism, εἰ in oaths and protestations.¹

(c) Comparative Clauses²

The atticistic καθάπερ is found in Paul and Hebrews, but often as a possible scribal correction, e.g. Ro 10¹⁵ B (rest καθὼς),

¹ Also in questions, in the Pauline εἴπερ *if indeed* and εἴγε *si tamen*, in εἴτε . . . εἴτε (LXX for οὐκ . . . οὐκ) *whether . . . or*. See ch. 25.

² K-G II 490ff. Mayser II 2, 440; II 3, 92ff. See also, for ὡς, Index.

11⁸ SB (rest καθώς), 12⁴ p⁴⁶ SBA (D*EFG ὥσπερ). Phrynichus (425) condemns the Hellenistic καθώς, which occurs frequently in the ii/B.C. papyri (Mayser II 2, 440; II 3, 92, n. 4), and prefers καθό (Ro 8²⁶ 2 Co 8¹² 1 Pt 4¹³) or καθά (Mt 27¹⁰ Lk 1² D Eus).

1. As correlatives we find ὡς, ὥσπερ, καθώς, καθάπερ, alongside οὕτως or καί or οὕτως καί. Some authors prefer ὥσπερ (Mt 10 ὥσπερ: 4 καθώς, Jas, Rev), some καθώς (Mk, Eph, Past, 1 & 2 Pt, 1, 2, 3 Jn; Lk 17:1, Jn 32:1, Ac 12:3, Paul 81:15, Heb 9:3). Some authors make the ὥσπερ-clause follow the main clause (Ac 2² 3¹⁷ 11¹⁵ Heb 4¹⁰ 7²⁷ 9²⁵ Rev 10³); but in Paul it nearly always precedes (Ro 5^{12.19.21} 6^{4.19} 11³⁰ 12⁴ vl. 1 Co 11¹² 15²² 16¹ Ga 4²⁹; ὥσπερ . . . ἀλλά 1 Co 8⁶, ὥσπερ ἵνα 2 Co 8⁷), the two exceptions being 1 Th 5⁹ and the introduction to a quotation in 1 Co 10⁷ (where however ὡς, in CD*KP 81 181 Marcion, is prob. correct as it accounts for the omission by haplography of τινες αὐτῶν ὥσπερ (ὡς) in FG *fg*, the eye travelling from ὡς to ὡς in καθὼς τινες αὐτῶν ὡς γεγραπται). The ὥσπερ-clause precedes also in Lk 17²⁴ 18¹¹ (vl. ὡς) Jn 5²¹ (S ὡς) 2⁶ (S*DW Eus¹ ὡς), whereas Mt has both orders: ὥσπερ . . . οὕτως 12⁴⁰ 13⁴⁰ 24^{27.37}, ὥσπερ following 6^{2.7} 18¹⁷ 20²⁸ 25^{14.32}. Where καθὼς introduces a following quotation in NT it almost invariably follows its main clause. Mk 1² would seem to be an exception, as it is usual to take ἐγένετο in 1⁴ as the main verb; however, the exception can be negated if the καθὼς-clause be taken with the preceding verse and the verb ἔστιν is supplied, although it is not at all like Mark to omit the copula in such circumstances. If we accept the necessary variants, the καθὼς-clause introducing a quotation does precede in all other instances: Lk 2²³ Jn 6³¹ 12¹⁴ Ac 7⁴² Ro 1¹⁷ 3⁴ AD (but SB καθάπερ) 10 4⁶ DG (rest καθάπερ) 17 8³⁶ 9¹³ (B corr. to καθάπερ) 29. 33 10¹⁵ vl. 11⁸ vl. 2⁶ 15^{3.9} 21 1 Co 1³¹ 2⁹ 2 Co 6¹⁶ 8¹⁵ Ga 3⁶ Heb 4^{3.7} 5^{6.1}

2. As *quandoquidem* = *even so as*, especially καθὼς: Ro 1²⁸ 1 Co 1⁶ 5⁷ Eph 1⁴ Ph 1⁷, Mt 6¹² ὡς.

3. In Mk 4²⁶ ὡς = *as if* (ὡς ἄνθρωπος βάλλῃ) SBD (others add ἐάν or ὅταν; so LXX Isa 7² 17¹¹ 31⁴); similar Lk 11⁵. ⁶, where ἐάν appears to be omitted before εἴπη.

4. In Bibl. Greek, through influence of 𐤒𐤓, ὡς may serve to soften a statement: *as it were, perhaps, approximately*, Mk 6¹⁵ Lk 15¹⁹, T. Abr. 82¹¹ 118²⁶ ὡς ἐν ὄνειροις *in a sort of dream*, 118²² τινες ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ τελευτῶσιν ὡς (or *perhaps*) ἐπὶ τόξοις, 107⁵ ἤγγισεν τῇ πόλει ὡς (*approx.*) ἀπὸ σταδίων τριῶν. Perhaps Heb. 11²⁷.

¹ On the strength of this evidence of clause-order, G. D. Kilpatrick argues in *JThS* XI, 2, 1960, 340ff., that at Jn 7³⁸ the main clause ends with εἰς ἐμέ, and the dependent clause begins at καθὼς (so *he that believes* is subject of *let him drink*). Among other things, this depends on whether it is feasible for τις to be resumed in the same sentence by such a phrase as ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμέ. Besides the note in *JThS*, I owe much to Dr Kilpatrick for private communications on this point of word order.

5. The predicative use of ὡς is very common: Mt 22³⁰ ὡς ἄγγελοι θεοῦ εἰσιν, 18⁸ Lk 15¹⁹ 1 Co 7⁸. Class. writers would have preferred the adj. ἴσος.

6. Sometimes ὡς may be confused with ἕως, e.g. Ac 17¹⁴ ὡς ἐπὶ (SBAE corr. to ἕως), for in Hell. Greek ὡς ἐπὶ = *against, versus* (Polyb. 1, 29, 1), as also do ἕως ἐπὶ and ἕως εἰς (cp. 1 Mac 5²⁹ ἕως ἐπὶ τὸ δούλωμα, where V reads ὡς).

7. ὡσεὶ (and rarely ὡσπερὶ or ὡσάν) may stand for ὡς: Lk 3²³ ὡσεὶ ἐτῶν τριάκοντα (but 8⁴² ὡς ἐτῶν δώδεκα), Mt 14²¹ (D ὡς), etc. Ὡσάν 2 Co 10⁹ (Hellenistic), ὡσπερὶ 1 Co 4¹³ vl. 15⁸ vl. (Mayser II 3, 167. Radermacher² 203. Moulton Einl. 261, n. 2).

(d) Concessive Clauses

For καίπερ and καίτοι see pp. 153, 157.

When one cannot render the particles καὶν and εἰ καὶ by *although*, they keep their proper sense as conditional, e.g. 2 Co 11¹⁵ οὐ μέγα οὖν εἰ καὶ οἱ διάκονοι αὐτοῦ μετασχηματίζονται ὡς διάκονοι δικαιοσύνης, Jn 8⁵⁵ καὶν εἶπω ὅτι, Lk 12³⁸. Concessive clauses with εἰ or ἐάν are essentially conditional clauses and follow the rules of class. Greek. When it does not mean *even if* or *and if* (καὶ ἐάν), καὶν is equivalent to ἐάν καὶ (e.g. Mk 5²⁸ *if only*, 6⁵⁶, Heb 10² p⁴⁶, etc.). See Harsing 46, Jannaris § 598.

In the sense of *except if* Hell. Greek places ἐκτός (1 Co 14⁵ 15², 1 Ti 5¹⁹) before the class. εἰ μὴ (Mk 6⁵ 2 Co 13⁵ Ga 1⁷ etc.). Hell. Greek, from i/A.D. onwards, is also fond of considering εἰ τις as equivalent of ὅστις ὅ τι (as Mt 18²⁸ ἀπόδος εἰ τι ὑφείλῃς) and of adding καὶν (as 1 Co 7⁵ εἰ μὴ τι καὶν ἐκ συμφώνου, Hist. Lausiaca p. 70, 14 Butl. εἰ τι καὶν με διδάξῃς, ἐκεῖνο ποιῶ). See Radermacher² 199, Ljungvik BSSVS 9ff.

(e) Temporal Clauses

There is a preference in Biblical Greek for temporal conjunctions, as against the genitive absolute, which is due perhaps to the frequency with which temporal clauses are introduced by ܐܘܪܝܘܩ or ܐܘܪܝܘܩ in Aramaic. For ὅταν, etc., see pp. 112f, 124f. There are also ὅτε (indic.), ἡνίκα (Paul), ὁπότε (only Lk 6³ AEHK; rest ὅτε), ἐπειδὴ (temporal only Lk 7¹ vl.), ἵνα (Jn 16²), ὡς (Ionic influence: Lk 1²³ 12⁵⁸ 24³² Jn 2⁹ Ga 6¹⁰; Mk 4³⁶ either *when he was in the boat* or *as he was, in the boat*), ὡς καὶν (see pp. 112f), ἕως *while* (Jn 9⁴), *until* (Mk 6⁴⁵ Jn 21^{22r} 1 Ti 4¹³), πρὶν and πρὸ τοῦ (see pp. 78, 113, 140, 144).

(f) Participle Absolute: accusative.

'Εξόν occurs in NT only as a predicate to a missing ἐστίν, and altogether lacking are ὑπάρχον (PSI IV 340, 9, 257 B.C.), πρέπον, etc., which are also very rare indeed in the Ptol. papyri. The obscure τυχόν (*perhaps, without doubt*) occurs Lk 20¹³ D Ac 12¹⁵D I Co 16⁶; δέον Ac 19³⁶ I Ti 5¹³ I Pt 1⁶.

Participle Absolute: genitive

The correct use is becoming rarer in Hell. Greek and it is misused more often; that is to say, the gen. is not truly absolute but is used even where the ptc. might have agreed with the subject or object of the sentence. This is one of the marks of the Koine (Mayser II 3, 66ff. Moulton Einl. 114. Radermacher² 208f) and of Biblical Greek (Johannessohn DGKPS 46).

Mark's usage is fairly regular: it is only a temporal use and always precedes the main clause, except for ὀψίας γενομένης 4³⁵ (unless we take this closely with the next sentence) and ἀνατείλαντος τοῦ ἡλίου 16². Nevertheless there are falls from class. grace in Mark, as in many NT authors, which scribes have often corrected: he should have placed the ptc. in the dat. at 13¹ (so also Mt at 1²⁰ 5¹ (B corr) 8¹ (S* corr) 8⁵ vl. 28 vl. 910. 18 17⁹ 18²⁴ 21²³ vl. 24³ 27¹⁷; Lk at 12³⁶ 14²⁹ (p⁴⁵ corr.) 17¹² (BL corr.) 22¹⁰; Jn 4⁵¹ vl. Ac 4¹, LXX Gen 18¹). But Mayser quotes the same thing in papyri of 255, 249, 218, 221, iii/B.C. ter, 161, 156, ii/B.C. (II 3, 67f), and Thucyd. 1, 114, 1 has διαβεβηκότος ἤδη Περικλέους στρατιά Ἀθηναίων ἡγγέλθη αὐτῷ, ὅτι (and Xen. Anab. 5, 2, 24). Mark should have made the ptc. agree with the accus. at 5¹⁸ ἐμβαίνοντος αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ πλοῖον παρεκαλεῖ αὐτὸν ὁ δαμονισθεὶς, 9²⁸ vl., 10¹⁷, 13³; so should Luke at 9⁴² 15²⁰ 18⁴⁰ and Ac 7²¹ 19³⁰ 21¹⁷ vl. 25⁷; and Mt 18²⁵ Jn 8³⁰ and Paul at 2 Co 12²¹ vl.; papyri of 258, 254, iii/B.C., 168, 176, 114, 51. More irregular still, Mark has a gen. absol. agreeing with the subject at 6²² SBC* (corr. by p⁴⁵ C³DWΘ), and so has Mt at 1¹⁸ (but a clause lies in between), Luke at Ac 21³⁴, and the LXX at Ex 4²¹, 1 Km 3¹¹ παντὸς ἀκούοντος αὐτά, ἡχῆσει ἀμφοτέρα τὰ ὦτα αὐτοῦ. Instances in the Ptol. pap. are so plentiful that Mayser gives only a selection (II 3, 68ff). When these "mistakes" are made in the NT it is very rarely that the gen. absol. takes up a word which has

preceded (but 2 Co 4¹⁸). There is no instance of gen. absol. without a finite verb, as often occurs in the Ptol. pap., e.g. βασιλέως προστάξαντος (= *in the King's name*) followed by a command.

(g) *Final Clauses*. See pp. 95, 100-6, 111, 128f 141-6.

(h) *Consecutive Clauses*. See pp. 102, 106, 136, 141f, 272.

CHAPTER TWENTY-FOUR

INCONSISTENCIES BETWEEN MAIN AND DEPENDENT CLAUSES

§ 1. Attraction of Relative Pronoun to case of antecedent¹

Little need be noted, as this phenomenon is well known to students of class. Greek, the LXX, and the papyri (Mayser II 3, 102). It may not occur if the relative clause is sharply divided from the rest, as in Heb 8², but often the scribes have corrected by bringing in the relative attraction, e.g. Mk 13¹⁹ (ἦς AWC²), Jn 4⁵ (οὗ DWC*)⁵⁰ (ᾧ AW) 7³⁹ (οὗ SDW) Ti 3⁵ (ὧν D^c C^b) Rev 1²⁰ (ὧν 046).

The Greek relative, unlike the English, includes in itself the demonstrative idea, so that we find compressions like Mk 10⁴⁰ ἀλλ' οἷς ἐτοίμασται (= τούτοις οἷς) and Lk 9³⁶ οὐδὲν ὧν (= οὐδὲν τούτων ᾧ).

Equally classical is the attraction of the noun into the relative clause sometimes (the art. omitted), e.g. Jn 9¹⁴ ἐν ἣ ἡμέρα (for papyri, Mayser II 3, 98ff), and not necessarily immediately after the relative, e.g. Jn 11⁶ ἐν ᾧ ἦν τόπω, 17³ ὃν ἀπέστειλας Ἰησοῦν, 2 Co 10¹³ κατὰ τὸ μέτρον τοῦ κανόνος, οὗ ἐμέρισεν ἡμῶν ὁ θεὸς μέτρου (οὗ incidentally attracted to κανόνος).

§ 2. Inverse attraction of the antecedent to the relative²

This attraction of the case of the antecedent to that of the relative pronoun may occur even when the antecedent is not drawn into the relative clause, and even when it precedes the relative (as class.): Mk 6^{11.16} 12¹⁰ OT (= Mt 21⁴²) λίθον ὃν ἀπεδοχίμασαν . . . , οὗτος ἐγενήθη, Lk 1⁷³ 12⁴⁸ Ac 10³⁶ 1 Co 10¹⁶ LXX Ge 31¹⁶ etc.

¹ K-G II 406ff. Meisterhans-Schwyzler 237ff 18-30. Mayser II 3, 98ff. Moulton Einl. 148. Radermacher² 220, 222.

² K-G II 413. Meisterhans-Schwyzler 239, 25. Mayser II 3, 107ff. Radermacher² 222. Wackernagel I 49f.

§ 3. Pleonastic insertion of Personal Pronoun¹

It is a Semitism in the sense that the Heb. וְלִי יָדָא is reflected through LXX usage, helped by a parallel Aramaic idiom; but non-Biblical Greek, and indeed many languages, reveal the same pleonasm. LXX Gen 41¹⁹ $\beta\acute{o}\epsilon\varsigma\ \omicron\lambda\alpha\varsigma\ \omicron\upsilon\kappa\ \epsilon\iota\delta\omicron\nu\ \tau\omicron\iota\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha\varsigma$, cp. Mk 13¹⁹ $\omicron\lambda\alpha\ \omicron\upsilon\delta\ \gamma\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omicron\nu\epsilon\nu\ \tau\omicron\iota\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta$, Mt 3¹² (= Lk 3¹⁷) $\omicron\upsilon\ \tau\omicron\ \pi\tau\acute{o}\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \tau\eta\ \chi\epsilon\iota\rho\iota\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$, Mt 3¹¹ corrects Mk 1⁷ by omitting $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$. Other exx.: Jn 1³³ $\acute{\epsilon}\phi'\ \delta\upsilon\nu\ \dots\ \acute{\epsilon}\pi'\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$, 18⁹, Ac 15¹⁷ OT 1 Co 8⁶ 2 Pt 2³ Rev 22. 17 3⁸ 7². 9 13⁸ 17² 20⁸. Nevertheless scribes have endeavoured to remove the feature: e.g. Mk 7²⁵ (SDW om $\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\varsigma$). Papyri: e.g. PSI IV 433, 7 $\delta\omicron\alpha\ \pi\omicron\tau\acute{\epsilon}\ \upsilon\pi\eta\rho\chi\epsilon\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \tau\alpha\mu\iota\epsilon\iota\omega\iota$ ($\xi\eta\nu\ \delta'\ \omicron\lambda\iota\gamma\alpha$), $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}\ \acute{\epsilon}\phi\upsilon\tau\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\alpha$ (261 B.C.).

§ 4. Prolepsis²

Prolepsis (anticipation) occurs when the subject (object) of the dependent clause is brought forward into the main clause. Such interlacing was frequent in class. Greek but is relatively rare in the Koine. In the NT the subject is brought forward in Mt 6²⁸ Mk 1²⁴ 7² 11³² 12³⁴ Lk 13²⁵ Ac 9²⁰ 19⁴ 1 Co 16¹⁵ Rev 3⁹; and the object (less often) in Lk 24⁷ Ac 13³² Ga 4¹¹ 5²¹.

§ 5. Anacoloutha after relative clauses³

In class. Greek there sometimes occurred a false grammatical connection when to a relative clause a second relative clause was joined by $\kappa\alpha\iota$, to which clause the rel. pronoun was not appropriate in its existing form: e.g. Rev 17² $\mu\epsilon\theta'\ \eta\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\pi\omicron\rho\epsilon\nu\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\alpha\nu\ \dots$, $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \acute{\epsilon}\mu\epsilon\theta\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\theta\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$, Mk 6¹¹ (scribes have corrected), Lk 17³¹ 1 Co 7¹³ (p⁴⁶ SD* $\epsilon\iota\ \tau\iota\varsigma$) Ti 1^{2f}. But Semitic rather than class. is the anacolouthon in Mt 7^{9f} $\tau\iota\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\xi\ \upsilon\mu\acute{\omega}\nu$, $\delta\nu\ \alpha\iota\tau\eta\sigma\epsilon\iota\ \delta\ \upsilon\iota\delta\varsigma\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \acute{\alpha}\rho\tau\omicron\nu$, $\mu\eta\ \lambda\acute{\iota}\theta\omicron\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\delta\acute{\omega}\sigma\epsilon\iota\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\omega}$; $\eta\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \iota\chi\theta\omicron\nu\ \alpha\iota\tau\eta\sigma\epsilon\iota$, $\mu\eta\ \delta\phi\iota\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\delta\acute{\omega}\sigma\epsilon\iota\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\omega}$.

§ 6. Mingling of direct and indirect speech: recitative $\delta\tau\iota$ ⁴

The Koine found it much more difficult than the class. Greek and Latin languages to sustain indirect speech for very

¹ K-G II 432f, 443f. Jannaris § 1439. Ljungvik SSAA, 27f. Psichari 182f. Abel § 134. Pernot *Études* 152. Winer-Schmiedel § 22, 7. Thackeray *OT Gr* 46. Moulton-Howard 434f.

² K-G II 577f. Jannaris § 1937. Mayser II 3, 111.

³ K-G II 431ff. Mayser II 3, 112.

⁴ K-G II 431ff, 557. Mayser II 3, 46f, 112ff. P. Winter, "Hoti recitativum in Lc 1, 25. 61, 2, 23," *HTR* 48, 1955, 213-216.

long, and in the NT direct speech is preferred in narrative wherever possible, especially in Mk and Jn (but not so much in Lk, and even less in Mt¹). The equivalent of inverted commas is “*ὄτι recitativum*”. The latter, and even the mingling of direct and indirect speech, is not unknown in class. Greek. The Hebrew ׀ and Aramaic ׀ helped to commend such an idiom to NT writers. It is the regular usage in Coptic. Note the peculiar positions of *ὄτι* in Jn 3²⁸ and the way some writers will attempt *oratio obliqua*, reverting to *recta* in a very short time (Mk 6^{8f} Lk 5¹⁴ Ac 1⁴ 23²² 25^{4f}), although sometimes they will revert also of direct speech in mid-stream and change to indirect (Mk 11^{31f}, but D² W and Mt 21²⁶ keep this in *oratio recta*), Jn 13²⁹ Ac 23^{23f}.

¹ See C. H. Turner, *JThS* 28, 1927, 9-15.

PART II
CONNECTIONS BETWEEN SENTENCES

This page intentionally left blank

CHAPTER TWENTY-FIVE

CO-ORDINATING PARTICLES¹

IN THE widest sense, prepositions and adverbs as well as conjunctions may be classed as particles, but in this chapter the study is confined to co-ordinating conjunctions. Nothing like a complete thesaurus will be attempted, attention being restricted to correct classification and observation of new tendencies, unusual instances, and instances with an interest for exegesis or textual criticism. The Koine and NT are more careless than the older Greek regarding the position of particles and, as in syntax generally, display the popular love of over-emphasis. The use of post-positive particles is declining and emphasis is achieved by forming more compound particles.

The double influence of later Greek usage and Jewish background worked upon NT writers and combined to achieve a considerable reduction in the number of particles as compared with more refined Greek; thus *τοι* and *μήν* (by themselves) and *γούν* are too subtle to be needed in the NT. Fascinating problems arise for the meticulous student. Why does *οὖν* occur so often in the fourth Gospel and what does it signify? Why is Paul so fond of *οὐχί*? Has Mark, who loves *καί*, any reason for changing to *δέ* at times? What NT writers use *τε . . . καί*, and is *καί . . . καί* the same thing?

§ 1. Simple Particles²

Ἄλλά.

Paul is particularly fond of it³. It is a stronger adversative particle than *δέ* but is often weakened in the clause where it most frequently occurs, that is, after a preceding *οὐ* or *οὐ μόνον*:

¹ K-G II 116-339. Jannaris §§ 1700-1728. Mayser II 3, 114-174. J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles*², Oxford 1954.

² K-G II §§ 515ff. Mayser II 3, 116ff.

³ Ro 67, 1 Co 71, 2 Co 66, Ga 23; cp. with Lk only 32, Ac 29, Mt 37, Heb 16, Rev 13, LXX Ge 20, Ex 13.

thus in Mt 10²⁰ Mk 5³⁹ 9³⁷ 14³⁶ Jn 12⁴⁴ 1 Co 15¹⁰ etc. the meaning is simply *not so much . . . as*. The preceding negative may easily be supplied in Mt 11⁷⁻⁹ Ac 19² Ga 2³, or an interrogative may be the equivalent of a negative in Jn 7⁴⁸ Ac 15¹¹. Thus the meaning is *sed etiam*. It also occurs simply as *however, nevertheless*, at the beginning of a sentence, but stronger than δέ, e.g. Ro 5¹⁴ *sin is not imputed when there is no law; nevertheless . . .* In Mk 14³⁶ it reverses a previous command. Sometimes before a command it is not so much adversative as consecutive, and is best translated as an interjection, *Well!*: Mk 16⁷ *See the place where they laid him. Well, go to his disciples . . .* Ac 9⁶ *I am Jesus . . . Well, rise and . . .*, Mt 9¹⁸ Mk 9²² Ac 10²⁰ 26¹⁶. After a conditional protasis, we must translate *at least*, e.g. Mk 14²⁹ 1 Co 4¹⁵. Introducing a strong addition, ἀλλά or ἀλλά καί may be *yes, indeed*, as in Jn 16² 1 Co 3² 2 Co 7¹¹ 11¹ Ph 1¹⁸. There is an ellipse (e.g. scil. *this has happened*) with ἀλλ' ἔνα in Mk 14⁴⁹ Jn 1⁸ 9³ 13¹⁸ 15²⁵ 1 Jn 2¹⁹. It is clear from Mk 4²² that ἀλλά must sometimes have the meaning of εἰ μὴ *except* (so Mt 20²³, and ἀλλ' ἦ in Lk 12⁵¹ 2 Co 1¹³), just as εἰ μὴ serves for ἀλλά (Lk 4²⁶. 27)—a confusion which may be traceable to Aramaic influence.

ἘΡΑ¹

Even Paul, who makes good use of it, sometimes breaks the classical rule by giving it first position (Ro 10¹⁷ 1 Co 15¹⁸ etc.). It is often combined with other particles: οὖν, γε, εἴπερ, ἐπεὶ, μήτι. Its use in the Ptol. papyri is rare and literary. It is not in itself an interrogative particle, like ἄρα, although it may be introduced into an interrog. sentence.

ἘΡΑ and ἄραγε.

Also particles of literary style, = οὖν, *num igitur, ergone*. Interrogative. Luke and Paul. There are four exx. in LXX, three of them in Ge (e.g. 18¹³), but it is more frequent in Symmachus. Lk 18⁸ Ac 8³⁰ Ga 2¹⁷ (it would be ἄρα here, since μὴ γένοιτο in Paul always answers a question; it may however be ἄρα if the clause is not interrogative but an argumentative statement posed for an imaginary opponent to answer).

¹K.-G II 317ff. Mayser II 3, 119ff.

Γάρ¹.

The usage is classical. Paul uses it even more than he does ἀλλά, and Matthew and Luke are fond of it². It is very rare in the Johannine writings, which makes the οὖν of D more likely than γάρ at Jn 9³⁰.

Γε³.

A modal particle which lends emphasis to another word. It is very elusive in NT and is almost always merged with another particle as a meaningless appendage: with ἀλλά, αρα, εἰ, εἰ δὲ μή, καίτοι, μήτι. Nevertheless it may have some significance in καί γε since, through the LXX, we can trace the influence of the Heb. וְגַם : Ac 2¹⁸ 1 Co 4⁸ (D*FG om γε) and indeed, Lk 19⁴² at least. Occasionally without another particle: Lk 11⁸ διὰ γε at least because of, 18⁵, Ro 8³² (DFG om) ὅς γε he who even.

Δέ and μὲν . . . δέ⁴.

Sometimes δέ will have the strong adversative force of ἀλλά after a foregoing negative (Ac 12⁹.¹⁴ Heb 4¹³ 6¹²) but usually it is weaker and indistinguishable from καί. Indeed the proportion of this δέ to καί raises interesting problems in Biblical Greek since it varies considerably in and between different books; in the NT the proportion of δέ:καί varies from 1:0.6 in Paul to 1:73 in Rev (4-21). The variety is still greater in the LXX, from 1:1 in 4 Mac to 1:188 in Jer β.

At times δέ will introduce a parenthesis (Ac 1¹⁵ (SBA τε) 4¹³D 12³) and that is how οὖν δέ is best explained in the middle of a sentence (Col 1²²). One of the most characteristic departures from class. style is the rarity of the correlation of μὲν and δέ in Biblical Greek; it occurs with any frequency only in some Paulines, Ac and Heb. Matthew has 20 instances, and this, together with his comparatively wide use of δέ (491 against Mk's 150), make the translation hypothesis for his gospel the less certain. Mark has only two or three instances, and Luke only

¹ K-G II 330ff. Mayser II 3, 121ff.

² Mt 125, Lk 96, Ac 80, Heb 91, Rev 16, Ro 143, 1 Co 108, 2 Co 74, Ga 35. LXX Ge 107, Ex (1-24) 70, Ex (25-40) 21, Isa 181, MiPr 3, 4 Mac 87. Didache 31, Ep. Barn. 47.

³ K-G II 171-178. Mayser II 3, 123ff. T. K. Abbott, ICC on Eph and Col, pp. ivf.

⁴ K-G II 261-278. Meisterhans-Schwyzler 250. 6. Mayser II 3, 125ff.

Proportion of δε : αἰ

LXX	NT	Apost. Fathers, etc.
4 Macc 123:141 (1:1)	Paul	Didache 66:31
Ex (1-24) 369:800 (1:2.1)	Ga 58:21 (1:0.4)	(1:0.5)
Ge 840:2023 (1:2.4)	Ro 145:77 (1:0.5)	Ep. Barn. 66:84
Isa (40-66) 81:672 (1:8.3)	1 Co 208:129 (1:0.6)	(1:1.3)
Isa (1-39) 82:882 (1:10.7)	2 Co 74:58 (1:0.8)	T. Abr. A 157:305
Ex (25-40) 35:605 (1:17)	Ac 556:522 (1:1)	(1:2)
Mi Pr 59:1548 (1:26)	Mt. 491:762 (1:1.5)	T. Abr. B 43:210
Jer α 22:917 (1:42)	Lk (3-24) 511:853 (1:1.6)	(1:5)
Ezk α 26:1642 (1:63)	Lk (1-2) 26:132 (1:5)	
Jg A 17:1588 (1:93)	Mk. 150:785 (1:5)	
Ezk β 6:592 (1:99)	Rev (1-3) 4:69 (1:17)	
Jer β 4:754 (1:188)	Rev (4-21) 8:586 (1:73)	

The books are arranged in reverse order of Semitic style.

seven (to Luke, asyndeton often seems more effective, e.g. 7²²); the whole of the Pent. (LXX) has only about 20 *exx.* of μὲν . . . δε, Dan O' has μὲν 8 times, but the more slavish θ has none. Mt's *exx.* are all in the part usually assigned to Q, which fact, unless a translator took great liberties, is against Q having been originally Aramaic.

	Mt	Mk	Lk	Jn	Ac	Past	Heb	Jas	1 Pt	Jude
μὲν only	-	2	3	4	34	-	5	1	-	-
μὲν . . . δε	20	3	7	4	14	3	14	-	4	3

	Ro	Cor	Ga	Eph	Ph	Col	Thes	Tot Paul	NT	Pap. iii/B.C.	ii-i/B.O.
μὲν only	7	10	1	-	2	1	1	22	71	4	8
μὲν . . . δε	12	19	2	1	4	-	-	38	110	18	47

The MSS differ considerably over the omission of μὲν.

Δή¹.

An invitatory particle (class.), as Lk 2¹⁵ *come, let us go*, Ac 13² 15³⁶ 1 Co 6²⁰ 15⁴⁹ p⁴⁶. But δς δή *who ever*, in Mt 13²³.

Διό, διόπερ².

Properly subordinating, but not necessarily so in NT. Διό occurs most often in Ac and Paul, and is confused with διότι by scribes (e.g. A*W in Lk 1³⁵). The context favours διό (*and so*) in Ac 20²⁶, but the MSS appear to favour διότι.

Εἰ.

For conditions, see pp. 113ff. In direct questions, as opposed to indirect, it is a Bibl. Greek usage (Mt 12¹⁰ 19³ Lk 13²³ Ac 1⁶, LXX Ge 17¹⁷ 1 Km 10²⁴ 2 Mac 7⁷ 15³, nineteen times in Luke), probably a Hebraism from עִי or עִי, which also may stand in both direct and indirect questions. In the Vulgate *si* renders this εἰ and as a result *si* in later Latin became a direct interrogative. Note that the interrog. ἦ is absent from Bibl. Greek (exc. in Jb 25⁵ B); like ἄρα, it is a mark of literary style.

In oaths³, εἰ renders Heb. עִי (Mk 8¹² Heb 3¹¹ 4³.⁵ LXX) and is the equivalent of a strong negative. Conversely, εἰ μὴ is a strong positive in Ro 14¹¹ D*FG (LXX Isa 45²³ S*B) ζῶ ἐγω, . . . , εἰ μὴ κάμψει πᾶν γόνυ.

Ἔτι⁴.

In NT = *still* Mt 12⁴⁶ 17⁵ (and parall.) 26⁴⁷; not *further*.

Εἴτε . . . εἴτε.

Properly with subordinate clauses, but also with ellipse of the verb, either disjunctive or copulative: Ro 12⁶⁻⁸ 2 Co 5¹⁰ Eph 6⁸ Ph 1¹⁸.

¹ K-G II 122-131. Mayser II 3, 133f.

² K-G II 462. Meisterhans-Schwyzler 253, 25. Mayser II 3, 134f.

³ Moulton-Howard 469. N. D. Coleman, "Some noteworthy uses of εἰ or εἴ in Hellenistic Greek—with a note on Mark viii. 12" *JThS* 28, 1927, 159ff. F. C. Burkitt, "Eἰ in Hellenistic Greek. Mark viii. 12" (reply to Coleman), *JThS* ib. 274ff.

⁴ Mayser II 3, 136f. Radermacher² 69.

"H and ἦ καί¹.

Disjunctive particles (*or*), especially when introducing a question: Mt 12²⁹ Ro 3²⁹ 9²¹ 1 Co 10²²; but (esp. in questions or negative sentences and with synonyms) almost copulative: Mt 5¹⁷ Jn 8¹⁴ (S corr. to καί) Ac 1⁷ 11⁸ Ro 9¹¹ FG Ga 3²⁸ D* 1 Co 11²⁷ 1 Th 2¹⁹. As a correlation, ἦ . . . ἦ *either . . . or* (ἦτοι . . . ἦ Ro 6¹⁶).

Kαί².

1. *The copula*: a. καί. b. καὶ . . . καί.

2. *The adverb (also, even)*.

1. (a) Καί joins together nouns, adjs., numerals, adverbs, or joins a part with the whole (Ac 5²⁹). Its excessive use in the narrative of many NT writers, esp. Mark, would appear vulgar to the normal reader; Luke and John to some extent mitigate this fault by the use occasionally of asyndeton, and of δέ, οὖν, or τε. The nuance may really be *and yet (et tamen)*, as in Mt 3¹⁴ *and yet you come to me!* where we expect καί μὴν or καίτοι. Or the nuance may be consecutive (Mt 5¹⁵ 2 Co 11⁹ Heb 3¹⁹ 2 Pt 1⁹) and even final (Mt 8²¹ ἀπελθεῖν καὶ θάψαι, 26¹⁵ Jn 14³ Rev 14¹⁵). This admittedly belongs to the uncultivated Koine, but note also the possibility of Aramaic influence³, by which the waw of apodosis might well be rendered by καί: Dan θ 4² ἐνόπριον ἴδον καὶ ἐφοβέρισέν με (καί = rel. pronoun⁴), θ' 7¹⁶ (καί purposive). The same appears in Mt: 6⁴ καὶ ὁ πατήρ (*for*, cp. Dan 10¹⁷) 18²¹ 21²³ etc. Καί in place of temporal subordination: Mt 26⁴⁵ Mk 15²⁵ Lk 19⁴³ 23⁴⁴ Jn 2¹³ Ac 5⁷ Heb 8⁸. Καί with fut. may also resume a final clause to express further result (Mt 26⁵³ Heb 12⁹). Although the papyri provide ample evidence that popular speech favours parataxis, we must remember as a

¹ K.G II 296ff. Mayser II 3, 138ff. Radermacher² 33f, 201, 207. H. Margolis in *Amer. Journ. Sem. Lang.*, 25, 1908-9, 257-275 (for LXX).

² K.G II § 521ff. Meisterhans-Schwyzler 161. 16; 162. 2; 249; 250. Mayser II 3, 140ff. S. Trenkner, *Le Style KAI dans le récit oral attique* (Institut d'Études Polonaises en Belgique) Brussels 1948. Abel § 78. Radermacher² 28, 37, 218, 222. Ljungvik BSSVS 55ff.

³ Lagrange *S. Matth.* XCI.

⁴ Cp. Lk 1⁴⁹ καὶ ἄγιον τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, *for* οὗ τὸ ὄνομα ἅγιον ἐστίν; esp. in Rev.

contributory influence that the Heb. *waw* introduced propositions of a temporal, conditional, causal and consecutive kind. Obviously Hebraic (not Aramaic) is the use of *καί* after (*καί*) *ἐγένετο* (*δέ*) in place of accus. and infin.¹: Lk 5¹ 9²⁸ 19¹⁵ Ac 5⁷. The translation of *καί* *ἰδοῦ* constitutes a problem: R. A. Knox renders it in Lk with a variety of English. It is often as redundant as the *ἐγένετο* construction (Lk 7¹² D implies that it is equivalent); at least the *καί*, if not the *ἰδοῦ*, is often pleonastic, which is why p⁴⁵ SBA omit *καί* in Ac 10¹⁷ (CD *καί* *ἰδοῦ*): Lk 7¹² Ac 1¹⁰ Rev 3²⁰ (AP om *καί*).

(b) *καί . . . καί*. The probability is that this is the Bibl. Greek equivalent of *τε . . . καί*, which is there extremely rare. Thus Mk 4⁴¹ *ὅτι καί ὁ ἄνεμος καί ἡ θάλασσα ὑπακούει αὐτῷ* = *both wind and sea* (but RSV, NEB, etc. take the first *καί* as *even*); so Mk 9¹⁸ Lk 5³⁶ Jn 6³⁶ 7²⁸ 11⁴⁸ 12²⁸ 15²⁴ 17²⁵ (*both the world and these*) Ac 26²⁹ Ro 14⁹ 11³³ etc., LXX Nu 9^{14b}, Pap. BU 417¹⁷ *ὅτι καί σοὶ τοῦτο ἀνήκει καί συμφέρει*. The scribes have corrected this in Mt 10²⁸ and Jn 4³⁶.

2. The adverbial or exegetical *καί* (*that is, even*): Mk 1¹⁹ Lk 3¹⁸ Jn 1¹⁶ (*that is, to receive grace upon grace*) 20³⁰, Ac 22²⁵, *καί ἀκατάκριτον and uncondemned at that*), Ro 1⁵ (*that is, apostleship, or hendiadys?: grace of apostleship*), 13¹¹ *idque*, 1 Co 2² *et quidem*, 6⁶⁻⁸, Eph 2⁸. It is pleonastic before a second adj., esp. after *πολύς*: Lk 3¹⁸ Jn 20³⁰ Ac 25⁷ Ti 1¹⁰ *vl.* The original meaning of *καί*, before it became also merely a co-ordinating particle, was *also*, as in Ro 8¹⁷ *εἰ δὲ τέκνα, καί κληρόνομοι*, Ph 4³. This appears with pronouns frequently: Mt 2⁸ *καὶ γὰρ I too*, Lk 14¹² Jn 7⁴⁷; Ro 8²⁴ *ὁ δὲ γὰρ βλέπει, τίς καί ὑπομένει who needs also to wait for that which he sees?* (p⁴⁶ B*DFG misunderstood and omitted *καί*). And with adverbs of comparison: Ac 11¹⁷ *ὡς καί*, Ro 15⁷ *καθὼς καί*. And after other particles: Lk 24²² *ἀλλὰ καί sed etiam*.

The idioms *καί νῦν* (*καὶ νῦν*) and *καί τις* (classical) are fairly common, where *καί* is best rendered emphatically *well, then*: Mk 10²⁶ Lk 10²⁹ Jn 9³⁶ 14²² SW Ac 3¹⁷ 7³⁴ 10⁵ 13¹¹ 20²². 25 22¹⁶ Ro 3⁷ 2 Co 2² Ph 1²² 2 Th 2⁶ 1 Jn 2²⁸.

A chain of dependent genitives, which is not liked by NT writers, is avoided by the use of hendiadys: Mk 6²⁶ (not *oaths*

¹ Thackeray *OT Gr* 50ff. Pernot *Études* 189-199. M. Johannesson, *Das biblische KAI EGENETO und seine Geschichte*, Göttingen, 1926.

and guests, but oaths sworn before the guests), Lk 2⁴⁷ (not *his intelligence and answers*, but *the intelligence of his answers*), 21¹⁵ Ac 1²⁵ 14¹⁷ 23⁶ (*hope of the resurrection*), Ro 1⁵ 2 Ti 4¹ Ti 2¹³ Jas 5¹⁰ 1 Pt 4¹⁴ 2 Pt 1¹⁶.

(Τὸ) λοιπόν ¹.

Essentially the meaning is *from now, henceforth*, as Eph 6¹⁰ DG (τοῦ λοιποῦ p⁴⁶ S*AB), and λοιπόν 1 Th 4¹ (cp. BGU IV 1079. 6, A.D. 41). Although it is weakened in Hell. Greek to a mere *so*, it cannot mean its opposite, *still*, as in so many modern translations of Mk 14⁴¹ (Moffatt, Goodspeed, RSV, NEB), for *still* means *until now*. Jesus means *from now*. He says, "Are you going to *continue* sleeping?" To introduce *still* is to throw emphasis on the past, but the point is that they must not be asleep when the betrayer arrives (future). Ἀπέχει will then have a direct ref. to Judas. He has been paid; he is here. *Henceforth*, it is no time for sleep.

Μήν and ναί ².

Particles of solemn affirmation or corroboration. In class. Greek ἦ μήν, but Hell. Greek (esp. LXX and pap.) since ii/B.C. substitutes εἰ μήν: Heb 6¹⁴ εἰ μήν εὐλογῶ εὐλογήσω σε (KL* corr. to ἦ) *yes, certainly I will bless*. But elsewhere in NT the corroborating and recapitulating particle is ναί (still current in MGR): Mt 11⁹. 25¹ 15²⁷ Lk 11⁵¹ 12⁵ Jn 11²⁷ Ro 3²⁹ Ph 4³ Phm²⁰ Rev 1⁷ 14¹³ 16⁷, LXX Ge 17¹⁹ Jdt 9¹².

Νή.

With accus., (scil. ὀμνομι) 1 Co 15³¹ LXX Ge 42¹⁵¹ *I swear by* (class.). K-G. II 147, 2. Mayser II 3, 147f.

*Οθεν.

Consecutive co-ordinating particle (class.): Mt 14⁷ Ac 26¹⁹ Heb 2¹⁷ and often. Mayser II 3, 148. Meisterhans-Schwyzler 253, 25 (i/B.C. inscr.).

¹ K-G I 315 n. 15. Mayser II 3, 145f. Moule 161f. A. Cavallin, "(Τὸ) λοιπόν: Eine bedeutungsgeschichtliche Untersuchung," *Erasmos* 39, 1941 121-144.

² R.G II 135ff; 147, 2. Mayser II 3, 146f.

ὁμως.

K-G II 85 n. 1; 95f. Mayser II 3, 148. Jn 12⁴² ὁμως μέντοι *but yet*. Displaced by hyperbaton in 1 Co 14⁷ *lifeless things may give a sound, nevertheless if . . .* (transfer ὁμως after διδόντα), Ga 3¹⁵ *it may be only a man's will, nevertheless no one . . .* (transfer before οὐδεὶς). Conceivably in these two passages we could accent it perispomenon, as adv. from ὁμός (Homer, class. poet.), and translate *likewise*. But ὁμως (sic) is much more frequent in Bibl. Greek (Wi 13⁶ 2 Mac 2²⁷ 14¹⁸ 15⁵ 4 Mac 13²⁷ SR 15¹¹ SR).

ὄυν.

The interrogative οὐκοῦν (only Jn 18³⁷) may be Pilate's ipsissimum verbum.

This interesting particle is the most widely used of the consecutive co-ordinating conjunctions and its use enters widely into the idiosyncratic style of the various Bibl. authors¹. John is very fond of it (but not in the epistles); in Rev it occurs only in 1-3 (one of several distinguishing features in the syntax of this part of Rev). It occurs most frequently in narrative. It is characteristic of Luke to place it after a ptc.: Lk 5⁷ D 23¹⁶. 22 Ac 10²³ 15² vl. 16¹¹ 25¹⁷. He also invariably adds μέν if the opening word is a noun or pronoun. Its use sharply divides the work of the translators in LXX Ge and Ex; in Ge it occurs almost only in the second half, in Ex almost only in the first half: Ge (1-25) 3, (26-50) 27, Ex (1-24) 26, (25-40) 3.

It is not always strictly causative, but sometimes temporal (= *then*), esp. in Jn. Moreover μέν οὖν (μενοῦν) is no longer the class. affirmation *indeed* (παντάπασι μέν οὖν), but is usually resumptive (= *so then*); it occurs most frequently in Ac (merely resumptive: 1⁶. 18 24¹ 54¹ 84. 25 93¹ 13⁴ 15³. 30 17¹². 30 19³⁸ 23¹⁸. 31 26⁴, 26⁹ ἐγὼ μέν οὖν ἔδοξα *why, I myself thought*, Moule 163). Also resumptive: Lk 3¹⁸ (μέν οὖν nowhere else in Lk) Jn 19²⁴ Ph 2²³. Nevertheless μέν οὖν has the class. use of modifying a previous statement by introducing a new one: *nay rather* Jn 20³⁰ Ac 12⁵ 14³ (see *Beg.* in loc., where it is suggested

¹ K-G 154; 163ff; 336. Mayser II 3, 148ff, W. Nauck, "Das οὖν Paräneticum," ZNW 49, 1958, 134. J. R. Mantey, "Newly discovered meanings for οὖν," *Expositor* ser. VIII 22, 1921, 205-214: contending that in Lk 14³⁴ Ac 8²⁵ Jn 20³⁰ (and papyri) οὖν = *nevertheless*.

to transpose ² and ³, to give οὖν its usual meaning in Ac) 17¹⁷ 25⁴ 28⁵ Heb 7¹¹ 9¹. What is not classical is the use of μεν οὖν (γε) to open a sentence: Lk 11²⁸ Ro 9²⁰ (p⁴⁶ corrects) 10¹⁸ (corr. by FG), Ph 3⁸: *much more, in fact*.

Οὐ, etc.

For negative particles, see ch. 19. For οὐ, μή, and οὐ μή in questions, see ch. 19 § 2; for οὐ μή otherwise, see ch. 8 § 2.2.

Πλὴν ¹.

In class. Greek, a preposition (as in Mk, Ac) or a conjunction in πλὴν ὅτι *except* (as Lk 22²² Ac 20²³ Ph 1¹⁸). In Hell. Greek it becomes an adversative particle. D corrects to δέ in Lk 12³¹ and to ἀλλά in 23²⁸. Lk 17¹ corrects Mt 18⁷ to οὐαὶ δέ (but SBDL harmonize it back again to πλὴν οὐαὶ). Matthew is fond of it; he changes Mk 14³⁶ ἀλλ' οὐχ into πλὴν οὐχ (26³⁹). Paul's use is peculiar and like that of LXX, a pleonastic *only* 1 Co 11¹¹ Eph 5³³ Ph 1¹⁸ (om B) 3¹⁶ 4¹⁴, LXX e.g. Ge 41⁴⁰ Ex 9^{9, 11} 9²⁶ 4 Km 14⁴ 15³⁵ (= Heb. 77).

Πότερον . . . ἤ.

Only Jn 7¹⁷ in NT and rarely in LXX (e.g. Jb 7^{1, 2}).

Τε ².

This copulative enclitic particle, declining in use in the Koine and later revived as an atticism, occurs in NT in all forms and compounds, but not very frequently (except in Ac), and it is an indication of stylistic pretension, its place being taken by καί or οὐδέ. In their use of τε we may group the books as follows: (1) Mk Jn Rev: 14 times, (2) Johannines: 1, (3) Mt: 9, (4) Pastorals: 1, (5) Lk: 11, (6) Paul: 32, (7) Heb: 23, (8) Ac: approx. 170. It is not surprising that in textual transmission scribes and editors were unable to resist introducing τε, sometimes at the expense of δέ: Ac 1¹⁵ (SAB ἦν τε, wrongly in parenthesis) Lk 4³⁵ D 23³⁶ D 24²⁰ Mt 28¹² Ro 7⁷. Although the

¹ Mayser II 2, 534. Schmid Atticismus I 133.

² K-G II §§ 517-520; 522. 2. Meisterhans-Schwyzler 249f. Mayser II 3, 155ff. Radermacher² 5f. J. A. Brown, *An Exegetical Study of τε* (Diss of Southern Baptist Theol. Sem.) 1948.

simple form almost disappeared οὔτε and μήτε lingered on awhile. But the single τε (without καί) occurs in Ac 2³³ 1 Co 4²¹ Heb 6⁵ 9¹ (only poet. in class. Greek). At times τε before γάρ appears to be a superfluous affectation: Ro 7⁷ 2 Co 10⁸ (see K-G II 245, Radermacher² 5).

The correlation τε . . . τε (class. especially in poetry) occurs only in Ac 26¹⁶ and elsewhere in οὔτε . . . οὔτε, εἴτε . . . εἴτε, etc. In Ro 1^{26f} (τε . . . ὁμοίως τε καί) the variant which reads δέ for the second τε has support from BU 417¹⁶ (ὁμοίως δέ καί περὶ τῶν τοῦ . . . Abel § 78). Ac 2⁴⁶ is not an instance of correlation.

The distribution of the correlation τε . . . καί is instructive (* τε καί):—Mt 22^{10*} 27⁴⁸ Lk 2¹⁶ 12⁴⁵ 15² 21^{11, 11} 22^{66*} 23¹² 24²⁰, Ac 60 times, Ro 11^{2*} 14. 14. 16 vl. 20. 27 v. 29. 10 3⁹ 10¹² vl. 1 Co 1² vl. 24. 30 Ph 1⁷ Heb 24. 11 4¹² vl. 57. 14 6². 4 19* 8³ 9². 9. 19 10³³ 11³². 32 Jas 3⁷. 7 Rev 19⁸ vl. It joins more closely than simple καί and joins words which have between themselves a close or logical affinity (*non solum . . . sed etiam*). "Jews and Greeks" is the kind of phrase which demands τε . . . καί or τε καί (Ac 14¹ 19¹⁰ vl. 17 vl. 20²¹ etc.). Other combinations occur: τε . . . καί . . . τε (Ac 9¹⁵ vl. 26^{10f} 20 vl.), τε . . . τε . . . καί (Heb 6² 11³²), τε καί . . . καί . . . καί (Ac 5²⁴ 21³⁰ Heb 24). The correlative τε will usually stand after the first word of the phrase in correlation, but τε is misplaced in Ac 26²²: it should follow and not precede οί. When a preposition (or article) joins two ideas together, τε may be placed after the preposition (Ac 10³⁹ 25²³ 28²³).

In ascertaining the true text we should remember the strong tendency of atticizing editors and scribes to add τε, but this may not always be so in the case of Ac where τε occurs so often that it must be a stylistic feature of the author.

§ 2. Compound Particles

Δήπου¹.

An ironical particle (class. and literary Hell.), partly confirmatory and partly hesitant, appealing to mutual knowledge: Heb 2¹⁸ οὐ γάρ δήπου.

Καί(τοιγε).

Parenthetical particle, *although*: Jn 4³ Ac 14¹⁷ 17^{27f}.

¹ K-G II 131. Mayser II 3, 169.

Μέντοι.

A rare adversative particle, and very weak (*but*) in Jas 2⁸ Jude⁸. Stronger in 2 Ti 2¹⁹ and in Jn where it is most found: οὐ(δείξ) μέντοι 4²⁷ 7¹³ 20⁵ 21⁴ ὁμῶς μέντοι 12⁴².

Οὐδέ, μηδέ.

See ch. 19. Besides beginning a sentence (Mk 8²⁶ Lk 7⁹), it may resume and emphasize a previous negative: Mt 6¹⁵ Mk 3²⁰ Lk 16⁹¹ Ro 4¹⁵.

Οὔτε and μήτε.

Fairly evenly distributed in all parts of the NT, but in many of these instances the endings -δε and -τε are confused in the MSS (cp. δέ and τε): e.g. Lk 20³⁶ οὐδέ γάρ (corr. to οὔτε γάρ by SW), Mk 5³ 12²⁵ 14⁶⁸ Lk 7³³ Ac 2³¹ 23⁸ (SBACE corr. to μήτε) 1 Co 6^{9.10} Ga 1¹² Jas 3¹². This is not surprising in view of the general confusion, e.g. Pap. Rei. 13¹⁰¹ καὶ μήτ' αὐτὸν Ἄνδρωνα μηδ' ἄλλον . . . μηδ' . . . μηδέ . . ., BU 388 II 36f πῶς οὔτε ὁ αὐτὸς χρόνος ἐν αὐταῖς πρόσκειται, ἀλλ' οὐδέ . . .

In class. Greek οὔτε . . . καὶ is very rare. In NT Jn 4¹¹ (D syriew corr. to οὐδέ), 3 Jn¹⁰. See Jn 5^{27f} οὔτε . . . οὔτε . . . καὶ . . . οὐ.

Τοιγαροῦν.

Class. but not Thucyd. Not Koine, and only 13 times in Polyb. I Th 4⁸ Heb 12¹ (p⁴⁶ τοίγαρ). First word.

Τοινοῦν.

Only 5 times in Thucyd. Not Koine, and only 3 times Polyb. Second word (class.): Lk 20²⁵ ACW 1 Co 9²⁶. First word (Hell.): Lk 20²⁵ SBL Heb 13¹³.

§ 3. Unconnected words and sentences: Asyndeton¹

Except occasionally for effect, this is contrary to the genius of Greek, but Paul and Hebrews are full of it (e.g. 1 Co 7²⁷ Heb 11^{32ff}). It increases in the Ptol. pap. between iii and i/B.C. Yet in NT scribes frequently introduced connecting particles (see Jn, for variants between asyndeton, δέ, καὶ and οὖν). Matthew is fond of asyndeton with ἔφη and λέγει (see Lagrange *S. Matth.* XCII) and John has λέγει, λέγουσιν 70 times

¹ K-G II § 546. Meisterhans-Schwyzler 161; 250, 4. Schwyzler II 632ff. , Mayser II 3, 179-183.

with asyndeton (against 31 with particle—but there are variants); Aramaic influence is probable (Lagrange *S. Jean CIVf*). On Mark see Zerwick, *Untersuchungen* 22f.

The use of $\tau\acute{o}\tau\epsilon$ ¹ to link sentences is not class. Mt has it 90 times, Mk 6, Lk 15, Ac 21, Jn 10, rest 18; LXX canonical books 156, Dan O' 43, θ' 30. Its extreme use in Mt must be explained ultimately as a rendering of Aramaic ךְדָּן or ךְדָּב , so frequent in Daniel, and rendered by $\tau\acute{o}\tau\epsilon$ 30 times in LXX. The Heb. וְאֵן is less frequent. It is significant that LXX has $\tau\acute{o}\tau\epsilon$ five or six times in 2 Esd 5, against only four times in the whole of Genesis (Lagrange *S. Matth. CX*). Scribes have sought to reduce the exuberance of $\tau\acute{o}\tau\epsilon$ in Mt.

Because of his elementary knowledge of popular Greek, the author of Rev confines his transition-formulae to the very simplest kind, most often $\mu\epsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}$ $\tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha$ ($\epsilon\lambda\acute{\iota}\delta\omicron\nu$), varying with $\kappa\alpha\iota$ ($\epsilon\lambda\acute{\iota}\delta\omicron\nu$) $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\acute{\iota}\delta\omicron\upsilon$. There is a poverty of particles and continual parataxis (Allo, *Apoc. CLI*).

Asyndeton makes the beginning of new long sections conspicuous, e.g. Ro 9¹ 10¹ 13¹ 1 Pt 5¹ 2 Pt 3¹.

¹ A. H. McNeile, "Τότε in St. Matthew," *JThS* 12, 1911, 127ff.

CHAPTER TWENTY-SIX

IRREGULARITY OF SUBORDINATION

§ 1. Parataxis instead of hypotaxis¹

We have seen how prevalent parataxis is in popular speech (ch. 25, *καί*), and it goes even further in MGr. We find direct in place of indirect speech (Lk 14¹⁸ 1 Co 7⁴⁰ FG), and *καί* is often used in place of subordination (Mt 18²¹ 26⁵³ Lk 14⁵) on the Semitic model which happens to coincide with popular Greek, and even without *καί* there is parataxis where we expect conditional hypotaxis (Jn 7³⁴ 10¹² Ro 13³). Parataxis is too much for D in Mk 2¹⁵ (*οἶ* for *καί*). The imperatives *δρατε* and *βλέπετε* are common in NT, as in the Koine (Mt 9³⁰ 24⁶ Mk 13³³) and are probably asyndetic additions to the normal imperative; so also *υπαγε*, *ἐγειρε*, *θέλεις*. Again, popular Greek coincides with a strong Hebraic idiom: e.g. LXX Ex 19²⁴ *βάδιζε κατάβηθι* (𐤁𐤓𐤁𐤀𐤁𐤀), 3 Km 19⁷ *ἀνάστα φάγε* (𐤁𐤏𐤁𐤀𐤁𐤀). For *ἐγένετο* with finite verb see p. 335; Moulton-Howard 425-428.

§ 2. Interpolation of sentences: Parenthesis²

The NT parentheses are harsher than would be permitted to a Greek stylist, especially those in Paul (Ro 1¹³ 2^{15f}), which may be due to dictation of the letters, but also those in Ac (1¹⁵ 4¹³ 5¹⁴ 12^{3f}). Short parentheses, such as those with *οἶδα*, *μαρτυρῶ*, *ὁρᾶς*, are found in class. Greek. Punctuation in Mark is often clarified if more parentheses than usual are recognized (Zerwick, *Untersuchungen* 130-138. C. H. Turner in *JThS* 26, 145). E.g. transpose.12¹², as ^a c ^b.

§ 3. Anacoloutha

- (a) For *casus pendens* see ch. 22 § 5.
- (b) For gen. absol. improperly used, see pp. 322f.

¹ K-G II § 516. Wackernagel I 62f. Mayser II 3, 184ff. Ljungvik BSSVS 76ff, 87ff. Radermacher² 213, 222.

² K-G II § 548. Schwyzer II 705. Mayser II 3, 186ff. Radermacher² 221. C. Grünwald, *Die Satzparenthese bei den zehn attischen Rednern* (B.z.h.Sd.gr.Spr.19) 1912.

(c) Chiefly in Paul's letters there occurs the anacolouthon whereby the original sentence construction is forgotten after an insertion: Ro 2¹⁷ (but read ἴδε for εἰ δέ?), 16²⁷ (B improves by omitting φ), Ga 2^{4f} (D* improves by omitting οἷς), 2⁶, 1 Ti 13^{ff}.

(d) Paul also tends to make a ptc. co-ordinate with a finite verb: 2 Co 5¹² 6³ 7⁵ 8^{18ff} (χειροτονηθεῖς and also στελλόμενοι. But if ¹⁹ is a parenthesis, the ptc. depends on συνεπέμψαμεν and there is no anacolouthon), 9^{11. 13} 10^{4. 15. 15} 11⁶.

(e) The imperatival ptc. is a well known phenomenon ¹ in Peter and Paul, and it is common in the Koine. However, as ἐστὲ (imperat.) never occurs in NT we must presume that it is understood as a copula with all these ptc's., which therefore do not constitute an anacolouthon. Note the durative sense of the ptc's.: *always* Ro 12^{9ff} 2 Co 6³⁻¹⁰ (the ptc's. skip over ² and carry on the construction of ¹, which is resumed in ⁹) 8²⁴ B δ-text (SC correct to imperat.) Eph 3^{17. 18} 4¹ (the ptc. may depend on the verb immediately before it) 5¹⁵⁻²² Ph 1^{29f} (but WH. make a long parenthesis and try to connect ἔχοντες with στήκετε) Col 2² 3^{16f} 4¹¹ 1 Pt 2^{12. 18} 3^{1. 7} 4^{8ff} 2 Pt 3³.

The only example outside Peter and Paul is Heb 13⁵ (but Moulton would add Lk 24⁴⁷: Proleg. 182).

(f) Very frequent is the use of a finite verb co-ordinate with a ptc. and strengthening it unnecessarily. This is class., but not in the same profusion as in NT. It may be that there is ellipse of the verb *to be* with the ptc's. (Regard, *Phrase nom.* 186-216): Mt 13^{22. 23} Lk 8^{12. 14} Jn 1³² (for emphasis) 5⁴⁴ (vl. corrects to ptc.) 15⁵ 2 Co 5^{6ff} 6⁹ Eph 1²⁰ (not WH.) Col 1²⁶ (D corr. to ptc.) 2 Jn ² Rev 1^{5f} 2^{2. 9} 3^{7. 9}. LXX Ps 17³³⁻³⁵.

¹ Moulton Einl. 284-288, 353f. Joüon, *Grammaire de l'Hébreu Biblique* § 121 e, n. 2. Zerwick § 265f. H. G. Meecham, "The Use of the Participle for the Imperative in the New Testament," *Exp. T.* 58, 1947, 207ff. C. K. Barrett, "The Imperatival Participle," *Exp. T.* 59, 1948, 165ff. Mayser II 1, 340f.

CHAPTER TWENTY-SEVEN

WORD ORDER

THE DETAILS of clause order and of word order within the clause ought to be more closely examined than is possible in the strict compass of this syntax volume and will be reserved for a separate publication on style as distinct from syntax. Certain ways in which the study may benefit textual and exegetical research will however be indicated. The matter has also been separately discussed in part at various points in this volume: the position of adverbs (pp. 227ff), of demonstratives (pp. 193f), the combinations with *πᾶς* (pp. 201-5), the position of adjs. relative to their noun with special reference to *πολύς* (pp. 185f), the position of the dependent genitive (pp. 217f), of comparative clauses (p. 320), and the difference between *εἰ καί* and *καί εἰ* (or *καὶ*) (p. 321).

§ 1. Clause Order

(a) Normally the dependent clause follows the main clause.

1. FINAL clauses with *ἵνα* precede in a very few instances, and mainly in the gospels: Mt 9⁶ (and parallels) 17²⁷ (Jn 14²¹?) Jn 19²⁸. 31 Ac 24⁴ (Ro 7¹³?) Eph 6²¹ "Ὅπως-clauses never precede.

2. LOCAL clauses: *ὅθεν*-clauses (15 times in post-position) never precede. *ὅς*-clauses (21 post-position) precede only at Mt 18²⁰ (2⁹ 28¹⁶ post-position) Ro 4¹⁵ 5²⁰ (9²⁶ post-position) 2 Co 3¹⁷ (1 Co 16⁶ post).

3. TEMPORAL clauses: here alone the pre-position is as much in favour as the post-position. But as *ἕως*-clauses are invariably post-positive, we must alter our punctuation of 1 Ti 4¹³ and take the clause with what precedes¹. We find however that *ὅτι*-, *ὅταν*-, and *ὥς* (temp.)-clauses precede much more often than they follow, especially in the gospels; while *ἐπεὶ*(*ὁ*η)-, *ἐπὶ*-, and *ἡνίκα*-clauses invariably precede, and

¹ "Make yourself an example, until I come."

ὁπότε-, ἄχρι (οὔ)-, μέχρις οὔ-, and μέχρι-clauses invariably follow. But πρὶν- and πρὸ τοῦ-clauses are about equally divided.

4. CAUSAL clauses: the majority have post-position, but ἐπεὶ and ἐπειδὴ are equally divided, and ἐπεὶ ἔν (1 Co 14¹⁶) has only pre-position. Ὅτι (causal) is post-positive 397 times, and the only exceptions are as follows: Lk 19¹⁷ Jn 15⁰ (a question) 8⁴⁵ (14¹⁹?) 15¹⁹ 16⁶ 20²⁹ (a question) Ro 9⁷ Ga 4⁶ Rev 3¹⁰. 16 18⁷. Invariably post-positive are ἀνθ' ὧν, ἐφ' ὧ, καθότι, διότι. But διὰ τό c. infin. (post-positive 23 times) has pre-position in Mt 13⁶ 24¹² Mk 4⁶ Ac 18³ 27⁹.

5. COMPARATIVE clauses: see also ch. 23 § 3. c. 1. Καθώς (with καθάπερ and καθά as variants)—clauses follow the main clause invariably in Mt, in Mk (except for Mk 1^{2t}, which is not an exception if punctuated with a stop after 1³), in Lk (except for 6³¹ 11³⁰ 17²⁶. 28). But in Jn the distribution is more even (19 post: 13 pre), like the Joh. epp. (8:5). In Ac there are 10 post: 2 pre. In Ro 15 (+5 vl.) post: 1 pre. 1 and 2 Co 24 (+2 vl.): 7. Ga 3:0. Ph 2:1. Eph 10:0. Col 4:1. 1 and 2 Th 12:3. Past 0:1. Heb 7:2. 1 Pt 0:1. 2 Pt 2:0.

(b) Chiasmus¹.

Lund argues that chiasmus is largely Semitic: hence, in the material common to Mt and Lk, it occurs rather in Mt. The instances outside Biblical Greek are not extensive chiasmic systems but usually the simpler kind of chiasmus of four terms only. The chiasmus in the MT of Ps 71⁶ 58⁶ is well preserved in LXX, but the remarkable ten-fold instance in Ps 37^t is not preserved quite so obviously, and in Ps 63⁽⁴⁾ the LXX spoils the chiasmus by using ἐταράχθη in both members. Before Lund, a chiasmus of four or six members had already been pointed out by J. Weiss in Ro 14^{7tt} 1 Co 7¹⁻⁷ 9¹⁹⁻²² Ph 4¹¹⁻¹³, but most writers had applied class. standards to the NT and failed to appreciate any influence of ancient Semitic culture or of contemporary Aramaic literature. Greek rhetorical forms do not explain everything in NT style, where the writers were Jews accustomed to the sound of a Hebrew liturgy. Lund

¹ N. W. Lund, *Chiasmus in the New Testament*, N. Carolina 1942. W. Milligan, *Lectures on the Apocalypse*³, 1892, pp. 94f, noticed chiasmus in Rev, using it to counter the source hypotheses of Vischer and Völter. J. Jeremias, *ZNW* 49, 1958, 145-156.

argues that although J. Weiss may correctly contend that the Paulines were written for the *ear*, the influence of the OT and the synagogue was paramount. Of this literary influence, Lund is concerned with one particular expression, chiasmus or inverted order. Discovering certain laws governing these structures in the OT, he makes tests for their occurrence in the NT. A point to which he might have given more attention is the important question whether the Semitic influence was direct from the Hebrew OT or whether it was by way of the LXX.

Instances of chiasmus are as follows—

- (a) Mt 9¹⁷ old—burst—skins—skins—lost—new (ABC CBA)
 (b) I Co 7³ to woman—man—woman—to man (AB—BA)
 (c) I Co 11⁸⁻¹²

A	man A woman B woman B man A	B	man A woman B woman B man A	C	angels	B	woman B man A man A woman B	A	woman B man A man A woman B
---	--------------------------------------	---	--------------------------------------	---	--------	---	--------------------------------------	---	--------------------------------------

Ps 89³⁰⁻³⁴ may have been the (unconscious?) model for Paul here, if he knew the psalms in Hebrew form.

(d) Col 3^{8r} death—life—hidden—Christ—Christ—manifested—life—glory.

(e) I Co 5²⁻⁶ is the kind of sentence which seems interminable to the Greek student and on which Semitic culture throws light, with a ABCBA arrangement and chiasmus within chiasmus:

A	puffed up	B	misconduct A presence B presence B misconduct A	C	Lord Jesus A you B me B Lord Jesus A	B	Satan destruction B flesh C spirit C salvation B Day of Lord A	A	boast- ing
---	--------------	---	--	---	---	---	---	---	---------------

In this instance the study of chiasmus helps the textual critic. The first reference to "Lord Jesus" in member C has the addition $\eta\mu\omega\nu$ in p⁴⁶ BKL 0142 DG lat syr^{esh}, and as this addition balances the fourth member of the chiasmus-within-chiasmus, there is a good reason for accepting it.

(f) Not only does this study help with the text, but also in interpretation, e.g.: Mt 7⁶

“ Give not what is holy to the *dogs* (A),
 Neither cast your pearls before *swine* (B),
 Lest they [B must be *swine*] trample them under foot (B),
 And they [A must be the *dogs*, not *swine*] turn and rend you (A).”

The last line is different from the usual interpretation.

Probably much longer passages than these, even whole epistles, among Paul's writings, may be planned (unconsciously?) on the chiasmic pattern.

§ 2. Word Order within the Clause¹

(a) Idiosyncrasies of Biblical Greek through Semitic influence.

1. Co-ordinating particles as first word. Semitic languages avoid second-place conjunctions, and this tendency was inherited by Biblical Greek, which either placed the conjunction first or else avoided altogether the second-place conjunctions like γάρ, γε, μέν, δέ, οὖν, τε. Thus ἀρα is first word in Mt 12²⁸, τούτων in Lk 20²⁵ Heb 13¹³, μενοῦνγε in Ro 10¹⁸, τοιγαροῦν in Heb 12¹.

2. The verb (contrary to contemporary secular Greek, where mainly it has middle position) occurs as near the beginning as possible², followed by pers. pronoun, subject, obj., supplementary

¹ T. D. Goodell, "The Order of Words in Greek," *Trans. and Proc. Amer. Phil. Assn.* XXI. 5 (21. 24). W. Rhys Roberts, "A Point of Greek and Latin Word-Order," *Class. Rev.*, 1912, 177-9. G. Cuendet, *L'ordre des mots dans le texte grec et dans les versions gotique . . . des Évangiles, I. Les groupes nominaux*, Paris 1929. M. Frisk, *Studien zur griechische Worstellung*, Göteborg 1932. J. M. Rife, "The Mechanics of Translation Greek," *JBL* 52, 1933, 244ff. D. J. Wieand, *Subject-Verb-Object Relationship in Independent Clauses in the Gospels and Acts* (Diss. Univ. Chicago) 1946. Moulton-Howard 416-418. E. Norden, *Agnostos Theos*, Leipzig 1913, 365f "Stellung des Verbums in NT Griechischen." He makes the prominence of the verb in first-place a sign of Semitism, and on this he quotes Wellhausen with approval.

² The normal order in the ancient Greek was Subj.-Obj.-Verb (SOV) and the nearest books to this ideal in Bibl. Greek literature are 2-4 Mac.

	VSO	SVO	SOV	VOS	OSV	OVS
2 Mac	1	4	4	-	-	-
3 Mac	1	2	5	-	2	-
4 Mac	-	2	5	2	1	-
Plato	-	1	7	1	1	-

ptc. E.g. Lk 1¹¹ ὄφθη δὲ αὐτῷ ἄγγελος κυρίου ἕστως ἐκ δεξιῶν. In Mk the copula occurs in this position in 24 out of 29 instances (the exceptions: 5⁵ 7¹⁵ 13²⁵ 14⁴⁰). The predicative ptc. immediately follows the subject in Bibl. Greek: Mk 1⁶ καὶ ἦν ὁ Ἰωάννης ἐνδεδουλευμένος, 14⁴. 40 Lk 2³² Ac 12⁶. This is Hebraic word-order, for in Aramaic the verb tends to end the clause. In periphrastic tenses the subject comes between the copula and the ptc., e.g. Mk 1⁶. 33 24. 6. 18 31 43⁸ 511. 40 652 144. 40 15⁷. 26. 40. 43 (exceptions 7¹⁵ 10³² 13²⁵). In Hebrew the subject follows the verb directly, but occasionally the object intervenes between the verb and subject (e.g. Ge 1¹⁷), and the personal pronoun always does so (see 8 below).¹

3. Article and noun adhere closely together, and in Hebrew they are actually one. That is why in LXX only 4 per cent of the def. articles stand apart from their nouns in books translated from the canonical literature, whereas in the books having no MT as *Vorlage* the percentage is as high as 11 per cent. For the NT epistles the figure is 18 per cent. It is still higher (25 per cent) when seven non-Biblical works of class., Koine, and MGr are chosen for a count (Rife, *JBL* 52, 248).

Some NT books approach this standard, but on the whole NT is closer to the Hebraic order (VSO) and towards the subsequent tendency of MGr (SVO)

	VSO	SVO	SOV	VOS	OSV	OVS
Synoptic parallels:						
Mk	3	9	4	-	1	1
Mt	1	5	1	-	-	1
Lk	1	4	2	-	-	1
Luke entire	9	19	8	2	-	1
John	-	4	3	1	2	-
Acts	6	31	1	1	1	5
Ro	-	4	5	-	-	1

The figures are those of Rife who restricted himself to main declarative clauses where both subj. and obj. were nouns, his method being to read from the beginning of each book until ten *exx.* were collected (*JBL* 52, 250f). But requirements of emphasis will everywhere upset rules of word-order. See also Zerwick *Untersuchungen* 75-108; P.-L. Couchoud, "La Place du Verbe dans Marc," *JThS* 30, 1929, 47ff.

¹ Therefore in Mk 2^{15f} punctuate (not as NEB, etc.): "For they were many. There followed him some scribes of the Pharisees. They noticed him eating . . ."

4. Again, Hebrew word-order supports the after-position of the adj., because nothing can come between art. and noun. Although the NT epistles display a very high proportion of non-Semitic word-order in this respect, the gospels more closely conform. The tendency in the Koine is for the adj. to precede the noun. A significant comparison is that between the papyri of ii-i/B.C. examined by Mayser and the first nineteen chapters of the LXX. The papyri have 140 exx. of the type δ ἀγαθὸς ἀνὴρ and only four or five of δ ἀνὴρ δ ἀγαθός; whereas the Biblical chapters have δ ἀγαθὸς ἀνὴρ 17 times, but δ ἀνὴρ δ ἀγαθός 56 times (the proportion in 1 Km 1-6 is 1:16). See Mayser II 2, 52ff and see also, pp. 189f.

5. As in the Heb. construct state, the genitive in translation Greek follows immediately upon its governing noun. The tendency in the literary style was, however, for the gen. to precede, and we find this much more frequently in the free Greek books of the LXX. In the NT it is consciously stylistic, as 2 Co 11⁹ δ τοῦ θεοῦ . . . υἱός, 2 Pt 3² τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων ἐμῶν ἐντολῆς. The need to follow the Hebrew construction closely may result in the dissociation of analogous nouns, as in Ge 41⁸ *the magicians of Egypt and their wise men*.

6. Unemphatic direct or indirect personal pronouns (αὐτῶ, αὐτῆ, αὐτοῖς) come closely after the verb in Bibl. Greek on the model of the Heb. pronominal suffix which is one with the verb: Lk 11¹ ὤφθη δὲ αὐτῶ, Ac 27² ὄντος σὺν ἡμῖν Ἀριστάρχου. There are exceptions, e.g.: the pronoun αὐτῶ precedes the verb in Jn 7²⁶ 10⁴ 12²⁹ (but it follows the verb 145 times in Jn), and αὐτοῖς has an intruding word (other than δέ or οὖν) between it and the verb in 2²⁴ (ἐαυτόν p⁶⁶ WΘ), 8²¹ (οὖν πάλιν, but S omits πάλιν, and some minusc. have πάλιν after αὐτοῖς), 10⁷ (οὖν πάλιν, but p⁴⁵ p⁶⁶ SW om πάλιν, and SB om αὐτοῖς).

7. In Semitic word-order the demonstrative adj. always follows the noun, and this is usual in Bibl. Greek. See p. 193. Some displacements are difficult to understand, e.g. Lk 24³¹ αὐτῶν δὲ διηγοίχθησαν οἱ ὀφθαλμοί.

8. (i) As in Hebrew the prepositional phrase comes immediately after the verb if the Heb. preposition would have a pronominal suffix (e.g. Ge 24⁶), but the prepositional phrase comes after the subject (which itself is after the verb) if the Hebrew preposition would have a noun after it (e.g. Ge 24²).

This makes it certain that, against RSV, NEB, etc., in Mk 6²⁶ we interpret *he was grieved because of his oaths and guests* (not *he was unwilling . . . because of his oaths and guests*); and in Lk 11¹³ it is *your heavenly Father*, not *your Father will give from heaven*.

(ii) So also the prepositional phrase occurs immediately after its noun, following the Heb. phrase with $\gamma\omega\mu$ or the Heb. genitive of quality. The LXX books written in free Greek, especially 2-4 Mac, tend to place the prepositional phrase between article and noun (Johannesson DGPS 362ff). The translation books tend to place the prep. phrase after the noun, usually with repetition of the article.

(b) Oratory and word-order. Interruption of the normal order to give oratorical effect may result in ambiguity: Ac 4³³ ΑΕ μεγάλη δυνάμει ἀπεδίδουν οἱ ἀπόστολοι τὸ μαρτύριον τῆς ἀναστάσεως Ἰησοῦ Χρ. τοῦ κυρίου (p⁴⁵SB τὸ μαρτύριον οἱ ἀπόστολοι; B τοῦ κυρίου Ἰ. τῆς ἀναστάσεως); either *the apostles of the Lord Jesus witnessed to the resurrection*, or *the apostles witnessed to the resurrection of the Lord Jesus*; the order is rather unnatural, whatever reading we adopt (see *Beg.* III, celix n. 2). Ac 19²⁰ οὕτως κατὰ κράτος τοῦ κυρίου ὁ λόγος ἠῤῥαεν (τοῦ κυρίου must refer to ὁ λόγος). Ac 1² ἐντειλάμενος τοῖς ἀποστόλοις διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου οὗς ἐξελέξατο (unnatural order). Heb 12²³ κριτῇ θεῷ πάντων *God of all* or *judge of all*? All this reveals a weakness inherent in the flexibility of the Greek language.

(c) Stereotyped phrases. A customary word-order is observed, e.g. ἄνδρες καὶ γυναῖκες, γυν. καὶ παιδία (but παιδία first in Mt 14²¹ D), ἐσθίειν καὶ πίνειν, βρῶσις καὶ πόσις, πόδες καὶ χεῖρες (reversed at Lk 24³⁹ but not in S), ζῶντες καὶ νεκροί, νεκρὸς καὶ ἡμέρας, etc. The suggestion that there is a stereotyped phrase may account for the peculiar order in Ro 8¹⁸ πρὸς τὴν μέλλουσαν δόξαν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι, and Ga 3²³ εἰς τὴν μέλλουσαν πίστιν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι (ἡ μέλλουσα δόξα being a set phrase).

INDEX TO REFERENCES

(a) NEW TESTAMENT.

Thick type represents more important discussion.

MATTHEW	PAGE	MATTHEW—continued	PAGE	MATTHEW—continued	PAGE
I. I	167	4. 3	183	5. 48	86
I. 2 f.	167, 345	4. 6	183	6. I	144
I. 6	167, 169	4. 8	227	6. 2	42, 77, 112
I. II f.	212	4. II	67	6. 3	17, 39
I. 16	152, 167	4. 15	175, 212, 247	6. 4	39, 334
I. 18	78, 140, 162, 176, 226, 322	4. 16	39, 316	6. 5	86, 112, 226
I. 19	157	4. 23	51, 211	6. 6	77, 112
I. 20	77, 151, 322	4. 25	275	6. 7	253
I. 21	40, 40, 246	5. I	173, 322	6. 8	49, 144
I. 22	70	5. 3	220, 239	6. 9	35
2. I	26, 172	5. 5	232	6. 10	75, 77
2. 2	26, 134, 172, 189	5. 6	177, 232	6. 12	37
2. 3	317	5. 8	220, 239	6. 13	14, 77
2. 4	63, 65	5. 9	208	6. 16	76, 112
2. 6	31, 48, 151, 170	5. 10	85	6. 17	37, 54, 154
2. 8	112, 154, 156, 335	5. 12	76	6. 18	106, 159
2. 9	26, 172, 279	5. 13	183	6. 19	42, 76
2. 10	160, 242	5. 14	279	6. 22	183
2. 12	52	5. 15	150, 292	6. 24	36
2. 13	141, 142	5. 16	72, 150	6. 25	24, 76, 99, 117
2. 14	235	5. 17	77, 134	6. 27	209
2. 15	151	5. 18	96	6. 28	76, 179, 313, 325
2. 16	72, 154, 227	5. 19	31, 45, 107	6. 30	115
2. 20	25, 75, 81, 154, 293	5. 20	96, 216	6. 32	313
2. 22	26, 64, 228	5. 21	86	6. 34	72, 76, 77, 311
2. 23	7, 28	5. 22	151	7. 2	291
3. 3	44	5. 24	75	7. 3	191
3. 4	41, 66	5. 25	88, 89, 110	7. 4	94
3. 5	16, 66	5. 25	96	7. 5	139
3. 6	66	5. 28	73, 144, 151, 232	7. 6	77, 346
3. 7	66	5. 29 f.	32, 42, 115, 139	7. 8	151
3. 9	42, 168	5. 32	107, 151	7. 9	55, 325
3. 10	62, 199, 200	5. 34	149	7. II	157
3. 11	252, 266	5. 35	255	7. 12	107, 108, 138
3. 12	325	5. 36	75	7. 15	48
3. 13	141	5. 39	48, 77, 149, 197	7. 16	293
3. 14	39, 65, 139, 334	5. 40	39, 316	7. 17	63
3. 15	88, 149, 200	5. 41	48	7. 21	196
3. 16	25, 259	5. 42	76	7. 23	153, 177
3. 17	25, 44, 186	5. 43	86	7. 24	48, 189, 233, 316
4. I	134	5. 44	86	7. 26	151, 221
		5. 44	86	7. 27	207
		5. 45	52, 53, 208, 291	7. 28	66

MATTHEW— <i>continued</i>		MATTHEW— <i>continued</i>		MATTHEW— <i>continued</i>	
	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
8. 1	39, 322	II. 8	17	13. 53	52
8. 2	65	II. 10	37, 45	13. 56	273
8. 4	40, 78	II. 11	29	13. 57	253
8. 5	322	II. 12	58	14. 1	167
8. 8	139, 189	II. 16	86, 179	14. 2	180
8. 9	75	II. 19	258	14. 6	27, 243
8. 11	26	II. 20	31	14. 7	135
8. 12	29, 173	II. 21	91	14. 8	64
8. 16	241	II. 23	17, 37	14. 9	26
8. 17	40	II. 27	107, 108, 110,	14. 11	40
8. 21	334		286	14. 13	18
8. 24	66	II. 29	42, 220	14. 14	40
8. 27	318	12. 1	27	14. 19	158
8. 28	322	12. 4	137	14. 20	316
8. 29	156, 179	12. 5	27	14. 23	28
8. 34	65, 106	12. 6	21	14. 28 f.	27
9. 2	64, 292	12. 10	100, 195, 333	14. 29	75
9. 3	43, 209	12. 13	197	14. 31	266, 267
9. 4	23	12. 18	43	14. 33	183
9. 5	32	12. 21	238	15. 2	38, 112
9. 6	344	12. 24	152	15. 5	91, 309
9. 10	322	12. 25	43	15. 6	96, 97
9. 13	282	12. 28	347	15. 8	23
9. 15	208	12. 35	14, 22	15. 13	48
9. 16	65	12. 36	48, 316	15. 19	28
9. 17	292	12. 39	214	15. 20	140
9. 18	65, 196, 322, 330	12. 41	21, 255, 266	15. 22	195
9. 21	43	12. 42	172	15. 23	156
9. 22	35, 69	12. 44	162, 319	15. 25	65
9. 26	312	12. 45	41, 43	15. 28	33
9. 27	51	12. 48	183	15. 30	43, 154, 197
9. 38	106	12. 50	41	15. 31	161
10. 1	136, 139	13. 2	154	15. 32	49, 135, 231
10. 2	168	13. 3	141	15. 35	236
10. 4	80	13. 4	36, 145	15. 37	316
10. 5	169, 212	13. 5	142	16. 3	27
10. 11	316	13. 6	142, 172, 345	16. 7	49
10. 13	86	13. 8	36, 67	16. 14	36, 197
10. 14	48	13. 11	45, 135	16. 16	183
10. 15	213, 216	13. 12	110, 282, 292	16. 18	22, 27, 189
10. 16	38	13. 14	97, 157, 238	16. 19	89
10. 19	49, 117	13. 15	23	16. 21	258
10. 21	313, 313	13. 19	151, 200	16. 22	97, 240, 282,
10. 22	45, 89	13. 23	36, 333		309
10. 23	112, 197	13. 24	179	16. 25	43, 107, 108
10. 25	139	13. 25	145	16. 26	98, 199
10. 26	77, 286	13. 26	72	16. 28	96, 233, 241
10. 28	335	13. 28	99, 154, 195	17. 1	18
10. 30	24	13. 29	276	17. 2	316
10. 32	48, 110, 316	13. 30	144, 187	17. 4	115, 149
10. 33	108, 110	13. 37	183	17. 9	316, 322
10. 41	266	13. 38	208	17. 11	63
10. 42	18	13. 39	183	17. 12	53, 264
11. 1	141, 159	13. 44	73, 179	17. 14	316
11. 3	63	13. 45	195	17. 15	189
11. 5	58	13. 46	70, 73, 154	17. 17	33, 35, 234
11. 6	253	13. 48	14, 73, 154	17. 19	18, 37
11. 7	134	13. 52	195	17. 22	24

MATTHEW—continued		MATTHEW—continued		MATTHEW—continued	
	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
17. 25	159	20. 33	94	23. 34	209
17. 27	42, 43, 53, 152, 258, 292, 344	21. 1	72	23. 37	42
18. 1	29, 183	21. 3	86	24. 2	96
18. 2	65	21. 4	70	24. 3	18, 322
18. 3	321	21. 5	239	24. 9	89
18. 4	29	21. 6	154	24. 12	142, 345
18. 8	149	21. 7	26	24. 13	45
18. 8 f.	31, 42	21. 8	31, 312	24. 20	235
18. 9	149	21. 9	174	24. 21	14, 70, 96, 286
18. 10	78	21. 11	210, 259	24. 22	196, 199, 268, 282
18. 12	63	21. 13	86	24. 27	26, 172
18. 14	139	21. 18	51	24. 30	161, 214
18. 15	42, 43, 73	21. 19	96	24. 31	25, 218, 225, 234
18. 16	42, 57	21. 21	16	24. 33	27, 179
18. 17	239	21. 22	316	24. 34	96
18. 18	89	21. 23	322	24. 35	96, 97
18. 20	344	21. 26	246	24. 40	36, 319
18. 21	342	21. 28	32	24. 41	36
18. 22	188	21. 31	32	24. 43	46, 63
18. 23	47, 56, 185, 195	21. 32	136, 141	24. 45	141, 183, 186
18. 24	322	21. 33	55	24. 46	162
18. 25	64, 138, 322	21. 34	135	24. 51	226
18. 26	65	21. 35	36	25. 1	154
18. 27	234	21. 41	27, 55	25. 2	178
18. 28	321	21. 42	21, 45, 253	25. 4	13
18. 33	90	21. 45	64	25. 5	67
18. 35	23	21. 46	246, 247, 266	25. 6	225, 235
19. 1	52	22. 1	27	25. 9	42, 75, 98, 99, 155
19. 3	268, 333	22. 4	309	25. 10	27
19. 5	253	22. 5	36, 192	25. 14	87, 192
19. 10	115, 226	22. 7	26, 72	25. 15	36
19. 17	183	22. 8	72	25. 16	154
19. 18	182	22. 11	161, 285	25. 18	154
19. 20	246	22. 13	232	25. 19	56
19. 21	146	22. 16	87, 257	25. 20	69
19. 22	154	22. 21	47	25. 24	226
19. 24	216	22. 27	316	25. 25	154
19. 28	214	22. 28	209	25. 26	38, 226
19. 29	48, 232, 316	22. 30	57, 321	25. 27	90
20. 4	107, 108	22. 31	180	25. 32	313
20. 6	179	22. 36	31	25. 34	152, 234
20. 8	155	22. 37	39, 199	25. 35	135
20. 9	179	22. 39	42	25. 36	39
20. 10	14	23. 2	72	25. 37	155
20. 12	220	23. 3	316	25. 38 f.	161
20. 17	18	23. 5	144	25. 40	31
20. 18	63, 240	23. 8	183, 189	25. 44	155
20. 19	143	23. 10	184	25. 45	31
20. 20	87	23. 13	81	26. 2	63, 135, 143
20. 21	36	23. 15	16	26. 4	54
20. 23	140	23. 16	48, 51	26. 9	90
20. 24	178	23. 18	48, 51	26. 10	256
20. 26	86, 107	23. 23	90, 148	26. 12	144
20. 27	108	23. 25	216, 260	26. 13	199
20. 28	31, 43, 51, 57, 134, 258	23. 26	14	26. 15	27, 334
20. 30	167	23. 30	215		
		23. 31	42		
		23. 33	99		

INDEX TO REFERENCES

355

MARK—continued		MARK—continued		MARK—continued	
	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
5. 34	35, 83	8. 3	82	10. 33	240
5. 36	75, 161	8. 5	65	10. 37	36
5. 42	242	8. 7	138	10. 38	245
5. 43	138, 149	8. 12	127, 333	10. 40	324
6. 2	31	8. 16	64	10. 41	178, 255
6. 3	183	8. 17	23, 185	10. 43 f.	108
6. 4	306	8. 19	236, 316	10. 45	57, 258
6. 5	39, 321	8. 23	65, 232, 256	10. 47	166
6. 6	221	8. 27	65, 212, 293	10. 49	138
6. 7	187	8. 28	306	10. 51	95
6. 8	225, 326	8. 29	65, 80	10. 52	83
6. 9	317	8. 31	258	11. 2	70
6. 11	324, 325	8. 35	43, 108, 110	11. 5	82, 154
6. 15	306, 320	8. 38	257	11. 8	115
6. 16	324	9. 1	82, 96, 233	11. 11	17
6. 17	41, 41	9. 2	18	11. 13	87, 116, 161
6. 18	41, 41, 67	9. 3	46, 88, 89	11. 14	121, 122
6. 19	52	9. 5	149	11. 16	138
6. 20	162	9. 6	67, 117	11. 17	83
6. 21	27	9. 7	88	11. 19	93, 226
6. 22	41, 41, 55, 108, 322	9. 10	140, 182	11. 23	63
6. 23	55, 210	9. 11	49	11. 24	73
6. 24	55, 151	9. 19	33, 35, 39	11. 25	112
6. 25	55, 154, 229	9. 20	66, 312, 316	11. 30	217
6. 26	26, 335, 350	9. 21	70	11. 31 f.	326
6. 27	149	9. 22	69, 330	11. 32	67, 149, 325
6. 28	40	9. 23	182	12. 1	55
6. 31	18	9. 24	156, 189	12. 2	128, 129, 209
6. 36	117	9. 26	31	12. 4	135
6. 37	37, 98	9. 28	18, 39, 49, 243, 322	12. 5	36
6. 39	138, 231	9. 30	129, 282	12. 7	94
6. 40	187, 266, 268	9. 31	24, 63	12. 10	324
6. 41	67	9. 34	30	12. 11	21
6. 43	209	9. 35	86	12. 12	64, 342
6. 45	40, 321	9. 37	107, 209, 282, 287	12. 14	99, 286
6. 48	146	9. 38	65	12. 23	209
6. 52	23	9. 41	96, 246	12. 26	137, 217
6. 55	116	9. 42	31, 92	12. 28	31, 161, 210, 316
6. 56	93, 100, 125	9. 43	31, 149	12. 30	199
7. 2	45, 325	9. 44	292	12. 31	42
7. 4	135, 179, 259	9. 45, 47	31, 149	12. 33	140, 181, 199
7. 5	185	9. 50	43, 44	12. 34	325
7. 6	23, 206	10. 1	82, 154	12. 36, 37	41
7. 11	91	10. 11	272	12. 38	154, 227
7. 19	316	10. 13	293	12. 40	45, 317
7. 20	46	10. 14	214	12. 41	67, 137
7. 21	23	10. 16	39	13. 1	322
7. 21 f.	28	10. 17	322	13. 2	96
7. 24	285	10. 19	51	13. 3	18, 322
7. 25	241, 325	10. 20	55	13. 4	89, 112
7. 26	67	10. 21	72	13. 8	268
7. 28	156	10. 23	137	13. 9	37
7. 33	18	10. 24	82, 137	13. 11	112
7. 36	29, 246	10. 25	31	13. 12	313
7. 37	26, 83	10. 30	193	13. 13	45
8. 1 f.	117	10. 32	37	13. 14	15, 82, 312
8. 2	243			13. 15, 16	15

MARK— <i>continued</i>		MARK— <i>continued</i>		LUKE— <i>continued</i>	
	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
13. 17	51	15. 7	83	1. 49	296
13. 18	235	15. 9	155	1. 51	23, 228
13. 19	46, 70, 96, 324, 325	15. 10	83	1. 51-3	74
13. 20	55	15. 12	183	1. 54	136
13. 22	144	15. 15	135	1. 55	238
13. 23	37	15. 16	216	1. 59	65
13. 25	89	15. 20	191	1. 62 39, 123, 130, 182	
13. 26	257	15. 22	102	1. 63	156
13. 27	25, 175, 225	15. 23	37, 65, 178	1. 65	16
13. 29	27	15. 27	179	1. 66	23, 23
13. 30	96, 196	15. 29	24	1. 68	174
13. 31	97	15. 34	72, 267	1. 70	25, 187
13. 34	75, 77	15. 36	94	1. 71	24
13. 35	235	15. 39	16, 183	1. 72	56, 136
13. 36	99	15. 41	153	1. 73	141, 324
14. 1	27, 252	15. 43	166	1. 74	24
14. 3	154	15. 44	5	1. 75	243
14. 4	70, 153	15. 44 f.	69	1. 77, 78 f.	142
14. 6	264	15. 47	168	1. 79	52
14. 7	112	16. 1	168, 278	1. 80	213
14. 8	138, 227	16. 2	187, 227, 322	2. 1	57, 139
14. 10 f.	129	16. 4	135	2. 2	32, 192
14. 14	109	16. 5	17	2. 3	57
14. 19	198, 268	16. 6	57	2. 4	47, 142, 148
14. 20	55	16. 7	330	2. 5	57
14. 21	92, 284	16. 9	187, 259	2. 8	235, 245
14. 23	209	16. 14	316	2. 11	239
14. 24	152, 271	16. 17	193	2. 12	192
14. 25	96, 112, 227, 286	16. 18	52, 96	2. 13	312
14. 28	57, 143, 146, 148	16. 19	143	2. 14	213, 264
14. 29	37, 115, 330		LUKE	2. 15	94, 175
14. 30	140	1. 1	33, 318	2. 21	40, 141, 144
14. 31	96, 97	1. 2	320	2. 22	142, 217
14. 35	66	1. 3	31, 33, 199	2. 24	142
14. 36	49, 330	1. 6	181	2. 26	113, 140, 148, 149, 176
14. 39	80	1. 7	220	2. 27	145, 151, 176, 234, 336
14. 41	24, 291, 336	1. 9	141	2. 30	14
14. 42	82	1. 14	233	2. 31	25
14. 44	41, 70, 83	1. 15	96, 180	2. 34	87
14. 47	55, 196	1. 17	23, 257	2. 35	105
14. 49	95, 330	1. 18	37, 268	2. 38	194
14. 54	54, 266	1. 20	48, 88, 89	2. 41	22, 67
14. 55	143, 166	1. 21	146	2. 42	81, 154
14. 58	161, 267	1. 26	258	2. 43	145, 166
14. 60	49	1. 29	123, 131	2. 44	212
14. 60 f.	67	1. 31	86	2. 47	66
14. 63	27	1. 33	25	2. 48	62
14. 64	233	1. 35	21, 87	2. 49	261
14. 65	241	1. 36	192	3. 2	174, 207
14. 67	166	1. 37	196	3. 5	16, 253
14. 71	137	1. 38	185	3. 6	14
14. 72	52, 137, 140	1. 39	16	3. 8	168
15. 2	183	1. 42	31	3. 9	63, 199
15. 4	50	1. 43	45, 139, 240	3. 13	151, 216
15. 6	48, 67, 93, 268	1. 44	254	3. 14	27, 57, 151
		1. 45	35, 42	3. 15	23, 123, 130
		1. 48	185		

LUKE—continued		LUKE—continued		LUKE—continued	
	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
3. 16	240	6. 45	14	9. 23	76
3. 18	197, 337	6. 47	233	9. 24	43
3. 21	145	6. 47-9	79	9. 25	43, 80, 157
3. 23	321	6. 48	152	9. 27	96, 233
3. 23 f.	168	7. 1	159, 321	9. 28	231, 335
4. 1	159, 257	7. 2	89	9. 29	87, 145
4. 3, 9	183	7. 3	106	9. 32	71, 265
4. 10	141	7. 4	139	9. 33	117, 149
4. 16	27, 151	7. 6	66, 139, 157, 216	9. 34	148
4. 17	173	7. 8	64	9. 36	70, 324
4. 19	211	7. 12	335	9. 37	235, 267
4. 20	158, 200	7. 17	257	9. 38	149
4. 22	213	7. 18	195	9. 40	312
4. 23	161	7. 22	58, 154, 331	9. 41	35
4. 24	89	7. 28	30	9. 42	322
4. 25	21	7. 32	153, 179	9. 44	24
4. 26	330	7. 35	73	9. 45	102, 234
4. 29	136	7. 36, 42	209	9. 46	123, 130, 182
4. 34	13	7. 39	48	9. 47	23
4. 35	246	7. 45	17, 159, 226	9. 48	30, 31
4. 36	318	7. 47	319	9. 49	65
4. 41	183, 292, 313	7. 49	312	9. 52	134, 136, 169
4. 43	197	8. 2	53, 292	9. 54	99
5. 1	335	8. 5	36	9. 55	49
5. 3	50, 52, 154	8. 5 f.	36, 145	9. 58	109
5. 4	52, 159	8. 6 f.	197	9. 59	149, 197
5. 5	199, 272	8. 9	123, 131	9. 61	197
5. 7	141, 198, 273	8. 10	102	10. 1	41, 187, 266, 311
5. 10	89, 239	8. 12, 15	23	10. 4	77
5. 12	179	8. 16	279	10. 6	52, 208
5. 13	156	8. 17	96	10. 7	15, 194
5. 14	40, 326	8. 18	284	10. 19	97
5. 17	143	8. 23	72	10. 20	25, 313
5. 19	16, 235	8. 25	318	10. 21	194
5. 21	26, 156, 226	8. 26	216	10. 23	18
5. 22	23	8. 27	244	10. 23 f.	38
5. 24	75	8. 28	156	10. 25	157, 232
5. 33	56	8. 29	65, 67, 243	10. 27	199
5. 37	41	8. 30	298, 313	10. 29	157
5. 39	31	8. 35	208, 313	10. 35	145, 148
6. 2	195	8. 37	65	10. 37	56, 152
6. 4	137, 149	8. 40	145	10. 39	44
6. 7	55	8. 46	160, 161	11. 2	112
6. 8	186	8. 47	137	11. 3	77
6. 11	123, 130	8. 48	35	11. 4	77, 151, 200
6. 16	168	8. 50	75	11. 5	99, 320
6. 22	72, 285	8. 52	76	11. 6	109, 320
6. 24	206	8. 54	52	11. 7	99
6. 25	35, 153	8. 56	151	11. 8	284, 330
6. 29	235	9. 1	55	11. 9	75
6. 30	76, 151	9. 3	78	11. 11	247, 258
6. 31	293	9. 8	305	11. 13	25
6. 32	115	9. 9	37, 46, 62	11. 15	210
6. 37	96	9. 10	18	11. 18	116
6. 38	240, 291, 293	9. 12	52	11. 19	37
6. 39	283	9. 14	187, 266	11. 20	180
6. 42	41, 94, 139	9. 16	67	11. 21	43, 112
6. 44	293	9. 18	18, 87, 89	11. 22	112

LUKE—continued		LUKE—continued		LUKE—continued	
	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
II. 24	312	13. 7	62	16. 16	58
II. 26	313	13. 11	266	16. 19	66, 247
II. 28	338	13. 16	90, 231	16. 20	86
II. 29	214	13. 19	253	16. 23	27, 168
II. 32	266	13. 22	56, 154	16. 24	225
II. 33	21	13. 23	333	16. 25	44
II. 34	112	13. 25	149, 325	16. 26	14, 226
II. 35, 36	305	13. 28	168, 226	16. 31	284
II. 39	35	13. 29	26, 172	17. 1	141, 292
II. 41	247	13. 31	194	17. 2	32, 92
II. 42	90, 211	13. 32	17, 63	17. 3	42
II. 46	246	13. 33	17	17. 4	14
II. 49	209	13. 34	42, 43, 317	17. 6	92
II. 51	182	13. 35	96, 111, 112	17. 8	49, 77
II. 53	52	14. 1	55, 145	17. 11	170, 267
II. 54	30	14. 4	39, 232	17. 12	322
I2. 2	286	14. 5	209, 342	17. 17	178
I2. 3	258	14. 7	137	17. 20	156
I2. 5	143	14. 8	89	17. 21	216
I2. 6	58	14. 8 f.	99	17. 27	66
I2. 7	24	14. 10	100, 154	17. 31	325
I2. 8	110	14. 12	112, 335	17. 33	110
I2. 9	58	14. 13	112	18. 1	144
I2. 11	112	14. 17	173	18. 5	266
I2. 12	185, 194	14. 18	18, 21, 162, 246	18. 6	213
I2. 13	149	14. 19	63	18. 7	56, 96, 235
I2. 14	33	14. 23	76, 181	18. 8	56, 330
I2. 15	146	14. 24	233	18. 9	153
I2. 16	156	14. 26	43	18. 10	134
I2. 17	117	14. 29	322	18. 11	44, 57
I2. 20	239, 293	14. 31	87, 154, 241	18. 12	235
I2. 22	24	14. 33	43, 209	18. 13	57, 173
I2. 23	311	15. 6, 9	55	18. 14	31, 45, 216
I2. 26	31	15. 7	32	18. 17, 29 f.	96
I2. 28	227	15. 12	52, 152	18. 30	193
I2. 30	181, 190, 313	15. 13	282, 286	18. 31	238
I2. 31	338	15. 14	21, 268	18. 36	65, 123, 131, 161
I2. 32	72	15. 16	66	18. 39	41
I2. 33	42, 151	15. 18	154	18. 40	322
I2. 34	23	15. 19	320, 321	18. 41	95, 99, 305
I2. 35	24, 89, 190	15. 20	42, 154, 322	19. 4	16, 235
I2. 36	322	15. 22	256	19. 7	273
I2. 38	321	15. 23	80	19. 8	63, 210
I2. 44	64, 151	15. 25	154	19. 9	305
I2. 45	139	15. 26	65, 123, 130	19. 11	148, 227
I2. 47	247	15. 29	62	19. 15	145, 149, 335
I2. 47 f.	18, 246	15. 30	44	19. 17	31, 89, 345
I2. 48	39, 293, 316, 324	15. 32	71	19. 20	197
I2. 50	138	16. 1	158	19. 23	92
I2. 52	89	16. 4	74, 235	19. 29	230
I2. 54	63, 172	16. 6	154	19. 30	76
I2. 56	193	16. 8	43, 208, 213, 216, 250	19. 33	22
I2. 57	258	16. 9	213, 260, 293	19. 37	274
I2. 58	76, 99	16. 10	31	19. 41	72
I2. 59	96	16. 11 f.	98	19. 42	180, 331
I3. 1	194	16. 13	36	19. 46	246
I3. 2	31	16. 15	23, 305	19. 48	182

JOHN— <i>continued</i>		JOHN— <i>continued</i>		JOHN— <i>continued</i>	
	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
4. 29, 33	283	6. 71	168	9. 25	64, 81
4. 31	67, 156, 277	7. 2	214	9. 26 f.	231
4. 32	135	7. 3	100	9. 27	78
4. 34	139	7. 4	115, 146	9. 28	46, 156
4. 35	17, 63, 76	7. 11	46	9. 29	149
4. 36	335	7. 12	36	9. 30	331
4. 38	135	7. 17	338	9. 33	90, 92
4. 41	29	7. 18	45	9. 37	46
4. 48	96	7. 22	304	10. 1	46
4. 49	140	7. 23	199, 217	10. 5	97
4. 50	324	7. 24	245	10. 7	212
4. 51	322	7. 27	112	10. 10	180
4. 52	65, 72, 226, 248	7. 30	173	10. 12	285, 342
4. 53	304	7. 34	342	10. 15	63
5. 2	18, 152, 171	7. 35	212, 226	10. 16	48
5. 6	62	7. 38	316, 320	10. 18	139
5. 8	77	7. 39	324	10. 21	26
5. 11	37, 46	7. 40	208, 234	10. 22	27, 171
5. 15	26	7. 45	46	10. 28	96, 286
5. 20	100	7. 47	335	10. 29	39
5. 24	175	7. 51	283	10. 30	37
5. 25	139	7. 52	63	10. 32	63
5. 27	49, 56	8. 7	159, 226	10. 36	183
5. 28	139	8. 9	155, 198, 263, 276	10. 37	284
5. 31	116	8. 12	96, 183	10. 39	24
5. 34	64	8. 14	334	11. 1	259
5. 35, 37	183	8. 15	177	11. 2	80
5. 36	135, 186	8. 18	42, 151	11. 6	324
5. 38	37, 45, 283	8. 19	92	11. 12	115
5. 39	37, 45	8. 22	259	11. 18	172
5. 44	13, 37, 226	8. 23	14	11. 19	16, 270
5. 45	76, 80	8. 24	26	11. 26	96
6. 6	41	8. 25	49	11. 27	183
6. 9	196	8. 26	135, 257	11. 28	62, 156
6. 10	221	8. 30	322	11. 31	135
6. 13	186	8. 38	38	11. 35	72
6. 14	26	8. 39	92, 168, 208	11. 36	66
6. 17	179	8. 44	40, 112, 177, 206, 208, 227	11. 36 f.	68
6. 21	227	8. 45	345	11. 42	268
6. 22	67	8. 51	96	11. 43	304
6. 26	26	8. 52	96, 233	11. 44	86
6. 30	37	8. 53	47	11. 47	98
6. 31	135	8. 55	216, 321	11. 48	63, 190
6. 32	70	8. 56	102, 138	11. 49	195, 196, 235
6. 33	217	8. 57 f.	168	11. 51	235
6. 35	96	8. 58	62, 140	11. 55	135
6. 37	21, 39, 97	9. 2	102, 156	11. 56	96
6. 39	39, 95, 179	9. 3	95, 304	11. 57	105
	197, 316	9. 4	110, 321	12. 1	248, 260
6. 40	139	9. 5	112, 183	12. 4	89
6. 43	76	9. 7	77	12. 8	42
6. 45	89, 234	9. 9	41	12. 9	186
6. 46	45, 304	9. 13	324	12. 10	54
6. 52	135	9. 14	26	12. 12	153, 186
6. 63	151	9. 16	67	12. 15	35
6. 64	86	9. 18	41	12. 11	81
6. 65	89	9. 21	86, 162	12. 20	135
6. 70	55	9. 22		12. 23	139, 155

ACTS—continued		ACTS—continued		ACTS—continued	
	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
2. 29	88, 304	5. 24	123, 130	8. 18	176, 255
2. 36	200	5. 25	88	8. 19	139
2. 37	23	5. 27 f.	66	8. 20	122
2. 38	214, 266	5. 28	172, 241	8. 22	251
2. 39	15, 239, 254	5. 29	216	8. 23	64, 161, 213,
2. 40	30	5. 32	218		253, 254
2. 45	67, 93, 125	5. 34	210	8. 24	159
3. 1	179	5. 36	147, 216, 253	8. 26	44, 156
3. 2	41, 55, 93, 180,	5. 38 f.	115	8. 27	87, 154, 157
	195	5. 39	99	8. 30	330
3. 3	65	5. 41	37, 66	8. 31	65, 116
3. 10	33, 41, 149	6. 3, 5	315	8. 35	155
3. 12	33, 141, 158	6. 4	89	8. 40	58, 144, 148
3. 13	45	6. 7	312	9. 1	166
3. 14	185	6. 8	159	9. 3	145, 171
3. 16	221, 267	6. 9	15, 170	9. 4	161
3. 17	154	6. 11	213, 315	9. 5	27
3. 18	25	6. 13	315	9. 6	49, 154, 330
3. 19	27, 52, 144	7. 2	140	9. 7	233
3. 20	105	7. 4	143	9. 9	88
3. 21	25, 174	7. 5	285	9. 11	154, 155
3. 25	208	7. 7	110	9. 12	105, 315
3. 26	146	7. 8	168	9. 13	233
4. 1	322	7. 10	206	9. 15	141, 213, 239
4. 4	315	7. 11	171	9. 16	50
4. 7	37, 65	7. 12	161, 254	9. 18	57
4. 9	212, 258	7. 14	241, 265	9. 20	183, 325
4. 11	44	7. 19	136, 141, 143	9. 24	55, 235
4. 12	153, 264	7. 20	239	9. 27	232
4. 13	55, 149	7. 21	39, 322	9. 31	241
4. 16	30, 304	7. 26	17, 65	9. 34	64, 154
4. 17	241	7. 29	253	9. 38	171, 216
4. 18	141	7. 30	213	9. 39	55, 154
4. 19	216	7. 33	56	9. 42	171, 237
4. 21	117, 182	7. 34	94, 157	10. 2	315
4. 22	216	7. 35	70, 156, 185	10. 3	248
4. 25, 27	181	7. 36	171	10. 6	206, 273
4. 29	200	7. 39	23	10. 14	196
4. 30	146, 148	7. 40	45, 316	10. 15	37
4. 32	191	7. 42	52	10. 17	123, 130, 335
4. 33	350	7. 43	28	10. 18	65, 152
4. 34	67, 81	7. 45	25	10. 20	154, 155, 330
4. 35	93, 125	7. 48	287	10. 24	55
4. 36	208, 220, 221,	7. 51	23, 220	10. 25	142
	258	7. 52	209	10. 28	30, 137
5. 3	136	7. 53	255, 266	10. 30	248
5. 7	231, 336	7. 54	23	10. 31	58
5. 9	149, 174	7. 56	25	10. 33	80, 135, 159
5. 12	24	7. 58	38	10. 34	55
5. 14	237	7. 60	72, 77	10. 36	324
5. 15	100	8. 2	56	10. 37	316
5. 16	58	8. 3	166	10. 38	72, 137, 240
5. 17	151, 152, 154	8. 5	40	10. 41	143
5. 19	27, 179	8. 6	52	10. 43	151
5. 20	57	8. 9	148, 159, 195	10. 44	176
5. 21	138, 275	8. 11	243	10. 48	65, 149, 256
5. 22	52	8. 15	106, 146	11. 1	313
5. 23	27	8. 16	159	11. 4	155

INDEX TO REFERENCES

363

ACTS—continued		ACTS—continued		ACTS—continued	
	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
II. 7	154, 161	I4. 13	151, 152	I7. 6	62
II. 13	137	I4. 14	42	I7. 11	48, 127, 131
II. 14	37	I4. 16	241	I7. 13	159, 171
II. 16	240	I4. 17	23, 41	I7. 14	321
II. 17	89, 237, 335	I4. 19	66	I7. 15	31, 139
II. 18	72	I4. 21	53	I7. 16	161, 171
II. 19	225, 271	I4. 21 f.	80	I7. 17	151
II. 26	72, 149, 199	I4. 27	50, 158, 212	I7. 18	36, 147
II. 28	21, 86	I5. 1	242	I7. 20	123, 130
I2. 1	15, 268	I5. 2	149, 181	I7. 21	30, 169, 200
I2. 2	240	I5. 3	66	I7. 22	30, 57, 161
I2. 3	27, 227, 311	I5. 4	258	I7. 23	88
I2. 4	56	I5. 5	15, 217	I7. 24	174, 175
I2. 5	337	I5. 9	23	I7. 26	27
I2. 6	27, 79, 260	I5. 10	37, 136	I7. 27	127, 157, 232
I2. 8	77	I5. 11	137	I7. 28	36, 165, 221, 268
I2. 9	331	I5. 12	71	I7. 31	262
I2. 10	178, 225	I5. 13	143	I8. 2	85, 171
I2. 11	200	I5. 14	181	I8. 3	221, 345
I2. 12	206	I5. 16	52	I8. 4	65
I2. 14	331	I5. 17	40, 105, 325	I8. 5	220
I2. 15	148, 322	I5. 19	242	I8. 6	24, 27
I2. 16	159, 226	I5. 20	181	I8. 7	27
I2. 25	206	I5. 21	62	I8. 8	67, 237
I3. 1	151, 152, 206	I5. 23	24, 78, 305	I8. 10	141, 318
I3. 2	333	I5. 27	267	I8. 11	72
I3. 3	39	I5. 28	139	I8. 14	33, 89
I3. 5	246	I5. 29	85, 157, 181	I8. 15	86, 268
I3. 8	31	I5. 32	267	I8. 17	232
I3. 10	208	I5. 36	333	I8. 19	41, 66
I3. 11	51, 89, 216	I5. 37 f.	79	I8. 21	52
I3. 13	16, 170, 270	I5. 38	65	I8. 22	158
I3. 14	27, 171	I5. 39	136	I8. 23	80, 158
I3. 16	35, 153	I6. 3	149	I8. 25	15, 220
I3. 19	53	I6. 4	52	I8. 26	30
I3. 20	243	I6. 5	220, 239	I8. 27	80
I3. 21	168	I6. 6	80	I9. 1	145
I3. 22	28, 156, 168, 247	I6. 7	282	I9. 3	255
I3. 23	190	I6. 8, II	171	I9. 4	325
I3. 25	49, 137	I6. 12	178, 210	I9. 5	255
I3. 28	149	I6. 13	27	I9. 7	201
I3. 32	246, 325	I6. 14	139, 215	I9. 13	166
I3. 33	80, 206	I6. 15	39, 65	I9. 15	155, 166
I3. 36	243	I6. 16	22, 56, 185	I9. 16	158
I3. 39	151, 217	I6. 17	40, 53	I9. 19	17
I3. 41	96	I6. 18	64, 194	I9. 20	350
I3. 42	277	I6. 19	22, 232	I9. 21	139, 143, 148
I3. 46	42	I6. 22	65, 78, 138	I9. 22	52
I3. 50	259	I6. 23	221	I9. 24	56, 152
I4. 3	24, 337	I6. 25	225	I9. 26	196, 235
I4. 4	36	I6. 26	27	I9. 27	22, 138, 235
I4. 5	139	I6. 29	55	I9. 28	316
I4. 6	182	I6. 31	237	I9. 30	322
I4. 8	180, 220	I6. 34	160, 237	I9. 31	239
I4. 9	141	I6. 37	18	I9. 32	30, 31, 198
I4. 10	186, 225	I6. 39	15, 65, 259, 268	I9. 33	209
I4. 12	41	I7. 1	171	I9. 34	316
		I7. 4	282		

ACTS—continued		ACTS—continued		ACTS—continued	
	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
19. 35	17, 162	21. 36	312	25. 14	15, 268
19. 36	88, 157, 159, 322	21. 38	183	25. 16	58, 113, 130, 140
19. 37	157, 159	21. 39	171, 282	25. 17	56
19. 38	26	22. 2	64	25. 20	55, 127, 131
19. 40	138, 231	22. 3	171, 185, 210	25. 21	42, 148
20. 1	143	22. 5	87, 157	25. 22	65, 91, 120
20. 2	170	22. 6	149	25. 23	15, 268
20. 3	89	22. 7	161	25. 24	312
20. 4	168	22. 8	39	25. 25	55
20. 5	171	22. 9	233	26. 1	58, 64
20. 6	171, 225	22. 10	39, 75, 149, 154	26. 2	169
20. 7	17, 179, 187	22. 13	194	26. 3	149, 162, 169, 221, 316
20. 9	258	22. 14	13, 233	26. 4	169, 200
20. 11	154	22. 15	70, 85, 200	26. 5	31
20. 12	282	22. 16	154	26. 7	33, 86, 169
20. 13	171	22. 17	149	26. 9	42, 147
20. 15	17, 171, 277	22. 19	237	26. 11	65
20. 16	127, 149, 248	22. 22	90	26. 12	218
20. 18	179, 201, 226	22. 24	138, 149, 156	26. 13	225, 235
20. 20	137	22. 30	58, 182, 273	26. 14	27, 161, 304
20. 21	86	23. 1	200	26. 16	330, 339
20. 22	63	23. 3	138	26. 17	87
20. 24	56, 105, 246	23. 10	99, 138	26. 17 f.	142
20. 26	215, 222, 333	23. 12, 13	56	26. 18	221
20. 27	253	23. 14	42, 233	26. 21	169
20. 28	78, 135	23. 15	30, 141, 144, 158	26. 22	221
20. 30	194	23. 18	65, 157	26. 23	260
20. 32	264	23. 19	18, 65	26. 25	31
20. 33	232	23. 20	30, 158	26. 26	137, 285
20. 35	31, 154, 216	23. 22	326	26. 28	63, 147, 262
21. 1	171	23. 23	195	26. 29	46, 91
21. 2	87	23. 26	78, 305	26. 30	182
21. 3	66, 171	23. 27	187	26. 31	62
21. 4	149	23. 29	73, 85, 86	26. 32	90, 91, 92
21. 5	174	23. 30	171	27. 3	149
21. 8	16	23. 31	267	27. 5	171
21. 11	190	24. 2	232	27. 8	216
21. 12	149	24. 3	344	27. 9	345
21. 13	52, 139, 226	24. 4	24	27. 6	86, 149
21. 14	156, 315	24. 7	162	27. 12	30, 127
21. 15	216	24. 10	17, 87, 135, 157	27. 13	30, 52, 172, 232
21. 16	80, 109, 206, 209, 210	24. 15	86	27. 14	52, 268, 282
21. 17	322	24. 16	253	27. 15	17
21. 18	17	24. 17	87, 157, 236	27. 17	53, 99, 154
21. 20	50, 66	24. 19	90, 126	27. 18	56
21. 21	241	24. 21	193	27. 19	17
21. 23	154	24. 22	30	27. 20	52, 140, 172
21. 24	24, 57, 100	24. 26	30, 154	27. 21	33
21. 25	181	25. 3	56	27. 22	138
21. 26	17, 57	25. 4	147	27. 26	53
21. 28	26, 69	25. 4 f.	137, 326	27. 27	51, 137, 172, 225
21. 29	66	25. 7	322	27. 29	53, 99
21. 30	27, 66	25. 8	169	27. 30	158
21. 31	199	25. 9	155	27. 33	65, 159
21. 32	154	25. 10	30, 88, 169	27. 34	226, 274
21. 33	65, 123, 130	25. 11	62, 140		
21. 34	198, 322	25. 13	80, 157		

ROMANS— <i>continued</i>		ROMANS— <i>continued</i>		I CORINTHIANS— <i>contd.</i>	
	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
10. 1	191	14. 9	71	3. 10	13
10. 6	135	14. 11	333	3. 13	49
10. 9	162	14. 13	140	3. 15	41
10. 10	291	14. 14	46, 137	3. 18	147
10. 11	237	14. 15	46, 242	3. 21	265
10. 14 f.	99	14. 16	189	4. 2	265
10. 17	330	14. 17	176, 221	4. 3	31, 139
10. 17 f.	283	14. 19	16	4. 4	42, 253
10. 18	338, 347	14. 20	267	4. 5	14, 111
10. 19	225, 282	14. 21	141, 253	4. 6	182, 271
10. 20	58, 156, 264	14. 22	265	4. 8	72, 91
11. 2	261	15. 2	72	4. 13	321
11. 6	318	15. 6	252	4. 15	115, 330
11. 8, 10	141	15. 7	335	4. 18	158
11. 11	190	15. 12	181	4. 20	265
11. 12	175	15. 13	145, 265	4. 21	241
11. 12 f.	181	15. 15	30, 73	5. 2	95
11. 13	149	15. 16	211	5. 5	46
11. 15	175	15. 19	221	5. 9	73
11. 17	115	15. 23	141	5. 10	318
11. 20	242	15. 24	112	5. 11	73, 149
11. 20 f.	99	15. 26	170, 209	5. 12	240
11. 21	221	16. 1	187	5. 13	194
11. 22	318	16. 2	41, 265	6. 1	274
11. 24	18	16. 3 ff.	47	6. 2	31, 253
11. 25	111, 238	16. 10	169	6. 3	283
11. 26	200	16. 11	15, 169	6. 5	23
11. 27	221	16. 13	77	6. 6	45
11. 28	268	16. 15	221	6. 7	43, 57
11. 30 f.	243	16. 16	212	6. 8	45, 51
11. 32	266	16. 18	23	6. 11	53
11. 33	33	16. 25	243	6. 15	24
11. 36	267	16. 27	343	6. 16	253
12. 1	28, 267			6. 18	216
12. 2	57, 240	I CORINTHIANS		6. 19	23
12. 3	143	1. 5, 7	265	6. 20	333
12. 5	15, 198, 268	1. 8	186	7. 2	28, 191
12. 6	333	1. 9	267	7. 5	13, 95, 321
12. 7	177, 302	1. 10	89, 265	7. 6	268
12. 9 f.	177	1. 11	16, 169	7. 7	36, 191
12. 10	239	1. 12	38	7. 8	321
12. 15	78	1. 13	270	7. 9	79
12. 18	14	1. 18	212, 217, 239	7. 10	95
12. 19	173	1. 22	55	7. 12	37
12. 21	62	1. 25	14, 21	7. 13	325
13. 1	52, 152	1. 26	282	7. 14	262, 313, 318
13. 3	14, 22, 319, 342	1. 27 f.	14, 21, 55	7. 15	262, 263, 265
13. 5	148	1. 28	55, 151	7. 17	75, 262, 264
13. 8	140	1. 29	105, 196	7. 18, 22, 24	264
13. 9	42, 182, 197	2. 2	335	7. 21	76
13. 11	45, 139, 335	2. 3	37	7. 25	158
13. 12	52	2. 5	253	7. 26	140
13. 13	76, 158, 243	2. 6	264	7. 28	74, 219, 238
14. 1	22	2. 8	70, 99	7. 29	95, 303
4. 2	36, 137	2. 13	211, 234	7. 31	51
4. 4	57, 153, 238	3. 2	246, 330	7. 34	220
14. 5	36	3. 4	112	7. 35	14, 151
14. 6	238	3. 8	182, 191	7. 36	75, 115, 116

1 CORINTHIANS— <i>contd.</i>		1 CORINTHIANS— <i>contd.</i>		1 CORINTHIANS— <i>contd.</i>	
	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
7. 37	45	12. 23	30, 137	16. 15	325
8. 4, 5	175	12. 24	56	16. 17	190
8. 6	325	12. 28	36, 55	16. 21	186
8. 7	187	12. 31	221	16. 22	122
8. 10	143, 153	13. 1	246	2 CORINTHIANS	
8. 12	189	13. 2	116, 200	I. 3	296
8. 13	96	13. 3	100	I. 4	200
9. 1	283	13. 13	177	I. 6	190
9. 4 f.	139, 283	14. 4	176	I. 8	141
9. 5	246	14. 5	135, 138, 216,	I. 9	42, 70, 89, 175
9. 8	283		321	I. 10	28
9. 10	141	14. 7	151, 337	I. 15 f.	257
9. 11	115, 190	14. 9	89, 151	I. 17	14, 102
9. 12	211, 231	14. 10	125, 127, 175	I. 19	349
9. 15	100, 135, 139,	14. 11	264	I. 20	14
	265	14. 15	241	I. 22	23
9. 17	225, 247	14. 16	14	I. 23	191
9. 18	100, 143	14. 18	160	I. 24	303
9. 19	30, 167, 215	14. 19	32	2. 1	45, 141, 238
9. 20	169	14. 20	177, 220, 239	2. 2	45
9. 21	100, 215	14. 26	112	2. 4	267
9. 25	46	14. 27	31	2. 6	30, 46, 311
9. 26	158, 285	14. 28	116	2. 7	46, 242
10. 3	186	14. 32	313	2. 11	282
10. 4	67	14. 34	58	2. 12	82, 171
10. 5	30, 253	14. 35	261	2. 13	70, 142, 146,
10. 6	67, 143	14. 39	140		148, 219, 238, 242
10. 7	135	15. 2	321	2. 14	53
10. 8	262	15. 3	5, 69	2. 15	239
10. 11	25, 46, 67	15. 7	200	2. 16	36
10. 14	173	15. 8	321	2. 17	158
10. 16	324	15. 9	31	3. 2	23
10. 17	231, 303	15. 11	46	3. 3	214, 287
10. 18	215	15. 12	210	3. 5	303
10. 20	215, 313	15. 18	330	3. 10 f.	151
10. 24	197	15. 19	228	3. 11	267
10. 27	151	15. 22	262	3. 13	144
10. 30	40, 241	15. 24	112	3. 15	23, 112
10. 33	151, 190	15. 25	111	3. 16	113
11. 5	21, 186, 220	15. 26	63	3. 17	344
11. 6	57, 140	15. 28	265	3. 17 f.	174
11. 13	88, 149, 253	15. 32	63, 239	3. 18	218
11. 14, 15	239	15. 37	86, 125, 127	4. 3	264
11. 18	62	15. 38	191	4. 4	218
11. 21	36	15. 39	196	4. 6	23
11. 22, 25	143	15. 41	172, 265	4. 8	56
11. 23	37, 259	15. 42	180, 291	4. 10	24
11. 26	111, 175	15. 45	253	4. 10 f.	167
11. 31	42	15. 47	175	4. 11	217
11. 34	94, 112, 261	15. 49	333	4. 13	194
12. 2	93, 125	15. 51	287	4. 15	30
12. 6	265	15. 58	265	4. 16	190, 243
12. 8	36, 267	16. 2	187	4. 17	14
12. 8 f.	197	16. 3	27, 135, 267	4. 18	323
12. 11	18, 191	16. 4	139, 141	5. 1	214, 218
12. 13	247	16. 5 f.	63	5. 4	272
12. 15, 16	210	16. 6	322	5. 5	214
12. 22	31	16. 9	82		

2 CORINTHIANS— <i>contd.</i>		2 CORINTHIANS— <i>contd.</i>		GALATIANS— <i>contd.</i>	
	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
5. 7	267	10. 12	42, 160	1. 13	186, 191
5. 10	201, 302, 333	10. 13	324	1. 16	264
5. 11	63	10. 14	285, 287	1. 22	212, 221
5. 12	343	10. 15	343	1. 23	81, 151
5. 13	238	10. 16	216	2. 3	157
5. 14	211	10. 18	45	2. 4	99, 100
5. 19	40, 89, 137, 175	11. 1	91, 330	2. 4 f.	343
5. 20	158	11. 2	55	2. 5	220
6. 3	343	11. 3	99	2. 6	49, 196, 343
6. 4	28	11. 4	197	2. 7	211, 247
6. 7	180, 186, 207	11. 5	137, 250	2. 9	37
6. 8	267	11. 6	343	2. 10	95
6. 11	23, 82	11. 8	27	2. 11	58
6. 13	245	11. 9	187	2. 12	144, 259
6. 14	89	11. 10	178	2. 13	136
6. 17	76	11. 14	300	2. 14	63
6. 18	253	11. 15	321	2. 15	181, 220
7. 3	23	11. 16	137	2. 17	330
7. 5	28, 70, 343	11. 18	177	2. 18	40, 115
7. 9	72, 260, 268	11. 20	256	2. 20	246, 264
7. 11	50, 140, 148 220, 239, 268, 330	11. 21	70, 137, 268	3. 1	33, 187
7. 12	144	11. 23	28, 250, 271	3. 2	259
7. 13	29, 258	11. 24	18	3. 5	53
7. 15	211	11. 25	70, 72	3. 7	208, 260
8. 1	264	11. 26	181, 212	3. 8	260
8. 2, 3	268	11. 29	38	3. 9	168, 260
8. 6	143	11. 31	151	3. 10	136, 260
8. 7	95, 259	12. 1	88	3. 14	168, 253
8. 8	14, 217	12. 2	25, 46, 162, 178, 221, 260	3. 15	337
8. 9	71, 72	12. 3, 5	46	3. 16	158
8. 10 f.	140	12. 4	88	3. 17	143
8. 11	141, 144	12. 10	28, 112	3. 18	70
8. 12	268, 320	12. 11	90, 250	3. 19	58, 111, 267
8. 13	95	12. 12	58	3. 21	152
8. 14	46, 105	12. 14	52, 139, 226	3. 22	21
8. 15	13	12. 16	157	3. 23	79, 144, 350
8. 17	30, 73	12. 17	70	3. 28	334
8. 18	73, 343	12. 18	173, 283	3. 29	168
8. 19	217	12. 19	62, 190	4. 6	23, 345
8. 22	29, 73, 162	12. 20	28, 58, 99, 283, 302	4. 10	55
8. 24	343	12. 21	322	4. 11	99, 325
9. 1	140	13. 4	260	4. 13	30, 267
9. 2	30, 170, 190, 259	13. 5	321	4. 15	92
9. 3	73, 89, 187	13. 9	45, 112, 195	4. 17	194
9. 4	95, 99	13. 12	75	4. 18	55, 145
9. 5	73	13. 13	211	4. 19	111
9. 7	63			4. 20	56, 65, 91, 120
9. 11, 13	343			4. 23	70
9. 11 f.	219			4. 24	187
10. 2	140, 146			4. 25	182
10. 3	157			4. 26 f.	47
10. 4	238, 274, 343			4. 27	31
10. 6	139			4. 30	96, 97
10. 7	15, 137, 268			5. 1	242
10. 8	339			5. 2	246
10. 9	267, 321			5. 4	63, 73, 74
10. 10	293			5. 5	214, 317
				5. 11	92

GALATIANS

GALATIANS— <i>contd.</i>		EPHESIANS— <i>contd.</i>		PHILIPPIANS— <i>contd.</i>	
	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
5. 12	57	4. 9	182, 215	1. 22	117, 264
5. 13	239	4. 10	25, 55	1. 23	29, 143
5. 14	42, 182, 201	4. 11	36	1. 24	140
5. 16	75	4. 13	111, 218	1. 26	191
5. 18	240	4. 14	89	2. 1	316
5. 20 f.	28	4. 16	190, 200	2. 2	189
5. 21	325	4. 17	75	2. 3	44, 52
5. 25	75	4. 18	23, 89, 235	2. 4	100, 197
5. 26	94	4. 21	167, 178	2. 6	21, 140, 226
6. 4	190	4. 22	148	2. 7	220
6. 6	200	4. 24	268	2. 11	256, 302
6. 8	190	4. 26	76	2. 12	42
6. 9	159, 182, 285	4. 28	81, 151	2. 15	175
6. 10	14	4. 29	25, 196, 274, 287	2. 18	246
6. 11	50, 73	5. 2-8	75	2. 20	270
6. 12	63, 100, 242	5. 4	90, 282	2. 23	15, 43, 270
6. 14	149, 175	5. 5	47, 85, 157,	2. 27	216
6. 16	110		196, 287, 303	2. 28	30, 73, 160
6. 17	235	5. 11	39	2. 30	218, 239
EPHESIANS		5. 12	40	3. 2	162
1. 1	152, 263	5. 13	55	3. 3	239
1. 4	55	5. 14	180	3. 4	157
1. 6	180, 218	5. 18	76, 240	3. 5	220
1. 10	271	5. 19	23, 43	3. 6	151
1. 12	143	5. 28	24	3. 7	246
1. 14	215	5. 32	37	3. 8	14, 52, 137, 338
1. 15	263	5. 33	15, 95	3. 9	191, 221
1. 15 f.	28	6. 3	100	3. 10	136, 141, 142
1. 16	159	6. 5	23	3. 11	221
1. 17	100, 128	6. 7	158	3. 13	137, 148, 250
1. 18	23, 100, 218	6. 8	333	3. 16	75, 78
1. 19	218	6. 9	25	3. 20	190, 206
1. 20	26	6. 10	235, 336	3. 21	41, 141, 214, 220
2. 2	208	6. 11	28, 144	4. 3	180, 335
2. 3	28	6. 14	24	4. 5	14, 226
2. 5	176, 240	6. 16	186	4. 6	241
2. 8	45, 176	6. 17	14	4. 7	23
2. 10	190	6. 18	267	4. 10	140, 270, 272
2. 12	27, 215, 235, 243	6. 18 f.	270	4. 11	37, 146, 303
2. 13	226	6. 19	129	4. 14	159, 189
2. 14	215, 242	6. 21	344	4. 17	303
2. 15	265	6. 22	23, 73	4. 18	15, 140
2. 16	43	PHILIPPIANS		COLOSSIANS	
2. 20	181	1. 3	200, 207	1. 2	181, 263
2. 21	200	1. 4	30	1. 3	28, 206, 206, 228
3. 4	187	1. 5	179, 187, 256	1. 4	187
3. 5	243	1. 6	39, 45, 246	1. 5	180, 213, 252
3. 6	215	1. 7	23, 39, 143	1. 6	17, 55
3. 8	31, 139, 200	1. 8	137	1. 7	259
3. 11	25	1. 9	29	1. 9	17, 159, 247
3. 12	263	1. 10	89, 143, 151	1. 10	55
3. 15	175	1. 11	232, 247	1. 12	154, 206
3. 16	129, 256	1. 12	15	1. 13	214
3. 17	23, 230	1. 14	222, 242	1. 15	200, 210
3. 18	55	1. 16	36	1. 16	14, 70, 253, 256
4. 1	37, 230, 343	1. 17	137	1. 17	40
4. 4	263	1. 18	241, 330, 333	1. 18	41, 89

COLOSSIANS— <i>contd.</i>		I THESSALONIANS— <i>continued</i>		I TIMOTHY— <i>contd.</i>	
	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
1. 20	43, 212	2. 19	190	1. 9	45
1. 21	89	3. 3	141	1. 10	197
1. 22	267, 331	3. 5	99, 143, 266	1. 12	80
1. 23	200	3. 7	190	1. 13	150, 151, 154
2. 1	50	3. 8	116	1. 17	25
2. 2	23, 206, 211, 230	3. 10	143, 189	1. 18	30
2. 4	95, 102	3. 11	41	1. 19	270
2. 5	189, 239	3. 13	23, 189	1. 20	210
2. 6	75, 167	4. 1	182	2. 6	42, 258, 271
2. 8	153	4. 3	139	2. 10, 15	267
2. 12	180, 218	4. 6	141	3. 1	232
2. 13	39	4. 7	263	3. 13	263
2. 14	219, 242	4. 9	139, 143	3. 14	30
2. 15	40, 51, 55, 265	4. 12	75	3. 15	303
2. 16	27	4. 14	167, 267	3. 16	57
2. 18	246	4. 16	41	4. 5	189, 267
2. 20	57, 251	5. 1	27	4. 8	274
2. 22	181	5. 3	112	4. 13	111, 321, 344
3. 1 f.	14	5. 5	208	4. 14	76, 267
3. 5	47, 311	5. 8	157	4. 15	265, 303
3. 6	208	5. 9	55	5. 13	160, 322
3. 8	25	5. 10	100	5. 19	321
3. 9	76, 94	5. 11	187	5. 22	76
3. 12	28	5. 13	43	5. 24	195
3. 13	44, 234	5. 15	78, 98	6. 2	39
3. 14	212, 317	5. 23	41	6. 4	270
3. 15	23, 264	5. 27	149	6. 5	235
3. 16	23, 43, 230	2 THESSALONIANS		6. 8	58
3. 17	206	1. 4	264	6. 12, 14	77
3. 18	90	1. 8	213, 316	6. 15	243
3. 20	263	1. 10	57	6. 17	193
3. 23	158	1. 12	105	6. 20	33, 77
4. 2	265	2. 2	137, 158	6. 21	235, 270
4. 3	154, 212	2. 3	208	2 TIMOTHY	
4. 5	75	2. 4	149, 151	1. 4	189
4. 7	15	2. 6	21, 151	1. 9	27
4. 8	23, 73	2. 7	21	1. 13	185, 221
4. 12	57	2. 15	77, 247	1. 14	77
4. 16	95	2. 16	41	2. 2	77, 267
4. 18	189	2. 17	23, 189	2. 3	77
I THESSALONIANS		3. 5	23, 189, 211, 212	2. 7	111
1. 1	206	3. 8	144	2. 10	232
1. 3	190, 211, 218	3. 9	25, 303	2. 12	115
1. 5	50, 175	3. 10	190	2. 14	78, 272
1. 7	25, 182	3. 11	62, 161	2. 16	77
1. 8	182, 187, 221, 286	3. 13	159	2. 18	235, 270
1. 9	49, 137	3. 14	187	2. 20	36
1. 10	180	3. 15	161	2. 22	269
2. 3	270	3. 16	41	2. 25	98, 99, 129, 178
2. 4	23, 147, 247	I TIMOTHY		2. 26	194, 266
2. 6	259	1. 1	206	3. 1	179
2. 8	231	1. 3	95	3. 4	216
2. 9	144	1. 3 f.	343	3. 7	178
2. 10	137, 226, 239	1. 4	216, 221	3. 8	270
2. 12	143	1. 6	235	3. 11	50
2. 14	212	1. 7	49	3. 15	62, 176, 263
2. 16	143, 189			3. 16	199

2 TIMOTHY—contd.		HEBREWS—contd.		HEBREWS—contd.	
	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
4. 2	77	3. 6	311	8. 1	175
4. 3	139	3. 8	23	8. 2	27, 324
4. 5	37, 77	3. 10	193	8. 3	109, 117, 143
4. 6	37	3. 11	333	8. 5	70
4. 7	84	3. 12	146, 213	8. 6	232
4. 8	213, 228	3. 13	42	8. 10	23
4. 9	30	3. 14	115	8. 11	30
4. 13	171	3. 15	23	8. 12	96
4. 15	227	3. 16	267	9. 1	186
4. 17	313	3. 18	86, 137	9. 2	27, 47
		4. 1	99	9. 2 f.	31
		4. 2	58	9. 3	27, 269
		4. 3	153, 157, 333	9. 5	21, 270
		4. 4	17, 52	9. 7	235
		4. 7	23, 261	9. 8	212
		4. 10	52	9. 9	47, 268, 311
		4. 11	257	9. 12	267
		4. 12	216	9. 24 f.	27, 135
		4. 13	274, 331	9. 25	241
		4. 14	232	9. 26	90, 272
		5. 1	221	10. 1	293
		5. 7	18, 251	10. 2	92, 143, 159, 318
		5. 8	157	10. 7	141
		5. 11	28, 220	10. 12	269
		5. 12	89, 139, 141, 146	10. 13	111
		5. 13	213	10. 15	143
		6. 1	28, 215	10. 16	23
		6. 2	218	10. 17	97
		6. 3	28, 114	10. 19	212
		6. 4 f., 5	233	10. 22	23
		6. 9	28, 247	10. 25	42, 43, 190
		6. 10	136	10. 26	143, 178, 269
		6. 11	28	10. 27	195
		6. 12	232, 331	10. 29	220
		6. 13	80, 268	10. 31	140
		6. 14	157, 336	10. 33	45, 215
		6. 15	232	10. 34	148
		6. 16	268	10. 37	50
		6. 17	14, 241, 253	10. 38	43
		6. 18	72, 153, 232	10. 39	208
		7. 1	45, 168	11. 1	307
		7. 2 f.	159	11. 2	157
		7. 4	50	11. 3	25, 143, 287
		7. 5	157	11. 4	146
		7. 6	70, 168	11. 5	141
		7. 7	21	11. 11	220
		7. 8	152	11. 12	45
		7. 9	70, 136, 151	11. 15	46, 52, 139, 259
		7. 13	146	11. 17	65
		7. 15	29, 115	11. 21	225
		7. 16	268	11. 23	17, 225
		7. 18	14, 190	11. 27	320
		7. 20 f.	36	11. 29	17
		7. 23	30	11. 32	157
		7. 23 f.	36, 143	11. 33	47, 232
		7. 24	148, 186	11. 34	259
		7. 26	147	11. 36	197
		7. 27	191	11. 40	55
TITUS					
1. 1	178				
1. 2	27, 325				
1. 5	37				
1. 12	192				
1. 15	190				
1. 16	146				
2. 4	101				
2. 7	270				
2. 9	192				
2. 10	217				
2. 11	186				
2. 12	193				
2. 13	181				
3. 5	190, 324				
3. 9	28				
3. 14	266				
PHILEMON					
5	189, 256				
7	267				
8, 9	157				
12	73				
13	65, 91				
14	13				
19	95, 191				
HEBREWS					
1. 2	25				
1. 3	214				
1. 4	46, 181				
1. 5	209				
1. 6	200				
1. 9	215				
1. 13	111, 209				
2. 1	52				
2. 4	190				
2. 6	234, 318				
2. 8	145, 146				
2. 10	80, 149, 267				
2. 13	89				
2. 14	231, 232				
2. 15	45, 140, 144				
2. 17	143, 221				
2. 18	253				
3. 1 f.	161				
3. 5	87				

2 PETER—continued		1 JOHN—continued		REVELATION—contd.	
	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
2. 7	217	5. 6	226, 267	2. 14	151, 232, 246
2. 12-5	158	5. 8	254	2. 15	232
2. 13	87	5. 10	267	2. 16	238, 239
2. 14	215, 233	5. 14	55	2. 17	325
2. 15	213	5. 15	116	2. 19	190
2. 16	192	5. 16	281	2. 20	314
2. 19	240	5. 20	13, 44	2. 22	116
2. 20	62	5. 21	42, 77	2. 24	187
2. 21	90, 149			2. 25	77
2. 22	16, 54			2. 28	70
3. 1	192	2 JOHN		3. 2	79, 89
3. 2	217, 218, 349	1	178	3. 3	69, 115, 248
3. 4	17, 62	3	178, 304	3. 8	325
3. 5	175, 267	4	178, 209	3. 9	100, 148, 325
3. 6	222	6	45	3. 10	345
3. 10	174	7	81, 153, 162	3. 12	97, 171, 314
3. 11	48	8	316	3. 14	14, 210
3. 14	239	9	45, 51	3. 15	91
3. 16	39	12	267	3. 16	79, 345
		13	313	3. 17	183
				3. 18	101, 149
1 JOHN		3 JOHN		3. 19	173
1. 1	232	1, 3	178	3. 20	115, 335
1. 4	28, 89	2	270	4. 1	315
1. 5	233	4	29, 161, 191	4. 3	185
2. 1	72	6	80, 159	4. 4	23
2. 3	45, 139	8	178	4. 5	311
2. 5	88	9	40	4. 8	266, 314
2. 6	139, 146	12	57, 178	4. 9	112
2. 9	62, 146	15	304	4. 9 f.	86
2. 12, 14	73			5. 5	136
2. 16	213	JUDE		5. 6	311, 314
2. 19	91, 95	1	174, 240, 264	5. 7	67
2. 21	196, 287	2, 9	121	5. 8	311
2. 27	139	4	153	5. 9	253
3. 4	183	11	234, 238, 242	5. 11	210
3. 8	62	13	28, 175	5. 12	315
3. 9	72	14	238, 241	6. 1	187
3. 10	313	15	56	6. 4	39, 100
3. 11	45, 139	18	27, 89	6. 6	27
3. 14	161	22 f.	36	6. 11	25, 100, 111
3. 15	196	25	25	7. 1	101, 196
3. 16	139			7. 2	26, 172, 325
3. 17	98	REVELATION		7. 3	111
3. 19	23, 260	1. 4	230	7. 4	314
3. 20	23, 189	1. 5, 11	314	7. 9	314, 325
3. 21	23	1. 8	174	7. 14	69
3. 23	139	1. 13	274	7. 16	97, 196
4. 2, 3	162	1. 15	27, 158, 314	7. 17	218
4. 4	216	1. 18	89	8. 1	93
4. 6	260, 260	1. 19	313	8. 3	100
4. 10, 14	70	1. 20	324	8. 4	238
4. 12	88	2. 2	325	8. 5	69, 70
4. 15	183	2. 5	115, 238, 239	8. 9	312, 314
4. 21	139	2. 8	71	9. 4	100, 196
5. 2	45, 112, 139	2. 9	148	9. 5	100, 113
5. 3	139	2. 10	209, 213	9. 6	63, 97
5. 4	21	2. 11	96	9. 7	24
5. 5	183	2. 13	273, 314		

REVELATION— <i>contd.</i>		REVELATION— <i>contd.</i>		REVELATION— <i>contd.</i>	
	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
9. 10	220	14. 1	315	18. 12	17, 31
9. 11	17, 230	14. 2	27	18. 14	97
9. 12	188	14. 4	110	18. 15	190
9. 14	314, 315	14. 6	53	18. 16	17
9. 17	24	14. 7	246, 315	18. 19	24
9. 18	312	14. 8	218	18. 20	35
9. 19	24	14. 9	272	18. 22	196
9. 20	100, 209	14. 10	213	18. 24	27
10. 6	137	14. 11	25	19. 3	70
10. 7	53, 112	14. 13	100, 102	19. 5	35
11. 1	315	14. 15	334	19. 6	315
11. 4	314	14. 18	215	19. 15	40, 218
11. 5	25, 116	14. 19	314	20. 2	314
11. 6	101, 139	15. 2	240, 260	20. 3, 5	111
11. 8	22	15. 7	209	20. 4	24, 71
11. 9	209	15. 8	111	20. 8	325
11. 13	210	16. 6	27	20. 10	81
11. 15	315	16. 9	136, 245	21. 2	238
11. 17	69	16. 10	89, 260	21. 6	39
11. 18	139, 313	16. 12	26, 172	21. 9	94, 186, 314
12. 4	79	16. 13, 14	313	21. 11	31
12. 5	315	16. 15	101	21. 13	26
12. 6	46, 258	16. 18	46	21. 16	240
12. 7	141	16. 19	58, 218	21. 21	198
12. 9	152	17. 1	27, 94	21. 24	313
12. 12	35	17. 2	325	21. 25	325
12. 14	46, 101, 210	17. 3	213, 233, 315	21. 27	196
13. 1	213, 272	17. 4	314, 315	22. 2	188, 198
13. 3	175, 214	17. 9	46	22. 3	196
13. 5	139	17. 10	178	22. 5	172
13. 8	325	17. 15	26, 27	22. 14	102
13. 11	220, 315	17. 16	40	22. 15	151
13. 12	100, 175	17. 17	23, 111	22. 18, 19	115
13. 14	71, 315	18. 7	345		
13. 16	24, 100	18. 9	112		

(b) SEPTUAGINT.

GENESIS		GENESIS— <i>continued</i>		GENESIS— <i>continued</i>	
	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
1. 6	23, 226	13. 14	26	21. 14	154
1. 9	226	14. 11	22	21. 22	108
1. 11	226	14. 19	240	22. 3	154
3. 19	144	15. 7	136	22. 14	104
3. 24	212	16. 2	142	22. 17	157
4. 2	227	16. 5	70	23. 6	235
5. 4	143	17. 17	333	24. 12	56
6. 3	96	17. 19	336	24. 15	154
6. 17	108	18. 1	322	24. 30	70
7. 1	193	18. 9	155	24. 33	144
7. 3, 9	187	18. 13	50	25. 1	227
8. 13	187	18. 21	95	26. 5	55
10. 19	144	18. 33	159	26. 11	215
11. 2	26, 145	19. 16	145	26. 12	162
11. 8	159	19. 22	144	26. 28	70, 157
12. 12	112	20. 6	142	27. 36	193
13. 10	144	20. 15	108	28. 6	145

GENESIS— <i>continued</i>		EXODUS— <i>continued</i>		JUDGES— <i>continued</i>	
	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
28. 15	144	33. 8	93	19. 2A	17
29. 20	144	34. 3	283	19. 6	155
29. 34	70	34. 24	232	20. 47A	17
30. 8	95	40. 2	187	Ru. 2. 11	143
30. 33	108			„ 2. 22	35
30. 42	93	LEVITICUS		1 KINGDOMS	
30. 38	143	10. 16	44	1. 8	32
31. 1	70	11. 43	97	1. 9	143
32. 16	18, 23	20. 8	55	1. 26	146
33. 3	144	21. 17	49	2. 19	144
35. 18	145	23. 29	284	3. 11	322
„ 9	93	23. 32	27	4. 7	21
38. 23	70	27. 12	110	5. 9	143
38. 26	31			8. 5	55
39. 3	107	NUMBERS		10. 24	333
39. 15	145	1. 1, 18	187	14. 34	40
41. 19	325	7. 6	154	14. 47	141
41. 55	70	9. 14	335	16. 4	151
42. 2	254	11. 4	154	17. 13, 14	30
42. 15 f.	336	11. 15	95	20. 3	85, 157
42. 30	70	12. 3	32	2 KINGDOMS	
43. 16	248	14. 22	193	7. 7	50
43. 25	144	14. 40	44	7. 10	208
44. 1	108	16. 29 ^b	287	11. 15	156
44. 12	155	16. 31	159	23. 3	99
44. 31	145	21. 9	93	24. 14	97
44. 34	95	21. 27	95	3 KINGDOMS	
45. 28	154	22. 6	32	1. 1	220
47. 19	95	22. 20	154	1. 20	314
49. 12	32, 216	23. 7	26	5. 14 (28)	317
49. 15	143	24. 14	246	17. 20	142
EXODUS		DEUTERONOMY		19. 5, 7	155
1. 10	113	1. 42	97	19. 7	342
2. 2	17	1. 45	154	4 KINGDOMS	
3. 2	213	4. 21	104	1. 3, 6, 16	144
3. 6	306	5. 14	95	2. 24	7, 245
3. 7	157	5. 21	232	8. 14	50
3. 14	230	6. 2	104	10. 6	156
4. 21	322	6. 14	97	19. 4, 6, 22	245
5. 22, 23	70	7. 12	113	1 CHRONICLES	
6. 4	70	7. 16	97	9. 25	141
6. 11	104	9. 28	144	17. 6	50
8. 6	22	21. 8	40	21. 3	95
8. 23	213	31. 6	286	21. 18	104
8. 29(25)	44	32. 21	282	EZRA-NEHEMIAH	
9. 15	213	JOSHUA		1 Esd. 1. 15	61
9. 18	248	1. 11	231	3. 13	154
12. 21	154	22. 24	95	4. 18	196
14. 11	144	23. 1, 2	220	4. 46, 47, 50	104
17. 3	232	JUDGES		4. 49	238
18. 11	32	6. 15	30	6. 27, 31	104
19. 24	342	7. 5	21		
20. 10	27	11. 35	35		
20. 17	232	13. 2	230		
27. 20	143	16. 15	193		
29. 29	213				
31. 3	232				

EZRA-NEHEMIAH— <i>continued</i>		JOB— <i>continued</i>		TOBIT— <i>continued</i>	
	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
8. 21	144	7. 9	96	6. 13	27
2 Esd. 6. 8	141	12. 5	250	6. 15, 18	104
Ne. 7. 65	104	27. 1	227	8. 4B	104
		29. 1	227	8. 12B	95
PSALMS		32. 13	95	8. 19	27
1. 20	122	36. 1	227	10. 7B	235
4. 9	18			10. 12B	22
6. 2	283			11. 16	161
13 (14). 1 ff.	151	WISDOM		12. 13	226
17. 33, 35	343	1. 8	96	13. 2, 4, 7, 11	25
21. 2	72	2. 12	245	14. 9	104
23 (24). tit	187	3. 1	96		
27. 3, 4	21	6. 6	52	MINOR PROPHETS	
32. 6	21	6. 22	96	Hos. 9. 13	141
38. 2	142	8. 21	242	Am. 3. 5	144
38. 5	95	12. 10	96	5. 25	35
38. 14	104	13. 5	218	5. 27	26
44(43). 22	210	13. 6	337	6. 12	215
45. 6	250	14. 4	104	7. 2	114
45 (44). 8	32	16. 3, 20	40	8. 10	212
60 (61). 4	213			Jon. 1. 3	40
60. 5	25	SIRACH		3. 3	239
68. 24	142	prol. 9	215	Soph. 2. 3	213
74. 18	21	4. 13	232	Hag. 2. 4	35
76. 8	25	6. 1	232	2. 9	32
77. 22	238	11. 7	113	Hab. 1. 5	96
78. 24	135	13. 24	284	Sach. 3. 8	35
83. 5	23	15. 15	213	Mal. 1. 7, 12	145
88. 23	208	16. 8	40	1. 9	104
88. 53	25	18. 1	25	Ze. 3. 6	144
90. 11	142	28. 1	151		
102. 19	21	29. 25	250	ISAIAH	
105. 12, 24	238	35. 21, 23	238	3. 9	70
106. 3	26	36. 15	187	10. 16	98
117. 23	21	37. 15	104	11. 11	258
118. 50, 56	21	38. 14	104	13. 4	70, 216
119. 7	93	39. 18	213	20. 3	70
142. 2	196	44. 18	104	22. 3	70
		45. 24	104	24. 13	114
PROVERBS				26. 20	307
3. 9	215	ESTHER		27. 12	187
4. 17	240	1. 5	58	30. 12	89
21. 26	232	2. 18	27	33. 24	98
		5. 3	210	36. 12	104
ECCLESIASTES		5. 13	113	38. 14	215
2. 9	32	9. 22	27	40. 7	72
2. 16	231			40. 17	253
3. 15	141	JUDITH		42. 21	104
9. 4	32	7. 28	104	45. 23	333
		9. 12	336	48. 10, 16, 17	70
CANTICLES		12. 19	154	49. 1	259
1. 8	31			49. 6	71
1. 16	250	TOBIT		51. 22	71
5. 1	104	2. 9	194	52. 11	76
		3. 6	32	53. 4	40
JOB		3. 15	104, 239	53. 5	70
6. 1	157	3. 17	194	54. 6	71
6. 9	155	5. 7, 9	104	54. 17	215

INDEX TO REFERENCES

377

ISAIAH— <i>continued</i>		DANIEL— <i>continued</i>		2 MACCABEES— <i>contd.</i>	
	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
57. 18	70	12. 1 ̸	70	2. 27	337
57. 19	254	Su. 28	100	2. 31	14
60. 1	71	Su. 33	16	3. 16	14
61. 1	71	Su. 37	161	4. 4	14
66. 8	70	Bel. 3. 4	173	4. 5	18
66. 9, 19	71	Bel. 12	113	4. 13	282
				4. 27	58
JEREMIAH		1 MACCABEES		4. 34	26
11. 5	156	1. 9	95, 143	4. 36, 45	144
11. 6	109	1. 11	17	4. 40	220
11. 21	97	1. 20	143	5. 11	220
12. 6	238	2. 15	16	5. 18	92
15. 17	18	2. 47	208	5. 27	144, 159
17. 8	159	2. 52	253	6. 18	65, 220
20. 13	236	2. 54, 58	144	7. 7	333
29. 11	100	3. 33	144	7. 9	140, 190
34. 10	144	4. 2	136, 258	7. 24	26
51 (44). 18	159	4. 28	136	10. 33	225
Ba. 3. 28	144	5. 19, 54	144	11. 22	52
Ep. Je. 65	7, 245	5. 29	321	14. 18	337
		7. 7	154	14. 21	18
EZEKIEL		7. 45	144	14. 32	26
9. 11	155	8. 6	154	14. 42	32
10. 11	93	9. 37	27	15. 3	333
14. 4	213	9. 44	16	15. 5	337
16. 49	232	10. 3	136	15. 36	187
29. 9	144	10. 38	144	3 MACCABEES	
34. 7-9	144	10. 58	27	1. 16	241
36. 3	144	11. 57	156	4. 5	276
37. 23	95	11. 58	241	4. 11	144
39. 14	17	12. 10	144	5. 20	70
44. 12	213	12. 36	18, 143	5. 32	92
DANIEL		13. 16	185	5. 34	198
2. 8 O'	71	13. 20	93	6. 6	143
2. 10	196	14. 41	144	7. 3	143
2. 31, 34, 41, 45	71	15. 28	80	13. 27	337
3. 33	314	16. 9	144	15. 11	337
3. 92 (25)	44	2 MACCABEES		4 MACCABEES	
4. 22, 28, 29	292	1. 3	143	6. 13	14
4. 30b O'	69	1. 9	95	10. 19	144
5. 52	25	2. 6	136	16. 7	17
6. 27 ̸'	25	2. 13	268	18. 8	14
7. 8 O'	196				

(c) OTHER VERSIONS OF OLD TESTAMENT.

AQUILA		AQUILA— <i>continued</i>		SYMMACHUS	
	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
Ge. 12. 9	52	2 Km. 6. 14	279	Ps. 57 (58). 10	113
17. 1	279	3 Km. 15. 6, 32	277	Je. 40 (47). 5	113
Dt. 33. 3	250	Isa. 7. 2	279	49 (42). 22	85
Jg. 5. 27	277	Ezk. 1. 17	250		
1 Km. 22. 4	279	7. 23(22)	250		

(d) PSEUDEPIGRAPHA OF OLD TESTAMENT.

Test. XII Patr.—	PAGE	Epist. Aristeas—	PAGE	Test. Abraham— <i>contd.</i>	PAGE
<i>Test. Levi.</i> 8. 311	25	51 . . .	16	Rec. B p. 107	
„ 14. 1	25	59 . . .	124	line 1 . . .	156
„ 18. 4	17	126 . . .	26	Rec. B p. 108	
<i>Test. Jud.</i> 5. 2	26	137 . . .	159	line 1, 21, 23	156
<i>Test. Naphth.</i> 7. 1				Rec. B p. 110	
	27	Vitae Prophet.—		line 7, 16, 21	156
<i>Test. Benj.</i> 7. 4	188	Elisha 2 . . .	70	Rec. B p. 110	
		Dan. 6 . . .	70	line 20 . . .	155
		Nah. 2 . . .	70	Rec. B p. 111	
		Mal. 2 . . .	70	line 18 . . .	156
		Jer. 13 f. . .	70	Rec. B p. 112	
Greek Enoch—		Jer. 14 . . .	96	line 6, 9 . . .	156
3. 1 . . .	50			Rec. B p. 113	
9. 4 . . .	25	Test. Solomon (T.Sol.)		line 9 . . .	156
10. 6-10 . . .	91	D 4. 4 . . .	124	Rec. B p. 113	
98. 12, 99. 10	97	17. 15 . . .	208	line 29 . . .	194
				Rec. B p. 114	
		Test. Abraham (T.Abr.)		line 6 . . .	156
Orac. Sibyll.—		(M. R. James, <i>Texts</i>		Rec. B p. 116	
3. 50 . . .	25	<i>and Studies</i> , II 2)		line 27 . . .	194
3. 308 . . .	27	Rec. A p. 82		Rec. B p. 118	
3. 767 . . .	25	line 11 . . .	320	line 15 . . .	156
		Rec. B p. 106		Rec. B p. 118	
		line 4, 11, 18	156	line 26 . . .	320
Ps. Sol. 1. 5 . . .	96				

(e) EARLY CHRISTIAN WRITINGS.

Clement of Rome (i/A.D.)

1 Cl. 2. 1 . . .	PAGE	1 Cl.— <i>continued</i>	PAGE	1 Cl.— <i>continued</i>	PAGE
2. 4 . . .	53	27. 5 . . .	96	39. 5, 6 . . .	144
4. 8, 10 . . .	279	28. 3 . . .	279	42. 4 . . .	247
10. 1 . . .	146	30. 4 . . .	137	43. 6 . . .	25
10. 4 . . .	26	32. 4 . . .	25	48. 6 . . .	29
12. 2 . . .	168	34. 3 . . .	279	50. 1 . . .	137
12. 4 . . .	16	34. 5 . . .	137	50. 3 . . .	192
12. 5 . . .	157	35. 3 . . .	25	51. 3 . . .	31
12. 7 . . .	227	35. 4 . . .	58	55. 2 . . .	162
18. 11 . . .	279	35. 10 . . .	279	55. 6 . . .	25
19. 3 . . .	137	37. 2 . . .	137	60. 2 . . .	86
20. 12 . . .	25	38. 2 . . .	109	61. 2 . . .	25
21. 3 . . .	137	38. 4 . . .	25	63. 2 . . .	192

Epistle of Barnabas (i/ii A.D.)

Barn 4. 3 . . .	PAGE	Barn— <i>continued</i>	PAGE	Barn— <i>continued</i>	PAGE
5. 9 . . .	216	10. 3 . . .	216	14. 6 . . .	137
5. 13 . . .	139	10. 4 . . .	97	17. 2 . . .	96
6. 9 . . .	279	11. 1 . . .	97, 137	18. 2 . . .	25
8. 5 . . .	50	11. 7 . . .	279	19. 1 . . .	94
8. 6 . . .	58	11. 8 . . .	110	19. 2 ff. . .	86
10. 1 . . .	50	12. 2 . . .	30, 93	19. 8 . . .	232

Shepherd of Hermas (i/ii A.D.)**V Visions M Mandates S Similitudes**

	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
V I. 1. 2	172	VII. 5	46	VIII. 7. 1	39
I. 4. 1, 3	26	VIII. 2	136	IX. 2. 3	187
II. 1. 3	148	IX. 2, 5	97	IX. 2. 5	42
II. 2. 6	86	X. 1. 6	30	IX. 4. 5	93
III. 1. 2	194	XII. 3. 1	86	IX. 5. 1	146
III. 3. 1	15	S I. 4	246	IX. 6. 4	93
III. 6. 1	208	I. 5	97	IX. 6. 8	148
III. 7. 2	142	I. 11	191	IX. 7. 6	100
III. 10. 10	30	II. 1	42	IX. 8. 3	138
III. 12. 3	74	II. 3	110	IX. 9. 1	98, 135
III. 13. 2	74	II. 5	190	IX. 10. 5 f.	111
IV. 1. 5	42	IV. 5	94, 190	IX. 10. 7	31
IV. 1. 6	137	V. 2. 2	111	IX. 11. 1	111
IV. 2. 1	17	V. 4. 3A	190	IX. 12. 4	126
IV. 3. 7	243	V. 7. 3	39, 99,	IX. 12. 8	17
M III. 2	74		113	IX. 13. 2	58
III. 5	45	VI. 1. 5	148	IX. 17. 3	93
IV. 1. 7	148	VI. 5. 3	17	IX. 18. 3	148
IV. 2. 2	146	S VIII. 1. 4	17, 49	IX. 19. 3	273
IV. 3. 7	116	VIII. 1. 14	273	IX. 20. 4	27
IV. 4. 3	17	VIII. 2. 5, 9	148	IX. 26. 2	74
V. 1. 2	116	VIII. 2. 8	187	IX. 28. 4	29
VI. 2. 2	190	VIII. 6. 1	148	IX. 28. 5	100
VI. 2. 10	100	VIII. 6. 6	17		

Ignatius, bp. of Antioch (ii/A.D.)

	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
Eph. 2. 2	124	IO	136	Rom. 5. 2	124
4. 2	101	Pol. 1. 2	27	5. 3	49
5. 3	73	Pol. 2. 2	279	10. 2	162
11. 1	78	5. 1	58	Sm 2	136
15. 3	279	6. 2	124	7. 2	18
Magn. 2. 12	124	8. 3	94	12. 1	91
Tral. 3. 2	137				

Martyrdom of Polycarp (ii/A.D.)

	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
12. 1	30	16. 2	27	31. 7. 4	227

Didache (ii/A.D.)

	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
3. 1	216	4. 3	136	8. 2	25
3. 8	89	4. 10	286	11. 7	86

Epistle to Diognetus (c. A.D. 150)

	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
2. 3	140	6. 1	136	12. 1	53
4. 3	27				

Justin Martyr (ii/A.D.)

	PAGE		PAGE
Apology I 22; 32	70		67. 8 248

Clement of Rome: so-called Second Epistle (ii/A.D.?)

	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
2 Cl. I. 2	49	14. 2	137	20. 4	92
3. I	245	2 Cl. 17. 3	30		
10. 5	159	19. 4	27		

Clementine Homilies (ii/A.D.? v/A.D.? vi/A.D.?)

	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
I. 7	137	9. I	17	15. 4	197
I. 7, II	190	9. 2I	240	16. 6, 7	137
I. 9	85, 91	9. 22	141	17. 18	42
I. 14	30	10. 2	146	19. I	197
2. 25	136	10. 15	190, 241	19. 2	99
3. 8	190	11. 3	98	19. 6	49
3. 68	240	11. 28	137	19. 23	240
3. 69	282	12. I	136	20. 13	136
6. II	49	14. 7	137	ep. ad Jac. 3	89
8. II	136	14. 8	159	" 9	30
8. 14	284	14. 10	42		

Gospel of Peter (ii/A.D.)

	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
2. 5	92	II	240	35	187

Apocalypse of Peter (ii/A.D.)

	PAGE		PAGE
2. 3	208	4	227

Apocryphal Acts (ii/A.D. onwards)

	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
Andr. et Matth.		Pet. et Paul.—		Thom. 41. 39	316
90. 9 f.	58	17	135	116. 4 f.	58
Barn. 7	142	186. 4	135	175. 2 f.	58
Ex Act. Andr.		187. I	256	198. 17	39
45. 26 f.	14	209. 14	95	218. 25 ff.	138
Gesta Pil. 12. 2	58	Phil. 10	227	253. 6 ff.,	
John 90	241	Phil. 39. I ff.	95	10 ff.	95
170. 29 f.	138	62. 9	50	254. 6 ff.	95
Paul et Thecl. 8	231	86. 21 ff.	95	Xanth. 76. 32 ff.	58
		Pionii 11. 4	196		

Gospels of Thomas and of the Naasenes (ii/A.D.)

	PAGE		PAGE
Ev. Thom. 15. 2	312	Ev. Naas. 2	53

Passions and Martyrdoms (iii/A.D. onwards)

	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
Pass. Andr. alt.		Mart. Dasii 5	136	I. I	99
28. 14 ff.	13	Mart. Matth.		Mart. Petr. 4	135
Pass. Barth.		243. 18 ff.	138	82. 20	13
133. 29 f.	138	Mart. Pelag. 26. 15	89	88. 7	135
141. 31	39	Pass. Perp. et Fel.			

Later Christian Greek texts

	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
Orig. c. Marc.		Ev. VI. 7	50	65. 105c	50
(ed. Wetst.) 35	227	Epiph. Haer.		65. 377	58
Apost. Const. 4.3	32	43. 2	208	93. 1708	52
Euseb. Praep.		Migne P.G.			

(f) INSCRIPTIONS AND PAPYRI

Please see vol. II pp. 503-12 for abbreviations not explained here.

	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
Arohv iii. 173	29	416. 3	153	1300. 4	16
IG XII. 5. 590	32	417. 16	339	1764. 9	255
Kaibel 642. 10	10	417. 17	335	CPR 22. 15	198
Preis. Samm		417. 28	30	P. Fay.	
620. 6 f.	146	423. 11	35	I. col. III. 16	112
5216. 11	15	436. 9	285	III. 14	293
5827. 17	29	451. 11	30	XCI. 28	151
SIG (Syll.)		467. 15	154	P. Fyll. I 6, 7	91
1240. 25	239	512. 2	152	P. Giss. I. col. I, 8	55
Ditt. Syll.		523. 6	155	23. 4	316
344. 59	48	523. 17	112	36. 10	44, 155
834. 10	144	530. 35	284	39. 9	53
410. 4, 24	17	543. 13	157	P. Grenf. I 33. 33	52
442. 3, 17	17	596. 11	157	53. 29	227
647. 17	220	615. 9. 28	30	P. Hamb. I.	
705. 57	276	624. 15	155	27. 4	17, 66
807. 9	18	625. 28	142	27. 9	159
III2. 25	26	813. 15	18	P. Hib. 27. 167	293
II57. 10	18	822. 4	49	29. 41	48
II73. I	194	844. 15	318	38. 8	52
P. Amh. 34(e) 6	56	846. 15	32	46. 13	90
37, 8	62	909. 3	27	54. 23	26
78, 4	53	909. 8	154	59. 2	112
III-III3	315	948. 13	49	63. 3	39
BGU (or BU)		1049. 8	26	75. 79	179
36. III. 3	255	1078. 2	162	96. 6, 23	27
46	185	1078. 5	315	110. 65, 100	179
69	238	1078. 8	91	P. Leip. 40. 10	162
86	42	1078. 10	162	40. 20	161
246. 12	242	1079. 6	336	108. 5	157
362. V. 9	151	1081. 3	101	P. Lille 26. 6	149
380. 3	17	1081. 5	138	29. II	152
388. II. 36 f.	340	1103. 11	247	P. Lond. no.	
388. II. 41	30	1158. 17	304	21	51
388. III. 8	220	1247. 13	58	879, 21	48
388. III. 16	151	1253. 10	125	897, 20	91

P.Lond.no.— <i>continued</i>	PAGE	P. Par.— <i>continued</i>	PAGE	PSI IV.— <i>continued</i>	PAGE
1343, 38	291	51. 9 . . .	68	484. 7 . . .	30
1394	93	51. 23 . . .	155	495. 8 . . .	99
P. Ox.		51. 25 . . .	315	495. 23 . . .	45
2. B 6 . . .	167	51. 39 . . .	35, 63	584. 30 . . .	26
6. 3 . . .	231	60. 4 . . .	48		
33. col. II 14	138	62. 2, 6 . . .	49	P. Strass. II	
37 . . .	192	63 . . .	45, 245	III. 23 . . .	52
40 . . .	221	63. II, 56 . . .	58	P. Teb. 5. 5 . . .	27
43. B IV 3 . . .	277	63. 16 . . .	178	6. 32 . . .	58
III . . .	27	P. Petr.		6. 43 . . .	76
II 9 . . .	96	I. 21 . . .	30	12. 23 . . .	15
120. II . . .	80	29. 4 . . .	16	14. 10 . . .	181
131 . . .	58	II. 10 (2) 5 . . .	179	17. 14 . . .	51
188 . . .	187	II (I) . . .	49	22. II . . .	62
292. 6 . . .	162	13 (17) 4 . . .	48	24. 65 . . .	125
413. 184 . . .	94	13 (18b) II . . .	29	33 . . .	30
472. 17 . . .	49	13 (19) . . .	45	43. 22 . . .	99
475. 16 . . .	17	16. 13 . . .	30	45. 17 . . .	31
482. I-2 . . .	70	18 (2b) 15 . . .	125	46. 14 . . .	31
526. 3 . . .	136	20. 2. 5 . . .	26	47. II . . .	31
528. 14 . . .	194	40 (a) 12 . . .	77	50. 12 . . .	52
658. 8 . . .	226	40 (a) 27 . . .	43	56. II f. . . .	105
886. 19 . . .	187	45 . . . 17, 27, 43		61 (b) 29 . . .	36
929. 12 . . .	254	P. Petr.		61 (b) 35 . . .	55
II 62 . . .	39	III. 56 (b) 12 . . .	17	105 . . .	213
II 89. 7 . . .	36	78. 13 . . .	17	309 . . .	152
1678. 16 . . .	48	P. Reim. 18. 5 . . .	38	331. 16 . . .	138
1680. II . . .	257	P. Ryl. II.		411. 3 . . .	194
1831. I . . .	137	II 2. 13 . . .	315	421. 12 . . .	157
1833. I . . .	137	II 3. 12 f. . . .	196	793. XI 8 . . .	266
P. Par.		140. 7 . . .	169	798. 16 . . .	256
8. 16 . . .	157	144. 14 . . .	37	P. Tor. I. 2. 17 . . .	52
12. 20 . . .	51	174. 15 . . .	266	4. 73 . . .	65
12. 21 . . .	157	PSI II. 286. 22 . . .	18	8. 21 . . .	51
15. 4 . . .	51	III. 167. 18 . . .	125	8. 65 . . .	29
18. 3 . . .	230	IV. 313. 8 . . .	37	UPZ	
22. 20 . . .	58	326. 4 . . .	39	I. I. 12 f. . . .	125
22. 25 . . .	135	340. 9 . . .	322	6. 30 . . .	155
22. 29 . . .	52	353. 16 . . .	76	31. 7 . . .	98
23. 9 ff. . . .	62	372. 12 . . .	189	41. 25 . . .	232
23. 12 . . .	53	380. 4 . . .	312	42. 32, 33 . . .	197
23. 22 . . .	135	380. 6 . . .	17	71. 18 . . .	112
23. 23 . . .	101	383. 8 . . .	15	II 3. 12 . . .	189
26 . . .	149	391. 4 . . .	17	II. 161. 61 . . .	220
26. 35 . . .	51	392. 6 . . .	136	162. VIII 29 . . .	220
26. 48 . . .	29	402. 4 . . .	312	W. Chr. 10. 6 . . .	16
27. 33 . . .	318	402. 7 . . .	222	26. II 32 . . .	80
32 . . .	98	408. 9 . . .	17	46. 15 . . .	18
34. 9 . . .	48	425. 28 . . .	48	122. 4 . . .	286
35. 30 . . .	155	432. 5 . . .	27	167. 21 . . .	48
38. II . . .	58	433. 7 . . .	325	P. Alex. 4. 15 . . .	15
42. 3 . . .	227	434. 12 . . .	18	<i>Pap. ptol. du Musée</i>	
45 . . .	99	435. 19 . . .	29	<i>d'Alexandrie,</i>	
46. 7 . . .	27	442. 14 f. . . .	226	G. Botti 1899.	
46. 12 . . .	43	443. 18 . . .	51	P. Eleph. I. 9 . . .	256
47 . . . 63, 92, 178		443. 19 . . .	43	13. 7 . . .	48
48. 12 . . .	161	444. II . . .	30	23. 13 . . .	22
49. 33 . . .	58	571. 15 . . .	196	45. I. 16 . . .	61

	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
<i>Elephantine Papyri</i> ,		Vol. II)		G. Zereteli 1925-35.	
O. Rubensohn 1907.		48. 15 . . .	30	P. Vat. A 15 . . .	51
P. Goodsp. 3 . . .	49	51. 9 . . .	18	(see MM Vocab.	
6. 5 . . .	48	130. 5 . . .	51	p. xxix)	
<i>A Group of Gk</i>		132. 12 . . .	22	SB (see Mayser II	
<i>Papyrus Texts</i> , E. J.		139. 21 . . .	101	1.p.xv)	
Goodspeed 1906.		186. 6 . . .	6?	3444 . . .	22
P. Hal. I. 30 . . .	17	737. 7 . . .	18	463I . . .	26
167, 177 . . .	62	P. Path. (see R. C.		5627. II . . .	113
<i>Dikaiomata</i>		Horn, <i>Use of Subj.</i>		5680 . . .	22
herausgeg. v. der		<i>and Opt. in. the non-</i>		Zen. P.	
<i>Graeca Halensis</i> ,		<i>literary Papyri</i> 1926)		(see Mayser II	
1913		I . . .	105	1.p.xiii)	
P. Mich. Zen.		P. Prk. (see Horn,		59037. 7 . . .	230, 296
77. 13 . . .	97	above)		59084. 9 . . .	96
ed. C. C. Edgar, 1931		5232. 32 . . .	105	59148. 2 . . .	230
P. Magd. 4. 6 . . .	51	5357. 9 . . .	105	59396. 4 . . .	96
9. 3 . . .	99	P. Rev. L. 4. 2 . . .	52	59610. 2I . . .	97
21. 6 . . .	31	5. I . . .	51	ZP or Zen. P. Cairo	
27. 6 . . .	58	17. 6 . . .	52	(<i>Zenon Papyri</i> .)	
29. 4 . . .	55 f	<i>Revenue Laws of Ptol.</i>		C. C. Edgar 1925,	
29. 9 . . .	52	<i>Philad.</i> , B. P. Gren-		1926, 1928, 1931)	
42 . . .	125	fell 1896.		II. 7 . . .	136
<i>Pap. de Magdola</i> ,		P. Ross. Georg.		28. 3 . . .	58
J. Lesquier 1912		III 2, vol. 27 . . .	35	762. 6 . . .	27
Or.Gr. (= OGIS, in		<i>Papyri russischer</i> . . .,		1038. 22b 15 . . .	25

(g) GREEK LITERATURE.

i. Classical.

Sophocles		Menander		Xenophon	
	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
Ajax 464 f. . .	213	Epitrr. 26 f. . .	192	Anab. I. 2. 2I . . .	170
554 . . .	145	Fr. 425. 2 . . .	144	3. 5. II . . .	142
1400 . . .	91			5. 2. 24 . . .	322
Ant. 369 . . .	215	Herodotus		7. 7. 48 . . .	141
Oed. Rex. 1458 . . .	190	I. 69 . . .	22	Hell. 5. I. 14 . . .	136
1471 . . .	195	I. 80 . . .	22	5. 4. 54 . . .	26
Ph. 442 ff. . .	92	2. 99 . . .	47	Cyr. 3. 3. 20 . . .	35
Trach. 865 . . .	195	2. 124 . . .	17	6. 2. 33 . . .	46
		4. 25 . . .	49	7. I. 44 . . .	58
Euripides		4. 50 . . .	187	Hier. 6. 5 . . .	28
Andr. 757 . . .	97	5. 76 . . .	136, 192	Mem. I. 2. 49 . . .	147
Bacch. 389 . . .	213	6. 92 . . .	53	3. 5. 26 . . .	62
914 . . .	58	8. 140 . . .	63	3. 7. 4 . . .	18
Cycl. 567 . . .	58	9. 26 . . .	32		
El. 982 . . .	97			Isocrates	
Hipp. 213 . . .	97	Thucydides		4. 44 . . .	109
Iph. T. 962 f. . .	198	I. 32. 5 . . .	18	4. 82 . . .	15
Med. 737 . . .	215	I. 114. I . . .	322	15. 30 . . .	71
Suppl. 1066 . . .	97	2. 4. 2 . . .	22		
		2. 45 . . .	282	Plato	
Aristophanes		3. 14 . . .	21	Crito 50B . . .	98
Ach. 166 . . .	97	3. 22 . . .	58	Gorg. 459. 6 . . .	282
Nu. 367 . . .	97	3. 59. I . . .	274	Leg. 629D . . .	198
Ra. 521 . . .	34	4. 52. 2 . . .	316	Meno 99A . . .	176
866 . . .	91	6. 78. I . . .	22	99E . . .	176
V. 397 . . .	97	6. 84. 3 . . .	22	100B . . .	176

Plato— <i>continued</i>				Lysias	
	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
Phaed. 246E	25	8. 67	169	12. 16	179
Rpb. 532C	186	18. 21	303	19. 57	153
Symp. 214A	98	19. 30	179		
Theæt. 147C	195	23. 93	49		
		27. 58	179		
Aristotle		54. 10	248	Lycurgus	
Metaph. 1071 ^a 2	276	56. 4	55	79	22
Demosthenes		Andocides		Hyperides	
I. 9	71	I. 125	32	Lycophr. 13	195

ii. *Hellenistic.*

Polybius		Josephus— <i>continued</i>		Epictetus— <i>continued</i>	
	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
I. 29. I	321	I. 37.	26	4. 6. 8	136
I. 48. 5	144	I. 100	49	4. 10. 27	74
I. 71. I	18	I. 193	16	4. 13. 15	137
3. 10. I	71	3. 272	26	Ench. 7	117
4. I. I	71	6. 287	227		
4. 15. II	18	7. 294	26	Arrian	
4. 32. 5, 6	93	8. 175	15	Ep. ad Traj. 5	17
4. 36	16	11. 104	52	Epict. 4. I. 120	50
4. 84. 8	18	11. 206	240		
5. 13. 8	255	11. 293	144	Aelian	
5. 18. 4	51	13. 187	16	Anim. 2. 38	32
6. 21	16	14. 170	144	8. I	216
6. 34. 3	17	15. 148	144	8. 12	32
11. 2	16	15. 370	16	14. 37	226
13. 7. 8, 10	93	17. 225	31		
27. 7. 2	17	17. 336	18	Lucian	
39. 9. 12	141	19. 48	227	Herm. 28	17
		B.J. 2. 124	15	Char. 3	17
Dionysius of		2. 199	18	Peregr. 39	26
Halicarnassus		3. 7. 3	226	Eunuch. 6	43
de Plat et Pomp.		6. 326	18	Dial. Mort. 10. I	53
756	196	c. Ap. I. 77	26	13. 3	192
de Thuc. 8	57	I. 217	284	Somn. 15	154
Opusc. I. 3. 6	31			D. Deor. 2. I	160
		Plutarch		Consecr. Hist. 2	187
Strabo		2. 120 d	18		
2. 5 (p. 133,		3. 231 d	160	Vettius Valens	
Casaubon)	71	Cat. min. § 18	32	71. 22	18
		Mor. 169 c	27	181. 22	243
Philo Judaeus		Pyrrh. 20. I	16		
5. 170. 8	18	Tranqu. c. 13	195	Philostratus	
6. cont. 15	16			Ap. I. 356. 17	49
Sacr. Abel 136	18	Epictetus		3. 19	32
Spec. Leg. 3. 187	26	I. 9. 15	94		
3. 121	49	I. 22. 15	240	Sextus Empiricus	
Abr. 28	27	I. 24. 10	30	Phys. I. 62	25
		3. I. 12	102		
Josephus		3. 22	32	Diogenes Laertius	
Ant. I. I. I.	187	3. 22. 33	96	3. 2	27
I. 33.	27	4. I. 50	136	6. 27	52
		4. I. 97, 100	99		

Aesop		Diodorus Siculus—		Marcus Antoninus	
	PAGE	<i>(continued)</i>			PAGE
121 . . .	32	19. 19 . . .	16	9. 3. 7 . . .	117
		20. 1 . . .	221	10. 30 . . .	52
Apollonius Discolus		Dio Cassius		Xenophon of	
de Synt. I. 14 . . .	196	58. 4. 5 . . .	231	Ephesus	
		987. 32 . . .	26	5. 7. 9 . . .	155
Diodorus Siculus		Achilles Tatius		p. 393. 29 . . .	135
I. 16 . . .	16	7. 11. 2 . . .	192	Tiberius Gracchus	
I. 21 . . .	18	Athenaeus		2. 3 . . .	16
I. 37 . . .	16	10. 438 . . .	49		
2. 43 . . .	26				
4. 51. 16 . . .	18				
11. 16 . . .	190				
16. 1. 6 . . .	71				

INDEX OF SUBJECTS

- A modern author is included for special indication, not when mentioned bibliographically.
- A.V. 55, 65, 181, 270.
- Abbott, E. A. 283
- Abel, F. M. 26, 56, 65, 235, 314 f., 316.
- Abraham, Testament of 203, 205, 332.
- Absolute verbs 51.
- Abstract nouns, neuter expressions for 13 f.
- Accent query 36, 40, 41, 230, 250, 337.
- Accusative: adjectival 220 f.—absol. 322—adverbial 247—cognate 245 f.—double 246 f.—extent 247 f.—ext. obj. 244 f.—point of time 248—predic. 253—w. *ἀκούω* 161—w. pass. 247—w. inf. 147, 148 f.—w. verb 244—8. S. Gk. Index under *ἀνά, εἰς, ἐπί, διά, κατά, μετά, παρά, περί, πρὶν, πρὸς, ὑπέρ, ὑπό*.
- Active 53—f. pass. 53, 292 f.—mid. or pass. f. 56 f.—intr. act. as causative 52 f.
- Acts—s. Luke.
- Acts, apocryphal 39, 50, 58, 138, 142, 196, 208, 227, 231, 241, 256, 316, 95 (imper. *ἴνα*), 128 (fin. opt.), 135 (fin. inf.).
- Adjectives: attrib. 185 f.—f. adv. 225 f.—gen. of qual. f. 212 f.—in *-μηνος* and *-ήμερος* 17—possess. 191—predic. 225 f.—pronom. 197—201—position 8, 185, 349—substantivized 13 f., 16—8.
- Adverbs: adj. instead of 225 f.—adverbial vbs. 226 f.—as predic. 226—combined w. prep. 278 f.—depend. on prep. 250—position 227—9—w. art. (attrib.) 222.
- Adversatives—s. Conjunctions.
- Aelius Aristides 96.
- Aeschines 52, 97.
- Aeschylus 52, 96, 97.
- Agent: dat. of, w. pass. 240—prep. w. gen. 258, 274.
- Agreement 311—7—*constr. ad sens.* 311 f.—gender 311—number 312 f.—solecisms: Rev 314 f., rest 315—7—several co-ord. words 313 f.
- Aktionsart* 59, 60, 64, 65, 67, 68, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 77, 78, 81 f., 89, 91, 94, 107, 114, 145.
- Alciphron 118, 122, 124, 127, 129, 130, 131.
- Alexandrinus, codex 62.
- Allo, E. B. 115, 314.
- Ambiguity: refl. or pers. pron.? 43—refl. or recipr. pron.? 43.
- Ambrose 26.
- Ammonius 55.
- Anacoloutha 342 f.—after rel. clause 325.
- Anaphora 166, 167, 169, 171, 172—4, 178—*οὗτος* 44—*ἐκεῖνος* 46.
- Aorist: indic. 68—74—ind. w. *ἄν* 91, 93—ind. w. *ὅταν* 124—ind. in wishes 91—ind. w. *ἄλλοιου* 91—imper. 74 f., 76 f., 78—subj. 74, 76—8, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 101, 107, 108 f., 111, 112, 114 f.—opt. 118, ch. 9—inf. 78 f., 145—ptc. 79—81—*Aktionsart* 59 f., 71—4 (ind), 74—8 (other moods), 107, 60 (stem used f. punct: action in pres. time)—constative (complexive) 70, 71, 72, 77—epistolary 72f.—ingressive (inchoative, inceptive) 70, 71 f., 75, 77—gnomic 73—4—perfective (effective, resultat.) 5, 68, 71, 72, 75—proleptic 74—w. descript. impf. 66 f.—different meaning from pres. 72—*aorist. pf.* 68—71.
- Apollodorus 29.

- Apollonius Dyscolus 102, 173, 174, 180, 196.
 Appian 159.
 Apposition 206.
 Aquila 52, 250, 277, 279.
 Aramaic—s. Semitisms.
 Aratus 118, 121, 124, 125, 127, 129.
 Aristeeas 16, 26, 124, 159, 245.
 Aristophanes 18, 34, 91, 96, 97, 106.
 Aristotle 233, 270, 276.
 Arrian 61.
 Article 36 f.—anaphoric 166, 167, 169, 171, 172-4, 178—adjectiv. and predic. 165-84—demonstr. force 36—generic 180 f.—forming adv. accus. 14—individualizing 36, 165-80—less prolific in higher Gk. 36—never as rel. pron. 37—non-class. use 2—not w. *ἕκαστος* 198—substantival or pronominal 36 f.—vocative 34—w. adj. 13 f.—w. astron. names, etc. 172—w. attrib. adv. 14—w. attribute after anarthr. noun 218—w. gen. of nouns 16, 166, 168, 179 f.—w. geogr. names 169-72—w. ind. interrog. 117, 182—w. names of peoples 169—w. neut. adj. f. abstr. noun 2—w. numerals 178 f.—w. ptc. 150-3—w. personal names 165-9—w. prep. phrases 14, 15, 221—w. pred. 182-4—w. quotns. 182, 261—w. several nouns connected together 181—w. *ἀληθεία* 177 f.—w. *αὐτός* 41, 183, 194—w. *γράμματα* 176—w. *ἐκκλησία* 176—w. *ἄλλος* and *ἕτερος* 197 f.—w. *θάνατος* 175—w. *θεός* 34 (LXX), 174—w. *κύριος* 174—w. *νόμος* 177—w. *ὄλος, πᾶς (ἅπας)* 199 f.—w. *οὐρανός, γῆ, θάλασσα, κόσμος* 174 f.—w. *οὗτος, ἐκεῖνος* 192—w. *πνεῦμα* 175 f.—w. *σάρξ* 177—w. *τοιοῦτος, τοσοῦτος* 46 f., 193 f.
 Omission of : w. abstracts 176—w. adv. if gen. follows 14—w. ordinals 178 f.—w. pred. 173, 182-4—theolog. significance? 175—like Heb. constr. state 34, 173, 179 f.—after prep. 179.
 Article, indef. (*εἰς*) 4, 195 f.
 Articula infn.—s. Infinitive.
 Aspect 59-86.
 Asyndeton 9, 340 f., 342.
 Attic Greek 31, 33, 34, 36, 37, 40, 41, 45, 47, 52, 53, 55, 56, 57, 82, 91, 94, 98, 105, 118, 126, 128, 135, 136, 152, 165, 173, 264, 265, 267, 273, 279, 286, 294, 295, 296, 312.
 Attic inscriptions 106, 118, 122, 128, 169, 170, 198.
 Atticisms, Atticists 7, 28, 30, 36, 106, 119, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 132, 187, 220, 240, 277, 338—inf. 135—opt. 119, 125, 128, 129, 130, 131 f., 313, 319—scribes and 6, 82, 119, 129, 135, 152, 245, 271, 313, 339.
 Attraction of relative 324.
 Attributives : art. w. several 186 f.—adv. 222—prep. phrases 221 f.—position 185, 217.
 Augment 73—meaning of 59 f.
 Augustine 26.
 Babrius 245.
 Barbelenet, D. 294.
 Barnabas 332—s. Index of Ref.
 Barrett, C. K. 343.
 Bauer, W. 21, 26, 40, 55, 237, 244, 254, 270, 278, 285, 291.
Beginnings 337, 350.
 Behm, J. 27, 233.
 Bertram, G. 300.
 Bezae, codex 41, 173.
 Biblical Greek 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 26, 38, 42, 61, 74, 82, 86, 120, 131, 142, 144, 145, 153, 154, 155, 156, 175, 178, 196, 209, 212, 237, 240, 241, 258, 271, 275, 277, 295, 318, 320, 321, 322, 331, 335, 347, 349—unity of 5, 9, 95, 108, 123, 127, 129, 201.
 Björck, G. 87.

- Black, M. 194, 209, 258.
 Blass, F. 50, 281, 285.
 Blass-Debrunner 41, 169, 284, 315, 316.
 Boobyer, G. H. 291.
 Bover, J. M. 258.
 Brown, J. A. 338.
 Büchsel, F. 18, 52, 215, 240, 296.
 Burkitt, F. C. 333.
 Burton, E. de W. 62, 142, 143.
- Cadbury, H. J. 47, 301.
 Callimachus 118, 121, 124, 125, 127, 129.
 Cardinals for ordinals 17, 187.
 Case 230-80—after verbs 7, 161, 231-48.
 Causal clauses 318 f.—negation 284—position 345—w. ptc. 157—ἀνθ' ὧν 258—ἀντι τοῦ w. inf. 144—διὰ τό w. inf. 142 f.—ἐάν (causal) 115 f.—εἰ (causal) 115—εἰς 266—εἰς τό w. inf. 143—ἐν τῷ w. inf. 145—ἐπεὶ 318—ἐφ' ᾧ 319—καθότι 318—καθώς 320—ἵνα 102 f.—ὅτι, διότι 318—οὐ χάριν 319—παρὰ τό w. inf. 144—τῷ w. inf. 142—ὡς 158, 320.
 Causative verbs: from intransitives 52 f.—w. double accus. 246.
 Cavallin, A. 336.
 Chambers, C. D. 79, 80.
 Chantraine, P. 5, 68, 71.
 Chiasmus 345-7.
 Chronicles (LXX): non-fin. ἵνα 104—s. Index of Ref.
 Chrysostom 14, 35, 135.
 Circumstantial (adv.) participle 150, 153-5.
 Classical Greek, differences from NT in syntax 2, 3, 18, 29, 30, 31, 33, 36, 37, 38, 47, 49, 50, 51, 53, 54, 64, 71, 79, 84, 85, 88, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 97, 98, 100, 109, 114, 117, 124, 128, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 142, 144, 147 f., 153, 158, 161, 197, 200, 207, 216, 220, 221, 226, 233, 235, 257, 261, 267, 273, 281, 282, 284, 285, 286, 311, 312, 331, 338, 341.
 Clause order 344-7—καθώς-clause 320—ὡςπερ-clause 320.
 Clement of Alexandria 31.
 Clement of Rome 96—s. Index of Ref.
 Coleman, N. D. 333.
 Colwell, E. C. 178, 183-4.
 Commands, pres. and aor. 74 f.
 Comparatives 29-32—elative 3, 29, 30—comp. form of a comp. 29—f. pos. 30 f.—heightened 29—instead of superl. 2, 29—levelling of comp. and superl. 29—pos. f. 29—reduction of μᾶλλον ἢ τοῦ ἢ or παρά 32—use of παρά and ὑπέρ w. pos. or comp. 7, 29, 31, 216.
 Comparative clauses 319-21—καθάπερ 319 f.—καθώς 319 f.—ὡς, ὡςπερ 320.
 Concessive clauses 153, 157, 321—conjunctions 116—w. ptc. 153, 157.
 Conditional clauses 91 f., 109, 113-6, 319—conjunctions 113—negation 283 f., 319—opt. 119, 125-8, 319—parataxis instead 319—tenses 114—w. ptc. 157, 319—ἐάν 113, 114 f.—ἐάν w. impf? 116—εἰ 91 f., 115 f., 125 ff.—ἐπι 272.
 Congruence—s. Agreement.
 Conjunctions: position 329—less rigid connection w. mood in Hell. Gk. 2, 107—co-ordinating 329-40—copulative 334 f., 338 f.—adversative 338, 340—causal 102 f., 158, 266, 318, 320—consec. 106, 336, 337—disjunctive 334—compar. 319 f.—concess. 116—condit. 113—temp. 110-13, 321.
 Consecutive clauses: ἐπι 272—ἵνα 102—ὅθεν 337—ὅτι 318—οὖν 336—τοῦ w. inf. 141, 142—ὡς 136—ὥστε 106, 136.
Constructio ad sensum 40, 311 f.
 Coptic 326.
 Copula, omission of 294-8.
 Copulative conjunctions—s. καί, οὐδέ, οὔτε, τε.

Corpus Hermeticum 33.

Correlative: conjunctions 320, 334, 339—pronouns 46 f.

Couchoud, P.-L. 347.

Countries, names of (partit.) 210, 259—w. art. 169-72.

Daniel (LXX or Th.) 61, 71, 104 (non-fin. ἵνα), 203 ff. (παῖς), 332 (μὲν)—s. Index of Ref.

Dates 17.

Dative: declining 7, 236, 249—added to vbs. 236-44—adjectival 219 f.—as attribute of nouns 219, of adjs. 220—associative dat. 240—credit and discredit 239—dat. absol. 243—*dat. sympatheticus* (ethical) 239—"happen to" 240—indir. obj. 236-8—instrumental 240—interchange w. accus. 7, 243—locative 242 f.—*modi* 241—of accomp. circumstances 241—of adv. and disadv. 238—of agent 240—of cause 242—of duration of time 243 f.—of possession 239 f.—of ref. 238—of respect 220—"relationis" 220, 238 f.—temporal 243—verbal noun 241 f.—εἰς and ἐν encroaching 236, 251-3—Hebrew inf. absol. 241 f.—w. compd. vbs. 242—w. πρὸς 237, 251—s. ἐν, ἐπί, παρά, σύν.

Debrunner, A. 116, 141.

Declarative clauses: w. διότι, ὅτι, ὡς, ὡς ὅτι 134, 137, 148, 161—negation 284.

Delling, G. 232.

Demonstrative pronouns: substantival 44-7—attributive 192-4—adverbial uses 45—*anarthr.* not necessarily predic. 4—art. as 34, 36 f.—position 193, 349—οὗτος followed by inf., ἵνα, ὅτι, etc. 45—αὐτός 7, 40-2, 194—ἐκεῖνος 45 f., 192 f.—ὅδε 44, 192—οὗτος 44 f., 192 f.—τοιούτος, τοσοῦτος 46 f., 193 f.

Deponents: now prefer pass. forms 54, 57—pass. of trans. deponents 58. de Zwaan, J. 87.

Diatribes 293.

Dibelius, M. 183.

Didache 96, 332—s. Index of Ref.

Dio Cassius 26, 231, 245.

Dio Chrysostom 299.

Diodorus Siculus 57, 58, 71, 118, 126, 128, 130, 266, 279, 299—s. Index of Ref.

Diogenes Laertius 27, 52, 57, 96.

Dionysius of Halicarnassus 55, 61, 118, 130—s. Index of Ref.

Direct questions—s. Questions.

Disjunctive conjunctions 334.

Distributive: numerals 266—distrib. doubling 187—art. w. prep. phrase 14—distrib. sing. 23 f.—ἀνά 265 f.—εἰς 266—κατά 268.

Ecclesiastical Greek 50, 208, 248.

Elatives 3, 29, 30.

Ellipse: of apodosis 91, 319, 333—of subject 291-3—of εἶναι 231, 294-310—of ἡμέρα 17, 18—of χεῖρ 17—of ὦρα 17—of others 17—w. ἀλλ' ἵνα 304, 307, 330—w. ἵνα 304, 305—w. οὐχ ἵνα 308—w. εἴτε . . . εἴτε 333—s. δυνατόν, δυναμα.

Emendation 246.

Enoch, Greek 26.

Epexegesis, methods of: inf. 78, 139—inf. w. τοῦ 141—ἵνα 103 f., 129—εἰς τό w. inf. 143—ἐν τῷ w. inf. 146—καί 335.

Epictetus 33, 91, 126, 128, 303.

Esdras, I: non-fin. ἵνα 104—παῖς 202 ff.—s. Index of Ref.

Esther (LXX) 130 f.—s. Index of Ref.

Euripides 52, 96—s. Index of Ref.

Euthymius 52.

Exclamations 33, 50.

Exodus (LXX) 202 ff., 332—s. Index of Ref.

Ezekiel (LXX) 132, 203 f., 275, 279, 332—s. Index of Ref.

- Feminine : to form adv. phrases 21—f. neut. (pron.) 21.
 Field, F. 93.
 Final Clauses 95, 100–06, 111—position 344—w. ptc. 157 f.—opt. 128 f.—
 εἰ w. opt. 127—εἰς τό w. inf. 143—ἐν τῷ w. inf. 146—ἐπί 272—πρός τό
 w. inf. 144—τοῦ w. inf. 141.
 Final conjunctions : enlarged use of ἵνα 94 f.—ἵνα 95, 100–05—ὅπως
 105 f.—ὡς 105, 136—ὥστε 106—μή, μήπως, μήποτε after statement of
 fear 99.
 Foerster, W. 211, 269.
 Fridrichsen, A. 147.
 Friedrich, G. 53.
 Future tense 86 f.—opt. 128—inf. 86—ptc. 86 f., 135, 150, 153—after εἰ
 115—after ἵνα 100—deliberat. 86, 98—for imperat. 86—gnomic 86—
 lit. tr. of Heb. impf. 86—periphrasis f. 89—w. ὅπως 105—w. μήπως 99—
 w. οὐ μή 96 f.—no *Aktionsart* 86—interchanging w. aor. subj. 97.
- Gender 21–2—agreement 311—fem. f. neut. 6 f., 21—masc. f. fem. (and
 reverse) 21—neut. of persons 21—anomalies 210—variation 21, 22.
 General epistles : position of adj. 8.
 Genesis (LXX) 108 f., 202 ff., 237, 332, 341—s. Index of Ref.
 Genitive : addition to vb. 231–6—adjectival 207–19—after preps. (proper
 and impr.) ch. 18 *passim*—art. w. gen. of nouns 16, 166, 168, 179 f.—
 art. w. gen. of origin, etc. 16—art. w. partit. gen. of country 210—
 compar. 216—appositive (*materiae, epecegeticus*) 214 f.—local and
 temporal 235—objective or subjective 207, 210–12—partit. 7, 208–12—
 position of 217 f.—possessive 207 f., 231—price 258—quality 7, 212–4—
 separation 215 f., 235 f., 258 f.—w. adjs. and advs. 215 f.—w. ἀκούω
 161—chain of 218, 335—in Mark 219.
 Genitive absolute, misused and extended 4, 322 f.
 Geographical names : country in partit. gen. 210, 259—w. and without
 art. 169–72.
 Ghedini, G. 84.
 Gildersleeve, B. L. 166, 170, 171.
 Goodspeed, E. J. 336.
 Goodwin, W. W. 96, 105.
 Gospels : κύριε *sir* 34—γένεγονα 70—πέποιθα etc. 82—fin. inf. 135—art.
 w. Ἰησοῦς 166 f.—position of adj. 349.
 Green, E. L. 191.
 Greenlee, J. H. 255.
- Harry, J. E. 192, 309.
 Harsing, C. 131.
 Hauck, F. 211.
 Hebrew influence—s. Semitisms.
 Hebrews, epistle to : neut. adj. w. dependent gen. 14—ἡμεῖς f. ἐγώ 28—
 fut. inf. 86—fut. pass. ptc. 87—periphr. tenses 89—ἵνα never imperat.
 95—οὐ μή 96—φοβέομαι μή (semi-lit.) 99—ἵνα w. subj. 101—opt. 119,
 120, 121—inf. abs. 136—style 137—inf. w. vbs. of believing, etc. 137—
 artic. inf. 140 ff.—εἰς τό w. inf. (final) 143—supplem. (predic.) ptc.
 158—position of πᾶς 203, 205—partit. gen. w. vbs. 231 f.—ἐν 257—
 aversion to σύν 265—το παρά w. dat. 273—ἕως, ἄχρι, μέχρι 276—μή w.
 ptc. 285—ellipse of εἶναι 299, 307 f.—καθάπερ 319—μέν . . . δέ 331—
 ὅθεν 336—τε 338—δήπου 339—asyndeton 340—position of compar.
 clauses 345—word-order 347, 350.
 Hellenistic Greek *passim*.
 Hendiadys 335.
 Hermas : πρώτα and ὀφίας unclass. 17—comparison 30—οὔτος and
 ἐκεῖνος 45—artic. inf. w. pron. 148—*schema Atticum* 312—s. Index of Ref.
 Herodotus 6, 13, 96, 106, 155, 170, 171, 270, 272, 274, 294, 295, 296, 299.
 Hesychius 50.

Hiatus 28.

Historical books, later (LXX) 61—s. Index of Ref.

"Holy Ghost language" 9.

Homer 22, 28, 32, 36, 106, 195, 252, 337.

Horn, R. C. 105, 115, 119, 120, 122 f., 125, 126.

Howard, W. F. v, 8, 72, 80, 182, 209, 240, 293, 315, 333.

Howes, G. E. 284.

Ignatius 96—s. Index of Ref.

Imperative: pres. and aor. 74-8—perf. 85, 89—periphr. f. 89—replaced by subj. 93-8; by fut. 86; by *ὕνα*-clause 94 f., 102, 129, 305; by inf. 78; by ptc. 293, 303, 308, 310, 343—f. opt. 118—negation 282—asyndeton w. 342.

Imperfect 64-8—retreat before aor. 2, 64—confusion w. aor. 2, 64, 67—conative or desiderative 65, 72—incohesive 65—linear 65—descr. impf. woven w. aor. in narrative 66 f.—iterative 67—f. Engl. plupf. 67—periphr. f. 87—to express necessity 90 f.—impossible wish 91—"unreal indic." 91—condit. clauses 91 f., 116—w. *ἄν* to express repetition 124—w. *ὅταν* 124.

Impersonal constructions: in pass. 291—"they" 292 f.—scil. "the Scripture" 293.

Impersonal verbs 291-3.

Indeclinable: personal names w. art. 167 f.—*πλήρης* 315 f.

Indef. pronouns: attributive 195-7—*ἄνθρωπος* 195—*τις* 195—*εἰς* 4, 195 f.—*-ουν* and *-ποτε* 196—*οὐ . . . πᾶς* 196 f.

Indicative 90-3—*Aktionsart* 91—to express necessity 90 f.—wishes w. *ἄν* 91—unreal ind. w. *ἄν* 91 f.—condit. clauses 91 f.—f. opt. w. *ἄν* 92—w. *ἄν* in subord. clauses in iterative sense 92 f.—impf. ind. after *ὅταν* 92 f., 124, 125—pres. ind. after *ὅπου ἄν* 93; after *εἰάν* 115 f.—fut. ind. w. *οὐ μή* 97, 282; f. imperat. 86; in dubitat. or deliberat. questions 98; after *εἰάν* 116; after *ὅς ἄν* 110; after *ὅταν* 112—pres. and fut. ind. after *ὕνα* 100 f.—relat. clauses 109—after *ὥστε* 136—negation 281 f.—s. Present, Imperfect, etc.

Indirect questions: opt. 130 f., 132—s. Questions.

Indirect statement: opt. 129 f.—*ὅτι* f. accus. w. inf. 148—mixed w. direct 325 f.

Infinitive 134-49—non-class. usage 2, 90, 134, 137, 148, 149—articular 2, 78, 134, 140-6—fin.-consec. 2, 78, 105 f., 134-6—replaced by *ὕνα* or *ὅτι* 2, 134, 137, 138, 139, 148 f.—after prep. 8, 78, 85, 105 f., 142-6—*ἐν τῷ* 8, 144 f.—*εἰς τό* 8, 143—*πρός τό* 144—*τό* 140 f.—*τοῦ* 8, 141, 142—w. *πρίν* 78, 140—of wish (epistol.) 78—imperat. 78—*πρό τοῦ* 78—epexeget. 78, 139—*Aktionsart* 78 f.—pres. and aor. 78 f.—fut. 79—w. *μέλλω* 79—pf. 85—w. function of dat. 134-6—w. various case-functions 136-46—inf. abs. (Gk) 136—w. vbs. *perceive, believe, say*, etc. 136-40—as dir. obj. 137 f.—in impers. phrases 139—w. nouns and adjs. 139—cases w. (nom., acc.) 146-9—negation 281, 285 f.

Inscriptions 22—s. Index of Ref.

Instrumental—s. Dative and *ἐν*.

Interrogative conjunctions: *οὐ* (*οὐχι*) and *μή* 282—*οὐκοῦν* 282, 337—*μήτι* (*γε*) 283—*οὐ μή* 283—*ἄρα* (*γε*) 330—*εἰ* 319, 333—*ἤ* 334.

Interrogatives: confused w. rel. (Hell. Gk.) 4, 49 f., 195—dir. interrog. pron. in indir. qu. 4, 48—pronouns 48-50—*is ὁ* interrog.? 50—exclam. 50—*ποῖος* = *τίς* 48—w. *καί* 334.

Intrans. verbs 51-3—used transitively 2, 51 f.—causative sense 52 f.

Ionic Greek 31, 94, 265, 269, 294, 295, 296, 304.

Ionicism in NT: *ὅστις* f. *ὅς* 47—*ἀνατέλλω* causat. 53—*σύν* with 265—copula 294—*ὥς* 321.

Isaiah (LXX) 132, 140, 203 ff., 271, 272, 274, 279, 332—s. Index of Ref.

Isaeus 97.

Isocrates 18, 170, 171—s. Index of Ref.

James, epistle of : ὡσπερ 320—periphr. tenses 88 f.—ἵνα never imperat. 95—artic. inf. 140—τοῦ w. inf. 142—position of πᾶς 203, 205—ellipse of εἶναι 299, 308.

Jannaris, A. 312, 315.

Jeremiah (LXX) 203 ff., 230, 332—s. Index of Ref.

Jeremias, J. 63, 237, 345.

Jerome 26—s. Vulgate.

Jewish Greek, spoken 4, 9.

Job (LXX) 62, 131, 202 ff.—s. Index of Ref.

Johannesson, M. 33, 335.

John, gospel and epistles : style 1, 5, 25 (like Rev), 34 (artistry), 38 (class. correct), 157 (variety)—πρωτα and δευτερα unclass. 17—*plur. sociativus* in 1 Jn 28—ὁ δέ rare 37—οὗτος foll. by ἵνα, ὅτι, etc. 45—ἐκεῖνος 45 f.—anaphora (οὗτος and ἐκεῖνος) 46—ὅστις rare 47—ὅς 47—ὕπαγω often intrans. 51—hist. pres. favoured (Jn) 60, 61 ; varied w. aor. 61, 62—epistol. aor. 73—strange use of tense 75, 85—pres. ptc. of relatively fut. time 80—pf. favoured 83, 84, 85—periphrasis f. pres., impf., pf. 87, 88, 89—imperat. ἵνα 95—οὐ μή 96 f.—ἵνα preferred to ὅπως 101, 103 f., 105—ὅταν w. subj. 112—ἄν and ἐάν 113—ἐάν w. subj. 114 f.—τοῦ w. inf. varied w. ἵνα 141—art. after prep. rare 142—art. w. prop. names 167—no ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν 155—ἀπεκρίθη λέγων 155—avoids redund. ptes. 155—asyndeton 155—favours co-ordination 155—λέγων 156—ἀπεκρίθη καὶ εἶπεν 156—art. w. Ἰησοῦς 167—favours ἐμός 191—ἕτερος rare 197—position of πᾶς 203, 205—τις never w. gen. 209—κοινωνάω w. dat. 232—case w. ἀκούω 234—εἰς f. ἐν 255—favours ἐκ 260—ἐκ to denote sects, etc. 260—theological ἐν 263—σύν and μετά 265—παρά w. accus. absent 273—ὑπό w. acc. rare 275—prep. repeated 275—ἕως, ἄχρι, μέχρι absent 276—ἐνώπιον rare 277—οὐ varied w. μή, 281—meanings of οὐ πᾶς 282—οὐ 285—copula inserted 294, 299, 303 f.—ellipse before ἵνα 298—καθώς 320—temp. ὡς 321—ὅτι *recit.* 326—οὖν 329, 337—τε rare and uncertain 338—asyndeton 340 f.—γάρ rare 331—μέντοι 340—τότε 341.

Josephus 13, 26, 33, 60, 61, 135, 144, 172, 191, 227, 243, 245—s. Index of Ref.

Jude, ep. of 119, 203, 205, 273, 308—vol. opt. 121.

Judges (LXX) 132, 202 ff., 332—s. Index of Ref.

Jülicher, A. 316.

Katz, P. 277.

Kennedy, H. A. A. 262.

Kilpatrick, G. D. v, 191, 209, 229, 279, 320.

Kingdoms (LXX) 62, 132, 202 ff., 279—s. Index of Ref.

Klostermann, E. 50, 156, 168, 316.

Knabenbauer, J. 316.

Knox, R. A. 335.

Koine : literary 45—and literary language 81—Ptolemaic period *passim*—Imperial 66, 68, 89, 96, 105, 111, 112, 113, 115, 116, 119, 125, 138, 255, 257, 258.

Krebs, F. 143.

L.S. 96.

Lagrange, M.-J. 18, 32, 38, 61, 87, 226, 252, 316, 334, 340, 341.

Laird, A. G. 284.

Lamentations (LXX) 52.

Latin versions 49, 58, 86.

Latinisms (alleged) : γάμοι 27—voc. without ᾧ 33—*aoristic* pf. 71—epistol. aor. 72 f.—plupf. 83—σὺ ἔψη (and pl.) 86—subj. in rel. clauses 109—pass. inf. f. act. w. verba iubendi 138—accus. refl. pron. in accus. w. inf.-construction 147—omission of art. 173—πόλις w. gen. of name 215—δμοιοις w. gen. 216—κονδύλοις ἔλαβεν 241—ὀψέ 278—impers. pass. 291—τί πρός σε ; *quid hoc a te?* 303.

- Lightfoot, J. B. 55, 56.
 Linear action 59, 64, 67, 71, 77, 86, 89.
 Literary features in NT: ὅδε 44—τοῦτ' ἐστίν 45—pf. 83—s. Optative, and *passim*.
 Ljungvik, H. 39, 316, 321.
 Lobel, E. 125.
 Local clauses, position 344.
 Locative—s. Dative.
 Lohmeyer, E. 102 f., 177.
 Lucian 245, 269.
 Lucianic text 80.
 Luke-Acts: style 2, 8, 137, 158—τοῦ w. inf. 8, 142—Septuagintisms 8, 142, 145, 156—art. inf. 8, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144 f., 262—τὰ κατὰ (of general relationship) (Ac) 14—τὰ περί 15—scil. ἡμέρα in dates 17—pl. of ὄχλος 26—meaning of πρῶτος 32—voc. 33—prol. Lk. 33—Latinism 33, 147—word-order 33—Semit. ὁ εἷς . . . ὁ ἕτερος 36—(ὁ) μὲν οὖν (Ac) 37, 337—Semit. redund. of αὐτοῦ (Lk 1) 38—favours unemph. αὐτός 40—demonstr. αὐτός 194—more fond than Mt of ἐαυτοῦ 42—reads ψυχῆ as refl. pron. 43—removes anaphoric οὗτος 45—ὅς and ὅστις confused 47—correcting Mt? 49—ἐκλέγομαι 55—ποιέομαι 56—avoids histor. pres. 60 f.—φησὶν 61—subtlety 75 f.—tenses and Mt 77 f.—fut. inf. (Ac) 79, 86—pres. pf. 82—use of pf. 84—fut. ptc. 86 f.—periphr. f. pres., etc. 87—9—οὐ μὴ 96 f.—φοβέομαι μὴ (semi-lit.) 99—ἵνα w. ind. 100—ἵνα w. subj. 101—imperat. ἵνα 95—stylistic ὅπως (Ac) 106—epexeg. ἵνα 103—ὅπως ἂν 105—ἕως 111—ὄταν w. subj. 112 f.—ἐάν w. subj. 114 f.—atticisms 131—opt. 119, 121, 123, 130 f.—inf. f. result 136—inf. w. vbs. *believe, say* 137—stylistic inf. (Ac) 138—τοῦ w. 2nd fin. inf. 142—τοῦ μὴ consec. 142—aor. inf. of anterior action 145—pleon. ἐγένετο 145—accus. w. inf. 149—avoids ptc. 154—λέγων 156—predic. ptc. 158—rule w. anaphor. art. 166—ἀκούω w. gen. and ptc. (Ac) 161—art. w. place-names (Ac) 170 f.—use of πνεῦμα 175 f.—τό before indir. qu. 182—ἀνὴρ f. τις 195—ἕτερος 197—ἅπας 199—πάντες ἀνθρώποι 200—position of πᾶς 203, 205—adj. gen. 207—κρατέω 232—εἰς f. ἐν 254—σύν 265—κατὰ w. gen. 268—repetition of prep. 275—παρά 272—ἕως, ἄχρι, μέχρι 276—ἐνώπιον 277—οὐ w. ptc. 285—καθὼς 320—temp. ὡς 321—ὡσεὶ 321—δέ and καὶ 322—ὅτι *recit.* 326—gen. abs. 322—ἀλλά 329—ἄρα (γε) 330—γάρ 331—μὲν . . . δέ 331—εἰ in dir. qu. 333—διό (Ac) 333—οὖν 337—τε (Ac) 338, 339—πλὴν 338—τότε 341—ellipse of copula 295, 299, 301, 304 f.
 Lund, N. W. 345.
 Lyonnet, S. 272.
 Maccabees, I 104 (non-fin. ἵνα), 274 (ὄπό)—s. Index of Ref.
 Maccabees, II 60 (hist. pres.,) 130 (opt.)—s. Index of Ref.
 Maccabees, II-IV 274.
 Maccabees, IV 33, 123, 129, 140, 332—s. Index of Ref.
 McNeile, A. H. 341,
 Malalas 134, 298.
 Mantey, J. R. 266 267, 337.
 Marchalianus, codex 44.
 Marcus Aurelius 58.
 Marcus, R. 267.
 Margolis, H. 334.
 Mark, gospel of: C. H. Turner and 2, 254, 292, 342—correct use of pf. 5, 69—πρῶτα and ὀψία unclass. 17—ὅ ἐστίν 48—change of subj. marked by ὁ (οἱ) δέ 37—favours hist. pres. 60, 61, 62—H. St. J. Thackeray and 62—impf. 66, 67—aor. 67—periphr. f. pres., impf. 67, 87, 88, 89,—pres. pf. 82—pf. 83—scribes and 87—position of copula 89—imperat. ἵνα 95—οὐ μὴ 96 f.—ἵνα frequ. 101, 103—non-fin. ἵνα 104—rel. clauses 108—ἕως 111, 276—ὄταν w. subj. 112—ἐάν w. subj. 114 f.—opt. 119—

- wish opt. 121—*ὅταν* w. ind. 125—*εἰ* w. fut. ind. (wish) 127—M. Zerwick and 137, 341, 342—*ἄρχομαι* 138—artic. inf. 141—*ἰδεῖν* w. ptc. or *ὅτι* 161—art. w. *Ἰησοῦς* 166 f.—*ἕτερος* absent 197—word-order w. gen. 217—attrib. and partit. gen. 219—word-order of *εὐθύς* and *πάλιν* 229—G. D. Kilpatrick and 229, 320—constr. w. *ἔρχομαι* 257—*παρά* 272—*παρά* w. acc. only local 273—repet. of prep. 275—*ἐνώπιον* absent 277—impers. "they" 292 f.—insertion of copula 294—ellipsis of copula 299, 306—pl. vb. w. *ὄχλος* 312—*καθώς* 320—gen. abs. 322 f.—*ὅτι* *recit.* 326—*δέ* or *καί* 329, 332, 334—*μὲν* . . . *δέ* 331 f.—*τότε* 341—position of verb 348.
- Mary of Bethany, identification 80.
- Masculine: f. fem. or neut. 21—masculinizing of *πέτρα* 22—pl. incl. masc. and fem. components 22.
- Matthew, gospel of: *πρωτῶν* and *ὀψίαν* unclass. 17—meaning of *πολλοί* 26—pl. of *ὄχλος* 26—oblique *αὐτός* 38—avoids refl. pron. 42—anaphora: prefers *οὗτος* to *ἐκεῖνος* 46—*ὅς* and *ὅστις* confused 47, 48—*ὅ* *ἔστιν* 48—*λέγει* 61, 340—style 66, 158—*γένεθεν* f. pf. 70—Chantraine and pf. 71—tenses and Lk. 77 f.—periphr. f. pres., impf. 88, 89—imperat. *ἴνα* 94—*οὐ μή* 96 f.—epexeg. *ἴνα* 103—non-fin. *ἴνα* 104—rel. clauses 107, 108—and LXX 108—*ἕως* 111—*ὅταν* w. subj. 112—*ἐάν* w. subj. 114 f.—artic. inf. 135, 141—fin. inf. (cp. Mk) 135—*ἄρχομαι* 138—*τοῦ* w. 2nd fin. inf. 142—Semit. *εἰς* 196—*ἕτερος* 197—position of adv. 228—*καί* *ἰδοῦ* 229—*εἰς* and *ἐν* correctly distinct 254—*παρά* w. accus. only local 273—repet. of prep. 275—*ἕως*, *ἄχρι*, *μέχρι* 276—*ἐνώπιον* absent 277—*οὐ* 285—ellipsis of *εἶναι* 299, 309 f.—*ὁ πᾶς* w. ptc. 316—*ὥσπερ* 320—gen. abs. 322—*ὅτι* *recit.* 326—*μὲν* . . . *δέ* 331 f.—*γάρ* 331—*πλήν* 338—asyndeton 340—*τότε* 341.
- Mayser, E. *passim*.
- Meeham, H. G. v, 81, 268, 343.
- Meisterhans, K. 122, 128.
- Menander 18—s. Index of Ref.
- Michaelis, W. 212.
- Middle voice 53—7—in class. Gk. 54—rarely refl. in NT 54—mid. f. act. 54—6—forms tend to merge w. pass. 54—not recipr. in NT 54—pass. f. mid. 56 f.—act. f. mid. 56 f.—not very significant 56—disappearing 56—7.
- Milligan, G. 25, 293.
- Milligan, W. 345.
- Minor Prophets (LXX) 203 f., 274, 279, 332—s. Index of Ref.
- Modern Greek 3, 17, 18, 26, 31, 32, 36, 40, 51, 52, 53, 58, 60, 68, 69, 74, 75, 91, 94, 95, 99, 103, 107, 138, 166, 171, 192, 212, 216, 225, 235, 236, 249, 250, 251, 253, 254, 261, 270, 284, 286, 295, 304, 312, 315, 336, 342, 347.
- Moffatt, J. 317, 336.
- Moule, C. F. D. 73, 86, 152, 178, 211, 233, 234, 245, 249, 267, 269, 271, 291, 292, 317, 337.
- Moulton, J. H. v, 1, 9, 16, 34, 63, 70, 77 f., 86, 96, 143, 147, 168, 194, 233, 248, 261, 269, 293, 308, 315, 316, 343.
- Multiplicatives 187.
- N.E.B. (New English Bible) 95, 102, 137, 143, 143, 145, 146, 151, 176, 181, 187, 212, 335, 336, 348, 350.
- Nauck, W. 337.
- Negatives 94, 95, 281—7, 286 (double).
- Neuter: substantival expressions 13 f.—neut. adj. w. sing. or pl. of persons (collective) 14, 150—plur. adverbially 21—masc. f. 21, 312, 314 f.—fem. f. (Heb.) 21—*ὅ* *ἔστιν* 48—pronom. pred. in neut. (*τι*, *οὐδέν*, *ὅ*, etc.) 311—predic. adj. in neut. 311—sg. and pl. vb. w. neut. pl. 312 f.—*Οὐαί* 315.
- Nissen, Th. 307.

Nominative 230 f.—f. voc. 3, 34 f.—*ad sensum* 230—prop. nouns without syntax 230—parenthet. (*ὄνομα*) 230—incongr. ptc. in nom. 230, 314, 316, 317—of time 231—absol. (*pendens*) 314, 316—indeclinable *πλήρης*, *εἰς*, *ἔχων*, *λέγων*, *λέγοντες* 315.

Norden, E. 347.

Noun: substitutes f. 13–8—ellipse of 16 ff.—as attribute 185.

Number 22–28—agreement 311–4—distrib. sing. 7, 23, 25—collective sing. 22 f.—dual 29, 32—eccentric usage 210, 317—*constr. ad sens.* 311 f.—collective noun w. pl. vb. 311 f.—*ἕκαστος* w. pl. vb. 312—neut. pl. subj. w. pl. vb. (*schema Atticum*) 312 f.—of vb. w. several co-ord. words 313 f.—pl. (not neut) subj. w. sing. vb. 315—s. Singular, Plural.

Numerals 187 f.—art. w. 178 f.—Aram. use 187—w. *τις* 195—s. Distributives, Cardinals.

Oepke, A. 255, 263.

Omission—s. Ellipse.

Optative 6, 114, 117, 118–33—periphrastic 88—survival in LXX and NT 90, 127, 132—dying out 90, 94, 118 f., 120, 124—*πρίν* 113, 140—fut. opt. 118—*aor. opt.* 118—potential 118 f., 120, 122–4, 132 f.—iterative (oblique) 119, 124 f., 126, 128—*volitive* 118 f., 120–2, 127—Byzant. period 119, 125, 126, 130—artificial revival 119, 125, 130, 134—classified 119—main clauses 119, 120–4—subord. clauses 119, 124–32—LXX 119, 120 f., 122, 123, 126, 129—conditional 119, 125–8—comparat. 119, 132—final 119, 127, 128 f.—temp. 119—*ἄν* 120, 122, 124—“urbane” 122—set phrases 123, 131, 132—replaced by indic. 125—indir. speech 129 f.—indir. qu. 130 f., 132—negation 281, 283.

Orators, Attic 91, 106.

Ordinals, cardinals f. 187.

Origen 14, 177, 227, 316.

Ottley, R. R. 93.

Owen, E. C. E. 50.

Pallis, A. 137, 291.

Papyri 7, 8, 22 and *passim*.

Parataxis 9, 155, 334 f., 342.

Parenthesis 127, 342.

Participle 150–62—predicative 150, 158–60—position 79—*Aktionsart* 79, 151—pres., *aor.* 79–81—pf. 85—fut. 86 f., 135, 150, 153, 158—pres. ptc. f. fut. ptc. 87—in periphr. 87–9, 158—w. *ἄρχομαι* 138—w. *χαίρω* 138—attributive 150–3—circumstantial (adv.) 150, 153–8—w. art. 150–3—substantival 150 f.—co-ordinate w. fin. vb. 150, 343—imperatival 150, 293, 303, 308, 310, 343—*πᾶς ὁ* w. ptc. 151—redundant *ὦν* 151 f.—absolute 153, 322 f.—particles w. 153, 154, 157, 158—supplem. 153—modal-temporal 154–7—f. *with* 154—pleonastic 154, 155—f. Heb. inf. absol. 156—concessive 157—causal 157—oblique cases 160—negation 281, 284—*anacoloutha* w. 312, 314, 316—indecl. *λέγων*, etc. 315—*incongruencies* w. 315 f.

Particles 329–40—new compound 4, 329—reduced number and use 4, 329—s. Conjunctions.

Partitive expressions as subj. or obj. 7, 208 f.

Passive 57 f.—of vbs. w. indir. obj. 57 f.—trans. depon. vbs. w. pass. sense 58—w. dat., not *ὑπό* 58—of vbs. w. double accus. 247.

Pauline epistles and Pastorals: adnom. gen. 1—correct use of pf. 5, 69—position of adj. 8—artic. inf. 8, 140, 141 (*τοῦ*), 141 (*εἰς τό, πρὸς τό*), 143 (*εἰς τό*)—neut. adj. w. depend. gen. (not in pap.) 13, 14—neut. expressions f. abstr. noun 13—*οἱ ἐκ ἱστῶν* 15, 260—*τά κατὰ* f. general relationship 14—*τὰ περί* 15—*αἰῶνες* *eternity* 25—*ἡμεῖς* f. *ἐγώ* (*pl. sociat.*) 28—vocative 33—use of *ἐγώ, σύ* 39—*οὗτος* foll. by *ὅνα, ἔτι*, etc. 45—*αὐτό τοῦτο* 45—*ὅς* and *ὅστις* rule 47—*ὅ ἐστιν* 48—*ἐνεργέομαι* 56—epistol. *aor.* 73—*μή τις* w. *aor. subj.* (*f. imper.*) 77—prefers pres.

- to aor. in commands 77—periphr. tenses 88 f.—imperat. *ἴνα* 95—*οὐ μή* 96—*φοβέομαι μή* (semi-lit.) 99—*ἴνα* w. ind. 100—*ἴνα* w. subj. 101—epexeg. *ἴνα* 103 f.—*δταν* w. subj. 112—temp. *ὡς ἂν* 112—*ἕάν* w. subj. 114 f.—opt. 119—wish opt. 121—*μή γένοιτο* 121, 330—*εἰ τύχοι* 125, 133—inf. w. vbs. *believe, say* 137—style 137, 158—*λέγων* 156—supplem. (predic.) ptc. 158—*Ἰησοῦς* and *Χριστός* without art. 167—pf. f. aor. 170—*ὁ κύριος* 174—*νόμος* 177—Colwell's rule 184—*ἕτερος* 197—*πάντες ἄνθρωποι* 200—*οἱ πάντες* 201—position of *πᾶς* 203, 205—mystic gen. 212—*σῶμα* 213—several genitives together 218—dat. of cause 242—*εἰς* and *ἐν* distinct 256—mystic *ἐν* 262 f.—*σύν* 265—repet. of prep. 275—*ἕως, ἄχρι, μέχρι* 276—*μή οὐ* in qu. 283—*μή* w. ptc. 285—ellipse of copula 295, 299, 300-3—*χάρις ὑμῖν, οὐχ ὅλον ὄτι*, etc. 300—*καθάπερ* 319—*καθώς* 320—gen. abs. 322—*οὐχί* 329—*ἀλλά* 329 f.—*ἄρα, ἄρά (γε)* 330—*γάρ* 331—*μὲν . . . δέ* 331 f.—*νοὶ δέ* 331—*δέ* and *καί* 332—*διότι, διό, εἴτε . . . εἴτε* 333—*πλήν* weak 338—*τε* 338—asyndeton 340—parenthesis 342—*anacoloutha* 343—chiasmus 346.
- Pentateuch (LXX) 61, 132, 202 ff., 271, 272, 274, 279—s. Index of Ref.
- Peoples, names of, w. art. 169.
- Perfect: unique features in NT 5, 69, 85—Aram. infl. 5—disappearance through assumption of aoristic functions 2, 68 f., 81—resultative (act., trans.) 5, 69, 82, 83, 84, 85—rarer in NT than Koine 5—Koine 68, 81—aoristic 68-71, 81, 85—Imp. and Byzant. period 68 f.—periphr. f. 69, 81, 88 f.—intrans. in origin 69, 81—stem assumes aor. endings 69, 81—MGr 69—gnomic 73—ptc. 81, 85—*Aktionsart* 81 f., 85—indic. 81-5—pres. meaning 82, 85—pres. forms coined 82—exegesis 84 f.—moods 85.
- Periphrasis in verb 5, 69, 81, 85, 87-9.
- Pernot, H. 135, 297, 304, 335.
- Perry, A. M. 175.
- Personal construction 291 f.
- Personal pronouns: non-class. insertion 3, 4—instead of reflex. pron. (Hell. and Semit.) 3, 41, 42 (even after prep. 42 f.)—gen. preferred to possess. pron. 4—pleonast. after rel. 9, 325—in nom. 37 f., 40—oblique cases 38-40—*ἐγώ, σὺ* in Paul 39—LXX use of nom. 40—*constr. ad sens.* 40—*αὐτός = οὗτος* (demonstr.) 41—position of dat. 349.
- Peter, epistles of: atticism in 2Pt 30—tenses of imperat. (1 Pt) 76—prefers aor. to pres. in commands 77—fut. ptc. 87—periphr. tenses 88 f.—*ἴνα* not imperat. 95—*οὐ μή* 97—opt. 119, 126 f.—wish opt. 121—*ἕτερος* absent 197—artic. inf. 140 ff.—position of *πᾶς* 203, 205—*φείδομαι* w. gen. (class. 2 Pt) 235—*ὑπαρχω* w. dat. (2 Pt) 240—*μή* w. ptc. 285—ellipse of *εἶναι* 299, 308—*καθώς* 320.
- Philo 26, 125, 126, 180—s. Index of Ref.
- Philostratus 159, 299—s. Index of Ref.
- Phonetic confusion 6, 94, 98, 101, 129, 130, 132.
- Phrynichus 158, 232, 320.
- Plato 96, 97, 98, 106, 118, 171, 180, 228, 279.
- Pleonasm: *μᾶλλον* 3, 29—pleonastic pers. pron. after relat. 9, 325—*ἔρχομαι* 138, 154 f.—*ἐγένετο* 139, 145, 148 f., 291, 335—*λαβών, λέγων, ἔχων*, etc. 154, 155—negatives 286.
- Pluperfect 86—periphr. f. 88 f.
- Plural 7, 25-8—f. one pers. (allusive) 7, 25, 26—place-names 26—festivals 26 f.—Sabbath 27—towns 27—pl. f. sing. (class. and non-class.) 27—*pl. poeticus* 27 f.—*pl. modestiae* 28—“cases of” 28—*pl. sociativus* 28—*pl. auctoris* 28—pl. or sing. vb. w. neut. pl. subj. 312 f.—w. several subsjs. 313 f.
- Plutarch 16, 53, 128, 191, 279—s. Index of Ref.
- Polybius 5, 6, 52, 57, 70, 71, 82, 106, 118, 122, 124, 128, 144, 179, 251, 267, 269, 271, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 291, 340—s. Index of Ref.
- Positive: f. superl. (Heb.) 3, 31—w. *παρά*, etc. 7, 29, 31, 32—f. compar. 29, 31—compar. f. pos. 30 f.

- Possessive pronouns 189-192—gen. of pers. pron. f. 4, 189—word-order 189—*ἴδιος* 191 f.
- Prayer, significance of grammar f. 75, 77.
- Predicate : anarthr. demonstr. prons. not necessarily predic. 4—nominal and verbal 11—ptc. 159—predic. adj. without art. 182-4—w. art. 183—position of predic. adj. 183—Colwell 183—pred. noun w. *εἶνα* and dat. 239—*ὧς* with pred. 246, 321—*εἰς* w. pred. 246, 253—predic. accus. 253—*τί, οὐδέν, ὅ* 311—*schema Atticum* 312 f.
- Prepositions 6, 249-80—fluidity in meaning and use 2, 3, 261—theology of 3—increase in number 3—cases w. 6, 249 f., 258—w. inf. 8, 78, 85, 105 f., 142-6—w. proper nouns 170 f.—prep. phrases as attribute 221 f.—improper 250—anomalies 254-7—repetition or non-repet. w. 2nd noun 275—circumlocutions f. 279 f.—w. adv. 250—position of prep. phrase 349 f.
- Present : *Aktionsart* 59 f., 64, 73, 74-6, 107—indic. 60-4, 98, 100 f., 115—subjunc. 94 f., 97, 101, 107, 108 ff., 112, 114—imperat. 74-6—inf. 72, 78 f., 145—ptc. 79-81—in indir. speech ref. to past 2, 64—historic 5, 60-2—perfective 62—futuristic 63—gnomic 63—conative 63, 72—expresses relat. time 80—periphr. f. 87—delib. 98—after *ἵνα* 100 f.—after *ἐάν* 115 f.—in *-στω* 71.
- Prévot, A. 58.
- Procopius of Caesarea 119.
- Prolepsis 3, 9, 41, 74, 325—proleptic attraction 226.
- Pronouns : extended use in Koine 3, 50—indir. pron. disappearing 4—substantival 37-50—proleptic 41—distinctions blurred 50—attrib. 189-97—s. Demonstr., Interrog., Indef., Pers., Possess., Refl., Relat., Recipr.
- Proper nouns w. and without art. 165-9.
- Proverbs (LXX) 131 f., 202 ff.—s. Index of Ref.
- Psalms (LXX) 132, 202 ff., 272—s. Index of Ref.
- Psichari, J. 266.
- Punctiliar action 59, 64, 67, 71, 72, 73, 74, 77, 86.
- Q 332.
- Quality, expressed by art. w. adj. 13 f.
- Questions, direct : *ὅτι* 49 f.—prons. 48-50—dubit. and delib. qu. 98 f.—*οὐ* 282 f.—w. *οὐ μή* 283—conjunctions 282, 283, 319, 330, 333, 334, 337. indirect : 116 f.—and relat. clause 4, 49 f., 195—use of dir. interr. pron. 4, 48.
- RSV 30, 95, 137, 143, 145, 146, 151, 265, 335, 336, 350.
- RV 55, 95, 137, 143, 151.
- RV^{ms} 40.
- Radermacher, L. 120, 124, 125, 126, 128, 135, 283, 316, 321.
- Rahfs, A. 108.
- Reciprocal pronouns 43 f.—refl. pron. f. 43—*εἰς τὸν ἑνα* 187.
- Redundancy—s. Pleonasm.
- Reflexive idea : expressed by act. rather than mid. in Hell. Gk. 54.
- Reflexive pronouns : substantive 41-3—3rd pers. f. all pers. 4, 42—Semit. periphr. f. 7, 43—direct 41-3—indir. 43—accent query 41—not increasing in Hell. Gk. 41, 42—*αὐτοῦ* nearly dead 41—often a substit. f. *ἐμός, σός* 42.
- Reinhold, H. 122.
- Regard, P. F. 302, 303, 304.
- Relative attraction 324.
- Relative clauses 47 f., 106-110—*and* interrog. clause 4, 49 f., 195—f. fin. clause 107, 109—f. condition 107—f. consec. 109—negation 106, 284—w. *ἐάν* or *ἔν* 108—moods 109 f.—w. subj. without *ἐν* 110—ptc. equiv. to 151—include antecedent 324—continued by main clause 325.
- Relative pronouns 47-8—confused w. interr. 4, 49 f.—pleon. pers. pron. in rel. clause 9, 325—w. *μὲν . . . δέ* not class. 36—confusion in Koine

of ὅς and ὅστις, ὅσος and ὅπόσος 47—rules 47 f.—general rel. 47, 107—ὅσπερ 48—ὅ ἐστίν (*i.e.*) 48—ὅ interrog.? 50—ὅς ἄν f. ἐάν τις 107 f.—*constr. ad sens.* 312—rel. attract. and inverse 324.

Repetition : of prep. 275—distrib. doubling 187.

Revelation : usage and style like Jn 25—αἰῶνες *eternity* 25—repet. of pers. pron. 39—τάδε λέγει 44—ὅ ἐστίν 48—pf. f. aor. 69, 70—periphr. tenses 88 f.—fut. f. Heb. impf. 86—imperat. ἴνα 95, 102—οὐ μὴ 96 f.—ἴνα w. fut. ind. 100—ἴνα w. subj. 101—epexeg. ἴνα 104—τοῦ w. inf. (imper.) 141—anarthr. Ἰησοῦς 167—ἕτερος absent 197—position of πᾶς 203, 205—προσκυνῶ w. accus. 245—εἰς and ἐν not confused 255—ἐκ against ἀπό 259—σύν absent 265—παρά w. acc. absent 273—ὑπό w. acc. absent 275—repet. of prep. 275—ἄχρις 276—ἐνώπιον frequ. in 1st part 277—ellipse of εἶναι 299, 310—solecisms 314 f.—ὡσπερ 320—γάρ 331—μέν lacking 332—δέ or καί 332—οὖν 337—few particles 341—parataxis 341—μετά τοῦτο (ταῦτα) 341.

Rhetoric 39.

Rhythm 39.

Rife, J. M. 347, 348.

Robertson, A. T. 80, 255, 283.

Schema Atticum 312 f.

Schlatter, A. 316.

Schmid, W. 135.

Schmidt, K. L. 27, 176.

Schneider, J. 26.

Schrenk, G. 213, 267.

Schwyzler, E. 33.

Scribes' corrections 25, 26, 27, 35, 38, 39, 43, 44, 52, 56, 68, 70, 71, 76, 77, 82, 83, 87, 91, 96, 97, 98, 100, 109, 116, 129, 132, 135, 136, 138, 140, 142, 152, 167, 178, 184, 190, 200, 209, 218, 228, 243, 245, 264, 286, 287, 312, 314, 319, 321, 322, 324, 325, 333, 335, 338, 340, 341, 342, 343.

Selwyn, E. G. 235.

Semitic influence 4, 8, 23, 88, 96 and *passim*—in MGr 32.

Semitiisms 4—interchange of εἰς and ἐν 2, 249, 251, 254–6, 257—pers. pron. : unemph. nom. 3, 37 f. ; oblique cases frequ. and unemph. 3, 38 ; f. refl. 42—pos. f. superl. (Heb.) 3, 31—proleptic pron. (Aram.) 3, 9, 41, 209—reduced number and use of particles 4—hist. pres. 5, 61, 61—perf. aor. (Heb. stative pf.) 5, 72, 73—periphrasis 5, 85, 87–9—partit. expression as subj. or obj. (Heb.) 7, 207 f.—αὐτός demonstr. 7, 41—gen. of qual. f. adj. 7, 212 f.—ἀπό μιᾶς (Aram.) 7, 18, 21—ψυχὴ refl. pron. 7, 43—οὐ . . . πᾶς 7, 196 f.—πᾶς . . . οὐ, εἰς . . . οὐ 196 f.—anarthr. πᾶς 199 f.—case w. vbs. 7—distrib. sing. 7, 23, 25, 187—τοῦ w. inf. 8, 141, 142—ἐν τῷ w. inf. 8, 144 f.—εἰς τό w. inf. 8, 143—position of adj. 8—pleon. pers. pron. after rel. pron. 9, 325—word-order 9, 193—parataxis 9, 155, 334 f., 342—asyndeton (Aram.) 9, 341—fem. f. neut. (Heb.) 21—εἰς κρυπτὴν (Aram.) 21—pl. f. sing. (αἰῶνες, οὐρανοί) 25—true superl. almost dead 31—ἀπό προσώπου 25, 279—pl. of ἡμέρα (Heb.) 27—periphr. w. πρόσωπον, στόμα, χεῖρ 25, 279, 280—pos. f. compar. (Heb.) 29, 31, 32—compar. expressing exclusion (ἢ or παρά f. μᾶλλον ἢ) 32—vocat. 33, 34 f.—Aram. emph. state 34—Heb. constr. state 34, 169, 170, 173, 179 f.—uses of εἰς 36, 187, 195 f.—ὁδε f. οὗτος 44—causatives in—εὐσιν 52 f.—act. form w. pass. meaning (Aram.) 53—ποιέομαι ἔλεος (Heb.) 56—fut. ind. for Heb. impf. (Rev) 86 ; f. imper. 86—pres. ptc. f. fut. ptc. 87—imperat. ἴνα 95, 102, 129, 305—compar. opt. 132—τίθημι ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ, etc. 139—use of inf. (without ὥστε) to express result 134–6—artic. inf. 134—pleon. ἀρχομαι 138, 154 f.—complem. inf. 138 f.—ἐγένετο constrs. 139, 145, 148 f., 291, 335—πρός τό w. inf 144—artic. ptc. as proper noun (Heb.) 150 f.—ptc. f. rel. clause 152 f.—pleon. λαβῶν, λέγων 154, 155—ἔγραψεν λέγων 156—ὁδὸν as prep. 175, 212, 247—ptc. f. Heb. inf. abs. 156—ἐν in

multiplic. 188—distrib. doubling 187—*ἄνθρωπος* f. *τις* 195—*εἰς* in post-pos. 196—*πᾶς ὁ* frequ. 201, 316—*υἰός* 207 f.—*μυριάδες μυριάδων* 210—partit. *ἐν* 210—obj. gen. 212—appos. gen. or gen. of content 214—pron. added to gen. of qual. properly belonging to 1st noun 214—*οὕτως* predic. 226—*fill* w. accus. 232 f.—*γεύομαι* w. accus. 233—*σπλαγγίζομαι* 234, 272—gen. w. verbal adj. 234—*κωλ ὕα ἀπό* 235—eth. dat. 239—*ἔρχεται σοι* 239—*ἀστείος τῷ θεῷ* 239—*γίνομαι* w. dat. 239 f.—dat. of agent w. pass. 240—dat. f. Heb. inf. abs. 241 f.—*ἡμέρα καὶ ἡμέρα* 243—*φοβέομαι ἀπό* 244—*θυνομι ἐν* 244, 252, 255—accus. of content 245—*καλέω τὸ ὄνομα* w. accus. 246—*εἰς* predic. 247—*ἄφαντος ἐγένετο ἀπό* 251—*ἐν instr.* 252 f.—*τοῖς εἰς μακράν* 254—*εἰς ὄνομα* 255—*δίδωμι εἰς place on* 256—*δὸς ἀντί ἐμοῦ καὶ σοῦ* 258—*ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν* 271—pre-position of *ἐνεκα* 276—*ἐν μέσῳ* etc. w. gen. 277—*ὀπίσω* as prep. 277—*ἔμπροσθεν, ἐναντίον, ἐνώπιον* 277 f.—impers. "they" (Aram.) 292 f.—*ὄνομα* without copula 295—*οὐαί* 296—ellipse of *εἶναι* 300—*τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί*; 303, 309—*τί πρὸς σε*; 303, 309—indecl. λέγων, λέγοντες 315—*πᾶς ὅς* 316—*ὁ πᾶς* w. ptc. 316—consec. *ὅτι* 318—weakening of *ἐπεὶ* 318—*εἰ* f. *οὐ* in oaths 319, 333—*εἰ* w. dir. qu. 319, 333—*ὥς* to soften 320—tempor. conj. instead of gen. abs. 321—anacolouthon after rel. clause 325—*ὅτι recit.* 326—*εἰ μὴ* interchanged w. *ἀλλά* (Aram.) 330—*καὶ* introd. subord. clause 334—*τότε* (Aram.) 341—chiasmus 345—7—particle 1st word 347—vb's position in sentence 347 f.—art. close to noun 348 f.

Sentence building 11, book I—sentence complete book II.

Septuagint: *ὅδε* more common than in NT 44—*τῆδε* 44—*ὅστις* confined to nom. and acc. 47—hist. pres. 61—*aor. pf.* 70—*pf.* 82 f., 84—periphr. tenses 89—*ἄφελον* 91—*imperat. ἴνα* 95—*οὐ μὴ* 96 f.—*fin. ἴνα* 102—*non-fin. ἴνα* 104—*ἐάν* w. *impf.* 116—*opt.* 120 f., 122, 123, 125, 126, 127, 130, 131, 133—*inf. of purpose* 135—*τοῦ* w. *inf.* 141—*ἐν τῷ* w. *inf.* 145 f.—*ptc.* 156—rendering of *Yhwh* 174—position of *πᾶς* 202 ff.—piecemeal transl. 237, 337—and *passim*.

Septuagintisms 8, 142, 145, 156.

Sibylline Oracles 25, 26, 27.

Singular 22—5—distrib. sing. 7, 23, 25—w. collectives (generic) 22 f.—*ἐκαστος* w. pl. 312—vb. w. neut. pl. subj. 312 f.—w. *compd. subj.* 313 f.—w. fem. pl. 315.

Sirach (LXX): *πρὶν* 140—*πᾶς* 202 ff.

Slavery (Paul's advice) 76.

Slotty, F. 95.

Soffray, M. 35.

Solecisms 93, 314—7.

Solomon, Psalms of 96, 203 ff.

Sophocles 49, 96, 97—s. Index of Ref.

Sophocles, E. A. (lexicographer) 58.

Souter, A. 22.

Stählin, G. 245.

Stauffer, E. 40.

Strabo 13, 14, 71, 118, 159, 299.

Style 137—*desire* f. variety 67, 105, 109 f., 113, 135, 142, 157.

Subject 11—absence of 291—3, change of, marked by *ὁ (οἱ) δέ* 37.

Subjunctive 93—117—more often without *ἄν* in Hell. Gk. 2—*Aktionsart* 74—8, 107—*periphrastic* 88—9—*confused* w. *opt.* in wishes 94, 120—*πρὶν* 113, 140—as substitute for *opt.* 119.

Use in main clauses 93—9—*prohib. subj.* 74, 76—8, 94, 95—as *substit. f. imperat.* 93—8; *f. fut.* 98—*jussive* 94—*hortat.* 94—*imperat. ἴνα* 94 f.—*οὐ μὴ* w. *aor. subj.* (*prohib. and denials*) 96 f., 97; w. *pres. subj.* 97—w. *μὴ* f. *cautious statements* 98—in *dubit. or delib. qu.* 98 f.—*οὐ μὴ* in *qu.* 283.

Subord. clauses 99—117—*fearing* 99—*after μὴ* 99 f.—*after ἴνα* 100—5—*neg. μὴ* 100, 105, 106—*fin. clause* 100—6—w. *ὅπως, ὥς* 105 f.—w. *ὥστε*

- 106, 136—in rel. clauses (futuristic) 106–10—in temp. clauses 110–13—w. ὅτε (late) 112—condit. clause 113–6—w. εἰ 116—indir. qu. 116 f.
 Subordination 318–23, 342 f.
 Swete, H. B. 221.
 Superlative: relative 3, 31—true superl. almost dead 31—comparison of 31—f. comparat. 32.
 Symmachus 85, 113, 330.
 Synagogue 6, 132.
 Temporal clauses 92, 110–3, 321—ὡς ἔν in Paul 112—πρίν 113, 140, 144—μέτα τό w. inf. 143—πρό τοῦ 140, 144—ἐν τῷ 144 f.—w. ptc. 154–7—ἐπί 272—position 344 f.—negation 284.
 Temporal conjunctions 110–3, 321.
 Tense 59–89—s. Time, *Aktionsart*.
 Text of NT 31 f., 40, 70, 84, 86, 92, 97, 122, 152, 167, 181, 184, 295, 346—readings rejected 37, 38, 41, 70, 106, 110, 129, 139, 141, 167, 170, 171, 209, 229, 331.
 Thackeray, H. St. J. 61, 62, 279, 315, 335.
 Theophylact 52.
 Thomas, D. W. 239.
 Thompson, F. E. 96.
 Thucydides 13, 84, 88, 96, 106, 171, 228, 275, 340—s. Index of Ref.
 Time: kinds of 59—ambiguity in Gk 60—pres. and aor. ptc. 79–81.
 Tischendorf, C. 183.
 Tobit: non-fin. ἔν 104—πρίν 140—πᾶς 203 ff.—s. Index of Ref.
 Tragedians 27.
 Transitive verbs 2, 51–3—from intr. 2, 51 f.—used absol. 51—pass. sense of trans. depon. 58.
 Trenkner, S. 334.
 Turner, C. H. 2, 254, 271, 326, 342.
 Turner, N. 2, 97, 192, 201, 252, 275, 276.
 Unreal indicative 91 f.
 Venetus, codex 44.
 Verbal adjectives 89, 91.
 Vettius Valens 128, 245—s. Index of Ref.
 Vocative 3, 33–5—use of ὦ 33—emotion in 33—nom forms f. 3, 34 f.—position 33—κύριε *sir* 34—explan. of anarthr. nom. 35.
 Voice 2, 51–8—s. Active, Middle, Passive.
 von Soden, H. 93.
 Vulgate 30, 35, 50, 65, 73, 181, 208, 256, 259, 272, 333.
 Wackernagel, J. 22, 63, 265, 270, 271, 273, 276, 293.
 Weiss, J. 345.
 Wellhausen, J. 347.
 Westcott, B. F. 143, 143.
 Westcott and Hort 183.
 Western readings 17.
 Winter, P. 325.
 Wishes: infin. 78—indic. 91—opt. 118 f., 120–2—ἵνα w. subj. 120.
 Word-order 344–50—unique in Bibl. Gk. 9—prep. and case 5, 276, 278—voc. 33—copula in periphr. tense 89, 348—ἔν 92, 93, 107, 110—ἵνα-clause 105, 344—ptc. and adjuncts 152—adj. attrib. 189 f., 349—poss. adj. and gen. of poss. pron. 189 f., 191—ἴδιος 192—attrib. pron. 193—οὗτος, ἐκεῖνος 193—τις 195—εἷς 196—πᾶς 201–5—prep. phrase 209, 349, 350—attrib. and partit. gen. 217 f.—adv. 227–9—several gens. 218—main and depend. gen. 218, 349—negative 286 f.—attrib.-subj. 296—καθώς-clause 320—ὥστε-clause 320—gen. abs. (Mk) 322—antec. of rel. clause 324—rel. pron. 324—conj. 329, 330, 340, 347—μενοῦν

338—τε 339—τοιγαροῦν, τολυον 340, 347—fin., local, temp. clauses
344—causal and comp. clauses 345—chiasmus 345-7—subj.-obj.-vb.
347 f.—in the clause 347-50—normal 347—set phrases 350—art. close
to noun 348—oratory and 350—ambiguity 350.

Xenophon 16, 61, 65, 96, 97, 106, 118, 143, 170, 171, 228—s. Index of
Ref.

Zerwick, M. 26, 35, 42, 50, 50, 56, 57, 65, 72, 75, 79, 80, 87, 114, 115, 127,
145, 178, 201, 207, 210, 212, 214, 215, 233, 236, 255, 256, 259, 263, 285,
316, 341, 342, 347.

Ziegler, J. 44, 230.

Zorell, F. 316.

INDEX OF GREEK WORDS

- Ἄβραάμ 168
 ἀγαθόν, τό 13, 14—τὰ ἀγαθὰ 14
 ἀγαλλιάω w. ἵνα 138—w. ptc. 160
 ἄγαλμα, ellipse of 17
 ἀγανακτέω περί w. gen. 269
 ἀγαπάω, ingress. aor. 72
 ἀγάπη w. gen. 211, 214
 ἀγαπητός 214—w. gen. 234
 ἀγγαρεύω ἵνα 138
 ἄγγελος anarthr. 174, 180
 ἄγε 51, 231
 ἄγιος, ὁ 13—τὸ ἅ. 2—τὰ ἅ. 27, 31
 (superl.)
 ἀγιάζομαι, aor. imperat. 77
 ἀγνίζω pass. 57
 ἀγνοέω not w. ptc. 161
 ἀγορά anarthr. 179
 ἀγριέλαιος 18
 ἀγρός anarthr. 179
 ἄγω: intr. 2, 51—aor. imper. 76—
 impf. 66—fut. ptc. 87—ἄγει τρίτην
 ταύτην ἡμέραν 291
 ἀγωνίζομαι pf. 84
 ἀδελφός, scil. w. gen. 168—plur. 22
 ἀδικέω intr. 51—pass. "submit to
 fraud" 57—perfect. pres. 62
 Ἄδριας 172
 ἀδυνατόν, τό 13—scil. ἐστίν 295,
 306, 307, 309
 ἄδω 236
 ἄζυμα 27
 ἀθεμιτόν ἐστίν 149
 ΑἸθῆναι 27—Ἀθηναῖοι w. art. 169
 ἀθῶς ἀπό 215
 Αἴγυπτος anarthr. 171
 αἵματα 27—ἐν τῷ αἵματι 241
 αἰνέω 236
 αἰρέομαι 78
 αἶρω, intr. 52—gen. w. 232—aor.
 imper. 76, 77
 αἰσθάνομαι w. acc. 234—not w. ptc.
 161
- αἰσχρόν (ἐστίν) 149, 295, 300
 αἰτέω: act. and mid. 54 f.—futuristic
 pres. 63—constr. w. 149—pres.
 imper. 75
 αἰών: pl. 25—ὁ ἄ. οὗτος, ἐκεῖνος 193
 ἀκατάπα(υ)στος w. gen. 215
 ἀκμήν 247
 ἀκολουθεῶ: constr. 241—impf. 66—
 pres. imper. 76, 77—aor. pf. 82
 ἀκούω: case w. 2, 161, 233—perfect.
 pres. 62—aor. pf. 82, 84 f.—ptc.
 160 f.
 ἀκριβέστερον 3, 30—ἐστατος 31
 ἀκροβυστία w. gen. 211
 ἄκρος: predic. 225—τὸ ἅ. w. gen.
 224
 ἄλατι instr. 240
 ἀλείφομαι 54
 ἀλεκτοροφωνίας 235
 ἀλήθεια: anarthr. 177 f.—ἐπ' ἀλη-
 θείας 253
 ἀλήθινος, ὁ 13
 ἄλλὰ 329 f.—w. γε 331—w. ἵνα 304,
 307, 330—w. καί 330
 ἀλλήλων 43 f.
 ἄλλος: f. ἕτερος 32, 197—position
 187—ἅ. πρὸς ἄλλον 44—ἄλλοι
 ἄλλο 197
 ἀλλότριος w. gen. 235
 ἄμα: w. ptc. 153 f.—w. dat. 276
 ἄμαρτάνω: ingr. aor. 72—pres. imper.
 76
 ἄμαρτία anarthr. 177
 ἀμετάθετον, τό 14
 ἀμήν, τό 14
 ἀμύνομαι f. -ω 55
 ἀμφί absent 249
 Ἀμφιπόλη 171
 ἀμφοότεροι: f. more than two 32—
 w. art. 197
 ἄν 107 f.—w. ind. 2, 91 f., 93, 110
 —w. subj. 2, 108—ἄν f. ἐάν 91,

- 113—w. opt. 91, 120, 122-4, 127, 130f.—position 92, 93, 110—
 ὅπως ἂν 94, 105—w. fut. ind. 110
 —w. ἕως ἄχρι μέχρι 110, 111—
 ὡς ἂν 112 f., 321
 ἀνά: τὸ ἄ. 14—ἄ μέσον 23, 251,
 265—distrib. 187—uses curtailed
 249—not w. dat. 249—w. acc. 265
 ἀναβαίνω: pass. meaning 53—futura.
 pres. 63—ἀνάβη ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν
 αὐτοῦ 292
 ἀναγινώσκω constr. 137
 ἀναγκάζω impf. 65
 ἀνάγκη: pl. 28—constr. 148—no
 ἔστιν 295, 300, 307, 309
 ἀνακάμπω intr. 52
 ἀναμιμνήσκω constr. 234
 ἀναπαύομαι constr. 235
 ἀναπληρόω: w. ἕνα 102—w. dat.
 238
 ἀναστρέφω(-ομαι) intr. 52
 ἀνατέλλω: causat. 53—gnom. aor. 73
 ἀνατίθεμαι w. dat. 242
 ἀνατολή: sg. and pl. 26—anarthr. 26,
 172
 ἀναφαίνω causat. 53
 ἀνεμος ellipse 17
 ἀνένδεκτόν ἐστιν τοῦ w. inf. 141,
 286, 305
 ἀνεσις w. dat. 219
 ἀνευ w. gen. 275 f.
 ἀνέχομαι constr. 234
 ἀνέωγα 5, 82
 ἀνήκεν 90
 ἀνὴρ: ὃ ἄνδρες 33—f. τις 195
 ἀνομολογέομαι w. dat. 236
 ἄνθρωπος: οἱ ἄ. one 180—f. τις 195
 —πάντες ἄ. 200
 ἀνθύπατος 26
 ἀνίστημι: ἀναστάς 154
 ἀντέχομαι w. gen. 232
 ἀντί: use curtailed 249—ἀντι τοῦ
 w. inf. 144—w. gen. 258—ἀνθ'
 ὦν (ἔτι) 258, 345—compound
 vbs. constr. 242
 ἀντικρὺς w. gen. 277
 ἀντιλαμβάνομαι w. gen. 232
 ἀντιπέρα w. gen. 216
 ἀντλάω pf. 34
 ἄνω 279—τὰ ἄ. 14
 ἀνωφελές, τό 14
 ἄξιός constr. 139, 141, 295
 ἀξιώω constr. 149—ἡξίου 65
 ἄρατα, τὰ 14
 ἀπαγγομαι 54
 ἀπαιτέω 292
 ἀπαλλοτριώω constr. 235
 ἀπαρνέομαι 58
 ἄπας 199
 ἀπειθέω constr. 237
 ἀπειθής constr. 220
 ἀπείραστος κακῶν 215
 ἀπεκδύομαι 55
 ἀπέναντι w. gen. 6, 278
 ἀπελθών pleon. 154
 ἀπέχω intr. 52—f. ἀπειλήφα 62—
 ἀπέχει 291, 336—ομαι constr.
 235
 ἀπιστέω constr. 237
 ἀπό: f. partit. gen. 7, 208 f.—ἀπὸ
 μιᾶς 7, 18, 21—οἱ ἀπὸ 15—ἀπὸ
 προσώπου 25—w. adj. 215 f.—
 gov. nom. 230—w. vbs. 233,
 258 f.—f. παρά w. ἀκούω, etc.
 233 f., 258 f.—ἀπὸ τοῦ στόματος
 233—f. gen. of sep. 235, 251—
 ἀπὸ τότε 250—f. far from 251—
 encroaches on ἐκ, ὑπὸ 251, 259—
 w. φεύγω 244—f. ὑπό (causat.) 258
 —w. gen. 258 f.—f. country of
 origin 259—f. after 259—ἀφ' ἧς
 17
 ἀπογράφομαι act. 57
 ἀποδίδωμι: futur. pres. 63—fut. pf.
 87
 ἀποθνήσκω: pass. sense 53—futura.
 pres. 63
 ἀποκόπτομαι 57
 ἀποκρίνομαι: constr. 237—ἀποκριθεὶς
 εἶπεν, etc. 61, 79, 155 f.—ἀπε-
 κριθῆ 54, 79
 ἀποκτείνω pass. 53
 ἀπολλύω 82
 Ἀπολλωνία 171
 ἀπολογέομαι w. dat. 236
 ἀπολούομαι mid. 54
 ἀπολύω impf. 67
 ἀπόλωλα 82
 ἀπορέομαι 56—constr. 244
 ἀπορίπτω intr. 52
 ἀποσπάω act. f. mid. 56
 ἀποστέλλω: aor. pf. 70, 84—constr.
 266
 ἀποστερέω: intr. sense 51, 52—pass.
 submit to loss 57—constr. 235
 ἀποστρέφω intr. 51 f.

- ἀποτάσσομαι w. dat. 236
 ἄπτομαι: pres. imper. 76—w. gen. 232
 ἄρα, ἄραγε 330, 347—ἄρα οὖν 330
 ἄρα, ἄρά γε 330, 333
 Ἄραβία: art. 170, 171
 ἀργύριον 17—pl. 27
 ἀρέσκω: constat. aor. 72—constr. 236
 ἀριστερά (χείρ) 17
 ἀρέομαι 57 f.
 ἀρκετῶν 139, 295, 309—ἀρκετός 220
 ἀρμόζω mid. f. act. 55
 ἀρνέομαι: aor. imper. 76—s. ἀπαρ-
 νέομαι
 ἄρτι position 228
 ἀρχομαι: pleon. 138—ἀρξάμενος 154
 f.—adverbial 227
 ἀρχήν, τήν 49 f., 247
 ἀσεβής, ὁ 13, 22
 ἀσθενές, τό 14, 21
 ἀσθενέω pf. 70
 Ἄσtia, ἡ 170
 ἀσπάζομαι: pres. 73—aor. imper. 75, 77
 ἄσπιλος ἀπό 216
 ἄσσον 30
 ἀστεῖος τῷ θεῷ 239
 ἀστήρ anarthr. pl. 172
 ἀστοχέω constr. 235
 ἄστρον anarthr. pl. 172
 αὐλίζομαι impf. 67
 αὐρα ellipse 17
 αὐριον: ἐπαύριον 17
 αὐτόματος adj. f. adv. 225
 αὐτός: not emph. 3, 40—demonstr. 7, 41, 194—confusion of αὐτός etc. w. αὐτός 41; of αὐτοῦ and ἴδιος 2; of αὐτοῦ and ἑαυτοῦ 41—αὐτοῦ frequ. and pleon. 38 f.—*he* emph. 40 f.—possess. gen. 40, 189 f.—in reflexives 41 f.—αὐτός ὁ 41, 194—αὐτό τοῦτο 45—ὁ αὐτός constr. 183, 194—τὸ δ' αὐτό constr. 246—position of dat. 349
 ἄφες w. subj. 94
 ἀφήμι: futur. pres. 63—aor. imper. 77—constr. 138—οὐκ ἀφίω 287
 ἀφίσταμαι constr. 235
 ἀφυπνώω ingress. aor. 72
 Ἄχατα: art. 170
 ἄχρι(ς): w. gen. 276—conj. 110 f.—*ἄ. οὐ* 276, 345
- βάαλ, ἡ 21
 βάλλω: intr. 51, 52—futur. pres. 63—impf. 67—gnom. aor. 73—proleptic aor. 74—aor. and pf. 84—fut. f. impf. 86
 βαπτίζω: mid. and pass. 57—impf. 67—periph. tense 87—ptc. 151
 βάπτισμα w. gen 211
 βασιλεία ἐν 241
 βασιλεύω 2, 52, 62, 64, 71—ingress. aor. 72—pres. imper. 76
 βασιλεύς voc. 34
 βαστάζω pres. imper. 77
 βάτραχος, ἡ 22
 βιάζομαι pass. 58
 βιβλίον art. 173
 βλασφημέω 245
 βλασφημία 26
 βλέπω: constr. 138, 160 f.—βλέπετε 78
 βορρᾶς anarthr. 172
 βούλομαι: constr. 78—impf. 65, 91—βούλεσθε w. delib. qu. 98
 βουλή ἐγένετο ἵνα 139
 βραδύνα w. gen. 235
 βραδύς constr. 141
 βρέχει: trs. and intrans. 52—impers. and pers. 291
 βροντή γέγονεν 291
 βρώμα ἵνα 139
 βύσσινος 17
- Γαλιλαία, ἡ 170
 γαμέομαι: w. dat. 238—*Aktionsart* 79—*-ίζομαι get married* 57
 γάμος pl. 27
 γάρ 331, 347
 γε 331, 347
 γέμω, γεμίζω: constr. 233: aor. imper. 77
 γενέσθαι 27
 γεννάω: futur. pres. 63—τὸ γεννω-
 μένον, τὸ γεγεννημένον 21—aor. pf. 70—γεννητός w. gen. 234
 γένος: τῷ γένει 221
 γεύομαι w. acc. and gen. 233
 γῆ: ellipse 16, 170—w. Ἰούδα, Ἰουδαία 170—w. Ἰσραήλ 169—art. w. 174 f.
 γίνομαι: γέγονα 5—γέγονεν f. ἐγένετο 70—futur. pres. 63—ἐγενήθημεν 54—aor. imper. 77—μὴ γένοιτο 118, 120-2—w. ptc. in periph. 87,

- 89—w. τί 130—ἐγένετο w. inf. 139, 148 f., 291; w. fin. vb. 335; ἐν τῷ w. inf. 145—fut. ptc. 86 f.—w. adv. 226—w. gen. 231—w. dat. 239 f.—w. εἰς 253
- γινώσκω: pass. 58—pf. 70, 84—ingress. aor. 71—gnomic aor. 74—constr. w. 160 f.
- γλώσσα ellipse 17, 18
- γνήσιον, τό 14
- γνώμη τοῦ w. inf. 141 f.
- γογγύζω pres. imper. 76
- γονεῖς, οἱ 22
- γράμματα 176
- γράφω: impers. pass. 5, 292—in epistles 73—pres. imper. 76—pf. 84, 85—constr. 149—w. λέγων 156
- γρηγορέω: pres. imper. 75, 77—new verb 82
- γυνή: art. w. 173 f.—f. τις 195
- δαμόνια *schema Atticum* 313
- δακρύω ingress. aor. 72
- δαμάζομαι pass. constr. 240
- δέ 329, 331 f.—position 347
- δεῖ constr. 139, 148, 291—supply w. inf. 78—δέον (ἔστιν) 88, 291, 295, 305, 308, 322—ἔδει 90, 148, 291
- δειγματίζω intr. 51
- δέω w. double accus. 247—δέομαι constr. 146, 149
- δεισιδαίμων comp. 30
- δέκα, οἱ 178
- δεκάμηνος, ἡ 17
- δέκατον, τό 17, 210
- δεξία 17
- δέρω: πολλάς, ὀλίγας 18, 246, 247
- δεσμεύομαι impf. 67
- δεσπότης, ὁ (voc.) 34
- δεῦρο, δεῦτε: w. subj. and imper. 94
- δευτεραῖος 225
- δῆ 333
- δῆλον ὅτι 295, 300
- δημοσία 18
- δήποτε 196
- δήπου 339
- διά: encroaches on simple case 236—w. gen. 267—w. acc. 267 f.—διά τοῦ w. inf. 144—διά στόματος 25, 280—διά χειρός 280—διά τό w. inf. 85, 142 f., 147, 345
- διαθῆκαι 27
- διαγρηγορέω linear aor. 71
- διακονέω: pres. imper. 77—impf. 67—w. dat. 236—pass. 57
- διαλέγομαι impf. 66
- διαλείπω w. ptc. 159, 226
- διάλεκτος ellipse 17
- διαμένω 82
- διαμερίζομαι: impf. 67—mid. 54
- διαρρήγνυμι f. mid. 56
- διατελέω w. ptc. 159, 226
- διατρίβω constat. aor. 72
- διαφημίζω perfect. aor. 72
- διδασκός w. gen. 211, 234
- διδάσκαλος, ὁ (voc.) 34
- διδάσκω: aor. pf. 70—w. double accus. 246—pass. w. accus. 247
- δίδωμι: futur. pres. 63—impf. 66, 67—aor. pf. 70, 83, 84—aor. and pres. imper. 76, 77—fut. f. impf. 86—opt. δῶ 100, 128 f.—w. εἰς 256—impers. δώσουσιν 293—δὸς ἐργασίαν 76, 99
- διέρχομαι: futur. pres. 63—impf. 66—constat. aor. 72
- δικαίος, ὁ 13, 22, 23—δικαίον ἔστιν 295, 300
- δικαιοσύνη: constr. 211—ἐν δ. 252
- δικαιῶ gnom. aor. 73
- διό 333
- διόπερ 333
- διοπετές, τό 17
- δίοτι 161, 318, 333, 345
- διψᾶω w. accus. 232, 244
- δογματίζομαι *submit to rules* 57
- δοκέω: constr. 78, 137, 147—pres. imper. 76
- δοκιμάζω constr. 147, 160, 162
- δοκιμεῖον, τό 14
- δῶλω, ἐν 252
- δοξάζω: impf. 66—prolept. aor. 74—constr. 242, 246
- δουλεύω: perfect. pres. 62—ingress. aor. 71—w. dat. 236
- δουλόω 56
- δραχμή ellipse 17
- δύναμαι: constr. 78, 138—ἔδυνατο *could have* 90
- δυνατός: constr. 78, 139, 147, 238—δυνάτον (*scil. ἔστιν* or *ἦν*) 295, 297, 300, 305, 306, 309—τὸ δυνατόν 14
- δύο δύο 187

δύο *second* 315

δυσμαί *anarthr.* 26, 172

δωρεάν 247

δῶρον 295, 309

ἐάν 109, 113 f., 115 f.—instead of εἰ
(w. indic.) 107, 115 f.—δς ἐάν
107 f.—ἐάν καί 321—f. ἄν 2

ἐάω: οὐκ ἐῶ 287

ἐαυτός f. 1st or 2nd p. 42

ἐαυτοῦ: f. ἀλλήλων 43 f.—and αὐτοῦ
41—indir. refl. 43—in Lk 42—
position 190

ἐβδομή, ἡ 17

ἐβδομηκοντάκις ἑπτα 187

ἐγγίζω: pf. 5, 82—ingress. aor. 72—
constr. 241

ἐγγύς: case 216—as predic. 226

ἐγείρω: intrans. 52—pass. w. act.
meanings 57—futur. pres. 63—
ἐγήγηρται *he is risen* 69—pres.
imper. 75—ἐγρήγορα 82—ἐγερθεῖς
154

ἐγκαίνια 27

ἐγκακέω w. ptc. 159

ἐγκαλέω: pass. 57—constr. 236, 242

ἐγκαταλείπω perf. aor. 72

ἐγκόπτω constr. 245

ἐγώ: μου f. ἐμός 4—literary pl. 28—
use of nom. 37 f.—μου and ἐμοῦ
38, 189—emph. obl. cases 39—
ἐμοῦ f. ἐμαυτοῦ 42—possess. gen.
189—position of μου 189

ἔθνη: *anarthr.* 180—*schema Atticum*
313

ἔθος ἐστίν constr. 149

εἰ 115 f.—wish-clause 91—f. ἐάν (w.
subj.) 107, 116—εἰ καί 115, 321—
w. opt. (final) 127—εἰ γε 319—
whether 319, 333—oaths, etc. 319,
333—εἰ οὐ 319—dir. quest. 319,
333—εἰ μή 333—εἰ μή f. ἀλλά
330—εἰ δὲ μή (γε) 331

εἰδέναι: constr. 160, 162—οἶδα perf.
pres. 62, 82

εἶθε w. ind. 91

εἰθισμένον, τό w. gen. 234

εἶμι, εἶναι: perf. pres. 62—imperat.
fut. 86—fut. ptc. 86—in periph.
5, 85, 88 f., 153—ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν
230—ptc. redund. 151 f.—ellipse
231, 294-310—w. dat. 240

εἶπερ 319, 330

εἶπεν: and ἔλεγεν 64—εἰπών 155 f.
—w. ἵνα 103—πρός 237

εἶπώς 127

εἰρήνη w. dat. 304, 308

εἰς: εἰς κρουπτήν 6—εἰς τό w. inf.
8, 85, 106, 135, 141, 142, 143—
ὁ (οἱ) εἰς 15—εἰς χειρας 24, 280
—encroaches on simple case 236,
251, 253—w. λογίζομαι 246—w.
ἔχω, etc. (predic.) 246, 247—
γίνομαι, εἶμι 253—f. ἐπί, πρὸς 258
local 266—distrib. 266—final
266—causal 266 f.—confused w.
ἐν, see ἐν

εἰς: indef. art. 4, 195 f.—ἀπὸ μιᾶς
7, 18, 21—μία f. πρώτη 17, 187—
ἐν fem. 21—ὁ εἰς . . . ὁ ἕτερος 36
—εἰς τὸν ἕνα 187—ἐν τριάκοντα
188—w. partit. gen. 195—εἰς τις
196—καθεὶς 197—εἰς ἕκαστος 198
—*cmpd. vbs. constr.* 242

εἰσάγω aor. 69

εἰσακούω 251

εἰσέρχομαι linear aor. 71

εἰσφέρω aor. imper. 77

εἴτε . . . εἴτε 302, 319, 333

εἴωθα 82

ἕκαστος 198—*anarthr.* 198—diff.
from πᾶς 199—w. pl. vb. 312

ἐκβάλλω futur. pres. 63

ἐκδίδομαι mid. 55

ἐκεῖ: redund. after ὅπου 46—f. ἐκεῖ-
θεν 226—temp. 226

ἐκεῖθεν: οἱ ἐ. 14—f. ἐκεῖ 226

ἐκεῖνος 5, 45 f., 192 f.—ἐκεῖνος
(scil. τῆς ὁδοῦ) 16—*anaph.* 46—
simply *he* 46—meaning 45 f.—
ἐκεῖνου possess. 190—art. 192

ἐκολλησία: *anarthr.* 176—*constr. ad
sens.* 312

ἐκκλίνω intr. 52

ἐκκόπτω 63

ἐκλέγομαι mid. 55

ἐκλεκτός w. gen. 234

ἐκρίπτω: f. ἐκβάλλομαι 53—*gnom.*
aor. 73

ἐκπλήσσομαι impf. 66

ἐκτός: w. gen. 216, 277—ἐ. εἰ μή 321

ἐκχέω: w. gen. 234—w. dat. 238

ἐλαία ellipse 18

Ἑλλαιῶν ὄρος 230

ἔλαττον, τό f. persons 14, 21

ἐλάυνω impf. 67

- ἐλαφρόν, τό 14
 ἐλάχιστος 31—ον w. ἴνα 139—
 -ότερος 31
 ἐλεῶ: trans. 234, 244—*aor.* 69
 ἐλεύθερος: ἀπό, ἐκ 215—w. *dat.* 238
 ἐλευθερώ ἀπό 235
 Ἑλλάς w. *art.* 170—Ἑλληνες 26,
 169—ἐλληνική, ἡ 17
 ἐπιίζω: *impf.* 66—w. *fut. inf.* 79—
 ἡλπικα 82, 84—*constr.* 238
 ἐμαυτοῦ 41—*position* 190
 ἐμαυτῶ f. μοι 42
 ἐμβάπτομαι *mid.* 55
 ἐμμένω *constat. aor.* 72
 ἐμός: disappearing 42, 191—μου f.
 4, 189
 ἐμπαίζω *constr.* 242
 ἐμπορεύομαι *tr. and intr.* 244
 ἐμπροσθεν 6, 278 f.
 ἐμφανής *constr.* 220
 ἐν 260 f.—*confused w.* εἰς 2, 249,
 251, 254—6, 257—*extension* 6—*f.*
partit. gen. 7, 208, 210—ἐν τῷ
 w. *inf.* 8, 142, 144 ff.—οἱ ἐν 15
 ἐν χειρὶ 24, 280—*encroaches on*
simple case 236, 241, 251—3, 264
 f.—*f. instrum. dat.* 240, 252 f.—
 w. accompanying circumstances,
 forces, etc. 241, 252—*adv.* 250—
temp. 252, 262—*manner* 252—*f.*
gen. of price 253—*of cause* 253—ἐν
 μέσῳ 257—*in quot. formulae* 261—
 local 261 f.—ἐν Χριστῷ κυρίῳ 262
 —*Christian use* 262 f.—*other uses*
 265—*compound vbs. constr.* 242
 ἐναντι w. *gen.* 278
 ἐνάντιος: *constr.* 220—ἐξ ἐ. 16—
 -ιον w. *gen.* 251, 277
 ἐνδέχομαι *constr.* 291 f.
 ἐνδιδύσκω: *constr.* 247—*impf.* 66
 ἐνεδρεύω *trans.* 244
 ἐνεκα (-εν) 276—ἐ. τοῦ w. *inf.* 144—
position 5, 276
 ἐνεργέω *trans. and intr.* 244—
 -έομαι 56
 ἐνέχω: *intr.* 52—w. *dat.* 242
 ἐνθυμέομαι w. *accus.* 245
 ἐνι 308
 ἐνοντα, τά 247
 ἐνορκίζω *constr.* 244
 ἐνοχος *constr.* 175, 215
 ἐντέλλομαι *constr.* 142
 ἐντολή ἴνα 139
 ἐντός: w. *gen.* 216, 277—τό ἐντός
 14
 ἐντρέπομαι w. *accus.* 234, 245
 ἐντυγχάνω *constr.* 242
 ἐνώπιον 251, 277
 ἐξ, ἐκ: *extended use* 249—*f. partit.*
gen. 7, 208—10, 233—οἱ ἐκ 15,
 260—ἐκ τοῦ w. *inf.* 144—ἐλεύθε-
 ρος ἐκ 215—w. *buy* 234—*f. dat.*
of sep. 235—*f. country of origin*
 259—*causal* 259 f.—*confused*
w. ἀπό 259—*as subj. gen.* 259—
instrum. 260—w. *fill* 260—w.
 στόμα, χεῖρ 24, 280
 ἐξαμαρτάνω *causat.* 52
 ἐξαπορέομαι τοῦ w. *inf.* 141
 ἐξαιτής 17
 ἐξέρχομαι: *linear aor.* 71—*aor.*
imper. 76—w. *fin. inf.* 134
 ἔξοστιν: *constr.* 149—ἐξόν (*soil.*
 ἐστιν) 88, 291, 295, 300, 304,
 309, 322—ἐξῆν *absent* 91
 ἐξῆς, (ἐν) τῇ 17
 ἐξίστημι *impf.* 66
 ἐξομολογέομαι w. *dat.* 236
 ἐξουσία *constr.* 139, 141, 211
 ἔξω: w. *gen.* 216, 277—ἐξωθεν
 w. *gen.* 216
 ἐορτή 243
 ἐπαγγέλλομαι 58—*constr.* 236
 ἐπάν 112 f., 344
 ἐπανάγω *intr.* 51
 ἐπάνω: f. ἐπί 251—w. *gen.* 279—
 ἐπάνωθεν f. ὑπέρ 251
 ἐπεί, ἐπειδή 318, 321, 344, 345
 ἐπέκεινα 26
 ἐπερωτάω *impf.* 65, 67
 ἐπέχω *intr.* 52
 ἐπηρεάζω w. *dat.* 7, 245
 ἐπί 6, 250—w. *accus.* 272—ἐφ' ὅσον
 272—w. *gen.* 271—ὁ ἐπί 15—ἐ.
 στόματος 280—w. *dat.* 271 f.—
 ἐφ' ᾧ 134, 272, 345—*cause* 272—
compd. vbs. constr. 242
 ἐπιβάλλω *intr.* 52
 ἐπιδείκνυμι *mid.* 55
 ἐπιεικής, τό 14
 ἐπιθυμέω: *constr.* 232, 244—*impf.*
 66
 ἐπικαλούμενος, ὁ 152, 206
 ἐπιλαμβάνομαι w. *gen.* 232
 ἐπιλανθάνομαι: *constr.* 58, 234—
gnom. aor. 73—*pres. imper.* 76

ἐπιμένω w. ptc. 159, 226
 ἐπιούσα, ἡ 17
 ἐπιποθία w. τοῦ w. inf. 141
 ἐπίσταμαι constr. 160, 162
 ἐπιστέλλω τοῦ w. inf. 142
 ἐπιστολαί, αἱ 27
 ἐπιστρέφω, -ομαι intr. 52
 ἐπιτάσσω constr. 149
 ἐπιτελέομαι 55—w. dat. 238
 ἐπιτρέπω 58—punctil. pres. 64
 ἐπιτυγχάνω constr. 232
 ἐπιφαίνω intr. 52
 ἐπιχορηγέω constr. 236
 ἐπτάκις, τό 14
 ἐπτάμηνος, ἡ 17
 ἐργάζομαι pass. 58
 ἐργασίαν, δός 76, 99
 ἔργον w. gen. 211
 ἔρημος, ἡ 13, 16
 ἔρις pl. 28
 ἐρρέθη ὅτι 291
 ἔρρωσο 85
 ἔρχομαι: perfect. pres. 62—ὁ ἐρχόμενος futuristic 63, 151—*aor.* pf. 70—ἔρχου, ἔλθέ 75—ἔρχου καὶ ἴδε 75—*impf.* 66—*aor.* 69—w. *fin.* inf. 134—w. dat. 238, 239
 ἐρωτάω: *impf.* 65, 67—*aor.* 65—w. ἵνα 138—w. inf. 149
 ἐσθίω constr. 244
 ἐστέρα anarthr. 179
 ἐστηκα meaning 5, 53, 82
 ἔσχατος 32—ἐπ' ἐ. τῶν ἡμερῶν 271
 ἔσω 216, 276
 ἐταῖρε 50
 ἔτερος: confused w. ἄλλος 32, 197—ὁ ἔ. 197
 ἔτι 333—w. comp. or pos. f. comp. 29, 31—position 228
 ἐτοιμάζω *aor.* imper. 77—*pf.* 84
 ἔτοιμος constr. 139, 141, 142
 εὐαγγελίζω: *causat.* 2, 53—*ομαι* 58, 291—constr. 245, 246
 εὐαγγέλιον constr. 210, 211
 εὐαρεστέομαι pass. 57
 εὐδοκέω: *ingress. aor.* 72—constr. 244
 εὐδοκία 213
 εὐεργεσία constr. 212
 εὐθύς, -έως 153—in Mk 229
 εὐκαιρία τοῦ w. inf. 141
 εὐλογήμενος: *superl.* 31—w. gen. 234—*scil.* ἐστίν 296, 305
 εὐλογητὸς ὁ θεός 296, 308

εὐπάρεδρον, τό 14
 εὐρίσκω: *pass.* 58—*act. f. mid.* 56—*pf.* 84—*impf.* 66—*fut. ptc.* 87—constr. 160, 162
 Εὐρώπη, ἡ 170
 εὐσεβέω trans. 244
 εὐσχημον, τό 14
 εὐχαριστέω constr. 160
 εὐχαριστία w. dat. 219
 εὐχομαι: *impf.* 65, 91—εὐξαίμην ἄν 91—constr. 236
 ἕως: *conj.* 344—ἐ. τοῦ w. inf. 144
 Ἐφεσος 171
 ἔχω: τῇ ἐχομένη (ἡμέρᾳ) 17—*intr.* w. adv. 51, 52—ἔσχηκα f. *aor.* 70, 83—*ingress. aor.* 72—*imperat. inf.* 78—*have to, know* 138—ἔχων with 154—ἔχων *indecl.* 315—w. ptc. 160, 162—*have as* w. double acc., ὡς, εἰς, ὅτι 226, 246—ἔχομαι w. gen. 232
 ἕως: w. gen. 276—*conj.* 110 f., 321—w. ἄν, οὐ, ὅτου 111
 ζῆλοι pl. 28
 ζηλόω *mid.* 55
 ζάω: *ingress. aor.* 71—constr. 264
 ζητέω: *futur. pres.* 63—*pres. imper.* 75
 ἡ 7, 216, 334—w. positive 31—f. μάλλον ἢ 32, 216—ἢ . . . ἢ 334
 ἦ 333
 ἡγέομαι: w. acc. and inf. 137—w. ptc. 162—w. double acc. 246—ἡγῆμαι *pres.* 82, 84—ἡγούμενος noun 151
 ἦκα 62, 82
 ἡλίκος *excl.* 50
 ἡλιος 172
 ἡμεῖς: f. ἐγώ 28—*use of nom.* 37—*position of ἡμῶν* 189
 ἡμέρα: *ellipse* 17, 18—*pl. f. sing.* 27—*art.* 179—w. gen. of qual. 213—(ἐν τῇ) ἡμέρᾳ 243—ἡμέρᾳ καὶ ἡμέρᾳ 243—τὴν ἡμέραν *per day* 247—(τὸ) καθ' ἡμέραν 247
 ἡμέτερος 191
 ἡμισυ, τὰ ἡμίσεια, w. gen. 210
 ἡνίκα 112 f., 321, 344
 ἦπερ 32
 ἡσυχάζω *ingress. aor.* 72

- θά 138
 θάλασσα art. 174 f.
 θάνατος anarthr. 175—θάνατοι 28
 θάπτομαι 62, 69
 θαυμάζω: aor. imper. 77—constr. 234, 244, 269
 θεά 22
 θεάομαι 58—constr. 160 f.
 θελήματα 28—θέλημά ἐστιν ἵνα 139
 θέλω 78—impf. *I would like* 65, 91
 —periph. fut. 89—w. ἵνα 103, 138—adverbial 227—w. accus. 244
 θεμέλιον 13
 θεός: gender 22—voc. 34, 35—
 anarthr. 174—θεοῦ 212
 θεοστυγεῖς 234
 θερμαίνομαι 54
 θεωρέω constr. 160 f.
 θησαυρίζω pres. imper. 76
 θλιψίς w. dat. 219, 238
 θήσκω: pf. τέθηκα 5, 69, 82
 θριαμβεύω causat. 53, 244
 θυγάτηρ 35
 θυμῶ ingress. aor. 72
 θύρα sing. and pl. 27—w. gen. of
 direction 212
- ἰάομαι pass. 58—punctil. pres. 64
 ἴδε 231
 ἴδιος 2, 4, 191 f.—ἰδίᾳ 18—κατ' ἰδίαν
 18
 ἰδοῦ: καί l. 229—ἴδε without syntax
 231—without fin. vb. 296, 303,
 306, 309
 Ἰεροσόλυμα 27—Ἰερουσαλήμ 171 f.
 Ἰερουργέω trs. 244
 Ἰησοῦς art. 166 f.
 ἰκανός constr. 139, 147, 220—ἰκα-
 νόν 305
 ἰκετηρία 18
 ἰλάσκομαι: *be merciful* 57—constr.
 244
 Ἰλωσ (σοι) 309
 ἰμάτιον: ellipse 17—pl. 27
 ἵνα 2, 2, 8 f., 128, 134, 138 f., 141—
 imperat. 94 f.—final 100 f., 105 f.
 —w. indic. 100 f.—ecbatic 102—
 causal 102 f.—epexeg. 103 f., 129
 —ἀλλ' ἵνα 304, 307, 330—ellip-
 tical 304, 305—temporal 321—
 position 344
 Ἰόππη art. 171
 Ἰορδάνης, ὁ 172
- Ἰουδαία, Ἰούδα 170—Ἰουδαῖοι art.
 169—Ἰουδαίος, ὁ 22
 ἵππος, ἡ 22
 Ἰσα 21—Ἰσος 220
 Ἰσραήλ, ὁ 169
 Ἰστημι aor. imper. 77
 ἰσχύω constr. 138
 ἰσχυρά, τὰ 21
 Ἰταλία, ἡ 170
- καθά 345—καθάπερ 319, 320, 345
 καθαιρέομαι constr. 235
 καθάπτω f. mid. 56
 καθαρίζω ἀπό 235
 καθαρός: ἀπό 215—w. dat. 220, 239
 καθ' εἰς 197, 268, 317—τό κ.ε. 197
 καθέδω impf. 66
 καθῆκεν 90
 κάθημαι impf. 66
 καθίζω: perf. aor. 72—constat. aor.
 72—aor. and pf. 70—aor. pf. 82
 καθό 320
 καθότι 318, 345
 καθώς 320, 345—scil. ἐστιν 297, 307
 καί: κ. ταῦτα w. ptc. 157—art.
 w. nouns connected by κ. 181—ὁ κ.
 206—καί . . . καί, τε . . . καί 329,
 334, 335—varies w. δέ 329, 332,
 334—ἤ κ. 334—introducing
 apodosis 334—copula 334 f.—
 after ἐγένετο 335—κ. ἰδοῦ 335—
 epexeg. 335—καί τίς *who then?*
 335—κ. νῦν 335—εἰ κ., s. εἰ—ἐάν κ.,
 s. ἐάν—κ. ἄν, κ. ἐάν, s. κἄν
 καίγε 331
 καίπερ w. ptc. 153, 157
 καιρός: pl. 27—constr. 139, 141—
 anarthr. 179—w. οὗτος and νῦν
 193
 καίτοι (γε) 157, 339
 κακά, τὰ 14—κακόν (soil. ἐστιν) 295
 κακῶ fut. ptc. 87
 καλέω: linear aor. 71—pf. 84
 imperat. fut. 86—ὁ καλούμενος
 152, 206—w. double acc. 246—
 w. εἰς, ἐν 264
 καλλιέλαιος, ἡ 18
 καλόν 90, 295, 309—constr. 139,
 149—τό καλόν 13—τὰ καλά 2, 14
 —καλός superl. 31
 καλῶς constr. 245—κάλλιον 30
 κἄν 100, 321
 καρδία, distrib. sing. 23

- καρποφορέω act. and mid. 55
 καρτερέω trans. 244
 κατά: w. accus. 268—as adv. 187—
 x. *μόνας* 18, 21—x. *ἴδιαν* 18—x.
 πρόσωπον 25—τὸ (τὰ) x. 15, 247
 —οἱ x. 15—w. gen. 268
 καταβραβεύω w. acc. 234
 καταγινώσκω pass. 58
 καταδικάζω 236, 245
 καταδουλόω 56
 κατακληρονομέω causat. 53
 κατακλίνω w. double acc. 247
 κατακρίνω: fut. ptc. 86—constr. 236
 —w. *θανάτω* 240
 καταλαμβάνομαι mid. 55
 καταλείπω futur. pres. 63
 καταμανθάνω pres. imper. 76
 κατανεύω constr. 142
 κατανόεω: gnom. aor. 73—w. ptc.
 160 f.
 καταπαύω: intr. 52—constr. 235
 καταράομαι w. accus. 7, 245
 καταργέομαι futur. pres. 63—prolept.
 aor. 74
 κατέναντι 6, 278
 κατεργάζομαι 58
 κατηγορέω pass. 58—w. *πρός* 237
 κάτω 279—τὰ x. 14
 καυματίζομαι w. acc. 245
 καυχάομαι constr. 236
 κε, κεν 124
 Κεδρών, ὁ 172
 κείρομαι *have one's hair cut* 57
 κείμαι perf. pres. 62, 82
 κελεύω: impf. 65—constr. 78, 148,
 236
 κενόν, εἰς 266
 κέντρον pl. 27
 κεφαλή distrib. sing. 24
 κηρύσσω: impf. 67—imper. inf. 78
 Κηφᾶς 22
 Κιλικία art. 170, 171
 κινδυνεύω constr. 138
 κλαίω: pres. imper. 76—*aor. imper.*
 76—*imperativ. inf.* 78—constr. 244
 κλέπτῃς, ὁ 180
 κληρονομέω constr. 232, 244
 κλίνω intr. 52
 κλοπή 28
 κοιμάομαι 62—*ingress. aor.* 72
 κοινωνέω w. gen. 232, 241
 κοινωνία constr. 211
 κοινωνός constr. 215
 κοινῶ pf. 69
 κολλάομαι w. dat. 241
 κόλπος pl. 27
 κοπιᾶω aor. pf. 82
 κόπτομαι constr. 244
 κόσμος: *anarthr.* 174f.—w. *οὗτος* 193
 κράζω and *κέκραγα* 82
 κρατέω: pres. and aor. imper. 77—
 ingress. aor. 72
 κράτιστε voc. 31
 κρεῖττον ἤν 90
 κριθαί 27
 κρίνω: constr. 78, 238—*pf.* 84—
 mid. 142
 κρούω pres. imper. 75
 κρυπτά, τὰ w. gen. 14—*εἰς κρυπ-*
 τήν 6, 21
 κτίζω pf. 70
 κυκλόθεν 277—*κύκλω* 221, 251
 κυλλομαι 66
 κύριος: pl. 22—*κύριε sir* 34—*ὁ x.*
 (*voc.*) 34—*anarthr.* 167, 174
 κωλύω constr. 235
 λαγχάνω constr. 141
 λάθρα 226, 277
 λαλέω: impf. 67—*aor. pf.* 70, 84—
 fut. ptc. 87—constr. 237, 238
 λαμβάνω: *aeoristic εἰληφα* 69 f., 82,
 84—*gnom. aor.* 73—*pleon. λαβών,*
 λάβετε 154—*-ομαι w. gen.* 232
 λάμπω *ingress. aor.* 72
 λανθάνω w. ptc. 159, 226
 λαός: ὁ λ. μου (*voc.*) 34—*w. constr.*
 ad sens. 311 f.
 λατρεύω w. dat. 236
 λέγω: λέγει hist. pres. 5, 60 f.—*τάδε*
 λέγει 44—*asyndetic λέγει* 61, 340
 —*ἔλεγεν* 67, 68; and *εἶπεν* 64, 68
 —*aeoristic εἶρηκα* 69, 70, 83—
 imperat. fut. 86—w. *ἵνα* 103—*w.*
 double accus. 147—*w. pers. accus.*
 149—*ὁ λεγόμενος* 152—*λέγων,*
 λέγοντες 155 f., 315—*impers. ἔλε-*
 γον 292—*ellipse of subject* 293
 λεγιών 21
 λείπομαι w. gen. 235
 λῆαν position 227 f.
 Λιβύη, ἡ 170
 λῆμός gender 7, 21
 λογίζομαι: w. inf. (*ὅτι*) 137—
 w. double acc. 246—*w. εἰς* 246—
 pass. 58

- λογομαχέω imperat. inf. 78
 λόγος constr. 180, 212, 220
 λοιπόν, τό 336—τοῦ λοιποῦ 235
 λούω: mid. 54—constr. 235
 λύω: impf. 65—aor. imper. 76—
 constr. 235—act. f. mid. 56
 λυπέομαι ingress. aor. 72
 λυσιτελεῖ constr. 292
 λυτρόω constr. 235
- μαθητεύω causat. 53, 244
 μακάριος without vb. 102, 296, 300,
 303, 305, 310
 μακράν 247—w. gen. and ἀπό 216
 —predic. 226
 μακροθυμέω aor. imper. 77
 μαλακοί, οἱ 13, 17
 μάλλον: pleon. 3, 29—w. pos. 31—
 ellipse of 32, 216
 μακνᾶνω constr. 146, 160
 Μαρίαμ, -ία art. 168
 μαρτυρέω: aor. pf. 82—constr. 146,
 238—parenthet. 342—pass. 57
 μαρτύριον, τό 14
 μάχα 28
 μάχαιρα: ἐν μ. 252
 μάχομαι constr. 241
 μέγας superl. 31—μέγιστος 29 f.
 μεθίστημι constr. 235
 μεθοδεῖται 28
 μεθύσκομαι 240—pres. imper. 76
 μεῖζων: as superl. 29—μεῖζον 21
 μέλει constr. 269
 μέλλω: w. inf. f. impf. 79—w. fut.
 inf. (Ac) 79—w. inf. f. fut. 89
 μέν . . . δέ 165, 331 f., 347—μέν οὖν
 37, 337—μενοῦν γε 338, 347
 μένω: constat. aor. 72, 77—aor.
 imper. 77
 μεντοί 340
 μεριμνάω: pres. and aor. imper. 76,
 77—constr. 238
 μέρος: ellipse 17—pl. f. *district* 26
 μεσονύκτιον: anarthr. 179—temp.
 gen. 235
 Μεσοποταμία, ἡ 170
 μέσος: predic. 225—τό μέσον 14—
 ἀνά μέσον 23—ἐν μέσῳ w. gen.
 257—w. ἐκ, διά 267
 μεστός w. gen. 215
 μετά 6—not w. dat. 249—w. acc.
 269—μετά τό w. inf. 85, 143—
 asyndetic μετά ταῦτα 341—w. gen.
- 268 f.—and σύν 265, 268 f.—w.
 λέγω, etc. 237—encroaching on
 simple dat. 236—in composition
 269
 μεταδίδωμι w. acc. 231
 μεταίρω intr. 52
 μεταλαμβάνω w. gen. 231
 μεταμορφόομαι w. dat. 240
 μετανοέω pres. imper. 75
 μεταξύ w. gen. 277
 μετέχω constr. 231
 μετοικεσία constr. 212
 μέτρον: (ἐν) ᾧ μέτρῳ 253
 μέχρι(ς): conj. 110 f., 276, 345—
 μ. οὖ 111, 276, 345—τοῦ w. inf.
 144—prep. w. gen. 276
 μή 4, 231—7—w. aor. subj. (prohib.)
 74, 76—8, 94—μή οὐ 98, 283—
 μή γένοιτο 118, 120—2—τό μή w.
 inf. 141—τοῦ μή w. inf. 142—
 interrog. 282 f.—in hesit. qu. 283—
 πᾶς . . . μή 287
 μηδέ 286, 340
 μῆν 336
 μήποτε 98, 99—neg. 98
 μήπως 99
 μήτε . . . μήτε 340
 μήτηρ scil. 168
 μήτι (γε) 283
 μικρόν (ἔστιν) 295, 303—μικρότερος
 30
 Μίλητος 171
 μνησκαω: constr. 234—ἐμνήσθην
 pass. 58—μέμνημαι 82
 μισέω: ingress. aor. 72—pf. 84
 μνημονεύω constr. 234
 μοιχάομαι ἐπί 272
 μοιχεῖται 27
 μόνος: and adv. μόνον 225 f., 228—
 οὐ μόνον . . . ἀλλά 295—ὁ μ. 13—
 κατά μόνος 18, 21
 Μυσία, ἡ 170
 μωρά, τά of persons 14, 21—τό
 μωρόν 14
- νά 95, 103
 ναί 286, 336—τό ναί 14
 νεκροί anarthr. 180
 νέος comp. 30
 νή 336
 νικῶν, ὁ perfective 62
 νίπτομαι aor. imper. 77
 νωέω constr. 240

- νομίζω: impf. 66—aor. imper. 77—
w. inf. or *ἔτι* 137
- νόμος: anarthr. 173, 177—constr.
212
- νότος anarthr. 172
- νῦν 153—τὸ νῦν 14—as adj. 222—
position 228
- νοὐὶ δέ 331
- νύξ 179, 235—*νυχθήμερος* 17
- ξηρά, ἡ 16, 17
- ξηραίνω: gnom. aor. 73—prolept.
aor. 74
- ξηράομαι 57
- ὁ, ἡ, τό: s. Article—as voc. 34—as
pron. 36—ὁ μὲν . . . ὁ δέ 36—ὁ δέ
37—ὁ καὶ 206—ὁ, τό, οἱ, τὰ w.
gen. 16, 166, 168, 179 f.—οἱ ἐκ
15, 260—τὸ, τὰ ἐκ 14—τὸ, τὰ
κατά 14—τὸ, τοῦ, τῶ w. inf. 8,
78, 85, 105 f., 139, 140 f., 142—6
ἵδε 44, 192
- ὀδός ellipse 16, 18—ὀδόν w. gen.
versus 175, 212, 247—ὀδῶ w.
πορεύομαι 241
- ὀθεν f. *where* 226—conj. 336, 344
- οἶδα, s. εἰδέναι
- οἶδε 43
- οἶομαι: pres. imper. 76—constr. 137
- οἰκία constr. *ad sens.* 311 f.
- οἶκος, voc. w. art. 34
- οἰκουμένη, ἡ (scil. γῆ) 17
- οἰκτιρῶ 28
- οἶος 46 f., 49—w. superl. 31—excl.
50—οὐχ οἶον *ἔτι* 295, 300
- ὀλίγος: τὸ ὀλίγον 13—ὀλίγας *δέρο-*
μαι 18, 246—ὀλίγου w. aor. absent
91—ἐν ὀλίγῳ 262
- ὀλος art. 199—*δι' ὀλης νυκτός*, etc.
199
- ὀμιλέω: impf. 66—constr. 241
- ὀμνυμι: pres. and aor. imper. 75, 76—
constr. 137, 244
- ὀμοιος case 216, 220
- ὀμολογέω constr. 162, 236, 291
- ὀμως 337
- ὀνειδίζω w. acc. 245
- ὄνομα: τοῦνομα 239—*ῶ δ.*, οὐ τὸ δ.,
καὶ τὸ δ. αὐτοῦ, δ. αὐτῶ, ὄνοματι
220, 230, 295 f., 303, 304 f., 306,
310
- ὀπισθεν w. gen. 277
- ὀπίσω w. gen. 6, 277
- ὀποῖος 49
- ὀπόσος 47
- ὀπότεν 124
- ὀπότε 321, 345
- ὀπου 46, 109, 116—scil. *ἔστιν* 297
—*ἔπου ἄν* w. ind. 93
- ὀπως 49, 94, 102, 105 f., 128, 138
—w. *ἄν* 94, 105
- ὀράω: pass. ὀπτάνομαι, ὄφθην 58—
aor. pf. 70—*ὄρα* (ὄρατε) μή 78—
pf., plu pf. 84, 85—σὺ ὄψῃ and
pl. 86—constr. 160
- ὀρατά, τὰ 14
- ὀργίζομαι: ingress. aor. 72—constr.
234
- ὀρεινή, ἡ 16
- ὀρκίζω constr. 244
- ὄς, ἡ, ὅ: confused w. *ὅστις* 2, 47 f.,
117; w. *ὅσος* 47; w. *τίς* (is *ὅ* dir.
interr.?) 49 f.—*ἄφ' ἧς* 17—*ἡ* w.
superl. 31—*ὅς μὲν . . . ὅς δέ* 36—
ὅ ἔστιν 48—*ὅτι* dir. interrog. 49 f.
—f. *τίς* 50—*ὅς ἕάν* 108—*ὅς ἄν* w.
indic. 110—*ὅς γε* 331
- ὄσος: confused w. *ὅς* 47; w. *τίς* 49—
w. *ἕάν* 108—excl. 50
- ὄσπερ 48
- ὄστις 110—confused w. *ὀπόσος* 47; w.
ὅς 47 f.—*ὅ* *τι* w. indir. qu. 49—
dir. interrog. 50—w. subj. without
ἄν 108
- ὄσφύς distrib. sing. 24
- ὄταν 2, 112 f.—w. ind. 92 f., 107,
112, 124, 125—position of clause
344
- ὄτε 321—w. subj. 107, 112
- ὄτι: s. *ὅστις*—declarative 134, 137,
148, 161, 306—f. inf. 2, 137—
w. superl. 31—*why?* 49 f.—nega-
tion 284—scil. *ἔστιν* 297, 309—
οὐχ (οἶον) *ἔτι* 298, 303—consec.
318—causal 318, 345—*recit.* 325 f.
—clause-order 344
- οὐ 4, 281—7, 338—τὸ οὐ 14—οὐ μή
w. subj. 95—8; w. fut. 96 f.—
οὐ . . . πᾶς (πᾶς . . . οὐ) 196 f.,
287—in questions 282 f.—οὐ 286
—οὐ . . . οὐ 286—οὐ . . . οὐδέ (μή
. . . μή δέ) 286—οὐ πάντως 287—
οὐ . . . ἀλλά 329—οὐ μόνον . . .
ἀλλά 329
- οὐαί 260, 296, 306, 308, 309, 315

οὐδέ 340
 οὐκοῦν 282, 337
 οὖν 329, 337 f.—ἄρα οὖν 330—
 position 347— -οὖν 196
 οὐρανός: sg. and pl. 25—*anarthr.*
 174 f.
 οὔτε . . . οὔτε 340
 οὗτος 192 f.—αὕτη f. τοῦτο 21—
 αὐτή and αὕτη confused 40—*deictic*
 44—*w. anaphora* 44 f., 46—*pro-*
nominal 44 f.—αὐτὸ τοῦτο 45—
 pointing forward to ὅτι, ἴνα, ἐάν,
 infin. 45, 139—τοῦτο μὲν . . . τ.
 δέ 45—*elliptical* τοῦτο δέ 45—
 τούτου possess. 190—*art.* 192—
asyndetic μετὰ τοῦτο (ταῦτα) 341
 οὕτω(ς): *w. ptc.* 154—*as predic.* 226,
 303—ὡς . . . οὕτως 320
 οὐχί 96, 282, 286, 329
 ὀφείλω: *intr.* 51—ὀφειλον 90—*ὀφε-*
λον 91, 295, 300—*constr.* 141
 ὀφειλέτης *constr.* 238
 ὀφθαλμός *anarthr.* 179
 ὄχλος: *constr. ad sens.* 311—ὄχλοι
 πολλοί 7, 26
 ὀψέ: ἐγένετο 226—ο. σαββάτων 278
 ὀψία 17
 ὀψιμον *scil.* ὑετός 18
 ὀψώνιον pl. 27

 παῖς, ἡ (voc.) 34—οἱ παῖδες 22
 πάλαι, ἐκ 260
 πάλιν in Mk 229
 Παμφυλία *art.* 170
 πάντοτε position 228
 πάντως οὐ (οὐ πάντως) 287
 παρά 6, 250, 272—*w. acc.* 273—
w. pos. and comp. 3, 7, 29, 31,
 216, 251—*w. inf.* 144—*w. gen.*
 273—οἱ π. 16—τὰ π. 15—ἀπό f.
 233 f. 258 f.—*w. dat.* 273—
cmpd. vbs. constr. 242
 παραβιάζομαι 65
 παραγγέλλω: *punctil. pres.* 64—*impf.*
 65, 67
 παράγω *intr.* 51
 παραδίδομαι: *futur. pres.* 63—*aor. pf.*
 83—*fut. ptc.* 86, 151
 παραινέω *constr.* 149
 παρακαλέω: *impf., aor.* 65—*constr.*
 142, 149
 παραλαμβάνω *Aktionsart* 79
 παραπλήσιον case 216

παρατηρέομαι 55
 πάρειμι *perfective* 62
 παρέχομαι 56
 παριστάνω *pres. and aor. imper.*
 76, 77
 παρησία *constr.* 241
 πᾶς: position 5, 201-5—πᾶς . . . οὐ
 (οὐ . . . πᾶς) 7, 196 f., 287—πᾶς
 ὅστις (ὅς) 21, 316—ὁ πᾶς and pl.
 21, 201—πᾶς ὁ *w. ptc.* 151, 197,
 316—*anarthr.* 199 f.—*w. art.*
 200 f.—πάντων f. fem. 316—
anacoluthon w. 316
 πάσχα, τὰ 27
 πάσχω: *pres. imper.* 76—*aor. pf.* 82
 —*w. ὑπό* 53
 Πάταρα 27
 πάτηρ: *voc.* 34, 35—*art.* 174
 παύομαι *mid. constr.* 159, 235
 πειθαρχέω *constr.* 7, 237
 πείθω, -ομαι: *constr.* 137, 138, 237
 —*perf. pres.* 62—πέπεισμαι 82,
 137—*s. πέποιθα*
 πεινάω *w. acc.* 232, 244
 πέμπω *epistol. aor.* 73
 πενθέω: *trans. and intr.* 244—*aor.*
imper. 76
 πεινθεροί, οἱ 22
 πέποιθα: *constr.* 237, 242—*pres.*
sense 5, 82
 πέραν *w. gen.* 216, 278
 περί 6—not *w. dat.* 249—*w. acc.* 270
 —οἱ π., τὰ π. 15, 16, 270—*w.*
gen. 269 f.—*w. σπλαγχνίζομαι,*
μεριμνάω, μέλει 269—*w. ἐγκα-*
λέομαι 231—*w. θαυμάζω* 269—
interch. w. ὑπέρ 270—τὰ π. *w.*
gen. 15, 269
 περιάγω: *intr.* 51—*w. double acc.*
 246
 περιβάλλω: *aor. imper.* 77—*w.*
double acc. 246
 περιβλέπομαι *mid.* 55—*impf.* 66
 περιέχω *intr.* 52, 292
 περικύκλω f. περί 251
 περίοδος *ellipse* 17
 περιπατέω: *pres. imper.* 75, 77—
aor. imper. 76
 περίχωρος, ἡ 16
 πέτρα, πέτρος 22
 πηλίκος *exclam.* 50
 πίνω *constr.* 244
 πίπτω: *impf.* 66—*fut. f. impf.* 86

- πιπράσκω: impf. 67—pf. 70, 84
 πιστεύω: constr. 137, 237 f., 247,
 263—pass. 57, 247, 291—impf.
 67—ingress. aor. 71—pres. and
 aor. imper. 75 aor. pf. 82
 πίστις constr. 211, 263
 πιστός constr. 220
 πλειστός, ὁ 30—τὸ π. *at most* 31
 πλείων: (οἱ) πλείονες 30, 172—
 πλείων 21
 πλεονεκτέω trans. 244
 πληγή ellipse 18
 πλήθος *w. constr. ad sens.* 312
 πλὴν prep. *w. gen.* 278—*advers. conj.*
 338
 πλήρης: constr. 215—*indecl.* 315 f.
 πληροφορία *w. gen.* 211
 πληρώω: act. and mid. 55—pass. 58—
 pass. *w. acc.* 233, 245, 247—pf. 84
 —ἵνα πληρωθῆ 102
 πλησίον *w. gen.* 216
 πλούσιοι, οἱ 13, 34
 πλουτέω ingress. aor. 72
 πνέω: τῷ πνέονται and τῇ πνεούσῃ 17
 πνεῦμα: pl. *w. sing. or pl. vb.* 313—
constr. ad sens. 312—π. ἅγιον art.
 175 f.—(ἐν) πνεύματι 241
 πνίγομαι impf. 67
 ποιέω: constr. 138, 142, 246—mid.
 56—ἔλεος μετὰ 56—ποιέομαι σπου-
 δῆν, etc. 56—futur. pres. 63—
 impf. 66—pf. 69, 70, 83, 84—
 ingress. aor. 72—pres. imper. 75,
 76, 77—*aor. imper.* 77—fut. ptc.
 87—*w. ἵνα* 104—*w. inf.* 138—*w.*
 ptc. 159—καλῶς (εὔ) π. 245
 ποῖος: f. τίς 48—f. ὁποῖος 48—ποιᾶς
 (scil. ὁδοῦ) 16
 πολεμέω constr. 241
 πόλις *w. gen. of name* 215
 πολύς: οἱ πολλοὶ 13, 31—τὸ πολὺ 13
 —πολλάς δέρομαι 18, 246, 247—
 πολλοὶ *great* 26—ὁ ὄχλος π. 26,
 186—πολύ, πολλῶ *w. comp.* 29—
 (τά) πολλά *adv.* 247 f.
 πονηρός, ὁ 13, 14—πονηρά, τά 14
 πορεύομαι: impf. 66, 67—futur. pres.
 63—*aor. pf.* 70—πορεύου, πορεύ-
 ῃτι 75—πορευθεῖς 154
 πορνεία 27
 πόρρω predic. 226
 πρόφυρος 17
 πρόσος: f. ὅσος 48—*exclam.* 50
 πόταμος, ὁ 172
 ποταπός 48
 ποτέ 153—ποτε 196
 πότερος: confused *w. τίς* 32—πότερον
 . . . ἢ 338
 ποτίζω: *w. double acc.* 246—pass.
w. acc. 247
 ποῦ 109, 235
 πούς: πόδες καὶ χεῖρες 350
 πρασιαί 231
 πράσσω perf. pres. 62
 πρέπει, πρέπει ἐστίν: 88, 149, 292,
 295, 309—personal constr. 147
 πρεσβύτερος 30
 πρὶν: constr. 78, 113, 140, 345—
 π. ἢ 78, 113, 130, 140—prep. *w.*
gen., acc. 260, 270
 πρό: *w. gen.* 248, 260—πρὸ τοῦ
w. inf. 78, 140, 144, 345
 προάγω intr. 51
 πρόβατον neut. pl. *w. sing. vb.* 313
 προβλέπομαι mid. 55
 πρόδηλον ὅτι 295
 προέχομαι 56
 προηγέομαι trans. 245
 προθυμία τοῦ *w. inf.* 141
 πρόϊμος 18
 προκόπτω intr. 52
 προλαμβάνω *w. inf.* 138, 227
 πρὸς 6, 273—*compd. vbs. constr.* 242
 —*adv. use* 250—*w. gen. and dat.*
 273 f.—*w. acc.* 274—πρὸς με 39—
 πρὸς τό *w. inf.* 105 f., 141, 144—*w.*
 λέγω, etc. 237—*encroaches on*
simple dat. 251—f. παρά 254, 274
 —εἰς f. 256 f.
 προσάγω intr. 51
 προσεύχομαι: impf. 66—pres. imper.
 75—*w. ἵνα* 103—*w. τοῦ w. inf.*
 142—*w. dat.* 236—περὶ *w. gen.*
 269
 προσέχω: intr. 52—constr. 138
 προσήκει absent 91
 προσκυνέω 7, 236, 245—impf. and
 aor. 65—fut. f. impf. 86—fut.
 ptc. 87
 προσποιέομαι constr. 138
 προστάσσω: aor. 65—constr. 149
 προστίθεμαι: constr. 138, 155, 227
 —προσθεῖς εἶπεν 227
 προσφέρω pres. imper. 75
 πρόσωπον: anarthr. 179—Hebraisms
 26, 279

- πρότερον, τό 30
 προϋπάρχω w. ptc. 159
 προφθάνω w. ptc. 159
 πρωτ̄: τό π. adv. 14, 247—ἦν π. 226
 πρωτα, ἡ 17
 πρώτος f. πρότερος 32
 πτωχεύω ingress. aor. 71, 72
 πτωχός, ὁ 13, 23
 πυκνότερον 3, 30
 πύλη: ellipse 18—sing. and pl. 27
 πυθάνομαι impf. 65—aor. 65
 πῦρ: w. φλόξ 213—(ἐν) πυρί 240, 252, 253
 πῶς 117, 123, 137—f. ὡς, ὅτι 137
- ραβδίζω constat. aor. 72
 ράβδος: ellipse 18—ἐν 241
 ῥίπτω intr. 52
 ῥομφαία, ἐν 252
 ῥύομαι: pass. 58—constr. 235
 Ῥώμη, ἡ 171
- σάββατον: sing., pl. 27—(δὶς τοῦ) σαββάτου 235—(ἐν) τῷ σ., τοῖς σ. 243—ὀψέ σ. 278
 σαλπίζω: aor. imper. 77
 Σαμαρίτης art. 169
 σαπρά, τά 14
 σάρξ: anarthr. 177—τῆ σ. 239—(τὸ) κατὰ σ. 268
 σεαυτοῦ 41—position 190
 σελήνη art. 172
 σημείον 26, 214
 σήμερον, ἡ 17
 σιγάω ingress. aor. 71 f.
 σιωπάω impf. 66
 σός disappearing 42, 191
 σπία 55
 σπέρμα constr. ad sens. 312
 σπλαγγίζομαι constr. 234, 269, 272
 σπουδαῖος comp. 30
 σταυρόω aor. and pf. ptc. 85
 στήχω 82
 στηρίζω w. πρόσωπον τοῦ w. inf. 142
 στοιχέω: imperat. inf. 78—pres. imper. 75
 στολή distrib. sing. 25
 στόμα Hebraism 25, 280
 στρατεία constr. ad sens. 311 f.
 στρ φω: intr. 2, 51, 52—aor. imper.
- σῦ: nom. 37—possess. gen. 38 f. 189—σου f. σεαυτοῦ 42 f.—position of μου, σου, ἐμοῦ 189
 συγκαλέομαι 55
 συγκληρονόμος w. gen. 215
 συλλαμβάνω pf. 84
 συλλέγω impers. pl. 293
 συμβαίνω: aor. pf. 82—συνέβη 139, 148, 292
 συμβουλευώ, -ομαι constr. 149
 συμπόσια 231
 συμφέρει: constr. 103, 139, 149, 292
 —συμφέρων scil. ἐστίν 88, 295, 300
 σύμφυτος w. dat. 220
 συμφωνέω constr. 149, 234
 σὺν: encroaches on simple dat. 236
 —and μετά 265, 269—οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ 265
 συνάγω intr. 51
 συναίρω λόγον 56
 συναντάω fut. ptc. 86
 συναρπάζω pf. 84
 συνέπομαι constr. 241
 συνεργέω 244
 συνέρχομαι linear aor. 71
 συνήμι constr. 160
 συντίθεμαι constr. 142
 Συρία art. 170
 σύρω 66
 συσχηματίζομαι to conform 57
 σῶζω constr. 235, 240—pf. 69, 83, 84—aor. 69—fut. ptc. 87
 σῶμα: distrib. sing. 7, 23, 24—w. gen. of qual. 213—schema Attic. 313
 σωτήριος constr. 220—τὸ σωτ-ήριον 14
- ταπεινῶω aor. imper. 77
 τάσσω constr. 149
 ταχύς: τάχιον 30—ἐν τάχει 252
 τε . . . καί, τε . . . τε, etc. 329, 338 f., 347—τε γάρ 339
 τέκνον ellipse 21—τά τ. voc. 34
 τελειῶω: futur. pres. 63—w. ἵνα 102
 τελέω: pf. 85—w. ptc. 159
 τελευτάω aor. pf. 82
 τέλος, εἰς 266
 -τεος 91
 τέταρτον, τό 17
 τηρέω pf. 84
 τίθημι: act. and mid. 55—ἔθετο 56
 —impf. 67—pf. 84—constr. 246

- τιμιώτατος 31
 τίς: f. ὅστις 4, 48, 49, 117—f. πότε-
 ρος 32—varying w. ὅσος and ὅς
 49—τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοὶ 240, 303, 306
 —εἰς τί 267—τί γάρ (μοι) 301—
 τί οὖν 301—τί πρὸς ἡμᾶς (σε) 303
 τις 195—indecl. 316—εἰς τις 195—
 w. partit. gen. or ἐν 209—οὐ (μῆ)
 . . . τις 77—εἶ τις 321—position
 195
 τοιγαροῦν 340, 347
 τοίνυν 340, 347
 τοιοῦτος 21, 46 f., 193 f.—ὁ τ. 46 f.,
 193 f.
 -τος verbal adj. w. gen. 89
 τοσοῦτος 46 f., 194
 τότε 341—as adj. 222—ἀπό τ. 250
 τούτεστιν 45
 τρέμω w. ptc. 160
 τρίβω trans. 244
 τρίμηνος, ἡ 17
 τρίτη, τῆ 17
 τρόπος: (καθ') ὄν τρόπον 247—παντὶ
 τρόπῳ 241
 Τρωάς art. 171
 τυγχάνω: constr. 158, 227, 232—
 aor. pf. 82—εἰ τύχοι 125, 133—
 τυχόν 322
 τύπος distrib. sing. 25
 τυφλῶ pf. 70, 84

 ὑβρίζω trans. 244
 ὕδωρ: pl. 27—ellipse 18
 ὑετός ellipse 18
 υἱός: voc. 34—scil. 168—anarthr.
 173 f.—figurat. 207 f.
 ὑμεῖς: nom. 37 f.—ὁμῖν f. ἑαυτοῖς 42
 —position of ὑμῶν 189, 190—
 ὑμῶν f. ὑμέτερος 190
 ὑμέτερος 190, 191
 ὑπάγω: intr. 51—ὑπαγε 75, 77, 342
 —w. ἵνα or inf.? 135
 ὑπακοή w. obj. gen. 211
 ὑπακούω w. dat. 237
 ὑπάρχω: w. dat. 240—w. ptc. 158 f.
 ὑπέρ: w. pos. and comp. 3, 7, 31, 216
 —τοῦ w. inf. 105—as adv. 250,
 271—w. acc. 270—interchanged w.
 περί 270—w. gen. 270 f.
 ὑπεράνω: w. gen. 279—f. ὑπέρ 251
 ὑπερέκεινα w. gen. 216
 ὑπερέχον, τό 14
 ὑπερλίαν 250

 ὑπήκοος 220
 ὑπηρετέω w. dat. 236
 ὑπό 274—not w. dat. 249, 274—
 ἀπό f. 258—cases 275
 ὑποκάτω: w. gen. 279—f. ὑπό 251,
 279
 ὑποκρίσεις 28
 ὑπολαβών 62
 ὑπομιμνήσκω, -ομαι constr. 234
 ὑπομονή constr. 173, 211, 212
 ὑπονοέω constr. 137
 ὕστερέω: mid. 56—constr. 235

 φαίνομαι 58—w. ptc. 159—πέφνηα 82
 φανερός: constr. 220, 227, 304—
 φανερότερον 30—scil. ἐστίν 295,
 304
 φανερώ 55
 φείδομαι w. gen. 235
 φέρω: impf. 67—imper. of pres. and
 aor. 75, 77, 231—φέρων 154
 φεύγω: futur. pres. 63—trans. and
 w. ἀπό 244
 φησίν: hist. pres. 60 f.—asynd. ἔφη
 61, 340—without subj. 293
 φθονέω 245
 φιλέω: impf. 66—pf. 84
 Φίλιπποι 27
 φιμόω: πεφίμωσο, φιμώθητι 85
 φοβέομαι: pres. and aor. imper.
 75 f., 77—w. μή 99 f.—trans. and
 w. ἀπό 244
 φόβοι 28
 φόνου 27
 φορά ellipse 18
 φορτίζω w. double acc. 246
 φρονέω constr. 238
 φρόνιμαι, αἰ 13
 Φρυγία art. 170
 φυλακή 243
 φυλάσσω φυλακᾶς 245— -ομαι ἵνα
 (μῆ) 104, 138
 φῶσει 220
 φωνή ellipse 17, 18

 χαίρω: constr. 160, 305, 308—pres.
 and aor. imper. 76—χαίρειν wish-
 inf. 78—w. χαρᾶ, χαράν 242
 χαρίζομαι 58— aor. pf. 70
 χάρις: art. 176—χάριν prep. w. gen.
 278—οὐ χάριν 278, 319—χ. ὑμῖν
 κ. εἰρήνην 300, 310—τῷ θεῷ 298

- χειμῶνος gen. of time within which 235
 χεῖρ: ellipse 17—distrib. sing. 24—
 πόδες καὶ χεῖρες 350—Hebraism
 24, 280
 χειρόγραφον 219
 χερουβείν gender 21
 χιτῶνες 27
 χορηγέω constr. 244
 χρεία constr. 103, 104, 139
 χρῆ 295, 308
 χρηματίζω: pass. 57—gnom. fut. 86
 —constr. 149
 χρῆσαι aor. imper. 76
 χρηστόν, τό 14—χρηστός comp.
 31
 χρίω constr. 240
 Χριστός 212—art. 167
 χρόνος: pl. 27—w. ἵνα 104—τοῦ w.
 inf. 141
 χώρα ellipse 16
 χωρίζω constr. 235
 χωρίς w. gen. 278
 ψάλλω constr. 236
 ψεύδομαι: pres. imper. 76—constr.
 236
 ψηλαφάω w. acc. 232
 ψυχῆ reflex. pron. 43—τῆ ψυχῆ 221
 ὦ, ὦ 3, 33
 ὦδε 44
 ὦρα 243—ellipse 17—w. ἵνα 103—
 constr. 139—art. 179—acc. for
 time—when 248—scil. ἐστὶν 295,
 300
 ὡς 135, 137, 161—w. superl. 31 (ὡς
 τάχιστα)—final 105, 136—consec.
 136—w. inf. abs. 136—declarative
 137—w. ptc 158—w. predic. 246,
 321—no longer prep. 249—posi-
 tion w. neg. 286 f.—scil. ἐστὶν 297
 —to soften a statement 320—
 causal 320—*as if* 320—correlative
 320—temp. 321—f. ἕως 321—
 clause-order 344
 ὡσάν, ὡς ἐάν 112 f., 321
 ὡσεὶ 158, 321
 ὡσπερ 158—scil. ἐστὶν 297, 310—
 correlative 320—ὡσπερεὶ 321
 ὡστε 106, 134, 135, 136, 137 f., 139
 —final 106, 136
 ὠφελέω constr. 246, 292
 ὠφέλιμος constr. 220

A GRAMMAR OF
NEW TESTAMENT GREEK

BY
JAMES HOPE MOULTON
M.A., D.LIT., D.D., D.C.L.
D.THEOL. (BERLIN AND GRÖNINGEN)

VOL. IV
STYLE

BY
NIGEL TURNER
B.D., M.TH., PH.D.

38 GEORGE STREET T. & T. CLARK LTD. EDINBURGH

A GRAMMAR OF
NEW TESTAMENT GREEK

This page intentionally left blank

A GRAMMAR OF
NEW TESTAMENT GREEK

by

JAMES HOPE MOULTON

M.A., D.Lit., D.D., D.C.L.
D.Theol. (Berlin and Groningen)

Vol. IV

STYLE

by

NIGEL TURNER

Ph.D., M.Th., B.D.

EDINBURGH: T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET

© T. & T. CLARK 1976

PRINTED IN SCOTLAND BY
MORRISON AND GIBB LIMITED
FOR
T. & T. CLARK LTD. EDINBURGH

ISBN 0 567 01018 X

FIRST PRINTED . . . 1976

All Rights Reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of T. & T. Clark Ltd.

CONTENTS

<i>Preface</i>	vii
<i>Abbreviations</i>	ix
<i>Introduction</i>	I
I. SOURCES BEHIND THE GOSPELS	5
2. THE STYLE OF MARK	11
3. THE STYLE OF MATTHEW	31
4. THE STYLE OF LUKE-ACTS	45
5. THE STYLE OF JOHN	64
6. THE STYLE OF PAUL	80
7. THE STYLE OF THE PASTORAL EPISTLES	101
8. THE STYLE OF THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS	106
9. THE STYLE OF THE EPISTLE OF JAMES	114
10. THE STYLE OF I PETER	121
11. THE STYLE OF THE JOHANNINE EPISTLES	132
12. THE STYLE OF JUDE AND 2 PETER	139
13. THE STYLE OF THE BOOK OF REVELATION	145
<i>Subject Index</i>	161
<i>Index of Names</i>	163
<i>Index of Semitic, Greek and Latin Words</i>	166
<i>Selective Index of New Testament References</i>	168

This page intentionally left blank

PREFACE

The appearance of the various volumes of this Grammar spans the greater part of a century. The first volume (Prolegomena) was the work of Dr. J. H. Moulton himself in the first decade of the century, the second (Accidence) was the work of both Dr. Moulton and his eminent disciple, Dr. W. F. Howard, but the volumes on Syntax and Style have been entirely the work of one of a younger generation. Because of that, and because the enterprise reflects so wide a passage of time, it is inevitable that the viewpoint of the Grammar upon the nature of New Testament Greek is not entirely a unity, and there are traces of the radical development to be expected as the state of these studies has progressed. Although Dr. Moulton did not visualize a fourth volume, nevertheless the Introduction to volume Two demonstrated his deep concern with questions of Style as well as with Accidence and Syntax. I am therefore glad that despite the passage of time I have found my own views for the most part to be consistent with those of the Grammar's originator even at the distance of seven decades from its inception, and I am also glad that Dr. Harold K. Moulton has kindly approved the suggestion that this fourth and final volume be added to his father's Grammar.

I would wish to express appreciation once again of the expertise of our printers, Morrison and Gibb, Ltd., in dealing so smoothly and competently with complex problems of typography.

Of my renowned and distinguished Publishers I cannot adequately speak the praise due from myself and fellow-students in this field, but I pay this humble tribute to T. & T. Clark's large share in producing a rising generation of scholars who, with reverent devotion, keep the light of Biblical Greek erudition shining in a dark world.

NIGEL TURNER

Cambridge

Epiphany 1975

This page intentionally left blank

ABBREVIATIONS

The works most often mentioned are abbreviated thus :

- Bauer : W. Bauer, *Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch . . .*⁴, Berlin 1952.
Beyer : K. Beyer, *Semitische Syntax im Neuen Testament*, I Satzlehre i, Göttingen 1962.
Black³ : Matthew Black, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*, 3rd ed., Oxford 1967.
Grammar I : J. H. Moulton, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, vol. I, Edinburgh, 3rd ed. 1908.
Grammar II : J. H. Moulton, W. F. Howard, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, vol. II, Edinburgh 1919-1929.
Grammar III: Nigel Turner, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, vol. III, Edinburgh 1963.
Grammatical Insights : Nigel Turner, *Grammatical Insights into the New Testament*, Edinburgh 1965.
Helbing : Robert Helbing, *Die Kasussyntax der Verba bei den Septuaginta*, Göttingen 1928.
LXX : Septuagint.
MM : J. H. Moulton, G. Milligan, *Vocabulary of the Greek New Testament*, London 1930.
Mayser : E. Mayser, *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit*, Berlin and Leipzig, II 1 1926 ; II 2, 3, 1934.
NT : New Testament.
Pernot : H. Pernot, *Études sur la Langue des Évangiles*, Paris 1927.
Radermacher² : L. Radermacher, *Neutestamentliche Grammatik*, Tübingen, 2nd ed. 1925.
S.-B. : H. L. Strack, P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, Munich, III, 4th ed. 1955.
TWNT : *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, ed. G. Kittel and others, Tübingen 1933ff.

Periodicals

- Biblica* : *Biblica*, Rome.
BJRL : *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, Manchester.
CBQ : *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, Washington.
ET : *Expository Times*, Edinburgh.
JBL : *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Philadelphia, PA.
JBR : *Journal of the Bible and Religion*, Bethlehem, PA.

JTS NS : *Journal of Theological Studies*, New Series, Oxford.

Nov.T : *Novum Testamentum*. Leiden.

NTS : *New Testament Studies*, Cambridge.

ZAW : *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, Berlin.

ZNT : *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, Berlin.

Other works are cited in full at their first mention, and other abbreviations are as in vols. I–III.

The bibliography at the end of each chapter is intended only to be selective, and apologies are offered to authors whose works do not appear.

INTRODUCTION

The characteristic components in the style of divergent New Testament authors have some practical pertinence for exegesis and for textual criticism, both in adjudging which alternative exposition of any verse conforms with the same author's style elsewhere throughout his work, and also in determining which of several variant readings has the highest internal probability on account of stylistic consistency.

In itself, too, the nature of the Greek in the New Testament demands close attention, raising the question as to what kind of "dialect" it is, and whether it is even a unity within itself. Each style is different, as the student discovers when he turns to the language of the Apocalypse after revelling in the charms of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

In the investigation, I do not seek to drive a rigid distinction between syntax, which was the subject of our third volume, and style. Since style, in our view, involves the same considerations as syntax, there must be some duplication, but this fourth volume rather concerns itself with grammatical and other linguistic features which distinguish the work of one author from that of another. Here we are attempting to isolate comparative tendencies and differing techniques. The reader is referred to the perspicuous distinction between style and syntax made by Professor K. J. Dover, when he claims that style is "a group of aspects of language," a contrasting of linguistic facts among various authors. There could be no clearer definition of the dichotomy between volumes three and four (*Greek Word Order*, Cambridge 1960, 66).

This does not restrict the theme to matters of syntax in different arrangement, or merely viewed in a new light. Close attention is given to wider categories, such as word-order, rhetoric, parallelism and parenthesis. Moreover, the irregularities in sentence-construction which result from Semitic influence will be particularly observed, in order to investigate the ways in which the dialect or variety of Greek found here is distinctive from the main stream of the language.

I cannot discern any telling evidence for Latin impression on New Testament style. Rather I am assured of the direct influence of Aramaic and Hebrew everywhere, together with that of the synagogue and the Septuagint, and the likelihood that many of the very earliest Christians in Palestine possessed Greek and Aramaic, and perhaps also Hebrew.

In particular, two conclusions may incite challenge, and therefore I

have provided the supporting evidence rather fully. First, though there is a comparative style for each author, I believe that the styles are not so far apart as to impair the inner homogeneity of Biblical Greek; even the extremes of, say, Mark and James share a stylistic generic likeness. Secondly, I find the hypothesis of Aramaic or Hebrew sources, except perhaps in limited areas which concern the teaching of Jesus and others, to be less credible than the use of a kind of Greek which was inoculated with Semitic syntax and style.

For instance, the language of Mark is a unity, rich in Aramaisms, perhaps based on an Aramaic catechism for converts, but here, as in all the New Testament books, exclusive Aramaisms and exclusive Hebraisms co-exist, even in the same passage, making less likely the use of Aramaic or Hebrew documents in the composition of the Gospel. However, the probability that Aramaic or Hebrew sources for the teaching of Jesus did exist at an earlier stage, cannot be excluded.

The style of Mark recalls parts of the Septuagint, e.g. Genesis, in some respects, and is as simple, stereotyped (as to set rules), and as patterned as that of the Apocalypse. The style of both Mark and the Seer is numinous and evocative, like their theology. The Greek of the Apocalypse is not *sui generis*, but rather it has more of the same qualities of Semitic Greek that are shared by other writers. It is also more provocatively barbarous in tone, a language of "anti-culture," neither inarticulate nor inartistic, however, which reads strangely at first after 2 Peter, dynamic and expressive, yet never very subtle. At his place of exile, the Seer may have missed the services of a revising amanuensis, which was enjoyed by some other authors. Even so, his Greek is not on the level of vernacular papyrus letters.

All the Gospels have considerable Semitic features, and Matthew cannot be said to be "improving" the style of Mark in this respect, for sometimes he is Semitic when Mark is not. Neither Matthew nor Luke take pains to avoid Mark's Jewish Greek, but they write more smoothly, less vividly and with less heavy redundancy. Matthew is less picturesque, resorting to mnemonic devices, and his style resembles in certain respects that of Hebrews, James, 1 Peter and Luke-Acts.

Even excluding his obvious sources, Luke has a style which varies from the same kind of Jewish Greek as Mark and Matthew to a more non-Biblical style, and this variation may either be contrived, a deliberate adaptation of language to narrative, or else it may have something to do with the date at which the author composed some parts of Acts. At times Luke displays that distinctively Christian style which is conspicuous elsewhere in the New Testament, and which has much in common with the Jewish Greek of the Septuagint and pseudepigraphical literature.

I find the style of the Fourth Gospel to be homogeneous, revealing no

sources, and at one with that of the Johannine epistles. While the Gospel alone is directly influenced by the Septuagint, the Johannine style generally teems with Aramaisms, Hebraisms and Semitisms. It is a simple language, distinguished by transparent sincerity; it is an attractive expression of the influence of the synagogue upon the new Christian community, remarkable especially for its new Christian use of the preposition *en* which it shares with Paul. Having the eurhythmic balance of Hebrew parallelism, it lacks the vigour and passion of other examples of Christian speech, notably Revelation.

A contrasting style must be distinguished for each of Paul's main groups of epistles, of which the least literary and most direct in expression is Thessalonians. The epistle to the Ephesians and the Pastorals stand apart, but not so very far, and merely on grounds of style it would be gratuitous to deny their authenticity. The Greek of the Paulines is Jewish, much influenced by the Septuagint. Its verbosity may derive from Paul's predilection for chiasmus and Old Testament parallelism.

The scope of the amanuensis in New Testament composition, gives rise to baffling perplexity, and on the general question I believe that some authors enjoyed varying degrees of help with their Greek, sometimes with an Atticizing trend.

For instance, the style of the Pastorals is much nearer to the higher Koine than most New Testament writing, not so closely Jewish and moulded less on the Septuagint. Nevertheless, it is not completely free from Semitisms, nor is it the most elegant style in the New Testament, never rising to the level of some of Paul's literary flights.

The epistle to the Hebrews affects an elegance memorable in the New Testament, and yet there is in it a layer of basic Jewish Greek. The author is less dexterous than appears at first sight, but his script reaches the parity of a pleasantly rhythmical sermon. The epistle of James, too, is of a cultural quality, recalling the philosophical diatribe. Yet this author is less careful of style than the author to the Hebrews and falls far short of Paul at his best. The Greek is inherently Jewish, and the vocabulary smacks of the Old Testament, to such an extent that here may be yet another example of the peculiarly Christian dialect.

Rather less elegant than these is 1 Peter, firmly Septuagintal and Semitic, despite the likely efforts of a lettered amanuensis, and again exhibiting the characteristic vocabulary, solemn liturgical style and the haunting loveliness, of the peculiarly Christian variety of Greek. On grounds of style at least, it cannot be divided into two parts at 4¹¹.

A later example of the Christian style appears with the epistles of Jude and 2 Peter. Jude's is an elevated diction, tolerably heavy with redundancy, but rhythmical, not altogether innocent of Semitism,

Jewish in recollection, and echoed to some extent in 2 Peter. Both authors borrow terms from renowned classical and Hellenistic writers, but 2 Peter is more Semitic in style, more patently influenced by the Septuagint, and a degree more pompous. In my opinion, the help of a professional amanuensis is plausible again in these two works.

In this volume, much of the Greek has been transliterated, especially where a single word was reproduced, and this resort has assisted to keep the cost of the book within a moderate range.

The absence of footnotes arises because matter not immediately serving the argument is avoided, and digressions, however intriguing, have been resisted; but the citations of authors, usually placed in footnotes, are retained in the text. Where there is a large number of supporting references, smaller type is used, but not to imply that they are a digression.

SOURCES BEHIND THE GOSPELS

Two distinct questions arise and are not to be confused : 1. whether any of the New Testament was originally written in a Semitic language, 2. how much influence from Semitic languages is discernible in the New Testament itself. The assessing of that influence occupies a considerable part of this volume, but in the Gospels especially the question of sources is important, and the question which immediately arises from it : how much Hebrew or Aramaic was used by Jesus and his disciples ?

Students of an extreme persuasion have discerned Aramaic written sources behind the whole of the New Testament, for instance, G. M. Lamsa (*New Testament Origin*, Chicago 1947). M.-J. Lagrange and C. C. Torrey made the more modest claim that all four gospels were written at first in Palestinian Aramaic. The evidence from style will suggest that this view also is too extreme. It is safer to look sceptically, with Dr. Matthew Black, on the thesis of written Aramaic originals and to accept his proposition that some sources of the gospels were at one point extant in Aramaic (Black³ 271-274). However, that would not be true of the hypothetical documents, Q, M, and L.

Matthew Black confirms that the Aramaisms are mainly confined to the teaching of Jesus himself and John the Baptist and are not spread through the whole narrative. There are, for instance, *talitha cum*, *ephphatha*, *eloi eloi lama sabachthani*, *abba* and *rabboni* (said to Jesus). Paul alone is found with *marana tha*.*

There is some reason to think that the apostle Matthew wrote an Aramaic gospel which was later rendered into Greek and, having been lost, was then replaced by the Greek version. St. Jerome referred to a "Gospel according to the Hebrews," written in Aramaic, as the original Matthew. Scholars continue to review the idea, and among theories more recent than those of Torrey and the like are those of B. C. Butler (*The Originality of St. Matthew*, Cambridge 1951) and P. Parker (*The Gospel before Mark*, Chicago 1953). The latter has in mind an original Aramaic gospel, probably by the apostle Matthew, which the authors of our present Matthew and Mark translated and

* By Aramaisms, Hebraisms and Semitisms respectively, are intended those Greek idioms which owe their form or the frequency of their occurrence to Aramaic, Hebrew, or an influence which might equally well apply to both languages.

revised. Parker regards Mark as a compression of the material, disjointed and episodic. It is consistent with the Papias tradition that the words of Jesus were first written down in a Semitic language, but it does not do justice to Matthew's style of Greek to suppose that it was a translation of Aramaic.

As to the Fourth Gospel, while few to-day claim that the whole of it is an Aramaic translation, some are reluctant to deny the possibility of Aramaic sources, especially since the discovery at Qumran of Aramaic writings comparable with the Fourth Gospel, and some critics are beginning to see a Jewish environment of thought behind the Gospel consistent with the underlying Semitic idiom. An interesting review is presented by S. Brown, "From Burney to Black: The Fourth Gospel and the Aramaic Question," *CBQ* 26 (1964) 323-339. E. C. Colwell's statement against Aramaic influence is too extreme (*The Greek of the Fourth Gospel*, Chicago 1931): cf. below pp. 64, 70.

There is some evidence to support the claim that Mark and perhaps John and Revelation and Acts I-II were originally composed in the Galilean or northern dialect of a contemporary Semitic language, spoken daily by Jesus and his disciples, perhaps the northern branch of Levantine Aramaic, distinguishable from the dialect centred at Jerusalem, for Peter's way of speaking was conspicuous to the serving maid in the south (Mt only).

Hebrew had been displaced as the national tongue of Judaea, probably as early as Hezekiah's reign: Neh 8⁷ provides evidence of the need of Aramaic in Nehemiah's day. One may assume that Aramaic continued in use at least until the time of Jesus and that sacred books of a faith beginning at Jerusalem would be issued in a native Aramaic dialect, even if Greek was spoken in Palestine at large and even by the rabbis (for there are Greek loan-words in their writings, although they are of uncertain date). It is argued that the Aramaic of the Palestinian Pentateuch Targum and other Targums is the very language of the time of Jesus, "when Palestinian Aramaic was spoken in a hellenistic environment" (Black³ 22f). It is urged that the many Greek borrowings in it suggest this early date, but the borrowings may have taken place at any time during a very long period of hellenization in Palestine, as is pointed out by J. A. Fitzmyer ("The Languages of Palestine in the First Century A.D.," *CBQ* 32 (1970) 524f). We do not know how far the Jews of Palestine ever used Greek at all except for commerce and social intercourse with Gentiles. It may be dangerous to assume that Greek was restricted to upper-class Jews and government officials under the Romans. There is some evidence that even Hebrew had been revived as a spoken language by the time of Jesus, as M. Bobichon argues ("Grec, Araméen et Hébreu: les langues de Palestine au premier siècle chrétien," *Bible et Terre Sainte*, Paris 58

(1963) 4-5). Most of the Qumran texts so far discovered are in Hebrew, but they are too early in all probability to be significant. At any rate, it looks as if the first-century Jews may have been trilingual.

Since the quality of New Testament Greek is decidedly Semitic in varying degrees, there may well have been a spoken language in common use among these trilingual Jews which would render superfluous the hypothesis of source-translation as an explanation of certain phenomena in New Testament Greek. In the most characteristic form of this language, which is found in Mark (especially the D-text) and the Seer, there was a strong tendency towards uncommon Greek idioms which happened also to be idiomatic in the two Semitic languages. The tendency is only less slight in some other New Testament authors. Our suggestion is that such a body of idiom, as is exposed everywhere in this volume, comprised a distinct dialect or branch of the Koine Greek. Reference must be made to our *Grammatical Insights* (183ff). One or two scholars have been found hesitatingly to agree; for instance, G. Mussies has this to say, "In our opinion it is even conceivable that original Greek works were composed in some kind of Biblical Greek which imitated Semitizing translation . . ." (*The Morphology of Koine Greek*, Leiden 1971, 96f). We believe our view to be supported by the possibility of the bilingual or even trilingual nature of much of contemporary Palestine. The author of the Epistle of James was bilingual, according to A. Schlatter (*Der Brief des Jakobus*, 1956, 84). A man living in Galilee would be likely to be bilingual for he would be in contact with Gentile culture. Moreover, from certain hellenistic towns, namely the league of Decapolis, Caesarea, Antipatris, Phasaelis and Sebaste, which were Greek-speaking, the influence would spread to the surrounding area and would produce a bilingual population.

Nevertheless the belief in the existence of Aramaic sources has been widely held. Irenaeus spoke of "the Gospel" as being at first in Hebrew (Aramaic intended?), and there is Jerome's reference to an Aramaic Gospel. On the face of it, the view seems likely enough. If Greek was understood well enough in Palestine to warrant issuing the Gospels in that language, it is strange that Palestinians who later became Christians needed to have their Scriptures in a Palestinian Aramaic version, the "Palestinian-Syriac" which was provided by Byzantine emperors for the Christianized Palestinians. Moreover, Eusebius seems to indicate that in the third century at Scythopolis parts of the Christian service were rendered into Aramaic for the benefit of peasants who were unversed in Greek. All this, however, is to assume that the same linguistic state of affairs existed two centuries earlier. More significant perhaps is the following contemporary evidence.

Josephus claims to have written some books in Aramaic and to have rendered them later into Greek, so he tells us in the preface to *de Bello Iudaico* (ed. B. Niese, Berlin 1895, vol. VI, i 3), and one passage in his *Antiquities* implies that a Jew in Palestine rarely acquired Greek, Josephus himself making the effort to master the elements, but pronunciation giving him difficulty. "I have also taken a great deal of pains to obtain the learning of the Greeks, and understand the elements of the Greek language, although I have so long accustomed myself to speak our own tongue, that I cannot pronounce Greek with sufficient exactness; for our own nation does not encourage those that learn the languages of many nations. . . ." (W. Whiston, *The Works of Flavius Josephus*, London 1875, vol. II, 143; Niese, vol. IV, *Antiqu. Iud.* xx 263, 264). The meaning of Whiston's translation is not always perfectly clear, and one should consult the discussion of the meaning of Josephus in J. N. Sevenster, *Do You know Greek? How much Greek could the Early Christians have Known?* Leiden 1968, 67-71). It is doubtful whether such information as Josephus gives is reliable, in face of contrary evidence that Greek was widely used even in southern Palestine. The language of the *Jewish Wars* does not read like translation-Greek, but it is in fact "an excellent specimen of the Atticistic Greek of the first century," according to Thackeray (*Josephus the Man and the Historian*, New York 1929, 104). But Josephus may have had help in the translation if we are to believe *contra Apionem* I 50. Still, Jews did take pains to learn Greek, as Josephus admits, though the practice may have been frowned upon.

There is evidence that Greek was a living tongue among first-century Jews even around Jerusalem, for on Mount Olivet it has been found that eleven out of twenty-nine ossuaries which were discovered there were written in Greek, and two articles by P. Kahane ("Pottery Types from the Jewish Ossuary-Tombs around Jerusalem. An Archaeological Contribution to the Problem of the Hellenization of Jewry in the Herodian Period," *Israel Exploration Journal* 2 (1952) 125-139; 3 (1953) 48-54) and one by R. H. Gundry ("The Language Milieu of First-Century Palestine. Its Bearing on the Authenticity of the Gospel Tradition," *JBL* 83 (1964) 404-408) are very informative in this respect.

The hellenization by Alexander and his successors included Palestine, synagogues in Jerusalem catered for the needs of Greek-speaking Jews (Ac 6^{1,9}), and copies of the Greek Bible were found at Qumran. Greek papyri dating from our period have been found in Judaea, as is noted by B. Lifshitz ("Papyrus grecs du désert de Juda," *Aegyptus* 42 (1962) 240-256). It should not be considered improbable, therefore, that Jesus normally spoke in Greek, albeit a simple Semitic kind of speech, such as is revealed in the subsequent enquiry in this volume, and that

he used Aramaic on certain occasions. The isolation of *talitha cum* and *ephphatha* and the like, as Aramaic phrases surviving in the Greek gospels, might then be explained as rare instances where patients of Jesus comprehended only Aramaic. H. Birkeland is among those who see the force of this, although he himself holds that Hebrew, slightly Aramaicized, was the normal language of Jesus ("The Language of Jesus," *Arhandlinger utgitt av et Norske Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo*, II *Historisk-Filosofisk Klasse* 19, 54). To suggest that it is due to "inadvertance" that Aramaic words are left untranslated is a needless charge against the final redactor of Mark. Nor is the presence of Aramaic transliterations in the vocabulary of the New Testament (*Boanerges, Barnabas, Cephas, pascha, abba, marana tha*) evidence that the first Christians lived in an Aramaic-speaking community any more than the survival of *amen* and *alleluia* proves that they lived in a Hebrew-speaking community. Presumably Jesus addressed the Syro-Phoenician woman, the Roman centurion, and Pilate in Greek; we hear of no interpreter on any of the occasions. Some inner-Greek alliterations are further evidence that at least some of his teaching was in Greek. Some of these alliterations were mentioned in *Grammatical Insights* (181f), and Dr. A. J. B. Higgins criticizes the suggestions concerning some of these alliterations, on the grounds that it is very improbable that Jesus used the Greek words *ecclesia* and *Son of Man* (*BJRL* 49 [1966] 375f). In an interesting note, A. W. Argyle shows that the word *hypocrite*, occurring 17 times in the synoptic gospels, has no appropriate Aramaic parallel (*ET* 75 [1964] 113f). Reserve is needed, however, as subsequent research may unearth such a parallel; the good Greek idiom of a noun in the genitive following a noun with pronominal suffix (*τὸ αἰμά μου τῆς διαθήκης*) has been found in an Aramaic Targum (J. A. Emerton, *JTS NS* 15 [1964] 58f).

As the volume proceeds, it will be shown that there are instances enough in the evangelists' Greek to suggest that they were influenced by idioms of an exclusively Hebrew kind, and in another place by idioms of an exclusively Aramaic kind. Unless Hebrew and Aramaic sources were used side by side, we must in consequence rule out the source-hypothesis, adopting instead the suggestion that the evangelists for the most part used Jewish Greek.

They may have used sources for the words of Jesus, on the occasions when he addressed people in Aramaic, but this cannot explain why the language of the evangelists is both Aramaized and Hebraized at the same time. It is not enough to say that some idioms are common to both languages, for some of them are not. The suggestion of a Semiticized Biblical Greek may remove the assurance felt by some expositors that "a Gospel so deeply coloured by Semitic usages must, in the main, bear a high historical value," for we presume that such expositors

set high store by the presence of Aramaic sources (Vincent Taylor, *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, London 1955, 65). The Aramaisms are not all primitive survivals of the original teaching of Jesus, but they may rather be a part of the evangelists' Greek style.

Other Literature :

- J. C. James, *The Language of Palestine*, Edinburgh 1920.
 S. Lieberman, *Greek in Jewish Palestine*, New York 1942.
 F. Büchsel, "Die griechische Sprache der Juden in der Zeit der Septuaginta und des Neuen Testaments," *ZAW* 60 (1944) 132-149.
 Articles in *ET*, "Did Jesus Speak Aramaic?"
 56 (1944) 95-97, 305, 327-328;
 67 (1955) 92-93, 246, 317, 383;
 68 (1956) 121f.
 S. M. Patterson, "What Language did Jesus Speak?" *Classical Outlook* 23 (1946) 65-67.
 R. O. P. Taylor, *The Groundwork of the Gospels*, Oxford 1946, 91-105.
 M. Black, "The Recovery of the Language of Jesus," *NTS* 3 (1957) 305-313.
 M. Smith, "Aramaic Studies and the Study of the New Testament," *JBR* 26 (1958) 304-313.
 J. M. Grintz, "Hebrew as the Spoken and Written Language in the Last Days of the Second Temple," *JBL* 79 (1960) 32-47 [Mishnaic Hebrew, not Aramaic, was the language of Palestine in 1st century A.D.].
 J. A. Emerton, "Did Jesus Speak Hebrew?" *JTS NS* 12 (1961) 189-202.
 S. Lieberman, "How Much Greek in Jewish Palestine?" *Biblical and Other Studies*, ed. A. Altmann, Massachusetts 1963, 121-141.
 M. Black, "Second Thoughts. IX. The Semitic Element in the New Testament," *ET* 77 (1965) 20-23.
 H. Ott, "Um die Muttersprache Jesu; Forschungen seit Gustaf Dalman," *Nov.T.* 9 (1967) 1-25.
 H. P. Rüger, "Zum Probleme der Sprache Jesu," *ZNW* 59 (1968) 113-122.
 J. Barr, "Which Language did Jesus Speak?—Some remarks of a Semitist," *BJRL* 53 (1970) 9-29.

CHAPTER TWO

THE STYLE OF MARK

§ 1. LITERARY SOURCES IN MARK

Although scholars of various schools have sought to detect literary sources in Mark and to distinguish them by means of linguistic tests, the attempt has never succeeded because the various stylistic features cut right across the boundaries of any literary divisions that have yet been suggested. In consequence, it seems that although there may have been literary sources to begin with a final redactor has so obliterated all traces of them that Mark is in the main a literary unity from the beginning to 16⁸, as the foregoing analysis of the stylistic features will show.

We must except both the Longer and Shorter endings (16⁹⁻²⁰) which are full of non-Markan words and phrases: e.g. *he appeared (ephane)*⁹, *first day of the week*⁹ (i.e. the normal Greek *prôtē* instead of Semitic *miā* as in 16²), *after this (meta tauta)*¹⁰ and so on. Cf. V. Taylor, *Mark* 610-615.

§ 2. ARAMAIC INFLUENCE ON THE STYLE OF MARK

On the one hand, it is felt that Mark's style is unpretentious, verging on the vernacular; on the other, that it is rich in Aramaisms. The latter are so much in evidence that early in this century scholars were convinced that Aramaic sources had been translated. Torrey followed them, adducing mistranslations to support the hypothesis (C. C. Torrey, *The Four Gospels*, Oxford 1922; *Our Translated Gospels*, London 1933). To Burney the Aramaic flavour of Mark was not so strong as that of the Fourth Gospel, and he found no mistranslation in Mark (C. F. Burney, *The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel*, Oxford 1922, 19). Rawlinson thought that the Paralytic narrative might be a translation (2¹⁻¹²), but anything further was "highly improbable." (A. E. J. Rawlinson, *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, London 1925, xxxiii.) Howard concurred with Lagrange that the Greek was translation Greek but he left open the question whether the evangelist translated or whether he was subsequently translated; he inclined to the view that Mark was here and there translating an Aramaic catechetical system of instruction (*Grammar* II 481). Since

Papias indicates that Mark was a catechist, it is conceivable that the Gospel was based on Aramaic catechetical teaching given by the evangelist to Palestinian converts.

Sentence Construction. *Asyndeton.* This is probably where Aramaic influence is strongest in the style of Mark (Taylor, *Mark* 49f, 58; Black³ 55-61). The same is true of the Fourth Gospel. C. H. Turner found 38 examples of asyndeta in Mark, and although many of these may not be abnormal in Greek the number is significant ("Marcan Usage," *JTS* 28 [1929] 15-19; Lagrange adds others: M.-J. Lagrange, *Évangile selon Saint Marc*, 5th ed. Paris 1929, LXXf).

Active impersonal plural. This Markan mannerism may well evince an Aramaic way of expressing a substitute for the rare passive voice. Thus, *Does the lamp come?* for *Is the lamp brought?* due to misunderstanding the Aphel or Ittaphel of 't' (*bring*).

Mk 4²¹ B-text 6¹⁴ 7¹⁹ 9⁴³ 10¹³ 13²⁶ 15²⁷. It is not exclusively Markan: Mt 5¹⁵ (Mt's Q) 9² (from Mk) 17²⁷ (M), Lk 4⁴¹ (add. to Mk) 8³ (L) 12²⁰ (L). Cf. "Marcan Usage," *JTS* 25 (1926) 377-386; M. Wilcox, *The Semitisms of Acts*, Oxford 1965, 127ff; *Grammar* II 447f; III 292f; Black³ 126-128; Taylor, *Mark* 47f, 62; L. Rydbeck, *Fachprosa*, Uppsala 1967, 39-42.

Similar is the impersonal plural with vague subject, e.g. *they were astonished* for *people were astonished* (which is strictly a Semitism, for it reflects a Hebrew idiom in the LXX, as well as Aramaic).

Mk 1^{22,30,32,45} 2^{3,18} 3^{2,21,32} 5^{14,35} 6^{33,43,54} 7³² 8²² 10^{2,49} 13^{9,11} 14¹² 15¹⁴.

Another kind of impersonal plural seems to reflect the eye-witness account of a group of disciples, as C. H. Turner suggested ("Marcan Usage," *JTS* 26 [1927] 228-231). Others find difficulty in accepting the suggestion, e.g. V. Taylor, *Mark* 47f; Black³ 127. To Black, such a plural seems to be "characteristic of simple Semitic narrative."

Mk 1²¹ (*they went into Capernaum*) 2^{9f} 5^{1,38} 8²² 9^{14f,30,33} 10^{32,46} 11^{1,11} v.1^{12,15,19,21,27} 14^{18,22,26f,32}. However, this plural is quite characteristic of Semitic speech.

Use of Participle for a main verb. Rare in the papyri, it is characteristic of Aramaic and it occurs in the Western text of Mark: 1¹³ 3⁶ 7²⁵ 9²⁶ (also Mt 2^{41D}). *Grammar* I 224; D. Daube in E. G. Selwyn, *I Peter*², London 1947, 47If; Lagrange, *Marc* XC.

Proleptic Pronoun. Black classes as a genuine Aramaism the proleptic pronoun followed by a resumptive noun (e.g. *he, Herod, had sent*). However, the construction is wider than Mark, and need not indicate the translation of a document unless the non-Markan instances do too.

It occurs particularly in the D-text: Mk 6^{17.18}D 5¹⁵D Mt 3⁴ 12⁴⁵D Lk 1³⁶ 4⁴⁸D 10⁷ 24¹⁰D Ac 3²D 6⁷D 7⁵²D 11²⁷SB. (Black³ 96-100; *Grammar* II 431; Taylor, *Mark* 59f; Burney, *Aramaic Origin* 85ff). However, in Mk 6²² where AC read ἀντὶς τῆς Ἡρωδιάδος, the Old Latin texts understand ἀντὶς (*ipsius*), i.e. of *Herodias herself*.

Conjunctions. In Aramaic the conjunction 'illā (*but*) has both exceptive and adversative force, which may explain how the Greek *alla* and *ean mē* can appear together in 4²², and it may account for the textual variants in 9⁸. Greek *alla*, in 10⁴⁰, may have been chosen for its similarity to Aramaic 'illā in form and sound, instead of the more appropriate *ean mē*. Thus the sense should clearly be: *To sit . . . is not mine to give (to anyone) unless it has been prepared for him. . .* The Biblical Greek confusion of *ei mē* and *alla* is further seen in 13³²=Mt 24³⁶, as also in Paul: cf. below pp. 92, 150

We must dismiss Burney's suggestion that Aramaic translation or influence accounts for the peculiar use of Greek *hina mē* as meaning *lest* five times in Mark, instead of the more normal *mēpote*. His grounds are that Aramaic has a similar composite term of two words *lemā dī* (Dan 2¹⁸ 6^{9.18}) where Hebrew has the single word *pen*. However, the suggestion of direct translation is weak when it is considered that on many occasions Paul wrote *hina mē* when *lest* was meant (e.g. I Cor 1^{10.15.17}); he was not translating but his Greek may well have been Semitic in style. The Testament of Abraham is not likely to have an Aramaic original, yet recension A 87⁷ has *hina mē* where recension B 109²³ has *mēpote*. Cf. *Grammar* I 241, and the additional note in J. H. Moulton, *Einleitung in die Sprache des Neuen Testaments*, Heidelberg 1911, 269 n. 1; *Grammar* II 468.

Other Syntax. Howard has reminded us of *pros*=*with*, reminiscent of Aramaic *lewāth*, though similar to the classical usage (*Grammar* II 467): Mk 6³ 9¹⁹ 14⁴⁸. One must reject this as evidence for translation, unless one makes the claim also for Paul, where it occurs more than a dozen times: cf. below pp. 71, 93. It may well be an Aramaic element in this type of Greek, however.

Black quotes a Targum to illustrate a construction parallel with *katēnanti* in Mk 6⁴¹D; cf. also 11² 12⁴¹ 13³ (*Grammar* II 465; Black³ 116f).

The use of Greek *hen* as multiplicative or distributive in the D-text of Mk 4⁸ recalls the same use of Aramaic *hadh* (e.g. Dan 3¹⁹); cf. Black³ 124; Taylor, *Mark* 60, and *in loc.* 4⁸.

A Markan and Pauline mannerism is adverbial *polla* (Mk 1⁴⁵ 3¹² 5^{10.23.38.43} 6²⁰ 9²⁶ 15³), the frequency of which induced Howard to concede as Aramaic, a parallel to *saggî* (= *many, greatly*); cf. *Grammar* II 446; Lagrange, *Marc* XCVIII. However, the adverbial accusative of extent is quite normal in Greek. If this were direct translation from an Aramaic source, why not also Paul and James? (Rom 16^{6.12} 1 Cor 16^{12.19} Jas 3²). Another adverbial expression is *loipon* (esp. 14⁴¹) with weakened meaning, which Torrey suggested was an over-literal rendering of *mikkā an* (= *from now*),

which itself was weakened in Aramaic to little more than *presently, now* (C. C. Torrey, *The Four Gospels*, 303); it is found in Test.Abr., which is probably innocent of Aramaic sources (84²⁷ 92^{19,21} 111¹² 113¹⁶).

Vocabulary. A. J. Wensinck's unpublished work (Black³ 302) pointed out the unattested Greek use of *poiein* in Mk 4³², instancing the Onkelos Targum of Gen 49^{15,21}. Further, as Black suggests, Greek *oros* in 3¹³ may correspond to Aramaic *tura*, with its double meaning of *mountain* and open *country* (Black³ 133, 299). He further suggests that the name *pîsteqâ* (Palestinian Talmud) was "simply transliterated, and then taken into the sentence as an adjective" 14³ (Black³ 223-225), but it may in fact be a loan-word, naturalized in Greek, and not a translation.

In 2²¹ the sense required of *pleroma* is *patch*, and Black's suggestion of a Syriac word which has the double meaning of *patch* and *fill* (*m^ola*) is interesting; perhaps it may be granted that here, as elsewhere, Semitic usage has enriched the vocabulary of Biblical Greek. This may be said of the next suggestions too. Black notes that the Greek verb *hupagein* in the sense *to die* (Mk 14²¹ and John) has no Greek or LXX parallel, but there was the Aramaic parallel 'zl; however, the Hebrew *hlk* might also have sufficed. In Mk 14⁴¹ Black rejects Torrey's theory of mistranslation and substitutes his own, based on the reading of the D-text: confusion of *r* and *d* means that the D-text is a mistranslation of, "the end and the hour are pressing" (Black³ 225f).

Mistranslation of Aramaic *d^e* has frequently been adduced, for *d^e* has a wide variety of usages, and sometimes an obscurity is cleared on the theory of mistranslation of this ubiquitous particle (C. F. Burney, *The Poetry of Our Lord*, Oxford 1925, 145n; *Aramaic Origin* 70; *Grammar* II 434-437; Black³ 71-81; Taylor, *Mark* 58f). T. W. Manson's explanation of the difficult 4¹² (*so that they may see but not perceive . . .*) is well known, based on confusion of *who* and *in order that*, both *d^e* (*The Teaching of Jesus*, Cambridge 1936, 76-80).

In Mk 4²² it has been suggested, not wholly convincingly, that *for there is nothing hid except with the purpose of being revealed* should read, *for there is nothing hid which will not be revealed*; it is claimed that Mark or one of his sources has failed to note that *d^e* might be relative in this context (Burney, *Aramaic Origin* 76). For the same reason the *hos* of the D-text in 9³⁸ may preserve the true sense of *d^e*, and in 4⁴¹ we ought to understand a relative (Old Lat. *cui*): *whom even the wind and sea obey* (Moulton, *Einleitung* 332; *Grammar* II 436; Black³ 71). Black has accepted Torrey's suggestion that *ti* in Peter's words 14⁶⁸ is a mistranslation of the relative pronoun and we should read: "I am neither a companion of, nor do I know at all, *him* of whom (*d^e*) you speak" (Torrey, *Four Gospels* 303; Manson, *Teaching* 16f; Black³ 79f). Three mistranslations suggested by Wellhausen are of great interest: 1. *Son of Man for Aramaic man, 2. uncovered the roof 2⁴ for brought him to the roof, 3. the improbable to Bethsaida 6⁴⁵ should be through Sidon* (W. C. Allen, *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, London 1915, in loc.).

There is considerable evidence favouring influence of an exclusively Aramaic kind upon the style of Mark, but the case for the translation of documents is somewhat weakened by the fact that here in the same gospel are instances both of exclusive Aramaisms and exclusive Hebraisms existing side by side. This occurs even within a single verse, e.g. 4⁴¹ where there is the influence of the Hebrew infinitive absolute together with a misunderstanding of Aramaic *dē* by the use of *ὄτι* for *ὅ*. Therefore unless we can suppose that the sources were composite, parts in Aramaic, parts in Hebrew, the source-hypothesis fails to account for all the Semitic features of style.

§ 3. HEBRAIC INFLUENCE ON THE STYLE OF MARK

The style is not free from Hebraism, in spite of Howard (*Grammar* II 446), although the exclusively Hebraic influence is less than that which is common to Hebrew and Aramaic.

Syntax. When partitive expressions are used as nominal phrases, without either definite or indefinite article, as subject or object of a verb, then the style ceases to be characteristic of normal Greek. It is rare in the non-Biblical language and seems to have originated with the LXX (Gen 27²⁸ 2 Kms 11¹⁷ 1 Mac 6⁴⁸ A, etc).

As object of a verb: Mk 6⁴⁸ (*they took up . . . some of the fishes*), 9³⁷W 12² (*receive some fruit*), 14²³ (*they all drank some of it*). *Grammar* I 72, 102, 245; II 433; III 7, 208f; *Grammatical Insights* 57f; H. B. Swete, *The Gospel according to St. Mark*³, London 1909, 158; E. Lohmeyer, *Das Evangelium des Markus*, Göttingen 1937, 147n.

The auxiliary use of the verb *add* may reflect Aramaic influence. Cf. G. B. Winer-W. F. Moulton, *A Treatise on the Grammar of New Testament Greek*⁸, Edinburgh 1877, 587-590; *Grammar* I 233; II 445; III 227; H. St. J. Thackeray, *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint*, I Cambridge 1909, 52f; Allen, *Mark* 169; Taylor, *Mark* 61. However, its common occurrence in the LXX (109 times) argues for its being an idiom of Biblical Greek (Hebrew *ysp*): Mk 14²⁵D (the same construction of the idiom as is found in the LXX).

The addition of a cognate noun or participle to the main verb, which is very rare in Aramaic, is more likely to be a Hebraism such as is found in the LXX, through the influence of the infinitive absolute.

Mk 4¹² (*seeing see and hearing hear*), 4¹ (*fear with fear*), 5⁴² (*amazed with amazement*). Also Mt Lk Jn Jas 1 Pet Rev LXX e.g. Gen 2^{16f} Jon 1¹⁰ 1 Mac 10⁸ (108 times). Cf. below pp. 47f; Thackeray, *Grammar* 48f; G. Dalman, *The Words of Jesus*, E. T. Edinburgh 1902, 34f; *Grammar* II 443-445; Taylor, *Mark* 61.

Sometimes the aorist indicative is found in a context which is unusual for Greek but which is explained by the influence of Hebrew Stative perfect in the LXX, e.g. *rsh* in Isa 42¹, *ḥaphēš b^e* in Isa 62^{4B}.

Mk 1⁸ *I baptize* (Mt corrects to pres. tense), 11 *I am well pleased*, also in Mt Ac. Cf. W. C. Allen, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Matthew*, ICC Edinburgh 1907, 29; *Grammar I* 134f; II 458; III 72; Black³ 128-130; Taylor, *Mark* 64.

The articular infinitive, very common in the LXX, characteristic of Luke, but rare in the secular papyri, is clearly influenced by the Hebrew *b^e* with infinitive, and is a fairly clear instance of the influence of the LXX upon the Greek of the NT.

It occurs in Mk with four cases: 1. Nom. 9¹⁰ 10⁴⁰ 12³³. 2. Acc. 1¹⁴ 4^{5,6} 5⁴ 13²² 14^{28,55B}. 3. Gen. 4^{3v.l.} 4. Dat. 4⁴ 6^{48B}. As *during* it occurs (but rarely) in Thucydides. *Grammar I* 14, 215, 249; II 448, 450f; III 140-142; L. Radermacher, *Neutestamentliche Grammatik*², Tübingen 1925, 189.

The prolepsis of the subject of a subordinate clause is widespread throughout the NT (Mark, Matthew, Luke-Acts, John, Paul, Revelation), and although it has a few parallels outside Biblical Greek it is clearly a Hebrew idiom, e.g. "God saw *the light*, that *it* was good" Gen 1⁴.

Mk 1²⁴ (*I know thee who thou art*), 7² (*seeing some of the disciples, that they ate*), 11³² (*all considered John, that he was a prophet*), 12³⁴ (*seeing him that he had answered*).

Certain Hebrew words are literally rendered. The word *nephesh* has a reflexive function, in Greek replacing the normal pronoun with *psuchē*. It is "a pure Semitism" (Black³ 102) in Mk 8³⁶, which Luke alters to more normal Greek. The Hebrew word *liphnē*, literally rendered in the LXX of Am 9⁴ etc., becomes the Biblical Greek *prosōpou* Mk 1². The Hebrew *bayyāmim hāhēm* (in those days), a very common LXX phrase, is literally rendered in Mk 1⁹, and the Hebrew *le'olām* (for ever) becomes logically *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα* 3²⁹, since 'olām (age) has become identical in meaning with αἰών.

Much has been written on the phrase *believe in the gospel* 1¹⁵, but in view of the massive Semitic complexion of Mark's language it would seem less appropriate to quote classical and vernacular precedents than to suspect the Hebrew phrase *he'emîn b^e* (to trust in) as the real inspiration. Neither verb nor noun with *en* are anything but rare outside Biblical Greek, but the noun with *en* is frequent in Paul. However, it does appear from Pauline usage that *to trust in* involves the prepositions *eis* and *epi*, and so *en* may carry quite a different sense in the primitive Church's terminology, especially as the important

formulae, *en Kurio* and *en Christo*, have a theological implication of their own, and so *en* may be taken in sense very closely with Christ and Gospel.

Grammar III 262f; A. Deissmann, *Die NT Formel "in Christo Jesu"*, Marburg 1892; A. Oepke, in *TWNT* II 534-539; M. Zerwick, *Graecitas Biblica*³, Rome 1955, § 88; N. Turner, "The Preposition *en* in the New Testament," *Bible Translator* 10 (1959) 262ff.

A difficult phrase for translation is *τι ἐμοὶ καὶ σοὶ* (= Heb. *mah-lî wâlāk*): Mk 1²⁴ 5⁷ Mt 8²⁹ Lk 8²⁸ Jn 2⁴.

The nominative case indicating time is a Hebraism borrowed by Mk and Lk from the LXX (Josh 1^{1A} Eccl 2¹⁶ emended in A S^{c.a}) Mk 8².

Word-order. 1. *Position of attributive genitive.* Mark's style is conspicuously different from the Ptolemaic Papyri and closer to the LXX, following the order: article—noun—article—genitive (54 times). He never has the position which is common in non-Biblical Greek: article—article—genitive—noun (*Grammar* III 217). Further influence of the Hebrew construct state appears, when the noun in the genitive case follows immediately upon its governing noun, in contrast with the tendency of literary style which is to precede (*Grammar* III 349).

The table will help to appreciate how the matter stands relatively to Biblical and secular Greek. The number of examples are given for some representative material, and it will be seen that there is a considerable difference between even the more "stylish" parts of the NT and a selection of non-Biblical Greek.

	Genitive before noun	Genitive after noun
Mk 1-5	none	50
Mt 1-5	1 ¹⁸	46
Ac (We sections)	16 ¹² 21 ¹⁴ 27 ^{23,34,42} 28 ^{3,17}	28
Jas	3	50
Thucyd. I 89-93	9	7
Philostratus	7	7
<i>Vit. Ap.</i> cc. 1-5		

2. *Co-ordinating particles.* The abundance of *kai* and *de* in Mark reflects Hebrew rather than Aramaic use. Moreover, because *waw* must occupy first place in the sentence, Mark prefers *kai* to the second-place conjunctions *gar*, *ge*, *de*, *men*, *oun*, *te*, and Mark has a *kai*:*de* proportion of 5:1 (*Grammar* III 332). Mark shares this characteristic with the vernacular too, but this is not to deny that the tendency is Hebraic.

3. *Position of the verb in nominal sentences.* Following Hebrew, the copula is almost always in first-position after the connecting conjunction; the subject immediately follows, and after that the predicate, as in the normal unemphatic and non-interrogative nominal sentence of Hebrew prose.

Exceptions: copula not in first-position 5⁵ 7¹⁵ 13²⁵ 14⁴⁹. Subject not immediately following 7¹⁵ 10³² 13²⁵. Where the copula is very closely taken with a ptc, we may be able to distinguish a periphrastic tense from the predicate ptc. e.g. 5⁵ 10³². Other exceptions are: the placing of a pronoun, etc., first in the sentence for emphasis, where (as in Hebrew) it avoids becoming "a mere appendage to a subject which consists of several words" (e.g. 2 Kings 2¹⁹ "good is the word of Yahweh which you have spoken"); E. Kautzsch, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, 2nd English ed. by A. E. Cowley, Oxford 1910, § 141n. Also exceptions to the primary position of the verb are 4³⁸ 13²⁵ 15²², but they are not exceptions to the Hebrew order in nominal sentences without the copula (subject-predicate). Nor is 14⁴⁹ an exception, because *daily* represents the adverbial phrase which may stand at the beginning of a Heb. nominal sentence (e.g. Gen 4⁷).

4. *Position of the verb in verbal sentences.* Contrary to the usual way in non-Biblical Greek, the NT verb tends towards the beginning of the sentence. For instance, the verb in Herodotus has mainly the middle-position, according to Kieckers (initial/middle/final: 47/167/71). It is a matter of tendency only. In good prose of the fifth and fourth centuries, the subject tends to precede its verb (K. J. Dover, *Greek Word Order*, ch. III), but classical authors vary so much that no principle appears to lie behind their choice of word-order; it is rather a matter of emphasis in each particular context. So it is, to some extent, in Biblical Greek; however, here there is definite influence from the normal Hebrew pattern of verbal sentences: verb—subject—object (*Grammar* III 347f). The Biblical Greek verb is followed by personal pronoun, subject, object, supplementary participle—often in that order, which owes everything to Hebrew and nothing to Aramaic, where the verb tends to end the clause, viz. subject—object—verb. Normally in Hebrew the subject immediately follows the verb unless a pronominal object is involved, for that will be inseparable from the verb and will precede the subject.

On our view that Mark's style is largely Hebraic, therefore, a radical change is probably involved in the rendering of Mk 2^{18f}, which will have to be: "For they were many. There followed him also some scribes of the Pharisees. They noticed him eating. . . ." The only translation, to our knowledge, which takes this point is the British and Foreign Bible Society's *Mark. A Greek-English Diglot for the Use of Translators*, London 1958, 6.

Also preceding the subject will be a prepositional phrase which includes a pronominal suffix, for that too goes closely with the verb. However, a prepositional phrase which includes a noun will follow the subject,

which makes probable the translation of Mk 6²⁶ as: "he was grieved because of his oaths and guests" (*Diglot* 15; *Grammar* III 350). A relative phrase with 'asher, and a genitive of quality, occur after the noun they qualify; so in Biblical and translation Greek, a prepositional phrase immediately follows the noun which it qualifies, usually with repetition of the definite article; i.e. it does not occur between article and noun as in secular Greek, and even in the free Greek books of the LXX to some extent (M. Johannessohn, *Der Gebrauch der Präpositionen in der LXX*, Berlin 1926, 362ff).

§ 4. SEMITIC INFLUENCE ON THE STYLE OF MARK

By "Semitic" we understand those features of syntax which may be either Hebrew or Aramaic; it is not always possible to decide which is the more likely when they are common to both Semitic languages.

Parataxis. Except in 5^{4,25,27}, Mark rather studiously avoids subordinate clauses, in the way of vernacular Greek. The tendency would be Hebraic and Aramaic too; indeed, *kai* is so commonly used in the LXX to render the Hebrew subordinating *waw* that Mark's *kai* may probably be said to have a subordinating function too.

E.g. 4²⁷ "while he rises night and day, the seed sprouts," 8³⁴ "if he will take up his cross, let him follow me," 15²⁵ "when it was the third hour, they crucified him." Perhaps add 1^{6,11} 4³⁸ 5²¹ 7³⁰ 6⁴⁵D. A. B. Davidson, *Hebrew Syntax*³, Edinburgh 1901, § 141; S. R. Driver, *A Treatise on the Use of the Tenses in Hebrew*³, London 1892, § 166ff; E. Kautzsch, §§ 116,u, 142,e; *Grammar* II 423; Black³ 66f.

Redundancy. Mark's style tends to be diffuse (cf. Lagrange, *Marc LXXII-LXXV*; *Grammar* II 419f; Taylor, *Mark* 50-52). It tends to repeat apparent synonyms, as also do some other NT authors to a less extent: e.g. *the house's householder* (Lk 22¹¹), *straightway immediately* (Ac 14¹⁰D), *again a second time* (Ac 10¹⁵), *return again* (Ac 18²¹ Gal 1¹⁷ 4⁹), *again the second* (Jn 4⁵⁴), *then after this* (Jn 11⁷v.l.). This, it has been suggested, is an Aramaic mannerism, but it belongs to Hebrew too, corresponding to the parallelism of Semitic speech.

Here are some examples of Mark's redundancy: 1²⁸ *everywhere, in all the district*, 3² *when evening was come, when the sun was set*, 3⁵ *early morning, very early*, 2²⁵ *he had need, and was hungry*, 4² *he taught, and said in his teaching*, 3⁹ *be quiet, be muzzled*, 5¹⁵ *the possessed man, the man who had the legion*, 1⁹ *to your home, to your family*, 3⁹ *why . . . distressed, why . . . weeping?* 6⁴ *family, relatives, home*, 2⁵ *immediately, with haste*, 7²¹ *from within, from the heart*, 3³ *away from the crowd, on his own* 8¹⁷ *know, or understand*, 9³ *privately, alone*, 12⁴⁴ *all that she had, all her livelihood*, 13¹⁹ *the creation, which God created*, 2⁰ *the predestined, whom he predestinated*, 14¹ *the Passover, and*

Unleavened Bread, ¹⁸ *at a meal, and eating*, ³⁰ *to-day, to-night*, ⁶¹ *he was silent, and answered nothing*, 15²⁶ *the superscription, which was superscribed*.

The Pleonastic Auxiliary. Mark is fond of the redundant auxiliary *began to*; it occurs 26 times, and a further three times in D, easily seen in the concordance, and evenly distributed throughout the Gospel. Matthew reduces these instances to six; Luke to two; yet Luke adds 25 others, and it is a Lukan stylistic feature, since 13 are in Proto-Luke. Since Aramaic used *shārī* as an auxiliary verb the idiom has been claimed as a pure Aramaism for the Gospels, and yet the matter cannot be decisive since we have the Hebrew *y'l hiph.* and the late Hebrew *thl hiph.* as well as the Latin *incipere*. The verb is relatively frequent in the Testament of Abraham, rec. A (82¹⁹ 83³⁴ 110²⁵), on each occasion as pleonastic as in the Gospels, without any trace of direct Aramaic influence, but rather of Hebrew.

Black³ 125f; J. H. Hunkin, *JTS* 25 (1926) 390-402; 28 (1929) 352f; Allen, *Mark* 49f; *Grammar* I 14f; II 455f; Taylor, *Mark* 48, 63f; Lagrange, *Marc* XCIII.

The Historic Present. Mark has 151 examples, although there are 151 also in John; and 52 of Mark's concern verbs of speaking. Thackeray suggested that, except with verbs of speaking, Mark indicates thereby a new scene and fresh characters (*The Septuagint and Jewish Worship*, Oxford 1923, 21). The tense is characteristic of vivid narrative in most languages; it may owe something to Aramaic influence in Mark, but it should be noted to the contrary that the historic present occurs some 330 times in the LXX, and thus Hebrew influence is very apparent. As well as Semitic influence, there may have been something theological behind the large use of this tense in Mark. T. A. Burkill reviews with approval Trocmé's view that from Mark's post-resurrection theological viewpoint the past record of Jesus' doings are "construed in terms of the present," and the acts and words of the Crucified One are now being said and done by the living and risen Christ (*New Light on the Earliest Gospel*, Ithaca, N.Y., 1972, 185f).

Periphrastic Tenses. Though these proliferate in Mark, they were not favoured in vernacular Greek (cf. MM 184f), nor by subsequent copiers and correctors of the NT text, for there are variant readings at Mk 1³⁹ 2⁴ 3¹ 5^{11,40} 9⁴ 13²⁵ 14⁴ 15²⁶. They were, however, characteristic of Aramaic and of Hebrew, as witness the LXX. In Biblical Greek they abound more than anywhere else.

Periphrastic imperfect: 1^{6,18,22,39} ACDW 2^{4,6,18} 3¹ 4³⁸ 5^{5,11,40} 9⁴ 10^{22,32} bis 14^{4,40,49,54} 15^{40,43}. Present: 5⁴¹ 7¹⁵ 15^{22,34}. Perfect or Plupf.: 1^{6,33} 6⁵² 14^{21D} 15^{7,26,46}. Future: 13^{18,25}. M.-J. Lagrange, *Évangile selon Saint Matthieu*⁸, Paris 1948, XCI; J. de Zwaan, "The Use of the Septuagint in Acts," *The Beginnings of Christianity*, ed. F. J. Foakes Jackson, K. Lake,

London 1922, II 62; P. Chantraine, *Histoire du Parfait Grec*, Paris 1907, ch. IX.

The Article. 1. Aramaic *nāsh* and Hebrew *'ish* are rendered literally in Mark as indefinite article 1²³ 7¹¹ etc. (cf. concordance under *anthrōpos*). 2. The use of the definite article displays some inconsistency in Mark. Black, following Wensinck, considers that the anomalous practice of all the evangelists may have been influenced by the disappearance of the formal distinction between definite and indefinite nouns in Aramaic, and makes the credible suggestion that Aramaic influence led to some confusion in the normal speech of Greek-speaking Jews. It can further be seen in Paul (cf. p. 91). Black³ 93.

Pronouns. 1. The incidence of a resumptive personal pronoun, used after a relative, is too widespread in the Gospels to be explained as vernacular Greek without Semitic influence. It is due either to the *dē* construction of Aramaic or, just as likely, to *'asher . . . lō* in Hebrew.

Mk 1⁷ 7²⁵ share the idiom with Biblical Greek in general, e.g. LXX Gen 28¹³ Mt 3¹² 10^{11D} 18^{20D} Lk 8^{12D} 12^{48D} Jn 1^{27.33} 9^{30?} 13²⁶ 18⁹ Rev 3⁸ 7^{2.9} 12^{8.14} 13^{8.12} 16¹⁹ 17⁹ 20⁸.

2. The construction which allows an expression in *casus pendens* to be followed by a resumptive personal pronoun is to some extent secular but, alongside all the other evidence for Semitisms, it is more probable that a Semitic idiom lies behind the Greek of Mark and John. While it is possible in Aramaic, it is more likely to have come by way of the LXX, as in Mark's own quotation at 12¹⁰ (cf. also Gen 31¹⁶).

Mk 1^{34D} (*and those who had devils he cast them out of them*), 6¹⁶ (*John whom I beheaded, he is risen*), 7²⁰ (*that which goes out, this defiles*), 13¹¹ (*whatever is given you, this speak*). For rabbinical parallel, cf. below, p. 71.

3. The high incidence of the oblique cases of *autos* is a Semitic tendency due to the pronominal suffix, although the similar tendency in the vernacular doubtless exerted some influence. Arranged in order of Semitic (or vernacular) influence in this respect, Mark, Matthew and John rank the highest in the NT (cf. below p. 72), with a figure of one occurrence of superfluous cases of *autos* every two lines, whereas the papyri have one every 13 lines.

Prepositions. 1. The repetition of the preposition before two or more phrases is a prominent feature of Biblical Greek, based on the Semitic practice. It is very pronounced in the style of Mark and Revelation, and least in evidence in that of Luke-Acts and the Pastoral Epistles.

It is particularly marked in the Western text: 3⁷ *from Galilee and from Judaea and from Jerusalem and from Idumaea*, 5¹, 6^{26D} *because of his oaths*

and because of his guests, ⁸⁸D into the fields and into the villages, ⁵⁶, ⁸²D of the elders and of the chief priests, ¹¹¹, ¹⁴⁴³D from the chief priests and from the scribes. Grammar III 275; Black³ 114f.

2. *Instrumental en.* Although in the vast majority of instances *en* has its fundamental spatial meaning of *in* or *among*, yet there are undoubtedly some important exceptions, not the least of which is the peculiarly Christian usage of this powerful word. Indeed, Mark correctly and more normally has *eis* after *dip* ¹⁴²⁰ where Matthew has pregnant *en* (Mt 26²³). But in Mk 4³⁰ *en* must be instrumental (= *be*), as in both Semitic Greek and the Koine (*with what parable shall we set forth the kingdom?*). Sometimes Mark's *en* is temporal: in rowing 6⁴⁸. The *en dolo* of ¹⁴¹ shows how close we are to the instrumental sense: *by means of guile*. In ¹²³ 5² the man is *with* an unclean spirit, but here we may meet the Christian sense of spatial *en* in a spiritual dimension: the man was *in the sphere of* the demon. This is more frequent in the Johannine writings.

En is not likely to express motion in Mk. Except for *epi* c. acc. twice, Mark's rule is invariable for expressing motion after *erchesthai*: i.e. *eis* (22 times) or *pros* (12 times), and so in ⁵²⁷ 8³⁸ ¹³²⁶ the preposition will not express *motion* from place to place, but rather the accompanying circumstances or the sphere in which the motion occurs.

Adjectives and Numerals. In Semitic languages the positive degree does duty for the comparative and superlative. The only analogy to this in the vernacular is the occasional use of comparative for superlative, but the Biblical Greek use of positive for comparative and superlative has come from the LXX. The use of the cardinal for the ordinal is recognized as Semitic, in Mk 16² (= Mt 28¹ = Lk 24¹ = Jn 20^{1,19}), coming into Biblical Greek by way of the LXX (Taylor, *Mark* 60).

Mk 9⁴⁸ *good* (= *better*) *to enter the Kingdom* *maintained* ^{45,47} ¹⁴²¹ *good* (= *better*) *for him if he had not been born*. LXX instances: Exod 25³³ *the first tabernacle for the former*, quoted at Heb 9²¹, Can 1⁸ *fair amongst women for fairest*. Cardinal for ordinal: Gen 8¹³ Exod 40² Ps 23 (24)⁴¹ *one* for *first*.

Other Parts of Speech. 1. Wensinck and Black have observed that there is a characteristic way of using the interrogative particle, *What?* to express sarcasm in Semitic languages (Black³ 121f). Although most of their parallels are Aramaic it is also a Hebrew feature. The fact that almost all instances are in the words of Jesus is not significant for, as Black concedes, ordinary narrative does not lend itself to questions.

Wensinck had noted its appearance in Lk (especially the D-text): Lk 5²²D ⁴¹D 6². Black adds the following from Mk: 2⁷ *What? Does this man so speak?* ⁸ *What? Are you discussing these things. . . ?* ²⁴ 4⁴⁰ 10¹⁸. (LXX Gen 44¹⁶ *What? Shall we justify ourselves?* etc.).

2. The pleonastic *thus* after verbs of speaking (Mk 27.^{8,12}) is more likely to be influenced by the Hebrew *kāzōth* (LXX Jg 13²³ 15⁷ 19³⁰ Isa 66⁸ etc.) than the Aramaic *hidnā* (e.g. Dan 2¹⁰), because it occurs in books with a Hebrew background, e.g. T.Abr. 85¹⁵ 86²⁵ 87⁸ cod. 88¹⁶ 96^{8,10} 103³¹.

3. The imperatival *hina*, a Biblical rather than a secular idiom (*Grammar* III 94f), occurs once or twice in Mark. The evangelist uses *hina* in a non-final sense at least as often as a final. It belongs to post-classical Greek but never occurs in so large a variety and concentration as in Biblical books. It may derive from Hebrew or Aramaic. The evidence for this is given below, pp. 73f. Cf. also the informative article by W. G. Morrice, "The Imperatival *iva*," *Bible Translator*, 23 (1972) 326-330.

Imperatival: Mk 5²³ *Come and lay your hands. . . !* 10⁵¹ (=Mt Lk) *Let me see again!* 14⁴⁹ *Let the Scriptures be fulfilled!* Epexegetical, after a variety of verbs of command and speaking: 3^{9,12} 5^{10,18,43} 6^{8,12,25} 7^{26,32,36} 8^{22,30} 9^{9,18,30} 10^{35,37,48} 11^{16,28} 12¹⁹ 13^{18,34} 14^{35,38} 15²¹. Ecbatic: 6^{2D} *so that mighty deeds are wrought by his hands* 11²⁸ *who gave you authority so that you do this?*

Word Order. I. *Position of the adjective.* The practice of joining the article and its noun closely together reflects the Semitic necessity to join them as one word. Thus it happens that in a kind of Greek which is influenced by Semitic forms, any matter which qualifies the noun tends to be placed in a separate and subsequent articular phrase, in contrast with secular style which avoids this almost completely.

	Between art. and noun	In subsequent articular phrase	Proportion
Papyri of ii-i/BC	140	4 or 5	28 : 1
Philostratus (sample)	27	1	27 : 1
Hebrews	15	10	1,5 : 1
Acts (We)	4	4	1 : 1
James	7	8	1 : 1
Rev 1-3	5	16	1 : 3,2
LXX			
Gen 1-19	17	56	1 : 3,3
Mark	7	27	1 : 3,8
Lk 1,2	2	8	1 : 4
Rev 4-22	21	107	1 : 5

The table on page 23, arranged in descending order, will illustrate the closeness of Mk's style to that of Rev and the LXX (Gen), and its contrast with that of the vernacular. (The table includes adjectival phrases but not cardinal numerals. Papyri statistics are from Mayser II 2, 54 and involve pap. Tebtunis nos. 5-124).

The close link between def. art. and noun is a feature of the LXX, where separation occurs in only 4% of the incidence of the art. in translated books; in 11% of the incidence in non-translated books, and in 18% of the incidence in the NT epistles (according to the research of J. M. Rife, "The Mechanics of Translation Greek," *JBL* 52 [1933] 247). The NT epistles thus stand half-way between the LXX on the one hand and non-Biblical Greek on the other (Philostratus *Vit. Ap.* 28%; Thucydides I 89-93 39%). On these estimates, Mk, Mt, Lk's Infancy, document L, and Rev 1-3 stand very much nearer to Semitic Greek than do the epistles (Mk 1-3: 4.7%; Mt 1⁸-4^{end}: 14%; Lk's Infancy: 3.3%; L: 6.5%; Rev 1-3: 9.4%).

2. *The post-position of demonstrative adjectives.* Again Biblical Greek follows the precedent set by Semitic word-order, and invariably places the adjective after its noun. But this is not as significant as the figures above, because it is only in the translated books of the LXX that there is a spectacular difference between Biblical and non-Biblical Greek in this respect. However, in the frequency of the demonstrative adjective itself there is a marked difference between Biblical and non-Biblical Greek, especially in the attributive use, which is very rare in the Ptolemaic papyri (Mayser II 2, 79-82).

	Pre-positive	Post-positive	Proportion
Mark	14	31/32	1 : 2
Matthew	23/24	76/79	1 : 3
Luke	28	95	1 : 3
John	32/33	36/38	1 : 1
Revelation	5	12	1 : 2,4
LXX : Gen Exod	1	54	1 : 54
Judith	1	10	1 : 10
2-4 Mac	4	8	1 : 2
Philostratus			
<i>Vit. Ap.</i> I	9	22	1 : 2
Thucyd. II 1-34	9	15	1 : 1,6

In the following two tables, the figures for the NT agree closely with the LXX, except that Paul, John and Wisdom are less Semitic in this respect. With these exceptions the figures differ markedly from the secular papyri. Even as early as the third century B.C., thirteen examples of independent *ekeinos* were discovered by Mayser for only two attributive (N. Turner, "The Unique Character of Biblical Greek," *VT* 5 [1955] 208-213).

Use of <i>ekeinos</i> (LXX)			
	Independent	Attributive	Proportion
Minor Prophets	1	59	1 : 59
Judges	—	36	—
Early Kingdoms	2	69	1 : 35
Chronicles	—	30	—
Jeremiah	1	30	1 : 30
Isaiah	2	56	1 : 28
Daniel LXX	—	28	—
1 Maccabees	2	56	1 : 28
2 Esdras-Nehemiah	—	26	—
Late Kingdoms	—	25	—
Pentateuch	8	159	1 : 20
Ezekiel	2	24	1 : 12
Daniel Th.	2	23	1 : 11,5
Joshua	2	22	1 : 11
Judith	2	11	1 : 5,5
Esther	—	3	—
1 Esdras	3	8	1 : 3
Job	3	8	1 : 3
Tobit S	2	5	1 : 2,5
Psalms	1	2	1 : 2
Ecclesiastes	—	1	—
Tobit B	1	1	1 : 1
2-4 Maccabees	14	13	1 : 1
Proverbs	3	2	1 : 0,6
Wisdom	12	6	1 : 0,5
Sirach	1	—	—

Use of <i>ekeinos</i> (NT)			
	Independent	Attributive	Proportion
Matthew	4	50	1 : 12
Luke-Acts	6	50	1 : 8
Mark	5	18	1 : 3,6
Revelation	—	2	—
Heb, Jas, 2 Pet.	6	6	1 : 1
Pastorals	4	3	1 : 0,75
Paul	9	4	1 : 0,5
John and 1 John	59	18	1 : 0,3

§ 5. MARK'S MANNERED STYLE

Apart from the redundancy which we have already noticed in discussing Semitic features of style, there are other stylistic features of a stereotyped nature which are not necessarily Semitic.

His mannered style is most conspicuous perhaps in his over-use of participles, which incidentally is often reminiscent of Semitic style. The concordance should be consulted for such redundant words as *coming, leaving, rising, answering, and saying*.

Accumulation of particles: Mk 1^{31,41} 5^{25ff} *there being a woman . . . having suffered . . . having spent . . . not having benefitted . . . coming . . . hearing . . . coming* 14⁰⁷ 15⁴³ (*Grammatical Insights* 66).

Redundant negatives are another contribution to Mark's distinctly heavy style, though several other NT authors share this habit, and it is common in earlier secular authors.

Mk 1⁴⁴ *see you say nothing to no one* 2² *room for no one not even at the door* 3²⁰ *not able not even to . . .* 27 *no one was not able to enter . . .* 5³ *no one had been able to bind him not yet not even with chains* 37 6⁵ 7¹² 9⁸ 11¹⁴ 12^{14,34} 14^{25,60} 15⁵ 16⁹.

Mark is particularly fond of clumsy parentheses, often delayed to such an extent that the reader is confused and sometimes entirely misled. Thus, in 2¹⁵, if the parenthesis is restored to its rightful place, the sentence will read: "While Jesus was dining at home many publicans and sinners (There were many such who followed him) came and joined Jesus and his disciples. There followed him also the scribes of the Pharisees." We may do the same for 6¹⁵: "John the Baptist is risen and therefore mighty powers are at work in him, like one of the prophets (some said that he was Elijah and others that he was a prophet)."

Parentheses are very common; we give but a selection: 1^{2f} 2^{10f,15,22,26b} 5⁴² 6^{14f} 7^{2f,11,19,25-26a} 8^{15,38-41} 11³² 12^{12a} 13^{10,14} 14³⁶ 16^{3f,7f}. C. H. Turner, "Marcan Usage," *JTS* 26 (1927) 145-156; M. Zerwick, *Untersuchungen zum Markus-styl*, Rome 1937, 130-138; *Grammatical Insights* 64-66.

Another factor contributing to heaviness of style is Mark's inclination to alternate the normal imperfect (220 times) with the sonorous periphrastic imperfect (25 times). C. H. Turner suggested that the periphrastic imperfect was intended to be the true imperfect, referring to continuous action in the past, and that Mark uses the normal imperfect-form as the equivalent of an aorist (doubted by V. Taylor, *Mark* 45). Swete's view was that the normal imperfect-form is used when an eye-witness is vividly describing events which took place under his very

eyes, especially 5¹⁸ 7¹⁷ 10¹⁷ 12⁴¹ 14⁵⁵. Just as plausible is the view that the normal imperfect-form represents the conative imperfect, since it is appropriate at 9³⁸ *we tried to forbid* 15²³ *they tried to give him*.

In addition to the heaviness of style, and germane to it, is what we choose to call the iconographic nature of Mark's Greek. To some extent all the NT authors share it, but especially Mark and Revelation. They eschew literary virtuosity, conventional rules of Syntax, and they succeed in evoking a numinous sense to point the reader upwards by the unclassical barbarism of the style. This is seen particularly in a feature which we must now consider, the over-use of stereotyped expressions and the preference for a set formula. Vincent Taylor assumed that such features were part of the ancient tradition which Mark received (*Mark* 53), but they are characteristic of the evangelist himself and they abound throughout his work. In this respect the language does justice to his somewhat stereotyped theme: viz. to explain the humiliation and passion of Jesus by showing that "the true status of Jesus was a predetermined secret" (T. A. Burkill, *Mysterious Revelation*, Ithaca, N.Y., 1963, 319; cf. also the sequel, *New Light on the Earliest Gospel*, Ithaca 1972, especially 184f, 198f, 214f, 263). This is the theological standpoint which will be found most helpful for the understanding of Mark's mysterious iconographic language. Theologically and linguistically all is predetermined, nothing left to human art or device, all conforming to an iconographic pattern.

Rigidity of style is apparent in some of the repeated expressions: 3¹² 8³⁰ *he charged them to*, 5⁴³ 7³⁶ 9⁹ *he strictly charged them to*, 3^{5.34} 10²³ *he looked around . . . and said*, 1³¹ 5⁴¹ 9²⁷ *he took . . . by the hand*, 7¹⁷ 9^{28.33} 10¹⁰ *he entered the house*, 8²⁷ 9³³ 10³² *on the road*.

This poverty of expression must be deliberate, for it is not due to lack of skill in Greek composition on the part of Mark: he can properly employ his tenses (e.g. 5^{15ff} 6^{14ff} 7³⁵ 9¹⁵ 15⁴⁴), preserving the correct distinction between perfect and aorist, imperfect and aorist, which was quite beyond the powers of some contemporary writers.

The aor. is correctly followed by impf. at 6⁴¹ *he broke* (aor.) *the loaves and kept giving* (impf.). Cf. 5¹⁵ *he is in process of being possessed* (pres.), *because he has received the devils* (perf.). In 5¹⁸ the aor. ptc. (*the once possessed*) represents the man who in 5¹⁵ was constantly possessed (pres. ptc.). The distinction of aor. and perf. is carefully preserved in 5¹⁹ (*what the Lord has done for him*, as a finished work, *and did have mercy upon him*, a single act in the past), and 15^{44f} (*Pilate marvelled that he was already dead* (perf.) . . . *and asked if he died* (aor.) *very long ago*). Swete, *Mark* xlix; *Grammar* III 69.

So when Mark economizes, it is deliberately, and not through inadequate knowledge of syntax. Rather than resort to proper names unduly, he will economize with *ho de* and *hoi de*, often to the reader's

confusion, and thus marks a change of subject which might have been done more clearly by the use of a proper name. But here he is imitating a classical Greek device, though doubtless the classical writers would have been less ambiguous. The only exception to Mark's rigid use of the *ho de/hoi de* device for change of subject is at 10³², as far as can be discovered, and then it is only apparent, for the witnesses which read *kai* or *kai ho* are probably correct (A, fam¹³, etc.), as against *hoi de* in S, B, fam¹, 565, etc. This rigid feature of style is not so much "harsh" (Rawlinson) as "iconographic."

Quite as economical and enigmatic is the phrase *καὶ ἰδὼν αὐτὸν τὸ πνεῦμα συνεσπάραξεν αὐτόν* (9²⁰), which seems to defy the laws of language, but Mark may have had some such model as LXX Exod 9⁷ in mind: *ἰδὼν δὲ Φαραὼ . . . ἐβαρύνθη ἡ καρδία Φαραὼ*, and perhaps Herm. M. V 14; VII 5.

The vocabulary is economical, too, limited to 1270 words, and specially weak in particles (another feature of Semitic Greek). He has only 80 NT hapax, and only five words entirely peculiar to himself. These are all words compounded with a preposition, of which he is specially fond: *ἐκπερισσῶς* and *ὑπερπερισσῶς*, *ἐπιράπτω*, *ἐπισυντρέχω*, *προμεριμνάω*. Whether Mark invented such words it is impossible to say; they may have belonged to the vocabulary of this circle of iconographic writers, whose habit it was to build up new words from old ones. To us it seems unlikely that he would be much given to invention, for variety is not to his taste: he overworks certain words and expressions, *immediately, which is, why?, again, much, amazed, bring*. In some ways we can detect a tendency towards the vernacular, in that he uses some diminutive words which bear no diminutive force: *little daughter, little fish, little girl, small child, little shoe, small morsel, small ear*, but perhaps *little dog* and *little boat* are true diminutives; and he has the vernacular *krabattos*.

One striking example of the economy of vocabulary is the load which *eis* is made to carry, being used 165 times. The overworked preposition appears in some very interesting contexts: viz. with *baptize IN, descend UPON, preach TO, sit ON, beat IN the synagogues, to be AT home or IN the field, speak IN the village, become (into) one flesh, spread ON the road, blaspheme AGAINST*. Nevertheless the idea of motion seems to be included in most of the instances of *eis*, and it is not simply a case of confusion with *en*.

In conclusion, the impression derived from a survey of Mark's style is that he is manipulating none too skilfully but with a curious overall effectiveness, a stereotyped variety of Greek, rather inflexible and schematized, adhering to simple and rigid rules.

Thus, if he uses *pros* with verbs of speaking, it is always before *heautos* and *allēlous*: 4⁴¹ 10²⁶ ADW 12⁷ 16³; in the two apparent exceptions, it

really goes with the preceding verb 11³¹ 12⁹ and once it means *against* 12¹².

His use of *palin* and *euthus* follows rigid rules: at the beginning of the clause they are mere conjunctions, but adverbial elsewhere (*Grammar* III 229). His use of recitative *hoti* is no less rigid; his rule apparently is not to employ it after a recitative *legōn*, avoiding two recitatives in juxtaposition, for to his mind they both perform the same function, that of quote marks. When in fact they occur together, some 11 times, the *legōn* is not recitative for the main verb is other than one of speaking; where it seems to be recitative (i.e. with *answer, glorify, cry, bear false witness*) then there is always a variant omitting *hoti* and this will probably be correct—unless we are presuming to invent Mark's own rules for him.

§ 6. LATINISMS IN THE GOSPELS

Some features of Markan style recall Latin constructions and vocabulary. That they are probably more frequent in Mark than in other NT texts, except the Pastoral epistles, may raise the question whether Mark was written in Italy in a kind of Greek that was influenced by Latin. However, supposing that his language is influenced in that way, we presume that it could have happened as well in the Roman provinces.

Syntax. Whereas Latin influence is possible but improbable in certain simplifications within the Greek language itself, the aoristic perfect, the omission of the definite article, the use of subjunctive to replace optative, the periphrastic tenses, yet the following constructions have some probability, inasmuch as they tend to occur in the particularly Roman parts of the Gospel.

2²³ *make a way* may be *iter facio*, but it may as well be a Hebraism 'sh dereh, LXX Jg 17⁸, which seems more likely in view of the considerable Hebraic evidence above. 3⁶S 15¹B *making consultation* may be *consilium facere* (*capere*), 14⁶⁵ *received him with blows* may be *verberibus recipere*, 15¹⁵ *make satisfaction* may be *satisfacere* (cf. also Hermas Sim. 6.5.5), 15¹⁹ *place the knees* may be *genua ponere* (= Lk 22⁴¹ Ac 7⁶⁰ 9⁴⁰ 20³⁶ 21⁵ Herm. Vis. 1.1.3; 2.1.2; 3.1.5). But some have found a non-official Latinism in 5⁴³: *he commanded to be given her to eat* may be the construction *duci eum iussit*.

Vocabulary. Several of Mark's words are obviously transliterations from Latin, and some of them are in other gospels too, but there is nothing very remarkable about transliterations and loan-words, for they occur in all languages.

Aitia = *causa* (papyri). *Census* (papyri). *Crabattus* (papyri). *Denarius* (papyri). *Phragelloō* = *fragellare*. *Praetorius* (papyri). *Kodrantēs* = *quadrans*. The following words are found only in Mk among the gospels: *centurio, xestēs* = *sextarius, speculator*. Luke has avoided some Latin words of Mk but he still has *assarion* (= Mt), a Greek diminutive of the Roman *as* (one-sixteenth of a denarius), *sudarium* (= Jn, Ac), *legio* (Mt Mk Lk), and *modius* (Mt Mk Lk).

Extent of the Latinism. In addition to these Matthew has *mille, custodia* and *rationes conferre* 18²³ (cast up accounts). Luke has *satis accipere* Ac 17⁹, *fora aguntur* 19³⁸ (cf. also the D-text of Acts, 19^{34,35} marked *ex lat?* in Nestle). Some others are sometimes cited, but their resemblance to Latin would seem to be incidental. The integrity of Hellenistic Greek, outside the NT, was not seriously contaminated by Latinisms, and this is not really surprising, for we would expect subject peoples to avoid aping the conqueror's language. T. A. Burkill very plausibly considers that the use of *legiōn* in connection with the demoniac (Mk 5¹⁻²⁰) betrays anti-Roman feeling (*Mysterious Revelation* 93, n. 12), and we would not consider the extent of the borrowing to be much more significant than this. Rather, external influence on Greek would tend to be other than Latin. Greek language and civilization deeply influenced the Romans; the Romans did not influence the Greek language very much (F.-M. Abel, *Grammaire du Grec Biblique*, Paris 1927, XXXVI).

Codex Bezae. A question which calls for consideration is whether some of the characteristic Semitisms of the Western text are in reality Latinisms: asyndeta and parataxis may perhaps be in this category. Theoretically, asyndeton is as much a Latinism as an Aramaism, especially perhaps when it occurs in Greek books written in Rome, e.g. the *Acts of Pilate* and *Shepherd* of Hermas. Black at any rate thinks not, because the reading involving parataxis will often occur in non-Western MSS alongside the witness of D; moreover, in several instances, it is the Westcott-Hort text which has parataxis and not D (Black³ 67).

E. P. Sanders, *The Tendencies of the Synoptic Tradition*, Cambridge 1969, 251; Taylor, *Mark* 45; P. L. Couchoud, "L'Évangile de Marc a-t-il été écrit en Latin?" *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions* 94 (1926) 161-192. The main argument of the latter, which concerns MSS and versions, we do not find wholly convincing.

Other Literature :

- J. W. Hunkin, "Pleonastic *archomai* in the New Testament," *JTS* 25 (1926) 390ff.
 J. R. Harris, "An Unnoticed Aramaism in St. Mark," *ET* 26 (1915) 248ff.
 C. H. Bird, "Some *gar*-clauses in St. Mark's Gospel," *JTS* NS 4 (1953) 171-187.
 R. Morgenthaler, *Statistik des neutestamentlichen Wortschatzes*, Zurich-Frankfurt 1958.
 J. C. Doudna, *The Greek of the Gospel of Mark*, Philadelphia P.A. 1961.
 R. Bultmann, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*, ET Oxford 1963, 339ff.
 J. G. Williams, "A Critical Note on the Aramaic Indefinite Plural of the Verb," *JBL* 83 (1964) 180-182.
 J. J. O'Rourke, "Critical Notes: A note concerning the use of *eis* and *en* in Mark," *JBL* 85 (1966) 349-351.

THE STYLE OF MATTHEW

It is widely granted that the first evangelist uses sources, certainly Mark, and probably also Q and other documents. However, we are specially concerned with the stylistic matters belonging peculiarly to the evangelist himself rather than to his sources. We shall take special note of the editorial additions and corrections of Mark, and of Matthew's special material, designated M, and of Matthew's special version of Q. We must first consider how Semitic is Matthew's own peculiar style, apart from any features he may take over from Mark.

§ I. ARAMAIC INFLUENCE

Asyndeta. Although this prominent feature in Mark is relieved by Matthew on some thirty occasions, yet there are still 21 instances of asyndeta in Matthew's Markan sections where Mark has no asyndeton. Mt remedies Mk's asyndeta on the following occasions :

Mk 1⁸ (=Mt 3¹¹), 2⁹ (=9⁵), 17 (=9¹³), 21 (9¹⁶), 3³⁵ (=12⁵⁰), 5³⁹ (=9²⁴), 6³⁶ (=14¹⁵), 8¹⁵ (=16⁶), 29^b (=16¹⁶), 10¹⁴ (=19¹⁴), 25 (=19²⁴), 27 (=19²⁶), 28 (=19²⁷), 29 (=19²⁸), 12¹⁷ (=22²¹), 20 (=22²⁵), 22 (=22²⁷), 23 (=22²⁸), 24 (=22²⁹), 36 (=22⁴³), 37 (=22⁴⁵), 13⁶ (=24⁵), 7 (=24⁶), 8^b (=24^{7b}), 8^d (=24⁸), 9 (=10¹⁷), 34 (=25¹⁴), 14⁶ (=26¹⁰), 9 (=26²²), 16⁶ (=28⁶). But the following asyndeta are in Markan sections where Mk has no asyndeta : Mt 12³ 13^{13,34} 16¹⁵ 19^{7,8,20,21} 20^{21,22,23,24,33} 21²⁷ 22^{21,32} 26^{34,35,42,64} 27²². For these references I am indebted to the careful work of E. P. Sanders, *The Tendencies of the Synoptic Tradition*, Cambridge 1969, 24of.

The asyndetic *he says/they say* is presumably based on the Aramaic ptc. 'āmar, 'āmārīn. Asyndetic *legei* never occurs in Mk, and thus Mt is responsible for the following : 13^{52D} 16¹⁵ 17^{25,26D} 18²² 19^{8,18,20,21B} (rest *ephē*) 20^{7,21,23} 21^{21,42} 22^{20D} 43 26^{25,35,64} 27^{22,23D}. Asyndetic *legousi* occurs once in Mk, but all the following are peculiar to Mt : 9²⁸ 13^{28bD} 19^{7,10} 20^{7,22,33} 21^{31,41} 22^{21,42} 27²². Although Mk has asyndetic *ephē* three times (9³⁸ 10²⁹ 12²⁴), the following are peculiar to M or Mt's Q or to his editorial adjustments to Mk : 4⁷ 19²¹ not B 21²⁷ 22^{27D} 25^{21,23} 26³⁴ 27⁶⁵ not D.

Excluding *he says/they say*, notable instances of asyndeton in Mt are 6¹⁴ 19^{22D} (which are alterations in Markan sections) 25^{14D} 22 (Mt's Q) 12⁴² (Q) 22^{25D} (also in Mk).

Therefore while it is true that Matthew's use of particles is actually the highest in the NT (cf. below), yet asyndeton in Matthew is con-

siderable, occurring both within and without the teaching of Jesus. Despite his wide use of particles, *asyndeta* may still be said to be a feature of the styles of Matthew and Mark.

Other Aramaic Features. 1. *Reflexives.* Black³ (102ff) urges that 23³¹ (*bear witness to yourselves*) and 23^{9D} (*do not call you*), as well as Mk 7^{4D}, Jn 19¹⁷, are Semitic forms of reflexives, the Aramaic ethnic dative, which in non-Biblical Greek would be expressed by the middle voice. Black gives convincing examples from the Elephantine papyri, e.g. *I went me home, he went him up to the roof, he fell him asleep.*

2. Adverbial *palin* in the gospels probably represents the Aramaic *tubh* (*then*) which occurs 26 times in Mark, but only a few times in non-Markan parts of Matthew.

Mt sometimes copies *palin* from Mk (21³⁶ 26^{42,43,72}), and sometimes he uses it independently, although most of these instances are better understood in the normal sense of *again* (4⁷ *again it is written*, 5³³ *again you have heard*, perhaps also 13⁴⁵ 19²⁴ 20⁵ 22¹ 26^{43,44,72} 27⁵⁰). Only on the following occasions has it certainly the Aramaic sense: 4⁸ *then the devil takes him* (Mt's Q), 18¹⁹ *then verily I say to you* (M), 22⁴ *then he sent other servants* (Mt's Q). Black³ 112f.

3. The redundant *begin to* is an Aramaism which Matthew has reduced from Mark's 26 instances to his own 13, but that is not the complete picture. In view of the following evidence it cannot be urged that Matthew was trying to improve the style of Mark by eliminating the auxiliary *begin to*.

Mt found this Aramaism in Mk 26 times and retained it only six times (12¹ 16^{21,22} 26^{22,37,74}); nevertheless Mt found it also in Q and retained it three times (11^{7,20} 24⁴⁹), and even more significantly (unless *begin* is not redundant here) he once added it to Mk quite gratuitously (at 4¹⁷); on a further three occasions it was either in his special M-source or was part of his own editorial work (14³⁰ 18²⁴ 20⁸).

4. *From that hour* 9²² 15²⁸ 17¹⁸ (in these Markan sections, the phrase is always peculiar to Mt) is a rabbinical Aramaism. Black³ 110 n.1.

5. The act. impers. plural is found in Mt as well as in Mk (cf. above p. 12): Mt 5¹⁵ (Mt's Q) 9² (from Mk) 17²⁷ (M) (sing.).

That, we suggest, is the extent of exclusively Aramaic influence upon the peculiarly Matthaean style. It is considerable, but probably not as much as it is in Mark.

§ 2. HEBRAIC INFLUENCE

Sentence Construction. 1. The anarthrous partitive expression as the object of a verb is found in Mark, but independently also in Matthew. One instance he shares with Luke (Q), 23³⁴ *some of them you will slay*, and one is from his M-source 25⁸ *give us some of your oil*, both with *ek* and both in the teaching of Jesus.

2. Prolepsis of the subject of a subordinate clause occurs in the teaching of Jesus 10²⁵ *it is enough for the disciple that (hina) he should be as his Master (M)*, when more naturally we should read: *it is enough that the disciple should be as his Master*, 25²⁴ *I knew you that you were (Mt's Q)*. This is widely used in the NT.

The Verb. Perhaps the Greek aorist, on occasions when the present tense might be more appropriate, is an unconscious substitute for the Hebrew Stative perfect, which is not actually a past tense. The instances occur in the teaching of Jesus and raise the question what language he used. If they reflect the Stative perfect, then he did not use Aramaic on these occasions. However, it is no more likely that he used Hebrew either, but this idiom is a part of free Jewish Greek.

These are all peculiar to Mt: 6¹² *as we forgive* (i.e. have reached a stage of habitually forgiving), 10²⁵ *if they called* (i.e. habitually call) *the householder Beezeboul*, 14³¹ *why did you doubt* (i.e. get into a state of doubting)?, 23² *the scribes sat (do sit) in Moses's seat*, 13³⁴ 22² *the Kingdom of Heaven was likened* (is like).

The Noun. 1. Perhaps the omission of the definite article on occasions when normal Greek requires it betrays the habit of thinking in terms of the construct state: 1²⁰ 2^{13,19} [the] *angel of the Lord* (Mt's free composition), 12⁴² [the] *Queen of the South* (both forms of Q), 12³⁵ [the] *good treasury* (both forms of Q).

2. However, sometimes Hebrew idiom will influence the Greek writers towards a needless insertion of the article, reflecting the emphatic state in which a noun is made more definite in order to denote a special person or object.

Mt 5¹⁵ *under the measure . . . upon the lampstand* (both forms of Q), 12²⁴⁻²⁷ *the demons* (for *some demons*) (Mt Mk Lk), 15²⁹ *to the mountain* (add. to Mk), 12¹²B *a man better than the sheep* (add. to Mk), 18¹⁹D* *all the matter* (for *any matter*) M.

3. Literal translation of Heb. infin. absol. is a Septuagintism in Biblical Greek. It occurs in Mt's own work: 2¹⁰ *rejoiced with joy*. Also in Lk Jn Jas 1 Pet Rev.

The Negative. The strong negative *ou mē* is restricted to the teaching of Jesus. In denials it is usually taken over by Matthew from Mark (16²⁸ 24^{2,21,34,35} 26^{29,35}), but occasionally it is peculiarly Matthaean, being added to the Markan material (16²² 21¹⁹) or taken from Q (5²⁸) or from Matthew's special material (5^{18,20} 15⁵). This double negative is a Septuagintal feature of Matthew, Mark, and John.

Thus, the peculiarly Hebrew influence is not considerable. However, any of the instances in the following section may just as well indicate Hebrew influence as Aramaic,

§ 3. SEMITIC (HEBREW OR ARAMAIC) INFLUENCE

Sentence Construction. 1. *Parataxis.* Generally, Matthew reduces the Semitic nature of Mark's style in this respect: Luke on 23 occasions, and Matthew on 19, have eliminated Mark's parataxis by the substitution of a participle.

E.g. Mk 1⁴¹ *he touched and says* = Mt 8³ *he touched saying*. However, there are four instances of the reverse process, where Mt has the parataxis and Mk is without it: Mt 14⁶ *she danced and pleased* = Mk 6²² *dancing she pleased*, Mt 17¹¹ *Elijah comes and will restore* = Mk 9¹² *Elijah coming restores*, Mt 21¹² *he entered and cast out* = Mk 11¹⁵ *entering he cast out*, Mt 26⁶⁹ *Peter sat outside and she came up* = Mk 14¹⁶ *while Peter was below she comes*. I owe these instances to E. P. Sanders, 238f.

It cannot therefore be urged that Matthew was "improving" the style of Mark in this respect, nor that Matthew felt that parataxis was alien to his own style.

2. *Casus Pendens.* This too is a genuine feature of Matthew's style, but it must be admitted that, since all the examples are from the words of Jesus, the casus pendens may be due to literal translation from the Semitic language of Jesus.

Mt 24¹³ has borrowed from Mk *he that endureth . . . he shall be saved*, the remainder being from M (13³⁸ *the good seed, these are . . .*, 19²⁸ *you that have . . . you shall . . .*) or Mt's additions to Markan sections (13^{20, 22, 23} *that sown . . . this is*, 15¹¹ *not that which enters . . . this defiles the man*, 26²⁸ *he that dips . . . this man shall*). To these examples of Burney (*Aramaic Origin* 65), Black adds 6^{4D} *and thy Father . . . he shall recompense*, 12³⁶ *every idle word . . . he shall account for it* (M), 5^{40D} *he that wishes . . . let him*, 12³² *whosoever shall speak . . . it shall be forgiven him* (Q). Cf. Black³ 53. Black observes that in this respect D has preserved the "primitive text" better than SB. It should be noted that in this Semitic construction *ekeinos* or *houtos* is equally possible, but that Mt favours the latter.

3. *Questions as protasis of a conditional clause.* Black points out that in Semitic languages a question may be a substitute for a condition, as in Ps 25¹² *who is the man that fears the Lord* (= if a man fears the Lord). In Hebrew, "in lively speech aided by intonation almost any direct form of expression without particles may be equivalent to what in other languages would be a conditional" (A. B. Davidson, *Hebrew Syntax*³, Edinburgh 1901, § 132, rem. 2). In Mt there is a possible instance: 24⁴⁵ *if a faithful and wise servant has been made overseer . . . blessed is he when his lord returns and finds him so doing* (Q).

The Verb. 1. Periphrastic tenses when found in Mark are nearly always changed by both Matthew and Luke, but Matthew leaves unaltered the periphrastic tenses at 7²⁹ 10²¹ 13³⁰ 19²² 26⁴³ 27^{33, 55}. In addition he retained 24^{40f} *shall be grinding* from Q (Mt and Lk's), and quite independently added 5²⁵ 10³⁰ 24³⁸ (in Mt's Q), and 1²³ 9³⁶ 12⁴ 16¹⁹ 18^{18, 20} 27⁶¹ (special source M or Mt's editorial work). The love for periphrastic tenses is therefore not peculiar to Mark.

2. The auxiliary verb *take* is very common in Matthew, who takes it from Mark only four times.

From Mk: Mt 21³⁵ *taking he beat*, ³⁹ *taking they cast*, 26^{26,27} *taking the bread/cup, he blessed/gave thanks*. The only other instances are Mt's own work (17²⁷ 25¹ 27^{24,46,59}) or else from Q (13^{31,33}). It corresponds to Heb. *lāqāḥ*, *nāṭal*, Aram. *nʿṣab*.

3. The auxiliary *come* (Heb. *lek*, Aram. *'azal*) is sometimes taken from Mark (9¹⁸ 15²⁵ 26⁴³), and Matthew uses it independently at 2^{8,9,23} 4¹³ 5²⁴ 18³¹ 20¹⁰ 27⁶⁴ 28¹³ (all M), 8⁷ 12⁴⁴ 24⁴⁶ 25²⁷ (Q), 8¹⁴ 9^{10,23} 13⁴ 14¹² 16¹³ (additions to Mark).

4. Use of the impersonal plural is Semitic, though it has been claimed as an Aramaism (cf. pp. 12, 89). It was frequent in Mark, but Matthew has it quite independently at 1²³ *they shall call his name* (M), 5¹⁵ *do they light* (Q), 7¹⁶ *they gather* 9¹⁷ *they put new wine* (Matthew only).

5. True, Matthew has changed Mark's historic present 78 times (Sanders 246), not because he found it alien to his style, for he has the tense 23 times when it is absent from Mark's parallel. However, it is doubtful whether the excessive use of historic present can certainly be claimed as a Semitism; "modern Aramaic scholars seem not to consider it an Aramaism, and it is not included in their discussions" (Sanders 253). As Sanders observes, the use is probably a matter of taste, but, we suspect, strongly affected by Jewish influence (above p. 20).

Pronoun. 1. *Substitutes for indefinite pronoun (tis)*. *Heis* is the equivalent of Heb. *'aḥadh*, Aram. *ḥadh*. Although Mt retains Mk's *heis* on two occasions (19¹⁶ 22³⁵ = Mk 10¹⁷ 12²⁸), yet on three other occasions he supplies *one* where Mk does not (21¹⁹ 26⁵¹ 27⁴⁸); sometimes he has conflated Mk and Lk (9¹⁸ v.l. 22³⁵ 26⁸⁹), and once he has taken it from Q (8¹⁹). Twice otherwise it is peculiar to Mt (12¹¹ 18²⁴). On another occasion, 27⁴⁸ *one of them* (*heis* as pure pronoun), he has altered Mk's more normal *tis* in the Semitic direction.

Other substitutes for the indefinite pronominal adjective include *anthrōpos*: 7⁹ *what man of you* (Q), 9³²D *dumb man* (M), 11¹⁹ *gluttonous man* (Q), 12¹¹ *what man of you* (Mt only), 13²⁸ *an enemy man* (M), ⁵² *a householder man* (M), ⁴⁵D *a man a merchant* (M), 18²³ *a king man* (M), 21²³ *a householder man* (Mt and Lk have only *man*), 25²⁴ *a hard man* (Q), 27³² *a man a Cyrenian* (Mt's add.), ⁵⁷ *a rich man* (Mt's add.).

Also *anēr*: 7²⁴ *wise man* (Q), ²⁶ *foolish man* (Q), 12⁴¹ *Ninevite man* (Q). Also *anthrōpos* as an indef. pronoun proper: 8⁹ *one under authority* (Q), 9⁹ *one sitting* (Mt only), 11⁸ *one clothed* (Q), 12⁴³ *out of someone* (Q), 13³¹ *someone sowed* (Q), ⁴⁴ *someone hid* (M), 17¹⁴ *someone kneeling* (Mt only; Lk *anēr*), 21²⁸ *someone had* (M), 22¹¹ *someone without a wedding garment* (Mt's add.).

We see then that this idiom occurs in Mt's own work and must be part of his style.

2. *Superfluous pronoun*. Instances of oblique cases of *autos* occur throughout all strata of the Gospel: M 1^{2,11,18} 5^{1,22,28,35} Markan 3^{3,4,6,13}

Q 4⁶ 5^{2,25,32,45} and so on. For parallel passages of Mt, Mk and Lk, E. P. Sanders examines Mt's occurrences of the superfluous genitive pronoun where Mk is lacking it, and vice versa, with these results: proportion Mt : Mk :: 14 : 16, proportion Mt : Lk :: 15 : 7, illustrating that Mk is most addicted to this superlative pronoun and Lk the least. However, "the difference is not large enough to be of significance" (Sanders 167f, 184); "and the Semitic Matthew's usage is no more abundant than Mark's or Luke's" (*Grammar* III 38).

3. *Resumptive pronoun after a relative.* This characteristic Semitic feature, found in Mk, is used independently by Mt or taken over from Q by Mt; 3¹² *of whom the fan is in his hand*, 10^{11D} *into whatsoever city . . . you enter into it*, 18^{20D} *among whom I am not in the midst of them*.

4. *Proleptic nominative pronoun.* Used by Mk 6¹⁷ 12^{36,37}, it is also added to a Markan section by Mt (3⁴ *he, i.e. John*). It is "evidence for a very primitive kind of translation or Semitic Greek. It would not, of course, be understood by Greek readers who were not Jews or Greek-speaking Syrians. . . . Many other examples were probably removed [by revising scribes] from the primitive text" (Black³ 100).

5. *Distributive pronoun: heis . . . heis for one . . . another.* Some of the Markan instances (Mk 4^{8,20} 9⁵ 10³⁷ 14¹⁹ 15²⁷) Mt has adopted 20²¹ 27³⁸, but in Mt's Q we find the same idiom 24^{40,41}. However, he seems to have left Q unaltered at 6²⁴ where Q has the normal Greek (*one . . . another*) in both Mt's and Lk's version, and he has altered Mk 4⁸ into less Semitic Greek (13⁸).

6. *Reflexive pronoun.* In common with other NT authors, Mt is prone to use the simple pronoun where a reflexive would be more normal: 6¹⁹ *treasure up treasure for you* (= yourselves), 17²⁷ *for me and you* (= myself and yourself), 18¹⁵ *judge between you and him* (= yourself).

The reflexive pronoun tended to fall out in Biblical Greek, in favour of simple pronoun. "The confusion has a Semitic explanation, in that Hebrew-Aramaic pronominal suffixes allow no distinction between personal and reflexive" (*Grammar* III 42).

Conjunctions. Epexegetical *hina*: the use of *hina* in Matthew is not considerable compared with some NT authors (cf. below pp. 73f), but the epexegetical *hina* occurs fairly often. Matthew takes it directly from Mark, but twice (with Luke) from Q (4³ 7¹²), once from Mt's Q (18¹⁴), once from M (28¹⁰). On the whole, Matthew tends to substitute an infinitive expression for Mark's *hina*.

Propositions. An instance of interest and difficulty concerns *pros* at 27¹⁴ *he answered him TO not even a word* (πρὸς οὐδὲ ἓν ῥῆμα). Black (117) tentatively suggests the Aramaic *lequbhla* but with hesitation. In fact, the idiom is a Septuagintism, although it does not directly correspond with a parallel Hebrew construction, occurring at Job 9³ (μὴ ἀντεῖπη πρὸς ἕνα λόγον), and the idiom may belong not to translation Greek but to Jewish Greek. On the whole, Matthew is not as Septuagintal in style as Luke.

But the citations peculiar to Mt are akin to the LXX, and even when they differ do not correspond with the Hebrew (K. Stendahl, *The School of St. Matthew and its Use of the Old Testament*, Uppsala 1954). The following

citations seem to be free renderings from the Hebrew : 2⁶ 8¹⁷ 13³⁵ 14^{15f} 27^{9f}. Citations taken from Mk are either left unchanged or else brought nearer to the LXX.

§ 4. RELATIVE SEMITIC QUALITY OF MATTHEW AND MARK

It is sometimes assumed that Matthew writes Greek of a less Aramaic quality than Mark, and that he tends to soften the Semitisms in general. That is not always true : we have found already many Semitisms which may be attributed to Matthew independently of Mark. Nevertheless, besides those already noted there are some general Semitic-type phrases which have been put forward to show that Mark is more Semitic than Matthew.

E.g. Mk 3²⁸ *the sons of men* (Mt 12³¹ *the men*), Mk 4²⁰ τὴν γῆν τὴν καλὴν (Mt 13²³ adj. placed between art. and noun, and in other ways the style of this passage in Mt is more elegant), Mk 4²² *nothing is hid, unless in order that* (Mt 10²⁶ *nothing is hid which shall not*), Mk 7²⁰ *that which . . . that defiles* (Mt 15¹⁸ less Semitic), Mk 8³⁶ *gain the whole world AND forfeit* (Mt 16²⁶ *but for and*), Mk 9⁹ *unless when* (Mt 17⁹ *until* less Semitic), Mk 11²⁴ *it shall be to you* (Mt 21²² *you shall receive*), Mk 11²⁹ *answer me AND I shall tell you* (Mt 21²⁴ first part conditional), Mk 11³² *BUT we say* (Mt 21²⁶ *IF we say*), Mk 12² partitive expression as obj. of verb (Mt 21³⁴ altered to accus.), Mk 12¹⁹ *die and leave . . . and not leave* (Mt 22²⁴ participle).

It is true that in these instances Matthew has substituted an expression which has a normal Greek sound for one with a Semitic flavour. Yet if we examine the Markan sections of Matthew we shall find the contrary evidence, suggesting that Matthew has altered Mark to something more Semitic, confirming what we have already found.

E.g. Mt 12²⁴ *this one does not cast out demons unless by Beezeboul* (Mk 3²² less Semitic : *he cast out demons by Beezeboul*), Mt 12²⁵ *every city . . . shall not* (Mk 3²⁵ *if a house*). . .), Mt 13¹⁹ *everyone hearing* (Mk 4¹⁵ *when they hear*), Mt 13^{20.22.23} *that which . . . this is* (Mk 4^{16.18.20} less Semitic), Mt 15¹¹ *that which comes . . . this* (Mk 7¹⁵ *the things which*), Mt 26²⁸ *the one dipping . . . this one* (Mk 14²⁰ no Semitism), Mt 27⁴² *let him come down AND we will believe* (Mk 15³² . . . *in order that*. . .).

It would seem then that there is very little to choose between the relative Semitism of Mark's and Matthew's style. Neither Matthew nor Luke discloses any significant tendency to avoid the Semitisms of Mark. Mark is no more likely to be an Aramaic translation than Matthew or Luke ; in some respects (e.g. parataxis) Mark may be more Semitic, but even this does not suggest direct translation. Matthew's Greek is assuredly not a translation, in spite of its Semitic idiom, for its style is too smooth, too much interspersed with subordinate clauses and genitives absolute, one of the latter appearing every twenty verses.

Men . . . de, not at all characteristic of translation Greek, occurs in the teaching of Jesus, his disciples, and the Baptist. The Greek puns are too complex to have been transmitted in a translation.

E.g. even in the teaching of Jesus we have 6¹⁶ ἀφανίζουσιν . . . φανῶσω (*they disfigure . . . to appear*), 16¹⁸ (the Peter-Rock pun), 21⁴¹ κακούς κακῶς. Thus, "it would have been pointless for early translators of the Lord's words to indulge in clever adornments, and interest in language for its own sake could not have been very high on their list of priorities" (*Grammatical Insights* 181).

§ 5. A SMOOTHER STYLE THAN MARK

Particles. Matthew's usage is the most considerable in the NT, with one particle every three lines of Nestle, closely followed by Luke-Acts with one in four lines; but although Matthew uses *men . . . de* twice as frequently as Mark pro rata (once in 100 lines for Matthew; once in 212 for Mark), he still falls behind all other NT authors in this respect, except for the Johannine epistles and Revelation.

Mt retains two instances of Mk's *men . . . de* (26^{34,41}), one he shares with Lk from Q (9³⁷), and the rest are either from Mt's Q (16⁸ 22^{5,8} 23^{27,28} 25¹⁵) or Mt's source M and his editorial additions (3¹¹ 10¹³ 13^{4,8,23,32} 16¹⁴ 17¹¹ 20²³ 21³⁵ 25³³).

The frequency of *gar* is about the same as in Mark (one in 15 lines), less frequent than Paul and Hebrews, more so than Luke-Acts and the Johannine writings. The frequency of *oun* is about the same as Paul's (one in 35 lines), of *alla* slightly more than Luke-Acts (one in 54 lines) but substantially less than the Johannine epistles, Paul, and 1 Peter.

Change to less vernacular speech.

a. Doubtful instances of this. *Hina* after a verb of command (Mk 6⁸) is absent from Mt 10¹⁰, perhaps because Matthew did not favour the emerging popularity of *hina*. W. C. Allen presented its absence as an instance of Matthew's correction of Mark's harsh syntax (Mark ICC xxvii). More probably there is no significance in the change, for Matthew failed to correct Mark at 16²⁰ 20³¹, and he has *hina* after commands several times: in Q-sections 4³ 14³⁶, in M 28¹⁰, or simply added gratuitously to Mark 26⁶³.

The removal of some of Mk's favourite words may be a bid to make the style more literary: *immediately*, *again*, adverbial *polla*, and recitative *hoti*. It is true that Mt has reduced 42 instances of Mk's *euthus* to seven, 28 instances of *palin* to 16, 27 instances of recitative *hoti* to about 13 (*Grammar* III 326). About 60 times he has substituted *de* for *kai*, and although he has 93 instances of historic present, he often alters Mk's characteristic imperfect and historic present to more normal aorist (he

retains only about 20 examples out of 150). Here again, however, caution is required. He retains 66 examples of *he says/ they say*, and so one should avoid exaggerating the extent to which Mt normalizes the style of Mk.

Sometimes the change of voice is towards a more conventional but less vivid Greek style, as when Mk 1¹² *the Spirit drives him* becomes Mt 4¹ *he was led up by the Spirit*; Mk 1³¹ *he raised her up* becomes Mt 8¹⁵ *she arose*; and Mk 5⁴⁰ *having put them all forth* becomes Mt 9²⁵ *when the crowd was put forth*. On the other hand again, the very reverse process takes place from Mk 15⁴⁶ *a tomb which had been hewn out of the rock* to Matthew's more vivid active voice, *which he had hewn in the rock* 27⁶⁰.

We must now look critically at the claim that Matthew avoids a compound verb followed by the same preposition (alleged by Allen, *Matthew ICC*). True, he does avoid it on a few occasions:

Mk 1¹⁸ *para- . . . para-* becomes Mt 4¹⁸ *peri- . . . para-*, Mk 1²¹ 2¹ 3¹ 5¹³ *eis- . . . eis* becomes either Mt 4¹³ 9¹ 12⁹— *eis* or 8³² *ap- . . . eis*, Mk 5¹⁷ *apo- . . . apo* becomes Mt 8³⁴ *meta- . . . apo*, and Mk 6¹ *ek- . . . ekeithen* becomes Mt 13⁵⁸ *meta- . . . ek*.

This is not the whole truth, for Matthew retains Mark's *eis- . . . eis* on a number of occasions: 10¹¹ 12^{4,29} 15^{11,17}. He takes *ek- . . . ek* from Q (15^{11,18}) and from M (27⁵³). The avoidance is therefore a matter of chance and not a regular feature of style.

This is confirmed by the circumstance that in some other respects Mt is quite vernacular in style. He is indifferent to the distinction between definite and indeterminate relative pronouns, i.e. between *hos* and *hostis*. He has *hostis* on several occasions when *hos* would be less vernacular; and only one instance is taken from Mk (Mt 16²⁸), the rest being part of his special source M or of his editorial work 7¹⁵ 13⁵² 19¹²bis 20¹ 21^{33,41} 25¹ 27^{55,62}, or else they are peculiar to his Q material 7²⁶ 22² 23²⁷. Then again, in common with other NT authors (Mk, Lk-Ac, Jn) he attempts to use the gen. absol. but fails to use it properly, making it once agree with the subject (1¹⁸M), and often using it in place of the ptc. in the dative: 1²⁰ 9¹⁸ 8²⁹ 18²⁴ (M), 5¹ 8^{1,5} 21²³ (Mt's Q), 9¹⁰ 27¹⁷ (Mt only). In textual transmission, atticizing scribes have often made the necessary correction.

b. More probable instances. It is difficult to decide how far Matthew's changes are intended to be improvements upon Mark, but there is no doubt that some of Matthew's changes make for smoother Greek: e.g. the substitution of *epi* for *eis* (e.g. Mt 3¹⁶ 24³⁰) and the replacing of vulgar and Semitic *pros* by a plain dative (8¹⁶ 9² 17¹⁷ 22²³ 27⁵⁸). Doubtless Matthew has improved the vernacular of Mark by avoiding his *hotan* with indicative (Mk 3¹¹ 11^{19,25}) and his *hopou an* with indicative (Mk 6⁵⁶) which also occur in Rev 14⁴.

Avoidance of Redundancy. Matthew seeks to avoid Mark's repetition and prolixity of expression by some significant omissions.

Examples are as follows, the bracketed words being Mt's omissions : Mk 1¹⁵ (*the time is fulfilled and*) *the Kingdom of God has drawn near* ; *repent (and believe in the Gospel)*, Mk 1³² *it being evening (when the sun had set)*, Mk 1⁴² *and immediately the leprosy (went away from him and he) was cleansed*, Mk 2²⁰ *then (in that day)*, Mk 2²⁵ *when they (had need and) were hungry*.

Matthew will avoid Mark's prolixity on occasion by removing a superfluous indirect object, whether introduced by plain dative or by *pros* (Sanders 158f).

First of all, after a verb of saying, the indirect object *to him/her/them/one another* is omitted by Mt (Mk 1⁴⁰ = Mt 8², Mk 1⁴¹ = Mt 8³, Mk 2¹⁷ = Mt 9¹², Mk 4¹¹ = Mt 13¹¹, Mk 4³⁵ = Mt 8¹⁸, Mk 4⁴¹ = Mt 8²⁷, Mk 5³⁴ = Mt 9²², Mk 5³⁹ = Mt 9²³, Mk 7¹⁸ = Mt 15¹⁶, Mk 7²⁸ = Mt 15²⁷, Mk 8¹ = Mt 15³², Mk 8¹⁷ = Mt 16⁸, Mk 8²⁷ = Mt 16¹³, Mk 8²⁸ = Mt 16¹⁴, Mk 8²⁹ = Mt 16¹⁶, Mk 9¹² = Mt 17¹⁷, Mk 9³⁶ = Mt 18³, Mk 10¹⁴ = Mt 19¹⁴, Mk 10²⁶ = Mt 19²⁵, Mk 10³⁸ = Mt 20²², Mk 10⁴² = Mt 20²⁵, Mk 11²⁸ = Mt 21²³, Mk 12¹⁴ = Mt 22¹⁶, Mk 12¹⁵ = Mt 22¹⁸, Mk 12¹⁶ = Mt 22²¹, Mk 14¹³ = Mt 26¹⁸, Mk 14²⁰ = Mt 26³³, Mk 15² = Mt 27¹¹, Mk 15¹⁴ = Mt 27²³). Then also after *command* Mk 6³⁹ = Mt 14¹⁹, *come* Mk 1⁴⁰ = Mt 8², *mock* Mk 10³⁴ = Mt 20¹⁹, Mk 15³¹ = Mt 27⁴¹, *bring* Mk 11⁷ = Mt 21⁷, *send* Mk 12⁴ = Mt 21³⁶, *indignant* Mk 14⁴ = Mt 26⁸.

Matthew's intention, however, may be only apparent, else it is unaccountable why sometimes he makes a point of adding a superfluous indirect object to Mark.

Mt 19³ *came up to him* (Mk 10²), Mt 21² *bring him to me* (Mk 11²), Mt 21³³ *set a hedge to it* (Mk 12¹), Mt 21⁴⁰ *do to those tenants* (Mk 12⁹), Mt 22¹⁹ *brought to him* (Mk 12¹⁶), Mt 26^{40,46} *comes to the disciples* (Mk 14^{37,41}), Mt 26⁶⁹ *came to him* (Mk 14⁶⁶), Mt 26⁶⁸ *prophecy to us* (Mk 14⁶⁵). Mt adds the indirect object to Mk's verb of saying: Mt 21⁶ = Mk 11⁶, Mt 21²⁵ = Mk 11³¹, Mt 26¹⁰ = Mk 14⁶, Mt 26⁶⁴ = Mk 14⁶², Mt 27¹⁴ = Mk 15⁵.

Avoidance of the graphic. Matthew will often avoid the vividly and descriptively colourful in Mark, and will seek a more commonplace expression. Not that Matthew is less Semitic, but he certainly is less dramatically picturesque.

E.g. such phrases as *were opened* Mt 3¹⁶ in place of *split asunder* Mk 1¹⁰ ; *he was led up* Mt 4¹ in place of *he throws him out* Mk 1¹² ; *throwing a casting-net* Mt 4¹⁸ in place of *casting around* Mk 1¹⁶ ; *bed* (a classical word) Mt 9⁶ in place of *pallet* (a late loan-word) Mk 2¹¹ ; *put on* Mt 9¹⁶ in place of *stitch on* (a very rare word) Mk 2²¹ ; *like the light* Mt 17² in place of *radiant* (a NT hapax) Mk 9³ ; *eye* (classical) Mt 19²⁴ in place of *hole* (in a needle) Mk 10²⁵ ; *entrance* (ordinary Hellenistic word) Mt 26⁷¹ in place of *forecourt* (very rare) Mk 14⁶⁸ ; *to persuade* Mt 27²⁰ in place of *rouse the rabble* (late and rare) Mk 15¹¹.

Systematic arrangement of material. As a teacher Matthew favours certain didactic arrangements involving three, five, seven, and

14. Moreover, the midrashic element is prominent. Matthew betrays a scribal training in other ways too: by the portrait of Jesus which he presents, by his concern over the fulfilment of prophecy and by his conception of Christianity as a reformed Judaism. There are six large discourses containing the teaching of Jesus, each (except the fifth) ending with the formula, *and it happened when Jesus had finished* 7²⁸ 11¹ 13⁵³ 19¹ 26¹. 1. The Sermon on the Mount (5-7). 2. Apostolic Instructions (10). 3. Parabolic Discourse (13). 4. The Apostolate (18). 5. The Woes (23). 6. Eschatology (24-25). Perhaps 5 and 6 form one discourse, to make a five-fold division, like the Torah. Accordingly we presume that the author was a Jewish Christian who had undergone rabbinical training.

The Priority of Mark. Matthew's style then is less spectacular, without distinction, smoother than Mark's; in this respect Matthew's Gospel may be said to be secondary to Mark's, and a development from it. It would be wrong however to conclude that the reduction of Semitisms is a sign of development. In an important chapter ("IV. Diminishing Semitism as a Possible Tendency of the Tradition," *op. cit.*), E. P. Sanders shows that although Mark is richer in certain Semitisms (e.g. parataxis, anacolutha), and although it "suited Mark's redactional style to write vernacular Greek more than it did the style of Matthew and Luke," yet on this evidence alone Mark is not the earliest gospel (Sanders 255). The Semitisms seem to me not to stem entirely from the speech of Jesus, but to belong to the style used by all the evangelists. How the Semitisms came into the language is a difficult question, but we doubt whether it was entirely through the translation of Aramaic or Hebrew documents. At any rate, although Mark is more Semitic in style it is not for that reason any closer to a primitive tradition.

§ 6. FURTHER STYLISTIC CHARACTERISTICS OF MATTHEW

Probably for mnemonic purposes, not clear to us, Matthew has the habit of repeating a phrase within the compass of a short passage, never to use it again. It seems no more than a curious habit.

Thus, within 2¹⁻¹⁹ are three similar phrases: 1. *When Jesus was born* (gen. absol.) *behold*. 2. *When they departed* (gen. absol.) *behold*. 3. *When Herod was dead* (gen. absol.) *behold*. Within 3¹⁻¹³ are two phrases: 1. *John comes*. 2. *Jesus comes*. Within 4¹²⁻⁵¹ three phrases: 1. *And Jesus hearing*. 2. *And Jesus walking*. 3. *And he seeing*. Within 4²⁰⁻²² *immediately leaving* (twice). Within 8²³⁻²⁸ two phrases: 1. *And having embarked* (dat.). 2. *And having come* (dat.). Within 9²⁶⁻³¹ two phrases: 1. *Into all that land*. 2. *In all that land*. Within 11²⁵⁻¹²¹: *And at that time* (twice). Within 13²⁴⁻³³ three

phrases : 1. *He put forth another parable to them saying* (twice). 2. *Another parable he spoke to them.* Within 13⁴⁴⁻⁴⁷ three phrases : 1. *Is like.* 2. *Again is like* (twice). Within 15²¹⁻²⁹ *And departing thence* (twice).

The Use of Prepositions. It is possible to some extent to determine the quality of Matthew's style from the kind of prepositions he uses and their relative frequency. From the evidence below Matthew would seem to be in a class with Hebrews, James, 1 Peter, and Luke-Acts.

Of all the NT authors it is Mt who comes nearest to Polybius in the use of cases with *epi* (Polybius gen : dat : accus : proportion of 1,5 : 1 : 3, Mt proportion of 1,6 : 1 : 3,3), in contrast to Jn (1,7 : 1 : 3,5) and the LXX (1,4 : 1 : 3,8) who are almost in the same category. However, in the relative frequency of *en* and *epi*, Mt is closest to Heb (1 : 0,41) ; and in the proportion of cases with *dia* he is closest to Jas (gen : accus :: 1 : 1). In the proportion of *en* : *eis* Mt is exactly in the category of Lk-Ac and 1 Pet (*en* : *eis* :: 1 : 0,8). Moreover, he is more careful than any NT author to preserve the distinction between *eis* and *en*, the nearest to him being Jn. In making a comparatively frequent use of *anti* (five times), Mt is comparable with Heb, Jas, and 1 Pet. Moreover, Mt and 1 Pet are the only NT authors to use *aneu* (Mt 10²⁹ 1 Pet 3¹⁴⁹). In the proportion of *apo* : *ek* Mt is once more in the class of Lk-Ac and Heb, as the following figures show :

Mt	1,2 : 1	Jas	0,4 : 1
Mk	0,6 : 1	1 Pet	0,6 : 1
Lk-Ac	1,2 : 1	2 Pet. Jude	0,6 : 1
Jn	0,2 : 1	Joh. Epp	0,6 : 1
Paul	0,5 : 1	Rev	0,3 : 1
Heb	1 : 1		

Mt's use of *pro* (once in 398 lines) is almost the same as Paul's (once in 366 lines) ; Mt's preference for *meta* c. gen as against *sun* is shared by the Joh. writings (including Rev) and Heb and to some extent Mk, viz.

Mt	15 : 1	Heb	14 : 0
Mk	9 : 1	Jas	0 : 1
Lk-Ac	1,2 : 1	Joh. Epp.	8 : 0
Jn	39 : 1	Rev	39 : 0
Paul	1,7 : 1		

Mt makes about the same use of *heneka* as Mk, and rather more than Lk-Ac or Paul, the only other NT users. The prepositional use of *hed̄s* by Mt (once in 104 lines) is nearest to that of Lk-Ac (once in 170) and Jas (once in 216), though Mk, Paul and Heb also have it to a less extent. Using *mechris*, Mt closely resembles Paul and Heb and to a less extent Mk and Lk-Ac. Mt uses *achri(s)* less frequently than Lk-Ac, Paul, Heb and Rev.

The Use of Other Syntax. 1. *Number.* Zerwick (*Graecitas Biblica* § 4a) suggests that the use of *pluralis categoriae*, twice in Mt, should be rendered by the singular: 2²³ *prophets* 27⁴⁴ *robbers* (when only one prophet and robber is intended). But also: 14⁹ (= Mk) 21⁷ 22⁷ 28⁹. Moreover, *many crowds* 4²⁵ 8^{1.18}v.l. 13³ 15³⁰ 19² is Mt's idiom for *a great crowd* and is not to be understood of separate groups. It may reflect late Greek usage (*Grammar* III 26).

2. *Tou c. infin.* (in a final sense) belongs to the LXX and the higher Koine; in the NT it is confined to the more "literary" books: Mt (six times), Lk-Ac (50), Paul (19), Heb (five), Jas (two), 1 Pet (two). The single instance in Rev is probably an independent imperative (cf. p. 152). The instances in Mt are usually his own work, but one is an agreement of Mt and Lk against Mk (13³ *went out to sow*) while one is from Q (24⁴⁵ *in order to give*), shared with Lk. Mt's own are 2¹³ *to kill him* (M), 3¹³ *to be baptized* (add. to Mk) 11¹ *departed to teach* (M), 21³² *repented in order to believe* (M).

Vocabulary. We can distinguish certain words as quite characteristic of Matthew. In total he has a vocabulary of some 1690 words, of which 112 are NT hapax. Among the latter, 26 occur in the LXX. Among Matthew's favourite words and phrases may be noted the following, which occur in all strata (Birth narrative, Markan sections, Q and L).

ὄχλος: sing. and plur. 47 times (but Mk has 38).

πληρώ: 16 times.

δικαιοσύνη: seven times.

ὑποκριτής: ten times.

ἰδοῦ: 45 times.

ἀναχωρέω: ten times, borrowed from Mk at 12¹⁵, but also in M.

προφέρω: 14 times.

προσέρχομαι: 52 times.

συνέγω: 24 times.

πλήν: five times, as cp. with Mk one, Lk-Ac 19, Paul five; Mt is especially fond of πλὴν λέγω ὑμῖν (11^{22.24} Q 18⁷ 26^{39.64} adds. to Mk).

τότε: about 90 times; not only to mark a new paragraph, but also in narrative and parables.

ἐκεῖθεν: 12 times.

ὥσπερ: ten times.

ὅπως: 17 times.

weeping and gnashing of teeth: seven times.

to outer darkness: 8¹² 22¹³ 25³⁰.

to make fruit (a Semitism): 3¹⁰ (Lk) 7^{12st} (Lk) 13²⁸ Rev 22².

ἕτερος: confined to Lk-Ac, Paul, and Mt, but it is not always correctly used (of duality). Mt uses it once correctly 6²⁴ (Mt's and Lk's Q) 10²³ *the next* (M) 11³ (Mt's Q; Lk alters to ἄλλον) 11¹⁶ (Mt's Q; Lk alters to ἀλλήλοις); 15³⁰ 16¹⁴ (add. to Mk). Thus Mt has it once in 249 lines. Lk-Ac once in 85 lines, Paul (including Pastorals) once in 156 lines, Heb once 120 lines. Mt comes very low on the list of "literary" writers in the NT, judging by vocabulary, as the following table will show; it is arranged in descending order of richness of vocabulary.

	Total Vocabulary	Concentration
2 Pet-Jude	627	One new word in 0,19 lines
Jas	560	0,39
1 Pet	545	0,39
Pastorals	900	0,49
Heb	1038	0,6
Johann. Epp.	302	0,95
Lk-Ac	4093	1
Mark	1270	1
Mt	1690	1,2
Rev	916	1,4
Jn	1011	1,5
Paul	2170	1,8

Other Literature :

- E. von Dobschütz, "Matthäus als Rabbi und Katechet," *ZNW* 27 (1928) 338-348.
- T. W. Manson, "The Gospel according to St. Matthew," *BJRL* 29 (1946) 392ff.
- M.-J. Lagrange, *Évangile selon S. Matthieu*^s, Paris 1947.
- G. D. Kilpatrick, *The Origins of the Gospel according to Saint Matthew*^s, Oxford 1950.
- F. V. Filson, "Broken Patterns in the Gospel of Matthew," *JBL* 75 (1956) 227ff.
- J. C. Fenton, "Inclusio and Chiasmus in Matthew," *Studia Evangelica* I 1959, 174ff. (adds nothing to N. W. Lund, *Chiasmus in the New Testament*, N. Carolina 1942).
- J. Jeremias, "Die Muttersprache des Evangelisten Matthäus," *ZNW* 50 (1959) 270ff.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE STYLE OF LUKE-ACTS

In assessing the Semitic style of Lukan Greek, it is essential to distinguish as far as possible the various strata of the Gospel and Acts, determining the peculiar contribution of the evangelist if we can. We must make a rough-and-ready division in some cases, as there is not unanimous agreement among literary critics, as to what is L and what is Q. In order to render investigation the more objective we have made samples of an equal number of lines (about 260 of Nestle) as follows :

The Infancy narrative : 1⁵-2⁵² (269 lines).

Lk's version of Q (a sample of 277 lines) : 6²⁰-7¹⁰ 7¹⁸⁻³⁵ 9⁵⁷⁻⁶² 10^{2-15, 21-24} 11^{2-4, 9-26, 29-36}.

Markan sections of Lk (a sample of 276 lines) : 8⁴-9⁵⁰.

The special source L (a sample of 268 lines) : 15^{1-16¹⁵} 16¹⁹⁻³¹ 17⁷⁻²¹ 18¹⁻¹⁴ 19¹⁻²⁷.

I Acts, i.e. 1-15 (a sample of 268 lines) : 3¹-5⁴².

II Acts (a sample of 275 lines) : 17¹-19⁴⁰.

We sections : 16¹⁰⁻¹⁸ 20⁵⁻¹⁵ 21¹⁻¹⁸ 27^{1-28¹⁸} (253 lines).

§ I. ARAMAIC INFLUENCE

Exclusive Aramaic influence, in the sense that it is not also Hebraic, is minimal, in our opinion. It may include more than the following, but other features seem to us questionable.

It is claimed that the influence of the Aramaic particle *d^e* has sometimes caused misunderstanding, resulting in Luke's abnormal use of *hoti*.

E.g. Ac 1¹⁷ *hoti* may be understood as a relative pronoun, as in Latin texts of Ac, through the ambiguity of *d^e*. Ac 7^{39D} *hoti* is read in the D-text instead of the relative in the B-text (Black³ 74). Lk 8²⁵ (= Mk 4⁴¹ Mt 8²⁷) *hoti* would be better understood as the dat. of relative pronoun (Black³ 71f), the real meaning being *who is this whom [not because] the wind and the sea obey him*.

The use of *begin* in Luke-Acts is hardly superfluous enough to suggest the influence of *sharī*.

The use of *tote* is more significant (*Grammar* III 341), since it occurs in the LXX in the parts of Daniel and 2 Esdras which have Aramaic sources. Although the four instances in the We sections of Acts cannot point to translation (Ac 21¹³ 27^{21.32} 28¹) yet those in Luke's Q may do so (Lk 6⁴² 11^{24B26} 13²⁶ 16¹⁶), for they are all in the words of Jesus, perhaps reflecting very primitive Aramaic sources behind the Greek Q. Even some of the instances in L (e.g. 14^{9.10.21}), belonging to the words of Jesus, may reflect an Aramaic source. There are no instances in the Hebrew-sounding Infancy narrative.

Active impersonal plural (cf. p. 12) : Lk 4⁴¹ (add. to Mk) 8² (L) 12²⁰ (L).

§ 2. HEBREW INFLUENCE

This is far more extensive, and is not confined to the Infancy narrative (which is believed in some quarters to be translated from Hebrew sources).

Sentence-construction. 1. The use of a partitive construction without article as subject or object of a verb occurs in both Matthew's and Luke's Q (Lk 11⁴⁹ as object); it also occurs in Luke's own work (if it is the genuine text) when he is not following Mark or Q (8^{36D} ἐκ τῆς πόλεως as subject). Both of these might be taken from an underlying Hebrew source, a translation of a phrase with *min*, as in Gen 27²⁸: *May God give you (some) of the dew of heaven.* Cf. also the LXX 1 Kms 14⁴⁵ 2 Kms 11¹⁷ 14¹¹ 4 Kms 10²³ 1 Mac 7³³ 10³⁷ etc. Nevertheless, an underlying Hebrew source is the more unlikely since the same construction is used by Luke in II Acts and even in the We sections, where we can safely rule out translation from any Hebrew text (Ac 19³³ in the "Gentile" narrative at Ephesus; 21¹⁶ in "diary" narrative). It looks as if the construction belongs to Biblical Greek, and as if the LXX idiom has entered the free-Greek books of Matthew, Luke-Acts, John, Revelation, and the *Shepherd* of Hermas.

2. Another construction, foreign to non-Biblical Greek, is ἐγένετο with a finite verb. H. St. J. Thackeray noted that the usual LXX construction follows the Hebrew literally (*wayehi* followed by a second *waw* consecutive): ἐγένετο καὶ ἦλθε. This is what the historical books prefer, whereas the earlier books, Pentateuch and Prophets, prefer it without *καὶ* (*Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek*, I Cambridge 1909, 50-52). Luke uses both constructions but consistently has the second in the Infancy narrative, and he prefers it

elsewhere (20 against 13). For this second construction there are no Koine parallels. True, the construction with the infinitive occurs, very rarely in non-Biblical authors, but the preponderance of the strictly Hebraic construction in Luke-Acts indicates that even when Luke sometimes uses the infinitive construction he is still writing Biblical Greek influenced by the LXX (II Acts 19¹; We 16⁶ 21^{1.5} 27⁴⁴ 28⁸; also in I Acts).

3. The anarthrous participle as subject or object of the verb is Hebrew: LXX Isa 19²⁰. In Greek we expect some kind of pronoun, or similar word, to which it can stand in apposition. Lk 3¹⁴ (elsewhere in NT only in quotations) T Abr 109¹⁰.

4. Prolepsis of the subject of a subordinate clause: Lk 24⁷ *saying the Son of Man, that he must be betrayed* (add. to Mk), I Acts 3¹⁰ *they recognized him, that he was . . .*, II Acts 13³² 15³⁶ *let us see the brethren . . . how they are*, 16³ Textus receptus *they knew his father that he was a Greek*, 26⁵ *knowing me that I have lived. . .* (cf. pp. 12, 16, 33).

The Verb. 1. Characteristic of Luke is the construction *ton* with infinitive (epexegetical, consecutive, final), as in LXX a reflection of Hebrew *le*.

It occurs in II Acts (18¹⁰ 20^{3.20.27.30} 23^{15.20} 26^{18bis}) and even in We sections (21¹² 27^{1.20}) as well as widely elsewhere in Lk-Ac. It may be argued that, in Lk-Ac, Paul, Heb, Jas and Pet, the construction has atticistic affinities, and that sometimes it appears in the papyri (Mayser II 1, 321). But never, outside Biblical Greek is it found so persistently as in the LXX, the NT, and other books written in this kind of Greek, e.g. eight times in T Abr.

The same may be said of *en tō* with present infinitive to express time during which, and aorist to express time after which. This is a frequent Hebraism in all parts of Luke-Acts except Q and the We sections.

Once Lk retains Mk's *en tō* (Lk 8⁵), but elsewhere he adds his own to the Markan sections (Lk 3²¹ 8^{40.42} 9^{18.29.33.34.36} 18³⁵ 24⁴); he uses it in the Infancy narrative (1^{8.21} 2^{6.27.43}), in L (5^{1.12} 9⁵¹ 10^{35.38} 11^{1.27.37} 12¹⁵ 14¹ 17^{11.14} 19¹⁵ 24^{15.30.51}), and in I Acts 2¹ 3³⁶ 4³⁰ 8⁶ 9³ 11¹⁵). The only instance in II Acts (19¹) is so clearly Septuagintal (*ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ*) that it renders it the more probable that all these instances are influenced by the LXX despite their occasional appearance in the papyri.

2. The literal translation of Hebrew infinitive absolute comes into Biblical Greek from the LXX, where the general method of rendering it is by means of the finite verb with a dative of the cognate noun or else by means of the finite with a participle (which appears in the NT only in quotations). The first method is widely used by Luke in the following phrases: Lk 2⁹ (Infancy) *feared with great fear*, 22¹⁵ (L) *with desire I have desired*, Ac 4¹⁷ Byzantine text (the main authorities

omitting by homoeoteleuton) *with a warning let us warn them*, Ac 5²⁸ *with a charge we charged you*, Ac 23¹⁴ *with an oath we have taken an oath*. It occurs in other NT books, some of which are thought to be fairly "literary": Mt 2¹⁰ Jn 3²⁹ *rejoiced with joy*, Jas 5¹⁷ *pray with prayer*, 1 Pet 3¹⁴ *fear their fear*, Rev. 16⁹ *scorched with great scorching*. This is not necessarily a sign of literal translating (cf. the classical Greek instance of *flee with flight*, and the instances in James and 1 Peter), but in the NT indirect Semitic influence seems to me very probable.

The Lukan method corresponds with that of the Pent. in the LXX, for which Thackeray gives these figures: dat. of cognate noun 108 times, participle 49 times. This is the reverse of the position in the later historical books, which employ participial construction almost exclusively. The free-Greek books of the LXX do not have the construction in either form. For classification of the LXX evidence, cf. Thackeray *Grammar* 47-50.

3. The use of the verb *add to*, meaning to do once more, is one of the most frequent Hebraisms in the LXX. Luke has three examples: one in Luke's own Q, one in an addition to a Markan section, and one in 1 Acts. We assume that Luke was consciously emulating the style of the LXX, rather than taking over source-material; for although he is not followed by any other NT author, except in the D-text of Mk 14²⁵, yet the idiom belongs to the style of Clement of Rome (cf. Lightfoot's note, Part I, vol. II p. 49, line 18) and of Hermas *Mandate* 4.3.1. As Thackeray observed, the instance in Josephus bears a different meaning (*JTS* 30 [1929] 361ff).

The LXX has three methods of rendering the Heb. verb *ysp* (Thackeray, *Grammar* 52f): a. By finite verb followed by infin. of the other verb (109 examples). b. Two finite verbs linked by *and* (only nine examples). c. The verb *added* becomes a participle, the other verb becoming finite; this method, the nearest to normal Greek, is very rare in the LXX (Gen 25¹ Job 27¹ 29¹ 36¹ Est 8³). Luke has three examples of a: Lk 20¹¹bis *he added to send*, Ac 12³ *he added to arrest Peter*; and only one example of c: Lk 19¹¹ *adding he spoke a parable*.

4. The imperatival infinitive may be derived from the Hebrew infinitive absolute (cf. p. 89): Lk 22⁴²v.l. *παρénéγκαι* Ac 15²³ 23²⁶ (Jas 1¹).

Adjectival Genitive. The genitive of quality also occurs in non-Biblical Greek, but some phrases in Luke-Acts are peculiarly Hebraic. As they do not occur in what one can be quite sure was Luke's own composition, it must be left open whether this genitive derives from Semitic sources or from free Semitic Greek.

Lk 16⁸ *the steward of dishonesty*, 18⁶ *the judge of injustice* (both L). Similar to this is the expression of quality of character by the phrase *son of* (in pre-Biblical Greek confined to such phrases as *a son of Greece*, *Grammar* III

208) : Lk 5³⁴ (Markan) 7³⁴ (Lk's Q) 16⁸ (L) Ac 13¹⁰ (perhaps due to Paul's own language). These are Septuagintal phrases, as also is *man of* : Lk 10⁶ (Lk's Q) 20³⁴ (peculiar to Lk).

Physiognomical Expressions. Prepositional phrases with *face*, *hand*, and *mouth* abound in the LXX. Howard agreed that even the non-Biblical *before the face of* Lk 2³¹ Ac 3¹³ was suggested by OT idiom (*Grammar* II 466). He should have added Lk 10¹ Ac 13²⁴. Some of these phrases occur in the papyri, which may not themselves be free of Semitic influence. In the words of Radermacher (143), "da auch sie von semitischer Beeinflussung nicht frei sind." Moulton regarded prepositional phrases with *face* as "possible in native Greek" but he thought their extensive use was because they render exactly "a common Hebrew locution" (*Grammar* I 14, 81). Specially interesting is their occurrence in II Acts where the question of Semitic sources does not arise : 17²⁶ (Paul preaching obviously in Greek at Athens) 24^{7v.l.} (Tertullus speaking, in Jewish [?] Greek, addressing procurator Felix). The preposition *enōpion* occurs twice in II Acts in non-Jewish narrative, concerning Paul in Ephesus, and once in the We sections 27³⁵ in the shipwreck narrative. It belongs to the Koine and medieval Greek, but also to the LXX (for *liphnē* and *l'ēnē*). It was a "secondary" Hebraism according to Moulton, due to the "over-use" of a Hebrew phrase which at the same time is not impossible Greek (*Grammar* II 15). The large proportion of its occurrences are not in the Koine but in Biblical literature, and the papyri instances are relatively slight when compared line by line with the LXX, Testament of Abraham, Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, Greek Enoch, Psalms of Solomon, and other works of this kind. There are 34 instances in Luke-Acts, 31 in Revelation. In view of its place in Luke's own composition, it is not only a word of translation Greek but belongs to Jewish Greek.

Vocabulary. There are several characteristically Hebrew phrases, found often enough, and not always in the Infancy narrative, especially *rhēma* (= *matter*) Lk 1⁶⁵ 2^{15,19,51} which is a Septuagintism for *dābhār* Gen 15¹ 18¹⁴ 19^{21,22} etc. Moulton and Milligan had little to urge against its Hebrew origin, merely observing that *logos* in a similar sense has classical authority, and that *rhēma* in this sense was a Hebraism which may have been so used in vernacular Greek. There is no evidence for its use in vernacular Greek, so far as we know, and its use is confined to translated writings of the OT and those which may also perhaps have been translated (Lk 1 and 2), and also to the Testament of Abraham rec. A 96¹⁵ (probably not a translation), Testament of Solomon V³, V¹⁰ (*do not hide the matter from me*).

Concerning the original language of T Sol, McCown was inclined to favour Greek, with the possibility that the author used Semitic sources already in Greek. C. C. McCown, *The Testament of Solomon*, Leipzig 1922, 43.

But there is another Hebrew phrase not confined to the Infancy narrative: *he has made strength in his arm* 1⁵¹, which has the LXX parallel (*Grammar* II 482f). *To make (magnify) mercy with* Lk 1^{58.72} 10³⁷ (L). This is also a Hebraism from the LXX: Gen 24¹² 1 Kms 12²⁴ 20⁸ Ps 108 (109)²¹ v.l. It is uniquely Biblical, and in Luke is not due to translation, unless L is a translation from Hebrew. More likely, with Wilcox, we may suspect that "it belongs to the vocabulary of the early Church" (M. Wilcox, *The Semitisms of Acts*, Oxford 1965, 85).

To make with (without the word *mercy*) is entirely Lukan in the NT (Ac 14²⁷ 15⁴) due to the Hebrew 'im or 'ēth. Helbing 7, 324.

Magnify (= *glorify*) is a LXX Hebraism, though it is found sometimes in non-Biblical Greek, but not nearly to the same extent as in Biblical: Lk 1^{46.58} (Infancy), Ac 5¹³ 10⁴⁶ (I Acts), 19¹⁷ (II Acts).

κατοικέω ἐπί c. gen. is Biblical; elsewhere it is transitive or has ἐν or κατά Ac 17²⁶ (II Acts), also Rev and Hermas S 1⁶.

σπλαγγίζομαι came later into non-Biblical Greek. To Bauer's references add T Abr rec. B 116^{31.32}. It is frequent in the Synoptic Gospels.

§ 3. SEMITIC INFLUENCE

This is vast, enabling the respective advocates of Aramaic and Hebraic sources to claim the features as Aramaic or Hebrew to suit their purpose.

Parataxis. This is not an incontrovertible Semitic feature, as it is shared with post-classical non-literary Greek. For what it is worth it may be tested by counting the number of main verbs per line and by noting the infrequency of aorist participles of precedent action and genitives absolute. There is no doubt about Luke's paratactic style, although it is much modified in Acts, especially in the We sections (which are well below classical standards in this respect, and much nearer to the non-literary Greek, as far as we examined it, with main verbs and subordinate verbs about equal, quite unlike the classical language which averages considerably more subordinate verbs than main verbs).

The Infancy narrative has 218 main verbs, samples of Lk's Q have 230, the Markan sections have 255, L has 267; but I Acts has much longer sentences with only 176 main verbs; II Acts has about the same with 168; the We sections have even longer sentences, i.e. 147 main verbs. These samples were all about the same length. We may tabulate and thus make a simple comparison of approximate figures as follows.

	Lines	Main Verbs	Subord. Verbs	Aor. Ptc.	Gen. Abs.	Subord. Total	Proportion Main : Sub.
Infancy narrative	269	218	52	9	3	64	1 : 0,3
Lk's Q (sample)	277	230	56	18	5	79	1 : 0,3
Markan sections (sample)	276	255	55	38	9	103	1 : 0,4
L (sample)	268	267	64	35	3	102	1 : 0,3
I Acts (sample)	268	176	57	24	6	87	1 : 0,4
II Acts (sample)	275	168	38	42	13	93	1 : 0,5
We	253	147	46	75	27	148	1 : 1
T Abr rec. A I-VII	256	210	30	34	8	72	1 : 0,3
Select papyri Plato <i>Apolog.</i> II 1-94	306	200	108	12	19	139	1 : 0,7
Thucyd. II 1-4 Andocides 1-10	295	129	153	23	14	180	1 : 1,4

Select papyri comprised P. Petrie II xi (1); P. Paris 26; 51; P. Oxy. 294; 472; 533; 742-746; P. Brit. Museum 42.

Under subordinate verbs we have not included participial clauses. Under aorist participle we have not included the obvious Semitisms, *answering, rising, going*.

The Verb. 1. A feature which is alien to non-Biblical Greek is the use of the redundant participles, *rising, answering*, and the various constructions modelled on the Hebrew *wayyēlek*. In some instances it may be assumed that Luke is deliberately Septuagintal because the narrative suggested it, as when the Lord is addressing first Ananias and then Saul. Doubtless, Hebrew was appropriate for the Lord's words on these occasions, and so the earliest tradition was in that language. But Semitic sources cannot really account for the instance in the Sanhedrin scene, which may well have seemed to Luke a felicitous setting for a Septuagintism. Neither can a Semitic source hypothesis account for *answering said* (Hebrew *wayya'an w. . .*) in II Acts, and yet this particular form of the redundancy is never found outside of Biblical Greek. It is certain therefore that here is an undoubted Semitic feature which is not due to translation; it must belong to Semitic Greek.

Rising constructions do not occur in Lk's Q or the We sections, but are plentiful elsewhere: e.g. II Acts 22^{10,16} 23⁹ 26¹⁸). *Answering said* permeates all parts except the We sections (but cf. 21¹³ as a variant), including II Acts (22^{28D} 25⁹). Cf. also T Levi 10², T Sol II², T Abr 106^{4,11,18} 107^{1B} 108^{1,21,23} 110^{7,16,21} 111¹⁸ 112^{6,9} 113⁹ 114⁶ 118¹⁵.

2. The otiose participle *saying* (*lēmōr*) occurs often in all strata of Luke-Acts, even in the We sections in such characteristically Greek material as the Lydia-story (16^{15,17}), the gaoler (16²⁸), and Paul on shipboard (27^{10,24,33}). True, the participle is never indeclinable, as in Revelation and in some books of the LXX, where it is due to direct rendering of the infinitive construct. It belongs essentially to Biblical Greek, although similar expressions occur elsewhere: *ἔφη λέγων* (Sophocles, Herodotus), *ἔφασκε λέγων* (Aristophanes), *λέγων εἶπεν οὕτω* (Demosthenes). It is however a marked feature of Jewish Greek books, e.g. Testament of Abraham rec.A (seven times) and rec.B (six times).

A few papyrus examples were quoted in *Grammar* III 155, but the conclusion reached there was that "such expressions when used on a large scale, as in Bibl. Greek, point away from the popular language to a specialized Semitic background."

3. The periphrastic verb *to be* with participle, as a substitute for imperfect is thought by some to be an Aramaic construction, but in the LXX it renders a Hebrew phrase which is more frequent in later than in earlier books. The periphrasis may be more characteristic of Aramaic, especially that of the OT and Palestinian Talmud, where the perfect *hāwā* and a present participle expresses a continuous state in past time. Its feasibility as a Semitism is reduced by the fact that it is not unknown in non-Biblical Greek and by the doubt whether the periphrasis is not deliberate in Luke-Acts.

We should probably, however, not give the idiom its true periphrastic force in many instances, but regard it as a Semitism (*Grammar* III 87).

There are 33 examples in Lk and 27 in Ac. They do not indicate a Semitic source, for the idiom is found in the We sections 16¹² 20¹³ 21⁸ and in the rest of II Acts 18²⁶ 19³². There is no reason why Semitic sources may not account for its use in Lk 17^{10,21,22} 22^{6,33,51} (Infancy narrative), 8^{32,40} 9^{32,45} (Markan) 51²⁴ (L), Ac 4³¹, and yet it is more probably not a feature of translation Greek in view of the other references. In the LXX: 2 Esd 4²⁴ 5¹¹ (from Aramaic). In the periphrastic future which occurs at Ac 6⁴D 11²⁸ 24¹⁸ 27¹⁰ (and nowhere else in the NT) the periphrasis probably has genuine force.

Recitative *hoti*. Although this device may be urged as normal Greek, nevertheless either *hī* or *dī* recitative is likely to be the explanation in the large concentration of occurrences in all parts of Luke-Acts, excepting the We sections. Even in II Acts it is well attested, although there is sometimes nothing in person or tense to indicate whether *hoti* introduces direct speech, and not rather indirect (we follow Bruder

here). It is prolific in the LXX, the Testament of Abraham and other books of Jewish Greek.

Infancy narrative 1^{25,61}, Lk's Q 7⁴, L 15²⁷ 17¹⁰ 19⁴² 22⁶¹, Add. to Mk: 20⁵. (Taken from Mk: 4⁴¹ 5²⁶ 8⁴⁹). I Acts: Ac 3²² 5^{23,25} 6¹¹ 7⁶ 11⁸ 13³⁴ 15¹. II Acts: 16³⁶ 19²¹ 23²⁰ 24²¹ 25⁸. Xenophon *Anabasis* I, 6, 8. Thucydides I 137, 4. P. Oxy. I 119¹⁰, BU 602⁵, 624¹⁵, P. Fay. 123¹⁵. Herodotus II 115⁴. Cf. also MM s.v. *hoti* 2.

Pronouns. There is confusion of personal and demonstrative pronouns in Luke-Acts which may well be due to a similar confusion in Hebrew and Aramaic. Dr. Black considers that *autos ho* may be due to the influence of the Aramaic proleptic pronoun and is therefore "evidence for a very primitive kind of translation or Semitic Greek" (Black³ 96-100). However, its distribution is widespread throughout Luke-Acts and is by no means confined to the words of Jesus or of anyone else who might have spoken Aramaic, especially Ac 16¹⁸, and thus the second alternative of Dr. Black is the more probable.

Infancy narrative 1³⁶ (Gabriel speaking) 2³⁸ (narrative). Lk's Q: 7²¹D (narrative) 10⁷ (Jesus speaking)²¹ (narrative) 12¹² (Jesus speaking). Additions to Markan sections: 4⁴³D (Jesus speaking) 20¹⁹ (narrative). L sections: 13¹ (narrative)³¹ (narrative) 23¹² (narrative) 24¹³ (narrative) 33 (narrative). I Acts: 7⁵²D (Stephen speaking) 11²⁷SB (narrative). II Acts: 22¹³ (Saul speaking). We sections: 16¹⁸ (narrative).

The incidence of resumptive pronoun after a relative occurs in Mark and Matthew, as we have seen (in John and Revelation too). It occurs in the D-text of Luke: 8¹²D (add. to Mk) 12⁴³D (Q: *whom . . . the Lord will find him*).

Casus pendens followed by resumptive pronoun (cf. pp. 21, 34, 71 occurs 1³⁶ 8^{14,15} 12^{10,48} 13⁴ 21⁶ 23^{50f} Ac 2^{22f} 3⁶ 4¹⁰ 7^{35,40} 10^{36,37} 13³² 17^{23,24}).

Oblique cases of *autos* are characteristic of Semitic Greek when used in profusion. Of the Synoptic Gospels, Luke is the least addicted to this redundancy (cf. pp. 21, 35f, but he is high on the list when the NT is considered as a whole (cf. p. 72): one in 2½-lines (the papyri, one in 13 lines). But the occurrence in the various strata of Luke-Acts is considered below (p. 56).

And (or for) behold! An exclusively Biblical Septuagintal phrase, perhaps also from Aramaic, it is frequent in the LXX, and Luke and Paul probably obtained the expression from here. As it occurs in the possibly "free" Greek of the Testament of Solomon (seven times) and Testament of Abraham (ten times) it may be a feature of free Jewish Greek, derived perhaps from the translated books. It is scattered throughout Luke-Acts, even including II Acts 20^{22,25} and the We sections 27²⁴. It occurs in his own work in the Gospel, the Infancy narrative, L (12 times), and his additions to Mark.

Interrogative *ei*. This undoubted Semitism appears only in Biblical Greek. Doubtless it originated in the translated books of the LXX, rendering '*im*, and thence passed into the free Biblical Greek of 2 Maccabees, the Clementine Homilies, the Gospel of Thomas, and the Testament of Abraham. The idiom is Luke's own, not from sources, plain evidence that he is writing free Semitic Greek.

It is used in II Acts 19² 21³⁷ 22²⁵. The question of sources does not arise, but perhaps Paul's own language accurately reported from Aramaic, accounts for these occurrences. This is not likely, because in speech there would be no need for it, the inflexion of voice conveying the interrogative. The instance in Lk 13²³ appears to be added to Q, and 22⁴⁹ to be added to Mk. The instances in I Acts (1⁸ 7¹) may be from Semitic sources, but in view of the above evidence it is more likely that they too are part of Luke's own style. We do not include the following, which are bordering on the indirect question, for person and tense are not decisive, but they *may* be direct questions: Lk 6⁹ 22⁸⁷ 23⁶ Ac 4¹⁹ 5⁸ 10¹⁸ 26^{23bis}.

***Pros* after verbs of speaking.** The use in non-Biblical Greek is so occasional as to be negligible, and its use here cannot be anything else than a Semitism. The very rare and eccentric examples in classical Greek are often poetic and probably intended to be emphatic. Its rare but increased use in the papyri is in line with the large use of prepositions in general, but it is still inconsiderable: in 300 lines which we examined we found but one instance as compared with eleven datives. In the higher Koine it is just as rare. Abel admitted it as a fact of the Koine but added, truly enough, that the construction would be favoured in Biblical Greek by the translation of *le* and *el* (*Grammaire* § 50[1]). This is doubtless true, but it occurs relatively more often in rec.A than in rec.B of the Testament of Abraham, and that is the recension least likely to be a translation. Even in II Acts, likely to be translation-free, *pros* is more in evidence than the dative (4:3 in the B-text; 5:3 in the D-text). As this use of *pros* is without doubt Semitic, then some parts at least of II Acts were composed in free Jewish Greek. Certainly, it scarcely appears in the We sections, which were probably a product of days before Luke had acquired the Biblical dialect. Later it became a conspicuous mannerism of his style.

Infancy narrative: 1^{13,18,19,34,55,61,73} 2^{15,18,20,34,48,49} Markan sections (added to Mk): 4^{36,43} 5^{22,30,31,33,34,36} 6^{3,9,11} 8²² 9^{3,13,14,23,33,43,50} 10²⁶ 18³¹ 19³³ 20^{2,3,9,23,25,41} 22⁵² 23²² 24^{5,10}. L sections: 3^{12,13,14v.l.} 4^{21,23} 5^{4,10} 8²¹ 10²⁹ 11^{1,5} 12^{1,15,16} 13⁷ 14^{3,5,7,7,23,25} 15^{3,22} 16¹ 18⁹ 19^{5,8,9,39} 22^{15,70} 23^{4,14} 24^{17,18,25,32,44}. Lk's Q: 4⁴ 7^{24,40,50} 9^{57,59,62} 10^{2,23} 11³⁹ 12^{22,41} 13²³ 17^{1,22}. The majority are in Lk's own work or his special source. I Acts: 1⁷ 2^{29,37,38} 3^{12,25} 4^{1,8,19,23,24} 5^{8,9,35} 7³ 8^{20,26} 9^{10,11,15} 10²⁸ 11^{14,20} 12^{8,15} 13¹⁵ 15^{7,36}. II Acts: 16^{36,37} 17¹⁵ 18^{6,14} 19^{2,2,3v.l.} 20²⁵ 21^{37,39} 22^{8,10,21,25} 23^{3,30v.l.} 25^{16,22} 26^{1,14,28,31} 28^{21,25}. We: 28⁴.

Cardinal for ordinal: in a We section *one* for *first* 20⁷.

Word Order. The practice of joining the article and noun together as closely as possible reflects the Semitic necessity to unite them as one word. Nothing can appear between the article and the noun in Hebrew or Aramaic. This very often involved Jewish writers of Greek in placing any qualifying matter in a separate subsequent articular phrase, where normal Greek would insert it between the article and the noun. So in Luke-Acts it is fairly rare for anything to obtrude between the article and its noun. From a study of the details we may assume that Luke's language, except in the diary behind the We sections, which would have been written in the early days of his Christian life, was in this respect different from normal Greek. But neither is Luke's usage that of the translated books of the LXX, which almost never separate the article from its noun (even in Genesis and Exodus); Luke's practice is that of the "paraphrase" Greek of the Epistle of Jeremy. Should it be urged that it is the parts of Luke-Acts which depend on Aramaic sources which have this word-order, let it be said that the stories of the Lost Sheep and Prodigal Son, which surely owe much to Luke's literary artistry, have this idiom three times: 15^{6,23,27}.

In the Infancy narrative only twice does qualifying matter obtrude between art. and noun 1⁷⁰ 2³, although there are a further six occasions when it might well do so. In material which appears to be from L, or is Luke's own editorial work, he has no special preference, but allows the Biblical word-order to influence him considerably. In Acts, except for the We sections, he has the subsequent articular phrase too often for normal Greek (3^{1,2,11,16} 4^{2,14} 5^{3,32} 17¹² 19^{6,12,13,15,16}), but in the We sections there is little that is not normal in this respect, for on the only two occasions when he permits a subsequent articular phrase a special reason seems to apply, viz. the formal *God Most High* 16¹⁷ and the Christian term *the Spirit the Holy* 21¹¹. In papyrus texts of similar length there was no instance at all of the Jewish Greek word-order, although there were 35 instances where it might have been appropriate. The same amount of Philostratus yielded one instance of the subsequent phrase as against 27 occasions when it was avoided. There were no instances in a sample from Lucian, but nine opportunities for it; Josephus yielded the same result.

§ 4. THE QUESTION OF SOURCES

In spite of what has been argued above, there is no doubt that some of the Aramaisms, Hebraisms and Semitisms must be attributed to the use of sources, if not sources in Hebrew or Aramaic at least Greek sources which had been translated therefrom. It would be wise to follow Plummer here, for he derived the nature of Luke's Greek from several causes: the fact that he was a Gentile accounts for the literary nature of some of the Greek, he used sources, he knew the LXX, and he enjoyed a constant companionship with Paul. The last cause

would account for his use of a Jewish kind of Greek (A. Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Luke*, ICC Edinburgh 1896, 1).

There is no doubt that some of the Semitisms listed above occur most frequently in those parts of Luke-Acts where Semitic sources would be most likely, Luke 1 and 2, Acts 1-12. An instance would be the over-use of redundant personal pronouns, which is derived from the Hebrew and Aramaic use of the pronominal suffix.

The occurrence of non-adjectival *autos* in oblique cases, taken line by line, shows that the We sections (35 instances in 253 lines) resemble the papyri (24 in 306) and Philostratus (37 in 288). The rest of II Acts (56 in 275) resembles Josephus (46 in 257); whereas the Infancy narrative (109 in 269), L (83 in 268), the Markan sections (126 in 276), and I Acts (413 in 268) resemble the fairly literally translated books of the LXX: e.g. 4 Kms 1-4⁶ (87 in 200).

Some have suggested that Luke 1 and 2 are so different in style from the rest of Luke's work that Luke used sources (most would think Hebrew) without polishing up the translation Greek. But Luke is a better handler of Greek than that; he is quite capable of modifying his style, from the stylized classical Greek of the Preface and the Hellenistic style of the end of Acts, to the Jewish Greek of some parts of the Gospel and the early chapters of Acts. His conscious imitation of the LXX would adequately account for the Hebraisms of Luke 1 and 2, and Kümmel's verdict is about right: "Now the linguistic observations of Sparks, Benoit, and Turner show that the hypothesis of a translation of both chapters out of the Hebrew is hardly tenable" (W. G. Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament*, ET London 1966, 96). In the Appendix of the *Grammar*, vol. II, W. F. Howard quoted with approval Harnacks' view that Luke 1-2 show such intrinsic unity with the rest of Luke-Acts as to eliminate the probability of Luke's use of sources. That judgment still stands.

It has been represented that the Semitisms of Acts occur in "pools" or "nests," and that these accumulations indicate underlying sources. M. Wilcox, having reviewed the question of Semitisms in Acts, concludes that the "knots" of non-Septuagintal Semitisms in Ac 1-15 "do not permit us to argue in favour of translation of Aramaic or Hebrew sources by Luke." He does, however, allow that for some parts of Stephen's speech and Paul's in Acts 13 Luke "seems to be drawing on a source of some kind" (*Semitisms* 180-184).

Luke may well have had the skill to write what looks like a deliberate LXX style; alternatively, his may have been part of the style of a Jewish kind of Greek. The language of the main body of Luke-Acts was perhaps Luke's natural speech which he was expert enough to elevate into something quite classical at times. One thing is certain,

whatever his sources may have been, and however extensive, there is a linguistic unity throughout his two books, and the final editor has been able to impose his own style upon all his material. To us it seems doubtful whether such an artist would inadvertently leave any so-called "pools" of Semitisms, if his natural language were not Semitic Greek.

§ 5. THE LITERARY ELEMENTS IN LUKE'S STYLE

Moulton urged that the Septuagintal flavour of the early chapters of Luke and Acts accorded with the view that Luke was a proselyte, and Moulton was reminded of the style of Bunyan who also lived in the ethos of the Bible (*Grammar* II 8). Modern opinion prefers to see Luke as a Gentile ("this versatile Gentile who writes for Gentiles," Plummer, *Luke* ICC I), which if true would explain the lingering secularism in his style, for it would be less likely to be there if he were brought up within Judaism.

It is contended that Luke could write Greek that was free altogether of Semitic influence, as in some parts of Acts and particularly in Luke 15 and some other parables.

H. J. Cadbury found that Lk used classical expressions in a proportion comparable with good non-Biblical writers (*The Style and Literary Methods of Luke*, London 1927, 36-39). Cf. also J. M. Creed, *The Gospel according to St. Luke*, London 1930, lxxxii-lxxxiii; *Grammar* II 6-8. True, Luke's style is more flowing, exchanging Mk's parataxis for a more periodic sentence by means of his more effective use of participles. He changes Mk's co-ordinate verbs for a ptc. on 33 occasions, whereas Mk changes Lk in the same direction on only one occasion. For detailed instances, cf. E. P. Sanders, 238-240. For effective use of participles in Acts, cf. 2³⁸ 4³⁵ 5^{11.19.25} 14²⁷ 18²² etc. *Grammar* III 158.

Often Luke secularizes the style of Mark, eliminating the following words: *Cananaean* (replacing it with *Zealot* Lk 6¹⁵ Ac 1¹³), *hosanna*, *abba*, *Golgotha*, *rabbi* (becoming *epistatēs* 9³³) and *rabbouni* (becoming *Kurie* 18⁴¹); but he retains *Beezeboul*, *mammon*, *pascha*, *sabbath*, *satan*, *gehenna*, and he inserts *sikera* 1¹⁵. Further, he retains *amen* on six occasions (4²⁴ 12^{37.44} 18^{17.29} 21³²), although sometimes he gives it the translation *truly* or *of a truth*. Virtually, except for 8⁴⁹, he ignores Mark's historic present, and his more characteristically Greek *de* replaces Mark's connecting particle *kai*.

The figures for *de* : *kai* reveal that Ac and 4 Mac have an equal proportion and that all parts of Lk-Ac are near this figure, except the Infancy narrative (1 : 5). In reverse order of Semitic Greek, we may set out the following. (For Polybius, Plutarch, Epictetus, and Papyri, we rely on figures supplied by R. A. Martin, *NTS* 11 [1964] 41).

Polybius	I : 0,07	Lk's Q	I : 1,9
Plutarch	I : 0,24	T Abr rec. A	I : 2
Josephus, <i>Ant.</i> I		LXX : Exod 1-24	I : 2,1
2-51 (Niese)	I : 0,3	Genesis	I : 2,4
Philostratus I i-x	I : 0,4	T Abr rec. B	I : 5
Didache	I : 0,5	Mark	I : 5
Acts : We sections	I : 0,5	Lk's Infancy	I : 5
Epictetus	I : 0,6	LXX : Isa 40-66	I : 8,3
II Acts (sample)	I : 0,6	Isa 1-39	I : 10,7
Paul (I Cor)	I : 0,6	Exod 25-40	I : 17
Lucian <i>Somnium</i>	I : 0,6	Rev 1-3	I : 17
Papyri	I : 0,92	LXX : Min Proph	I : 26
I Acts	I : 1	Jer α	I : 42
4 Mac	I : 1	Ezek α	I : 63
Lk, Markan sections	I : 1,2	Rev 4-21	I : 73
Ep. Barnabas	I : 1,3	LXX : Judg. A	I : 93
L	I : 1,4	Ezek β	I : 99
Matthew	I : 1,5	Jer β	I : 188

We may grant that in secular Greek, simple speech favours *kai*, but the above table reveals a progression from the free Greek to Biblical Greek, and thence to the more literally translated LXX books.

Other "improvements" on Mark. The superfluous pronoun as indirect object, which sounds none too elegant in Greek, *to/her/them/you*, is often removed by Luke in Markan passages.

Mk 1⁴⁰ = Lk 5¹², Mk 1⁴¹ = Lk 5¹³, Mk 4¹¹ = Lk 8¹⁰, Mk 5⁹ = Lk 8³⁰, Mk 5¹⁹ = Lk 8²⁹, Mk 5³⁹ = Lk 8⁵², Mk 5⁴¹ = Lk 8⁵⁴, Mk 8²⁷ = Lk 9¹⁸, Mk 8²⁸ = Lk 9¹⁹, Mk 8²⁹ = Lk 9²⁰, Mk 9¹⁹ = 9⁴¹, Mk 9³⁸ = Lk 9⁴⁹, Mk 10²⁶ = Lk 18²⁶, Mk 11⁶ = Lk 19³⁴, Mk 12⁴ = Lk 20¹¹, Mk 12¹⁶ = Lk 20¹³, Mk 12⁴³ = Lk 21³.

On the other hand, this works (less often) in the opposite direction :— Lk 5²⁰ *your sins are forgiven to you* (Mk 2⁵ om. *to you*), Lk 9⁵⁰ *Jesus said to him* (Mk 9³⁹ om. *to him*), Lk 22⁶ *to hand over to them* (Mk 14¹¹ om. *to them*), Lk 22¹¹ *the Master says to you* (Mk 14¹⁴ om. *to you*).

Similarly Lk omits the gen. pronouns in Markan passages : Mk 1²³ = Lk 4³³, Mk 1⁴¹ = Lk 5¹³, Mk 3³¹ = Lk 8¹⁹, Mk 10²⁰ = Lk 18²¹, Mk 11¹ = Lk 19²⁹, Mk 12⁴⁴ = Lk 21⁴. On the other hand, there is the reverse process again : Lk 6⁶ *his hand* (Mk 3¹ om. *his*), Lk 22⁶⁶ *their Sanhedrin* (Mk 15¹ om. *their*). The matter is not really decisive. Indeed, as we have already seen (p. 56) certain strata of Luke-Acts resemble the fairly literally translated books of the LXX in this respect.

Vernacularisms removed by Luke from Mark are *krabbatos* (Mk 2¹¹) which becomes *klinidion* (Lk 5²⁴) ; *raphis* (Mk 10²⁵) which becomes *belonē* (Lk 18²⁵) ; *korasion* (Mk 5^{41f}) becoming *pais* (Lk 8^{51.54}). Like Matthew, Luke tends to remove some of Mark's more vivid details : e.g. *the whole city was gathered at the door* (Mk 1³³), *they take him, as he was, in the boat*, etc. (Mk 4³⁶⁻³⁸), and the detail concerning Legion in the tombs, night and day, cutting himself with stones (Mk 5⁵).

Genitive Absolute. Nowhere in Luke-Acts is this mark of free Greek entirely absent. It seems to be characteristic of Lukan style without being alien to Biblical Greek.

In the Infancy narrative it occurs once in 43 verses, thus ranking it with the paraphrases in the LXX (Tob, Ep. Jeremy, Dan, 1 Esd), apart from the translated books. In Lk's Q it has about the same proportion as 4 Mac, which argues against Q having been written in anything but Greek (*Grammatical Insights* 178). In the We sections, the number exceeds anything in the LXX, and indeed in the NT, and is in this respect quite up to classical standards. In the samples of the rest of Lk-Ac the proportion is one in 17 verses, like the LXX free Greek books, much more frequent than the Pauline epistles (1 in 177 verses).

Men . . . de. This may also be cited, for there is nothing Semitic which provides an excuse for it. But before we claim it as something alien to Biblical Greek, we must note its occurrence in the free Greek books of the LXX.

There are no instances in the Infancy narrative. Lk's Q 3¹⁶ 10² 11⁴⁸, L 3¹⁸ 13⁹ 23^{23, 41, 56}. Not surprisingly it occurs in II Acts (seven times), and We sections (twice). More unexpectedly, in I Acts, particularly in the story of Saul's conversion (Ac 9⁷) where Semitic sources are most likely. However, it is doubtful whether there is a *de* to the *men* at 3²² 8⁴ 12⁵ 13⁸, the subsequent *de* being independent, and 11¹⁶ owes its *men . . . de* to the passage (Lk 3¹⁶) which it is paraphrasing; while Ac 14⁴ (events in Galatia) is unlikely to depend in any case on a Semitic source. This leaves only Ac 1⁵, and we must allow that *men . . . de* is possible in moderation within Jewish Greek, occurring fairly often in the free Greek books of the LXX.

The double particle *men . . . oun* may be adduced too as "literary," for Lk is fond of it in Ac (27 times, in all parts), if not in the Gospel (3¹⁸ only). However, it occurs in the LXX, mainly in the free Greek books: Gen once, Exod once, Wis twice, Dan LXX once, 2 Mac seven times, 3 Mac seven times, 4 Mac four times.

Relative attraction. It has been claimed that Luke's use of relative attraction "testifies to a relatively high standard of literary style" (Creed, *Luke*, lxxxi-lxxxiii), and yet (so the same author stated on the following page) this idiom is "by no means confined to the literary style in the later Greek." Indeed, the idiom was shared by Biblical Greek authors with others (*Grammar* III 324).

Other doubtful literary features. It is just as questionable to mention as "literary" the occurrence of the article with indirect interrogatives, since this is no more literary than our own quote marks; it occurs in the papyri (Mayser II 1, 80; II 3, 52f), and so does *tou* with infinitive, final and consecutive. However, there is more force in Creed's observation that *prin* with subjunctive (Lk 2²⁶) and with optative (Ac 25¹⁶) "is correctly used to follow a negative" (lxxxii). To this we would add the suggestion that Luke has the literary ability to adapt the style of his speeches to the culture of the speaker (in the

latter case the urbane Festus), and in the former case (Lk 2²⁶) the construction may be following the LXX (Sir 11⁷).

We find it difficult to set much store by Creed's reasoning from Phrynichus, namely that "in a number of cases Luke's taste has led him to correct words and phrases in his sources which are found in Phrynichus's list of condemned vulgarisms" (Creed, *Luke* lxxxiii). Creed cited merely four instances, thereupon giving the conflicting evidence that Luke himself uses 33 times words which Phrynichus condemned or disapproved.

§ 6. SEMITISMS EVEN WHERE SOURCES ARE LEAST LIKELY

Moulton claimed that Luke 15 was entirely free of Semitic influence. We will confine our test of the truth of this to one part of the chapter, the parable of the Prodigal Son, which Moulton singled out as having nothing "which suggests translation from a Semitic original" (*Grammar* II 8). The truth is rather that the parable is full of Semitisms, all of which are features of Jewish Greek and which must either have come through the original Aramaic of the Lord's words or (we suggest) derive from the Lukan style itself.

They are the Aramaism *began* (15¹⁴), superfluous *going* (15¹⁵) and *rising* (15^{18,20}) and *answering* (15²⁹). There is *μεμύσειν ἐκ* (15¹⁶) which is not a Septuagintism but which Luke shares uniquely with Rev 8⁵. There is the peculiar phrase *came to himself* (15¹⁷), which we can explain only by reference to the Hebrew *shúbbh*, meaning *to repent*, the underlying idea in Hebrew being that of turning back and meeting with oneself (LXX 3 Kms 8⁴⁷ Ezek 14⁶ 18³⁰). There are also the following: *eis* with *hamartanein* (15^{18,21}), which is due to LXX influence on account of the Hebrew *l^e*, rare indeed in non-Biblical Greek, for Bauer can cite but five examples and they mainly from classical Greek; *enōpion* (15^{18,21}), *idou* (15²⁹), *esplagchmisthē* (15²⁰), *fell on his neck* (15²⁰, a Septuagintism: Gen 33⁴ 45¹⁴ 46²⁹), and *give a ring on (eis) his hand* (15²²). The use of *give* (= *place*) is Hebraic, as in Rev 3⁸; and *give on (eis) his hand* (Esth 3¹⁰ LXX) is the same phrase as Lk 15²²).

Another significant factor in the parable of the Prodigal Son is the priority of the verb, the surest NT Semitism (Norden). The regular order in Hebrew verbal sentences is Verb—Prepositional phrase with suffix—Subject; or else Verb—Subject—Preposition (if with noun); exceptions occurring when particular emphasis is sought. Kiecker's figures, as tabulated by Howard (*Grammar* II 418), show that in classical Greek the verb occupies more usually a middle position. The following figures give the percentage of verbs in the primary position, that is, the Hebrew position, and thus we obtain the reverse order of Hebraic influence, revealing that the parable of the Prodigal Son is in this respect the most Hebraic of all our samples and the furthest away from the classical Attic norm. (The verb has been considered only in relation to subject, object, or complement).

Polybius (Kieckers)	11%	T Abr. rec. A	36%
Attic (Kieckers)	17%	Infancy Narrative (Lk)	41%
We sections (Lk-Ac)	30%	Luke (Kieckers)	42%
Mark Kieckers)	31%	T Abr. rec. B	45%
Matthew (Kieckers)	34%	Luke 15 ¹¹⁻³²	50%

There are indeed Semitisms throughout Luke-Acts, not even excepting the We sections, as we have seen. Luke's style varies somewhat, and the secular style of the We sections may be explained in either of two ways. 1. Luke may have been a proselyte, well acquainted with Jewish Greek, and may have secularized the language deliberately, when he felt the context demanded it, e.g. when describing Paul's journeys among Gentile cities. 2. Luke may not have been a proselyte but may have come as a raw Gentile to Christianity, and so we suppose that before arriving at Caesarea after Paul's third journey he had not quite succumbed to the full influence of Jewish Greek, as he did later. Thus we can account for the We sections with considerable display of "literary" or secular Greek, that is, of the Koine as used by Greek professional men, such as Luke.

Nevertheless, the hard line of division is not rigid, and his style is fairly homogeneous, for the LXX Hebraisms are widespread, occurring even in the most Gentile sections, where the possibility of translation-Greek is ruled out.

The closing chapters of Ac may be singled out as very Gentile in outlook and language, and yet even here (Ac 26²²) there is a peculiar construction which Lk shares with Rev 17⁸ and for which we find no non-Biblical parallel: viz. the use of an ensuing ptc. attracted to a previous relative pronoun. Ac 26²² οὐδὲν . . . λέγων ὡν τε οἱ προφήται ἐλάλησεν μελλόντων γίνεσθαι. Rev 17⁸ θαυμασθήσονται οἱ κατοικοῦντες . . . ὡν οὐ τὸ ὄνομα . . . βλέποντων (we expect βλέποντες). The peculiarity, first noticed by W. H. Simcox (*The Language of the New Testament*, London 1889, 135), was explained by R. H. Charles as far as Rev was concerned as "a not unnatural rendering" of *bir'otham*, by which he doubtless intended the Qal infin. with 3rd p. pl. suffix, though it is not easy to see why that would make attraction of case more natural in Greek. At any rate, the construction is more likely to be Hebraic than normal Greek (*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Revelation of St. John the Divine*, ICC Edinburgh 1920, II 68).

In this part of Ac we have already noted the following: *tote*, the construction *it came to pass*, the independent non-articular infin., the dat. of the cognate noun in imitation of Heb. infin. absolute, Heb. physiognomical expressions, the Semitic *answering said*, the otiose Semitic ptc. *saying*, *autos ho*, *behold!* interrogative *ei*, *pros* after verbs of speaking, too close association of art. and noun for normal Greek, and we may have overlooked others. There is much here to commend the view of H. Grundman (*Das Evangelium nach Lukas*, Berlin 1959, 23) that Luke is writing "holy history", as sacred as the OT itself.

§ 7. THE CHRISTIAN STYLE

There is the surest presumption that many or all of the Semitic features of style are incidentally part of the primitive Christian language, although probably Luke's own theology would tend to supplement their number. He conceived the Christian revelation as the fulfilment of the old Dispensation, and would in consequence tend by his language to emphasize the links between Old and New.

de Zwaan instanced the use of new Christian words, e.g. *way* for Christianity and the peculiar use of *believing* (*Beginnings of Christianity*, ed. Foakes Jackson and K. Lake, II London 1922, 63, 64). We may add *angel*, *scribe*, *devil*, *nations* (Gentiles), *evangelize*, *Kurios* (Jesus), *nomodidaskalos*, and *respector of persons*. We may add that other words, belonging to Jewish Greek, seem to have been taken over by Luke and others to receive a special Christian sense: *agalliasis* (Christian joy), *alisgema* (weaker brother's pollution by contact with idols), *antapodoma* (the recompense of the Last Judgment), *lutrotēs* (redeemer), and *false prophet*.

However, the unique character of Luke's language seems rather to rest on syntax, as for instance in his strong use of the optative mood, the language of devotion (*Grammar* III 118-133). The phrase *epi to auto*, familiar in the Greek Psalms, is thought by some to be virtually a technical term for Christian fellowship, since it occurs in Apostolic writings where it has been peculiarly Christianized (A. Vazakis, followed by M. Wilcox, *Semitisms* 93-100).

Referring to the optative, Moulton declared that Lk-Ac alone in the NT, along with 2 Pet and Heb, "show any consciousness of style," and he instanced the potential optative which made Lk "the only littérateur among the authors of NT books" (*Grammar* II 6ff). The optatives are widespread in Lk-Ac, and probably not always intended to be "literary," for Lk shares his love for the optative with the LXX. Volitive optatives: Infancy narrative 1³⁸, Lk's add. to Mk: 20¹⁶ (*God forbid!*), I Acts: 8²⁰ (*may your money perish!*). Potential optatives: I Acts: 2¹²E (*what could this be?*), II Acts: 17¹⁸ (*what could he be wishing to say?*) 26²⁹BAS^c (*I could wish*). Potential optative in indirect speech: (deliberative): Infancy narrative: Lk 1²⁹ (*what manner of salutation this might be*) 1⁶² (*what he might wish*), Lk's add. to Mk: 6¹¹B (*what they could do to Jesus*) 8⁹v.l. (*what this parable might mean*) 9⁴⁶ (*which could be greatest*) 13³⁶ (*enquired what this might be*) 22²³v.l. (*which of them could be intending*), L document: 3¹⁵ (*whether he could be the Christ*) 15²⁶ (*asked what this might be*), I Acts: 5²⁴ (*what this might be*) 10¹⁷ (*what this dream could mean*), II Acts: 17¹¹ (*to see if it could be thus*) 17²⁰v.l. (*to know what these things could mean*) 21³³ (*asked who he might be*) 25²⁰ (*whether he might like to go*). Conditional optative: II Acts: 24¹⁹.

By now the optative was dead in popular speech, and yet Luke freely uses it. Many instances may be the corrections of atticizing scribes,

but not all. Elsewhere it is suggested that the optative is part of Christian speech, expressing the Christian's devout aspiration, the language of devotion (*Grammar* III 118-133).

Other Literature :

- W. K. Hobart, *The Medical Language of St. Luke*, Dublin 1882.
 H. J. Cadbury, *The Style and Literary Method of Luke*, Harvard 1920.
 M. Dibelius, "Stilkritisches zur Apg," in *Eucharisterion* II (1923) 27-49.
 H. J. Cadbury, "Lexical Notes on Luke-Acts," *JBL* 45 (1926) 190ff.
 H. J. Cadbury, *The Making of Luke-Acts*, New York 1927.
 S. Antoniadis, *L'Évangile de Luc ; esquisse de Grammaire et de Style*, Paris 1930.
 H. F. D. Sparks, "The Semitisms of St. Luke's Gospel," *JTS* 44(1943) 129ff.
 E. Schweizer, "Eine hebraisierende Sonderquelle des Lukas?" *Theologische Zeitschrift* 6 (1950) 161ff.
 H. F. D. Sparks, "The Semitisms of Acts," *JTS* NS 1 (1950) 16-28.
 A. W. Argyle, "The Theory of an Aramaic Source in Acts 2 : 14-40," *JTS* NS 3 (1952) 213f.
 A. Vögeli, "Lukas und Euripides," *Theol. Zeitsch.* 9 (1953) 415-438.
 P. Winter, "Some Observations on the Language in the Birth and Infancy Stories of the Third Gospel," *NTS* 1 (1954) 111ff.
 "On Luke and Lucan Sources," *ZNW* 47 (1956) 217ff.
 N. Turner, "The Relation of Luke I and II to Hebraic Sources and to the Rest of Luke-Acts," *NTS* 2 (1955) 100ff.
 M. Dibelius, "Style Criticism of the Book of Acts," *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles*, ed. H. Greeven, London 1956.
 P. Benoit, "L'Enfance de Jean-Baptiste selon Luc I," *NTS* 3 (1956) 169ff.
 R. Mc. L. Wilson, "Some Recent Studies in the Lucan Infancy Narratives," *Studia Evangelica* 1959, 235ff.

CHAPTER FIVE

THE STYLE OF JOHN

I. THE MAIN SOURCES

Although it is generally recognized that the style of the Gospel is fairly uniform throughout, two distinct written sources have been proposed, following R. Bultmann, *Das Evangelium des Johannes*, Göttingen 1941: a speeches-source (*Redenquelle*) and a signs-source (*Semeiaquelle*). Dr. Black is of opinion that the distribution of Aramaisms, corresponding to Bultmann's sources, is such as to suggest that there was a sort of Johannine Q, an Aramaic document lying behind the Gospel, a sayings-source as distinct from the narrative part of the Gospel (the signs-source or miracles-stories collection), of the latter of which the Greek is normal and without "Aramaic colouring" (Black³ 150). However, it must be borne in mind that Bultmann himself declared the language of the signs-source to be Semitic Greek without being translation-Greek (e.g. 9¹⁻⁴). He pointed to certain Semitisms: asyndeta, superfluous *autou*, and the tendency of the predicate to come as near as possible to the beginning of the clause. Bultmann was right: we cannot say that any part of John is free from "Aramaic colouring," nor Hebraic colouring either. Except for one critic, who has insisted on the normal character of the Greek, which he thought resembled the style of Epictetus, most scholars have found the style of the Fourth Gospel to be Semitic to some degree, without necessarily being a translation. The idiom is the very simplest and the vocabulary the poorest in the NT, relatively to the size of the book. Dodd, Bultmann, and Barrett in their respective works on the Fourth Gospel, tended to the view that the author thought in Aramaic but actually wrote in Greek. Bultmann suggested that the author lives in a bilingual environment and hence used a language which was full of Semitic idioms. John is more Semitic than the other gospels, without being a translation, for else some errors of rendering must appear in what he called the editorial sections. Bultmann would think it not impossible that one of his sources was in Aramaic.

The Sayings-source. Bultmann's *Redenquelle*, which may have an Aramaic original, included the Prologue 1¹⁻⁵.9-12.14.16, which he held to be "a piece of cultic-liturgical poetry," half revelatory, half confession, in which each couplet has two short sentences, in synonymous

or antithetic parallelism, like Semitic poetry. The poetry has, moreover, a chain-locking device which links the clauses together, e.g. *in him was LIFE : and the LIFE was the LIGHT of men. And the LIGHT in DARKNESS shined : and the DARKNESS did not comprehend it.* Subsequent links are *world, his own, glory, and full.* The same device appears in the epistle of James (cf. p. 116).

Moreover, there may be chiasmic patterns in the Johannine discourses : in 6³⁶⁻⁴⁰ R. E. Brown sees an ABCBA pattern (*The Gospel according to John*, New York 1966, 275f.

- A. Seeing and not believing,
- B. What the Father has given shall not be cast out,
- C. From heaven,
- B. What has been given shall not be lost,
- A. Seeing and believing.

Léon-Dufour sees further examples of chiasmus : (1) 12²³⁻²²

- D. The hour has come ²³
- A. Fall INTO the ground ²⁴
- B. Hate one's life in this world ²⁵
- C. The Father will honour him ²⁶
- D. This present hour ²⁷
- C. Father, glorify thy name ²⁸
- B. Judgment of this world ³¹
- A. Raised FROM the ground ³²

(2) 5¹⁹⁻³⁰ : this fails to convince by its complexity (X. Léon-Dufour, "Trois Chiasmes Johanniques," *NTS* 7 [1961] 249-255).

Other examples of the antithetical poetic style are 3⁶ (*flesh, flesh : spirit, spirit*)^{8,11-13,18,20f} 4^{18f} (*earthly water, thirst again : water from Christ, satisfied*)^{7,37f} and 1 John.

Characteristic of the Sayings-source is the use of the artic. ptc. : 6^{35,47} 8¹² 11²⁵ 12⁴⁴ 15⁵. Also the use of *pas* with the ptc. (*everyone who*) : 3^{8,20} 4¹³ 6⁴⁵ 15² 18³⁷ 1 Jn 2²⁹ 3^{4,6,9f}al. But this construction occurs outside Bultmann's Sayings-source, too : 3^{15,16} 8³⁴ 11²⁶ 16² 19¹².

The Signs-source. Bultmann's other main source consists of stories which have a Semitic tone throughout, including among its idiom the superfluous *autou*, the verb near the beginning of the clause, and nearly all the clauses short and asyndetic (unless with a simple particle *uch* as *kai, oun, de*). Bultmann rejected translation, on the ground that the language was not impossible as Greek and that a translator would have corrected the asyndeta ; he claimed it as a specimen of Semitic Greek, written by a Greek-speaking Jew.

1³⁵⁻⁵⁰ (the Call of the Disciples) is probably the introduction to the Signs-source (omit *and* in 37,38 with S*^{a1}), which begins properly at 2¹⁻¹² (Cana) and includes 4^{5-9,16-18,28-30,40} (Samaritan Woman), 6¹⁻²⁶ (Feeding), 5¹⁻¹⁸ (Lame Man), 9¹⁻⁴¹ (Blind Man), 11¹⁻⁴⁴ (Lazarus).

The Evangelist's additions. The evangelist is held by Bultmann to have joined the Sayings-source and the Signs-source together and to

have added his own work in a characteristic style which can be detected. It was very prosaic by contrast with the Sayings-source and modelled itself on OT style, sometimes borrowing rabbinic linguistic usage: e.g. *to have the commandments* 14²¹, *ep̄isunagōgos* (*m̄enūdhah* 9²² 12⁴² 16²).

Instances of the evangelist's work are 1^{6-8.18-20} 3²²⁻²⁶ 4⁴³⁻⁴⁴ 7^{1-13.45-52} 10^{19-21.40-42} 11⁵⁵⁻⁵⁷ 13³⁴⁻³⁵ 16²⁵⁻³³ etc. Bultmann suggested that a marked characteristic of the evangelist was the use of the pronoun to resume a subject or object in the rabbinical antithetic style: e.g. *he who sent me to baptize in water HE said to me* 1³³, the resumptive being either *ekeinos* (1³³ 5^{11.43} 9³⁷ 10¹ 12⁴⁸ 14^{21.26} 15²⁶) or *houtos* (3^{26.32} 5³⁸ 6⁴⁶ 7¹⁸ 8²⁶ 15⁵). Other characteristic phrases are the rabbinical *but in order that*, with a suitable ellipse, e.g. *he was not the light BUT (was sent) IN ORDER THAT*, for this evangelist loves to state the negative of a proposition: 1^{8.31} (*I knew him not, but*) 3¹⁷ 9³ 11⁵² 12^{9.47} 13¹⁸ 14³¹ 17¹⁵ 1 Jn 2¹⁹ (Mk 14⁴⁹), and there is an occasional example in Soph. Oed. Col. 156; Epictetus 1.12.17).

Another instance of the evangelist's own work is the phrase which he shares with the Johannine epistles: *δὴ τοῦτο . . . ὅτι for this cause . . . because*, which seems to be his substitute for *διότι* (H. Pernot, *Études sur la Langue des Évangiles*, Paris 1927, 5): 5^{16.18} 7²² 8⁴⁷ 10¹⁷ 12^{18.39} 1 Jn 3¹ (without *ὅτι* 6⁶⁵ 9²³ 12²⁷ 13¹¹ 15¹⁹ 16¹⁵ 19¹¹ 1 Jn 4⁵ 3 Jn¹⁰). Paul is fond of a similar phrase: 1 Cor 7³⁷ 2 Cor 2¹ 13⁹ 1 Tim 1⁹.

The evangelist favours the transitional phrase *after this* 2¹² 11^{7.11} 19²⁸ and *after these things* 3²² 5^{1.14} 6¹ 7¹ 19³⁸ 21¹, as well as the connecting particles *hōs de* and *hōs oun*: e.g. 2²³. He shares with 1 Jn the recurring phrases: *not only . . . but also* 11⁵² 12⁹ 17²⁰ 1 Jn 2² 5⁶, and *I know (you) that* 5³² 12⁵⁰ 1 Jn 3^{6.15}. Indeed, *hoti*-clauses are typical of the evangelist 3¹⁸ 5³⁸ 8²⁰ 10^{13al}.

Conclusion. It would appear that Bultmann has failed to make a convincing case stylistically (theology apart) for the presence of detectable sources, inasmuch as the stylistic details to which he points are found everywhere, cutting across the divisions of alleged sources, e.g. the resumptive *this* and *that* (demonstrative) occur several times in the Signs-source. E. Ruckstuhl has shown how arbitrary it is to escape from this dilemma by supposing that such examples are the evangelist's own editing of his sources (*Die literarische Einheit des Johannes Evangeliums*, Freiburg 1951, 62 n.2). Moreover the stylistic rhythms which Bultmann claims for the Signs-source are easily shown to belong as much to what he ascribes to the evangelist (Ruckstuhl 43-54).

E. Schweizer had already examined the language of John and found it impossible to isolate any sources, for the Gospel is stylistically a unity, e.g. *emos* instead of the more regular NT *mou* occurs forty times throughout the Gospel in more than one "source" (*Ego Eimi . . .*, Göttingen 1939, 82-112). Ruckstuhl extended Schweizer's thirty-three stylistic tests to fifty and conclusively showed that they cut right across Bultmann's stylistic divisions (180-219). We must leave the question open, concluding that if the evangelist used written sources, their

distinctive character is not discernible through the finishing work which he or a subsequent editor accomplished on his material.

Schweizer had nevertheless apprehended that in some parts of John the characteristic features of style, which were the subject of his tests, were less in evidence, viz., some narrative sections, 2^{1-10.13-19} 4⁴⁶⁻⁵³ 7⁵³⁻⁸¹ 12^{1-8.12-15}. He noted that the style of 1 John agreed not with these, but with the speeches (Bultmann's *Redenquelle*). T. W. Manson, too, felt that the author of 1 John was the author of that part of the Gospel least influenced by Aramaic. Manson's divisions, however, which he takes from Burney, do not correspond even broadly with those of Schweizer (*BJRL* 30 [1946] 322). The only permissible course is to ignore these divisions and to comment on the style of the Gospel as a unity.

Exceptions will be the pericope de adultera, 7⁵⁰⁻⁸¹, which is generally agreed on textual grounds to be an interpolation, linguistically distinct from the Gospel style and vocabulary. One word is Lukan NT hapax: *early morning* 8². Other words and phrases are mainly Lukan: *arrive* 8², *people (laos)* 8², *sitting down he taught them* 8².

The other exception may be ch. 21, where there are some linguistic differences from the rest of the Gospel: e.g. a different word for *to be able* 21⁶, partitive and causative *apo* 21^{6.10} (in all the other gospels, but not Jn), *ἐπιστραφείς*, 21²⁰ for *στραφείς*, but the great words (e.g. *verily verily, manifest*) appear both here and in 1-20, along with words of less significance too (e.g. *ἰδοὺ, ὁ ἀπό, ὁ λεγόμενος*, and the weakened *οὖν* which appears in every part of the Gospel). Although ch. 21 presents 28 words which do not otherwise occur in Jn, only a few of them matter very much, there being no call for most of them in 1-20. C. K. Barrett examined this evidence and concluded that a separate authorship was not proven: *The Gospel according to St. John*, London 1955, 479f.

§ 2. SEPTUAGINT INFLUENCE

At first it looks as if the evangelist was unacquainted with the Greek Bible, as Burney argued, for he uses *αἴρειν τὴν ψυχὴν* in two quite different senses, neither of them that of the LXX, which is *lift up my soul* (Ps 24[25]¹, 85[86]⁴ 142[143]⁸). In Jn 10¹⁸ the phrase must mean *take back one's life after laying it down*, and in spite of some ambiguity in 10²⁴ it there seems to mean *hold in suspense*. A Jewish expression, *to take the soul away*, may be in the author's mind, as in the Testament of Abraham rec.A ch. XX, where the same expression is used of *taking Abraham's soul* to heaven.

The Johannine writings are very sparing in the use of artic. infin. after a preposition, a LXX construction.

The expression behind *τηρέω λόγον* 8^{51.52.55} 14^{23.24} 15²⁰ 17⁶ 1 Jn 2⁵ Rev 3^{8.10} 22^{7.9} is an OT phrase (Dt 33⁹ Pr 7¹), but only at 1 Kms 15¹¹ do the LXX render it by John's verb, and then not if we follow the A-text. The Heb.

phrase, *full of grace and truth* 1¹⁴ is not rendered in quite the same way in the LXX: cp. Exod 34⁴ where *full of grace* = *polueleos*.

As to citations, it is not quite the LXX version of Isa 40³ that is quoted at 1²³, nor that of Ps 68(69)¹⁰ at 2¹⁷, nor that of Ps 77(78)²⁴ or Exod 16³ at 6³¹. Moreover, the passage, *they shall look on him whom they pierced* 19³⁸, follows the Heb. of Zech 12¹⁰ rather than the LXX. The *Hosanna* quotation 12¹³ is not from LXX Ps 117(118)²⁸, and Zech 9⁹ is not the LXX version. Isa 6⁹⁻¹⁰ is not from the LXX at 12⁴⁰, nor is Ps 41¹⁰ at 13¹⁸.

On the other hand, some knowledge of the LXX must be assumed: Isa 53¹ at Jn 12³⁸ and Ps 22¹⁹ at 19²⁴ appear to be accurately quoted, and there is some connection between 15²⁵ and the Psalms, for *δωρεάν* renders *without a cause*.

There is no doubt about the expression *τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί*; 2⁴, which is a Hebraism and Septuagintism: *mah lî w'lâk* 2 Sam 16¹⁰; cf. *Grammatical Insights* 43-47 for full discussion. There are many other Heb. phrases in the Gospel, some of which are given in the LXX wording: e.g. *to do the Truth*: 'asâ 'emeth Jn 3²¹ 1 Jn 1⁶=LXX Gen 32¹¹ 47²⁹ Isa 26¹⁰ Tob 4⁸ 13⁶ T 12 P Reuben 6⁹ Benjamin 10³. Qumran 1 QS 1.5; 5.3; 8.2. (It was therefore an expression widely used in Judaism). Although the Heb. phrase *way'hî 'îsh* is not certainly rendered in the LXX by the Johannine *ἐγένετο ἄνθρωπος* (it is a v.l. in 1 Kms 1¹, but we find *ἐγένετο ἄνθρωπος* in Jg 13^{2A} 17¹ 19¹), yet in the same verse 1⁶ the Hebraism *ὄνομα αὐτοῦ* is undoubtedly LXX: Jg 13^{2A} 17¹ 1 Kms 1⁹al (as in Rev 6⁸ 9¹¹). The phrase *unrighteousness is not in him* 7¹⁸ is LXX, though with a different order of words, Ps 91(92)¹⁵, and a very frequent phrase in the LXX Psalms is *many waters* Jn 3²³ Ps 17(18)¹⁶ 31(32)⁶ 76(77)¹⁹ 92(93)⁴ 143(144)⁷. *To give in(to) the hand* occurs twice in John and twice in the Greek OT, once with *en* (Jn 3³⁵ Dan Th 2³⁸) and once with *eis* (Jn 13³ Isa 47⁶). It is remarkable that John shares with the LXX the unusual construction of *ek* after *times* (e.g. Exod 16²⁷).

John may have made his own Greek translation from the Hebrew, but more probably he used a version something like our own LXX, possibly in the form of a collection of proof-texts, or he quoted Aramaic or Greek Targums.

§ 3. OTHER HEBRAISMS

There are other phrases which Bultmann (*Kommentar* in loc.) claimed as Hebraic, Semitic, or at least as "not Greek," viz. *to do the works* 5³⁶ 7^{3,21} 8^{39,41} 10^{25,37} 14^{10,12} 15²⁴ 3 Jn¹⁰, *work the works* 6²⁸ 9⁴, *to come as (eis) a witness* (rabbinical) *bâ le'ēdhōth* 1⁶⁻⁸, *receive the witness* 3^{11,32f}, *qābhal 'ēdhūth, receive the words* 12⁴⁸ 17⁸, *have the commandments* (rabbinical) 14²¹, *having 38 years in his weakness* 5⁵, *on that day was a Sabbath* 5⁹.

As an example of colloquial Semitic speech Bultmann cited *τί ὑμῖν δοκεῖ*; 11⁵⁶. There is *ἴδε* 11^{3,36}, which may be the Hebrew *behold*; and *come and see* 13^{9,46} 11³⁴, which is a rabbinical idiom (S.-B. II 371), but

probably also a paratactic condition : *if* you come, you will see. There is the Hebrew OT phrase, *send saying* 11³, using *apostellein* absolutely, which is not normal for Greek.

Glory (1¹⁴ and 16 times) is one of those terms which radically changed meaning through Hebrew influence : originally *doxa* was *good repute*, but it became also *visible splendour* because in the LXX it rendered *kābhōdh* (*honour, glory*) and such words as *hōdh* (*splendour*).

By the same influence *erōtān* comes to mean *ask a request* 4³¹ 12²¹, and *peripatein* becomes *moral walk* (= *hālak*) : 8¹² 11⁹ 12³⁵ 1 Jn 1^{6,7} 2^{6,11} 2 Jn 4^{,6} 3 Jn 3^{,4} Rev 21²⁴ LXX 4 Kms 20³ Pr 8²⁰. *To believe in* (*eis*) is quite characteristic of this Gospel (33 times), a term shared with 1 Jn 5^{10,13}, derived from *he'emin b'e* : also Mt 18⁶ Ac 10⁴³ 14²³ 19⁴ Rom 10¹⁴ Gal 2¹⁶ Phil 1²⁹ 1 Pet 1⁸.

The Noun. 1. The Hebrew idiom *son of* 17¹². 2. The Hebrew infinitive absolute *rejoice with joy* (dative) 3²⁹ is rare in normal Greek, where in any event the cognate noun usually has the accusative ; dative of the cognate noun belongs to Biblical Greek ; LXX Isa 66¹⁰ 1 Thes 3⁹. 3. The Hebrew noun, if indefinite, may stand alone without the numeral *one* or the adjunct *man* or other form of indefinite article, whereas in non-Biblical Greek the absence of an indefinite pronoun would be unusual : Bultmann notes that in Jn 3²⁵ *μετὰ Ἰουδαίον* would be improved by the addition of *τινός*. 4. The influence of the construct state is sometimes seen in the omission of the article : 1⁴⁹ *thou art [the] king of Israel*, 4⁵ *there was there [the] well of Jacob*, 5²⁷ *[the] Son of Man*, 9⁵ *[the] Light of the world*.

Negation. The strong negative *ou mē* with aorist subjunctive or future indicative is found in the NT outside Revelation mainly in LXX quotations or in sayings of Jesus. There are papyri instances (although it is rare in literary Hellenistic : *Grammar* III 96), and they are sufficient to show that this negative occurred in popular speech ; but it was doubtless LXX or Hebrew influence which made it a very prominent feature in John and Revelation : Jn 4^{14,48} 6^{35,37} 8^{12,51,52} 10^{5,28} 11^{26,56} 13⁸ 18¹¹ 20²⁵.

Other syntax. 1. In a variety of forms, *answered and said* (*wayya'an wayyōmer*) 1^{28,49,51} 2^{18,19} 3^{3,9,10,27} 4^{10,13,17} 5¹⁹ 6^{26,29,43} 7^{16,21,52} 8^{14,39,48} 9^{20,30,34,36} 12^{28,30} 13⁷ 14²³ 18³⁰ 20²⁸. Jn rings the changes with *answered saying, answered and said* (aor. and impf.), and *answered*. 2. Under the influence of *waw*, *καί* seems sometimes to be adversative, as 1⁵ 17¹¹. 3. The Heb. *liphné* probably extended the use of *enōpion* in our Greek : Jn 20³⁰ 1 Jn 3²² 3 Jn⁶ and Rev 34 times.

Sentence Construction. 1. Prolepsis of the subject of a subordinate clause occurs frequently in John (as in Mt 25²⁴, Mark, Luke-Acts, 1, 2 Cor, 1, 2 Thes, Rev ; cf. pp. 16, 33, 36, 93, 151) : e.g. *look on the fields that they are white already* 4³⁵ 5⁴² 7²⁷ 8⁵⁴ 11³¹, and this is due to the

influence of a Hebrew idiom, e.g. Gen 1⁴. 2. In Hebrew, the anarthrous partitive expression (cf. pp. 15, 46) may stand alone as subject or object of a verb 7⁴⁰ 16^{14,15,17} (*ek*), 21¹⁰ (*apo*). 3. Commonly in the LXX, especially 1 Mac, is *eis* used predicatively: 16²⁰ *your grief shall be INTO joy* (so Rom 5¹⁸ 1 Jn 5⁸ Rev 8¹¹ 16¹⁹).

§ 4. ARAMAISMS

Although Dr. Beyer's estimate is that Hebraisms predominated over Aramaisms in the Fourth Gospel (*Syntax* 17f), we suspect that the Gospel may have had a large Aramaic element, perhaps because of the dominating influence of Jesus' own language.

Asyndeton. This is an important element in Johannine Greek: scores of verses are asyndetic, even when verbs of speaking are left out of the count. An Aramaic original is not to be assumed from the presence of this Aramaism, for "the construction is one which would tend to predominate in Jewish or Syrian Greek" (Black³ 56). Dr. Black instances the *Shepherd* of Hermas as the same kind of Greek, influenced by Jewish idiom and marked by an over-use of asyndeton, though to a less extent than John. Because the asyndetic *he says/they say* is particularly frequent in the teaching of Jesus, Black has modified Burney's theory, to the extent that only for the teaching of Jesus did John edit and rewrite Greek translations of Aramaic traditions (Black³ 61).

The Verb. 1. The passive voice is rare in Aramaic (in Hebrew too), and the impersonal plural takes its place: 15⁶ 20² (cf. p. 12). 2. It is undeniable that the use of the historic present and imperfect tenses characterizes good secular Greek and the vernacular, but it may be under the influence of the Aramaic participle that the historic present occurs as frequently as it does in Mark (151 times) and John (164), together with the imperfect: Mark (222 times), John (165).

The Pronoun. 1. The idiom *one . . . one, for one . . . another*, occurs in 20¹² and elsewhere in the Gospels, Acts, and Paul (1 Cor 4⁶ Gal 4²² 1 Thes 5¹¹): *Grammar* III 187. 2. A redundant pronoun is used proleptically to strengthen a following noun in a well-known Aramaic idiom (Black³ 96): 9¹⁸ *his parents, his that had received his sight, 13 they bring him to the Pharisees, him that once was blind* (cf. p. 12).

Conjunctions. 1. *ὡς when* is frequent in John (16 times) and Luke-Acts (19+29) and may correspond to the Aramaic *kadh* (Black³ 89f). Elsewhere it is rare: in the NT only in Paul and Mark (3 times each). 2. *When* is sometimes a not unreasonable meaning for *ὅτι* enlarging its sphere in imitation of *dē*: 9⁸ *when he was a beggar*, 12⁴¹ *when he saw*. However, a loose temporal use in Greek, as in English, may be enough

to account for the extension "without any appeal to Aramaic" (Black³ 79).

Vocabulary. 1. λαμβάνω, bearing the meaning of παραλαμβάνω, Jn 1¹² is not secular Greek (Bultmann 35 n.4) but is influenced by the Aramaic *qbl*. 2. A manifest Aramaic phrase is *everyone who does sin* Jn 8³⁴ 1 Jn 3⁴ (Black³ 171, where it is effectively rendered back into Aramaic). 3. πρὸς c. accusative meaning *with*, Jn 1¹ 1 Jn 1², is a Semitism and it may be due to the Aramaic *l'wāth*. If used in this sense in the papyri, it has the dative: cf. pp. 13, 93, W. F. Howard, *The Fourth Gospel in Recent Criticism*, London 4th ed. 1955, 2851

§ 5. SEMITISMS

Parataxis. Brief clauses linked by *and* are common to Hebrew and Aramaic. Biblical Greek will often disguise the parataxis by making one of the verbs a participle, e.g. *answering said*, but John prefers the co-ordination (*answered and said*), avoiding some of the redundant participles appearing in Biblical Greek (e.g. *coming, rising*) and preferring *they came and saw* 1³⁹, *he rose and went out* 11³¹.

The ptc. λέγων may be an exception, but even here Jn more commonly co-ordinates: (1) . . . and said 1^{29,45} 2¹⁰ 4²⁸ 5¹⁹ 7³¹ 10^{24,41} 12²² 18³⁸ 19⁴ 20²². (2) . . . saying 1^{15,26,32} 7^{15,28,37} 8¹³ 9² 11³ 12²¹.

Parataxis may be (a) conditional: 1³⁹ *if you come you will see*, 16²⁴ *if you ask you will receive*. (b) temporal: 2¹³ *when the Passover was near, Jesus went up . . .*, 4³⁵ *when it is the fourth month the harvest comes*, 7³³ *when I have been with you a little while I go away*. (c) consecutive: 5¹⁰ *it is the Sabbath, so that it is not lawful*, 6⁵⁷ *I live by the Father, so that he who eateth me . . .*, 11⁴⁸ *all will believe in him, so that the Romans will come*, 14¹⁶ *I will ask the Father, so that he will send another Paraclete*. There are many such examples.

Casus pendens. The construction is very frequent in John compared with the Synoptists (Burney, *Aramaic Origin*, 34, 64f). Matthew has eleven examples, Mark four, Luke six, but John has 28 (Black³ 52). The pendens construction, *as many as . . . to them* and *every . . . he*, was recognized by Lagrange as a Semitism (Black). Casus pendens occurs mainly in the speech of Jesus, at least six-sevenths of the time, always in direct speech, thus favouring, according to Black, a translation-hypothesis. Nevertheless, it occurs in 1 Jn 2²⁴ where words of Jesus are not in question: *what you have heard from the beginning, let it abide in you*. As it is found, moreover, in vernacular Greek, it may not necessarily be a sign of translation.

Word order. Dr. Black faces "the difficulty of determining what order is un-Greek." It is largely a matter of determining the frequency over a fairly large piece of writing; it is indeed a question of style, whether the concentration has become "such that no native Greek

writer, uninformed by Semitic sources or a Semitic language, would have written it" (Black³ 51). The place of the verb is important: in Luke and John it is so often in primary position that it is no longer secular Greek. W. F. Howard was prepared to concede that it was "remarkable" (*Grammar* II 418).

The Verb. 1. Co-ordination of a participle with a finite verb "is a common custom with Hebrew writers" (Driver, *Tenses* § 117) and it occurs in the Aramaic of Dan 4²². Jn 1³² *the Spirit descending . . . and he abode*, 5⁴⁴ *receiving glory from each other, and you do not seek, . . .* 2. Superfluous auxiliary verbs are Semitic: 9⁷ *go wash!* 6¹¹ 13^{4,25} 19^{1,6,23,40} 21¹³ *took and*, 12¹¹ 15¹⁶ *went and*. 3. Semitic also is the periphrastic imperfect 1^{9,28} 2⁶ 3²³ 10⁴⁰ 11¹ 13²³ 18^{18,25,30} (cf. p. 20, *Grammar* II 451-452).

Comparison. 1. Ellipse occurs 5³⁶ *I have a witness greater than [that of] John*, and it is Semitic (Black³ 118). 2. The cardinal numeral replaces the ordinal 20^{1,19} (= *first*). "There is no need to ransack the papyri to explain the Hebrew or Aramaic phrase. . . . It is Jewish Greek" (Black³ 124). This particular phrase is common also to Matthew, Luke-Acts and Paul.

Pronouns. 1. As in Mk, resumptive pers. pronoun is found after a relative (Aram. *d^e*, Heb. *'asher . . . lô*) 1^{27,33} 9^{34?} 13²⁶ 18^{9?} (cf. pp. 21, 36). E.g. *of whom . . . his sandal*. That similar constructions occur in the secular Koine makes direct translation from Aramaic less likely. 2. Often the oblique cases of *autos* are unemphatic and superfluous, as widely through the NT, too widely to detail each example. The redundancy may be explained partly by the tendencies of popular speech. By this rough test the NT books are seen arranged in order of non-literary, or else Semitic, quality and compared with some other texts.

Mk Mt Jn	1/2 (=one in two lines)
Lk-Ac	1/2½
LXX: Gen, T Abr	1/3
Johann. Epp., Rev	1/3
Heb	1/5
Jas 2 Pet Jude	1/6
Josephus	1/6
1 Pet	1/8
Philostratus	1/8
Paul	1/9
Pastorals	1/13
Papyri	1/13
Plato	1/19

3. The indef. pronoun in John takes the form of the indef. pronoun in Semitic speech, viz. *heis* (Heb. *'aḥadh*, Aram. *hadh*) 6^{8,70} 12² 18^{22,26} 19³⁴ 20²⁴ or *anthrōpos* (Heb. *'ish*, Aram. *barnash*) 1⁶ 3^{1,4,27} 4²⁹ 5^{5D} 7.34 7^{22,28,46,51} 8⁴⁰

9^{1,16} LXX Gen 41³³ (Black³ 106f). 4. *A man cannot* is Semitic for *no one can* 3²⁷ (Bultmann, contra E. C. Colwell, *The Greek of the Fourth Gospel*, Chicago 1931, 74) and *never man* 7⁴⁶ (Burney 99, but Colwell declared not, 74). Likewise, *not . . . all and all . . . not (lō . . . kol)* as equivalent of *none* 6³⁹ 11²⁶ 12⁴⁶ 1 Jn 2²¹ (Mk 13²⁰ = Mt 24²², Lk 1³⁷ Ac 10¹⁴ Eph 4²⁹ 5⁵ 2 Pet 1²⁰ Rev 7¹⁶ 18²² 21²⁷ 22³ Didache 2⁷: *Grammar* II 434).

Conjunctions. 1. *Poiein* with *hina* is the Semitic causative: 11³⁷ (Col 4¹⁶ Rev 3⁹ 13^{12,13,15}). 2. According to Bultmann, Burney's view that *hina* often literally translated Aram. *dē* (*who*) is arbitrary, because Colwell had pointed out that it may = *who* also in normal Hellenistic Greek. It is, however, the frequency of the occurrence that affords it significance. As Black³, 76, says, the excessive use of *hina* in Jn is unparalleled, and is not that of the Koine. (It is frequent in the LXX, and increasingly so in the Koine, until at last the infinitive disappears to make way for it. *Grammar* III 103f; Pernot 53-69.) Within the Fourth Gospel there is a wide range of usage—epexegetic, ecbatic, completing the action of verbs of will, command, beseech, agree, allow, etc. 1²⁷ 2²⁵ 4^{34,47} 5⁷ 6^{7,29,40} 8⁵⁶ 9^{2,22} 11^{50,53,57} 12^{7,10,23} 13^{1,2,29,34} 15^{8,12,13,17} 16^{2,7,30,32} 17^{3,4,15,21,24} 18³⁹. Some of these may be imperatival *hina*: 13³⁴ 15¹⁷ (*love one another*), more doubtfully imperatival: 1⁸ 6³⁹ 9³ 12⁷ 13¹⁸ 14³¹ 15²⁵ 18^{9,32} 19²⁴. Dr. W. G. Morrice notes with approval the opinion in *Grammatical Insights* that the Fourth Gospel is less "fatalistic" if the imperatival *hina* is recognized (*Bible Translator* 23 [1972] 327). As time went on, the less "literary" writers tended not to resist the encroachments of this conjunction: thus we have a rough guide to the "literary" quality of the NT authors. (Besides the test in the following table, and that concerning *autou* above, we may test the frequency of the pure nominal phrase, both for Semitic influence and lack of literary standards: Mk and Jn resort more often to the copula than any NT author, cf. *Grammar* III 294-310).

Incidence of <i>hina</i> per number of lines of Nestle	
Johnn. Epp., Jn	1/12, 1/13 (one in twelve lines)
Eph, Pastorals	1/15
1 Pet	1/17
Phil-Col-Phm	1/21
Mk	1/23
1,2 Thes	1/24
Rom-Cor-Gal	1/24
Rev	1/31
Heb	1/46
Mt	1/60
Lk-Ac	1/87
{ Infancy	1/269
{ I Acts (sample)	1/268
{ II Acts (sample)	1/138
{ We	1/253
Jude-2 Pet-Jas	1/136

Thus, the Johannine writings in this respect are the least literary, or perhaps the most Semitic, of all NT books. The Semitic influence on Jn cannot be doubted, and yet Bultmann (on 5⁷) has correctly observed that this need

not imply an Aramaic translation ; so also E. Ullendorff, " A Mistranslation from Aramaic ? " *NTS* 2 (1955) 50-52. Already in Jewish forms of Greek, *hina* may have come to embrace the same diversity of meanings as *d^o*, *dⁱ*, and in a few instances it will probably still have the final force (Jn uses *hopōs* for a final conjunction once only, at 11⁵⁷) : e.g. Jn 6³⁰, cf. Black³ 78, Pernot 55. That *hina* has also the temporal sense (that too included in *d^o*) seems probable from 12²³ 13¹ 16^{2,32} (*the hour comes WHEN*). However, Hebrew is as likely as Aramaic, as an examination of the LXX will reveal : Gen 18²¹ 44³⁴ 47¹⁹ Num 11¹⁵ 21²⁷ Deut 5¹⁴ Josh 22²⁴ 1 Chr 21³ Tob B 8¹² Ps 38⁵ Ezek 37²³ 2 Mac 1⁹ Job 32¹³. *Grammar* III 95 : " virtually a Semitism." There are also many LXX examples of non-final *hina* in the various other senses, *Grammar* III 104. In many LXX books, *hina* is as often non-final as final.

Vocabulary. The use of *city* (*polis*) where village is meant (Jn 4 of Sychar, Mt 2²³ of Nazareth) is a Semitism deriving from the Palestinian use of 'ir and *qiryā* for a place of any size (Bultmann). So perhaps is *sea* for *lake*. Believe c. *eis* (over 30 times) reflects the Hebrew *he'emîn b^e* or Aramaic *hēmîn b^e*.

§ 6. JOHANNINE CLAUSE-ORDER

One or two points are of interest in the order of clauses within the sentence.

(1) The *kathōs*-clause has both pre- and post-position. In the pre-position it is usually taken up in the second half by *kai* or *houtos* or *tauta* : 3¹⁴ 5³⁰ 6⁵⁷ 8²⁸ 12⁵⁰ 13^{15,34} 14^{27,31} 15^{4,9} 17¹⁸ 20²¹. In post-position : 1²³ 5²³ 6⁵⁸ 10^{15,26}v.l. 13³⁴ 15^{10,12} 17^{2,11,14,16,21,23} 19⁴⁰ ; they include the two instances 6³¹ 12¹⁴ which introduce quotations, and that probably means that we must punctuate differently at 7³⁸ and count the clause as post-position (*Grammar* III 320).

(2) The *hotan* clause usually has pre-position : 2¹⁰ 4²⁵ 5⁷ 7^{27,31} 8^{28,44} 9⁵ 10⁴ 15²⁸ 16^{4,13,21} 21¹⁸. Occasionally post-position : 13¹⁹ 14²⁹ 1 Jn 5².

(3) The *hōs* (*when*)-clause always has pre-position : 2^{9,23} 4^{1,40} 6^{12,16} 7¹⁰ 11^{6,20,29,32,33} 18⁶ 19³³ 20¹¹ 21⁹ (as also in Acts, and very nearly always in Luke). Pre- : Mt 28⁹v.l. Post- : Mk 9²¹v.l.

§ 7. USE OF PARTICLES

John makes no use of *ara* or *dio* ; only once uses *kaitoi ge* 4² and *dē* only once as a variant 5⁴. Other connectives which he uses very rarely are *homōs* 12⁴² (a NT hapax, except for Gal 3¹⁵ 1 Cor 14⁷v.l.). Another particle which is almost a NT hapax is *mentoi* 4²⁷ 7¹³ 12⁴² 20⁵ 21⁴ (elsewhere only 2 Tim 2¹⁹ Jas 2⁸ Jude 8). But most characteristic of John are *alla* (once in 15 lines of Nestle, along with 1 Peter and Paul the most frequent in the NT), and *oun* (one in seven, quite the most

frequent in the NT, followed next by Mark, less than half as often). Fairly frequent is *de*, but it is more excessive in the other gospels and Acts, Paul and the General Epistles. In this respect, the Johannine Epistles differ, making much less use of the particle. Except for Revelation and the Johannine Epistles, which do not use it at all, John makes least use of *men . . . de* (one in 264 lines, less even than Mark). He uses *gar* with about the same frequency as Luke-Acts and 1 Peter (once in 24 lines). He shares *ti oun* with the other gospels, Acts and Paul: more frequently than Luke-Acts, but not so much as Matthew-Mark and Paul, $\tau^{21.25} 6^{30}$. On the whole, his use of particles is not strong. Eliminating *kai*, there is only one connective particle for 3, 1 lines, compared with Matthew's 2, 5 and (even allowing for the longer sentences and therefore less need of connectives) Luke-Acts 2, 9.

§ 8. USE OF PREPOSITIONS

John uses his full share of ordinary Greek prepositions, with all cases. Thus the use of *epi* corresponds closely with that of Polybius: gen. dat. accus. = 1, 5 : 1 : 3 (John's 1, 7 : 1 : 3, 5), in line with Matthew and the LXX, but not with the NT as a whole. The proportion of *en* : *epi* in the Ptolemaic papyri is 1 : 0,45, in the whole NT is 1 : 0,32, but in John it is 1 : 0,18 (the same as James, Paul, and 1 Peter), which marks a considerable increase in the use of *en*. As Mayser observes (II 2, 461), the use of accusative with *hyper* is very rare in the papyri (gen : accus = 20 : 1); Johannine practice bears this out, John 13 : 0, Epistles 3 : 0. But Matthew is a notable exception in the NT (0,25 : 1). With *peri* accusative is very rare in the NT, much more so than in the papyri (Mayser II 2, 446), and John is here at great variance with the papyri (gen : accus = papyri 1,5 : 1, NT 7,6 : 1, John 67 : 1).

Another general departure from NT standards is marked by the use of the case with *dia*, where the meaning can be almost the same, *through* (gen) and *because of* (accus). The proportions are Matthew 1 : 1, Mark 0,61 : 1, Luke-Acts 1,7 : 1, Paul 2 : 1, Hebrews 2,3 : 1, 1 Peter 4 : 1. Against these figures, those for John (0,37 : 1) and Revelation (0,12 : 1) stand out conspicuously. In the Ptolemaic papyri *en* is the most frequent preposition, with *eis* next in order, which is broadly the position in the NT, including John (200 : 180), to which Mark and Hebrews are exceptions. But perhaps it is in the use of *para* with its cases that we find the widest cleavage between NT and secular use (*Grammar* III 272f), where there is enormous use of the genitive. We do not find this in John, though perhaps he is nearest to the papyri in this respect of any NT author. Like the LXX, the NT also differs from secular Greek in having completely renounced the

dative case with *hupo*, now a two-case preposition. John and the NT authors have much the same proportion of gen : accus as the LXX, and nothing like the secular writers (NT gen : accus = 3,3 : 1, John = 3 : 1).

But John is more fond of *eggus* than any NT author (11 times), yet always probably as an adjective rather than a prepositional adverb, reflecting as in the LXX the Hebrew *qārōbh 'el* (gen) or *le* (dat) or pronominal suffix (gen).

The Christian use of en. This is a slight extension of the local and spatial sense of *in* in a special direction to denote *in the sphere of*, especially of God, Christ and the Gospel. This is the *en* of spiritual union, very common in Paul, and important in John, as when he refers to walking *in* the light, or *in* darkness. "I *in* you, and you *in* me," is the beginning of the doctrine of co-inherence.

§ 9. THE LIMITED VOCABULARY

The Gospel vocabulary is limited to 1011 different words, only 112 of which are NT hapax. Many of these words are repeated, so that the vocabulary is only 6½% of total word-use, almost the lowest in the NT (cf. p. 44). God the Father is mainly *living, holy, or righteous*, and the characteristic words of revelation (*know, bear witness, glorify, manifest*) are much over-worked. Other characteristic words are *true, truly, Truth, life, light, love, abide*. Quite insignificant words are given theological overtones: *from above, whence, whither, now, not yet*. We have noticed the over-worked *hina*. *Pneuma* serves for *spirit* and *wind*; *lifted up* means both exaltation and death; *water* has a hidden meaning, so has *blindness, sleep, departure, crossing over, and resurrection*. Even at a more trivial level, terms occasionally bear stereotyped meanings: *go up* = go to Jerusalem, *go down* = go to Capernaum.

§ 10. POINTLESS VARIETY IN STYLE

On the other hand, John will occasionally use a needless synonym; there are two words each for *love, send, heal, ask, speak, do, feed sheep, know* (references in Howard, *Fourth Gospel*⁵, 278f). There is no apparent point in these synonyms beyond the avoiding of monotony, however hard one looks for a subtle distinction. Very occasionally, doubtless, he can be subtle in his distinctions; e.g. *hear a voice* (gen) seems to mean *obey* 5^{25.28} 10^{3.16}, whereas *hear a voice* (accus) is confined to perception 3⁸ 5³⁷. But on the whole the distinctions are pointless. The author of 1 John has the same pointless variation in syntax; e.g. *a sin not* (μῆ) *unto death* and *a sin not* (οὐ) *unto death* 5^{16r} can have

no difference in meaning. (Similarly 1 Pet 1⁸.) John shows this characteristic in the use of prepositions: when Jesus sees Nathanael he is *hupo* the fig-tree 1⁴⁹, but *hupokatō* the fig-tree 1⁵⁰ (Revelation always has the latter), and Philip is *apo* Bethsaida but *ek* the city of Andrew 1⁴⁴. Lazarus was *apo* Bethany, but *ek* the village of Mary 11¹. For some reason John is conspicuous among NT authors as being four times more prone to use *ek* than *apo* and the Johannine epistles are nearly twice as prone. The NT authors range from Luke-Acts, Matthew and the author of Thessalonians, who prefer *apo*, to John and Revelation at the other extreme, with the remainder having no particular preference. The Johannine writings, together with Revelation and Hebrews, shun the preposition *sun*; there are three examples in John, only one of which is not a variant reading. Acts definitely prefers *sun*, to *meta* with genitive, but Paul and Luke have no preference. Matthew avoids *sun* (which he uses four times compared with *meta* (5:45). There is yet another exception to John's tendency to variety in the use of similar words, and that is his use of the negative, for he only once uses *ou* with the participle (10¹²), but whenever he negatives the participle he uses *mē*; this was a Hellenistic tendency, but here John has advanced further than Hellenistic usage would permit: 3¹⁸ 5²³ 6⁶⁴ 7^{15,49} 9³⁹ 10¹ 12⁴⁸ 14²⁴ 15² 20²⁹.

Desire to avoid monotony explains John's varying the tense according to the particular verb, but he varies it often enough with the same verb, e.g. 11^{36f} *were saying* (imperfect) . . . *said* (aorist).

The perfect of *erchesthai* is a favourite tense with John: 3^{2,19} 5⁴³ 6¹⁷ 7²⁸ 8^{20,42} 11^{19,30} 12^{23,46} 16^{28,32} 17¹ 18³⁷. What is the difference between *I HAVE* (perfect) *come into the world as light* 12⁴⁶, and *I DID* (aorist) *not come to judge the world* 12⁴⁷? Why the perfect tense of *send* 5^{33,36} 20²¹ and the aorist everywhere else? Why the perfect *have known* 5⁴² 6⁶⁹ 8^{52,55} 14⁹ 17⁷, alongside the regular aorists? Perhaps something theological enters here: the stress on the abiding significance of the Christian revelation. If so, the evangelist has not made his theology consistent always with his syntax.

Eccentricity is remarkable again when the choice is between a normal and a periphrastic imperfect: each may occur within two verses, e.g. 3^{22f} *was baptizing* with no apparent significance in the choice. Is there any real difference between the periphrastic perfect 20³⁰ and normal perfect 20³¹ *have been written*? The author of 1 John has the same habit: 2⁵ normal perfect, 4¹² periphrastic.

CONCLUSION

These instances of Hebraisms, Aramaisms and Semitisms occur not only nor even mainly in the words of Jesus, as is sometimes assumed.

We conclude that John's language throughout is characteristic of Jewish Greek, syntactically very simple, dignified but without the flexibility of the secular language, pointlessly varied in syntax and vocabulary, but without the solecisms and without the linguistic energy of Revelation. It moves within well-defined Semitic limits of style and vocabulary. Perhaps it was based on an underlying *Mischsprache* of Hebrew and Aramaic (Black³ 16); certainly the Greek itself is a mingling of Hebrew and Aramaic constructions with other constructions that may be either Hebrew or Aramaic.

It cannot be, as some have urged, that the Semitic Greek is simply due to the earliest Christian preachers being Jews who were using a second language, without complete mastery over it. If that were so, this kind of Greek would be a more clumsy language, inclined to mistakes, instead of which, even in Revelation, it obeys rules of its own syntax and style. Semitic features lend it solemnity, and they are not makeshifts filling the gaps left by ignorance of Greek. Moreover, Jewish Greek is not in fact restricted to early Christian preachers, but is found on the pens of men well accomplished in Greek, able to use it effectively, such as the authors of James, Hebrews, and 1 Peter. It appears in some free-Greek books of the LXX (e.g. Tobit), and some Jewish works as far away in time as the Testament of Abraham and the Testament of Solomon, which cannot be shown to be translations of Semitic originals. Ignorance of Greek as a cause of Jewish Greek, is altogether less probable than the influence of the Greek Bible through widely scattered synagogues, forming a new community language.

Other Literature :

- C. Lattey, "The Semitisms of the Fourth Gospel," *JTS* 20 (1919) 330ff.
 C. C. Torrey, "The Aramaic Origin of the Gospel of John," *HTR* 16 (1923) 305ff.
 C. F. Burney, *The Poetry of our Lord*, Oxford 1925.
 N. W. Lund, "The Influence of Chiasmus upon the Structure of the Gospels," *ATR* 13 (1931) 27-48, 405-433.
 T. W. Manson, "The Life of Jesus: a Survey of Available Materials: (5) The Fourth Gospel," *BJRL* 30 (1946) 322-329.
 O. Cullmann, "Der johanneische Gebrauch doppeldeutiger Ausdrücke als Schlüssel zum Verständniss des vierten Evangeliums," *Theologische Zeitschrift* 4 (1948) 360-372.
 J. Bonsirven, "Les aramaïsmes de saint Jean l'évangéliste," *Biblica* 30 (1949) 405f.
 E. Hirsch, "Stilkritik und Literaranalyse im vierten Evangelium," *ZNW* 43 (1950) 129ff.
 B. Noack, *Zur johanneischen Tradition, Beiträge zur Kritik an der literarkritischen Analyse des vierten Evangeliums*, Copenhagen 1954.
 G. D. Kilpatrick, "The Religious Background of the Fourth Gospel," *Studies in the Fourth Gospel*, ed. F. L. Cross, London 1957, 36ff.

- R. Schnackenburg, "Logos-Hymnus und johanneischer Prolog," *Bibl. Zeit.* 1 (1957) 69-109.
- H. Clavier, "L'ironie dans le quatrième évangile," *Studia Evangelica* I, Berlin 1959, 261-276.
- S. Brown, "From Burney to Black: the Fourth Gospel and the Aramaic Question," *CBQ* 26 (1964) 323-339.

THE STYLE OF PAUL

Modern scholarly opinion requires that, as far as possible, we consider the various groups separately: *group* (1) 1 and 2 Thessalonians; *group* (2) Galatians, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Romans; *group* (3) Philippians, Colossians, Philemon; *group* (4) Ephesians. We have excluded the Pastoral epistles, but have noted parallels there, for they probably contain genuine Pauline elements at least. Unfortunately, we cannot take into consideration the view, not generally held, that parts of Paul's epistles may be earlier Christian fragments (e.g. R. Bultmann, "Glossen in Römerbrief," *Theologische Literatur-Zeitung* 72 [1947] 197-202), or that Paul did not write 1 Corinthians 13, etc. It may be so, but the question lies beyond the scope of this volume.

§ I. THE LITERARY CHARACTER OF THE MAIN GROUP

Compared with the others, *group* (2) above is marked by energy and vivacity, sincerity and a controlled outflow of words, reaching a high peak of eloquence at times, spontaneous, without contrivance. For simplicity and clarity alone, the first group would be more notable, as it is also the least literary, but the second group achieves sometimes a rare literary quality. Romans is more tightly constructed than 1 Corinthians, and neither of them is as full of feeling and quick changes of mood as 2 Corinthians, Galatians and Philippians. In the latter epistle, change of mood is so marked that it looks as if there has been an insertion: thus, some have considered whether a separate letter does not begin at Phil 3², perhaps added later by Paul while composing the same letter, but others declare against it (e.g. J. Jewett, "The Epistolary Thanksgiving and Philippians," *Nov.T.* 12 [1950] 40-53). Changes of mood are especially evident in 2 Corinthians and they tend to mar its literary excellence, as compared with 1 Corinthians, although chapters 9-12 are powerful in style. The polishing function of an amanuensis does not seem so evident in 2 Corinthians.

It is true that the Paulines and Hebrews are not wholly spontaneous in style, inasmuch as they show some influence of the rules of rhythm current in Asian Hellenistic circles, especially the influence of Polybius. Sometimes Paul could rise to the heights of Plato and Cleanthes, as in

the ending of Romans 8, and in 1 Corinthians 13. E. Norden's comments should be observed on this aspect of Paul's style (*Die antike Kunstprosa vom VI Jahrhundert v. Chr. bis in die Zeit der Renaissance*, Leipzig 1898, 509). In his education, some part was doubtless played by Hellenism, and the influence of that was progressive perhaps, for none of the philosophical terms in the second group (*knowledge, wisdom, understanding, conscience, form*) occur in the earlier group. Yet Paul is fairly innocent of artificial rhetoric: the conventional rhetorical word-order is often neglected, e.g. Rom 14⁹ "Christ *died* and *lived*, so that *the dead and the living*," Eph 6¹² *blood and flesh*, Col 3¹¹ *Greek and Jew*. These might seem quite inelegant to a stylist. Paul's art is usually unstudied. The eloquence is spontaneous, barely touched by an amanuensis. Of Bultmann's view that Paul's style is that of the Stoic-Cynic diatribe or popular moralizing address, it may be apt to comment that Paul's training as a rabbi probably taught him the skilful use of question and answer (*Der Stil der paulinischen und die kynisch-stoische Diatribe*), *FRLANT* 13, Göttingen 1910). Moreover, Paul's style is too passionate for the diatribe. However, there is something to be said for Bultmann's view: the defensive language of 1 Thess 2¹⁻¹² is close to Dio Chrysostom's concerning some Cynic preachers, and it would seem that each of these two writers, in much the same style, distinguishes himself as a true philosopher from the charlatans. A. J. Malherbe has made this point (" 'Gentle as a nurse': The Cynic Background to 1 Thess ii," *Nov.T.* 12 [1970] 203-217). Yet the language proves no more than that Paul may have been acquainted with the phraseology of Hellenistic writers such as Dio. Certain passages should be noted, especially Rom 2, 3, 4¹⁻¹², 9¹⁴⁻¹¹ 32, Gal 2^{17f} 3¹⁹⁻²² 1 Cor 6^{12, 13, 18} 15²⁹⁻³⁴, in which are some features of the diatribe: the short simple sentence, the ironical imperatives, parataxis, asyndeton, rhetorical questions (especially characteristic of Romans, e.g. 3¹ 4¹⁰ 8³¹ and also 1 Cor 7^{18f}, which recall the diatribe of Epictetus), and introduction of the opponent's case by *they say* or *someone will say* (e.g. 2 Cor 10¹⁰ *his letters, they say, are heavy and strong* . . .). The question is not so much whether Paul's style resembles the diatribe as shown at its height in the Latin Seneca and the Greek Arrian's dissertations of Epictetus, and other Hellenistic literary features, but how the resemblances came to be in his letters. There is some superficial resemblance between Paul's language and Seneca's and Paul seems to use some Stoic catch-phrases, without however caring for the real Stoic meaning: e.g. 1 Cor 3²¹ (*all things are yours*) 4⁸ (being rich and reigning) 7²⁰ Eph 4¹ (cp. with Epictetus i 29.46, H. Schenkl's editio minor, Leipzig 1848: *called by God*) 1 Cor 9²⁵ (cp. with Seneca, *Ep. Mor.* 78.16: athletes receive blows all over the body to win glory), 1 Cor 7³⁵ (cp. with Epictetus iii 22.69: ἀπερισπάστως) Eph 6¹⁰⁻²⁰ (cp. with

Seneca, *Ep. Mor.* 96, *ad Marc.* 24: the Christian warfare). J. B. Lightfoot's full discussion of the Stoic parallels is impressive (*St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians*⁶, London 1881, 289f). Although possibly Seneca knew something of Christianity, Lightfoot thought that it was more likely that the linguistic coincidences were due to the common elements in Stoicism and Christianity, since both of them were established in the Near East (cf. Lightfoot's dissertation, "St. Paul and Seneca," *op. cit.* 270-328). Even more probably, however, these Stoic traits and other forms of literary affection were mediated to Paul by way of the Hellenistic synagogue. By this very means the influence of the diatribes of Seneca and Epictetus would have reached Philo. "Regardless of the avenue by which Paul was introduced to this mode of expression, he appropriated it in no artificial way. It became part of his own style" (Malherbe, "The Beasts at Ephesus," *JBL* [1968] 73, 79). Paul was no conscious stylist, but his eloquence was "der Rhetorik des Herzens" (Norden 502), embellished at times perhaps by an amanuensis. The clarity of expression, more Greek than Hebrew, which some commentators have marked in the letters, may be due to occasional revision. The notion of a regular amanuensis, however, is not easy to credit; too many inelegances were allowed to go uncorrected, and in particular some instances of zeugma, which scribes loved to rectify, are left alone. In 1 Cor 3² only one of the nouns suits the verb and this is an excellent example of zeugma (*I gave to drink milk, not meat*); in 14³⁴ very early scribes have corrected the zeugma, *it is not lawful for them to speak but to be submissive* (meaning, *it is lawful to be submissive*), into *let them be submissive* (DKG 1739 Old Lat Harkl Syr). There is no variant at 1 Tim 4³ (*forbidding to marry and to abstain from meats*). Cf. also 1 Tim 2¹².

Almost all the literary forms in the NT were in use among contemporary Greeks and Romans. The *gospel* indeed was a new form, but the *logia* of a master, which formed part of the structure of the *gospel*, had already been collected by the students of philosophers; they corresponded to the private summaries, as opposed to published works, a distinction made by Aristotle. Secondly, the Hellenistic form, the *dialogue* may be present, e.g. in the discussions between Jesus and the disciples over such questions as the Christians' attitude to the Law. Thirdly, the *dialatribe*, a dialogue transformed into a monologue, in which an imaginary opponent is refuted, seems to be shared by Paul with Bion, Epictetus, Seneca, Philo, followed later by Clement of Alexandria. Fourthly, the *address* (or *homily* or *dialexis*) which was less to refute an opponent than to convince an audience, is exemplified in Hebrews. Lastly, the epistle, not so much private correspondence as something in the manner of the epistles of Epicurus and Polemon of Ilion, are considered by some to be models for Paul's letters, but the

question remains whether his letters are indeed so "literary" or formal as these epistles. They were written to give instruction and they were intended to be read aloud, but Paul did not observe points of style or obey the laws of rhythm so closely. His are rather private *letters* than formal epistles, a distinction made by Deissmann (*Bible Studies, ET* Edinburgh 1901, 4ff), which is perhaps rather too naïve (cf. W. G. Doty, "The Classification of Epistolary Literature," *CBQ* 31 [1969] 183-199). Paul's letters begin with an address, "A. to B. grace and peace," but in secular letters in place of the Pauline *grace and peace* was simply *chairein*; Paul's greetings are less formal and were often expanded into prayers. Like the Pastorals, Hebrews, 1 Peter and 2, 3, John, the Paulines end with a salutation, usually of a type which is common in the secular papyri: "Greet your mother and your father" (P.Tebt.412), but once first person, as in Rom 16²², "I send greetings to your father and all your household" (P.Tebt.415). Cf. the useful article by T. Y. Mullins, "Greetings as a New Testament Form," *JBL* 87 (1968) 418-426. Paul's letters more often than not end with a grace, and in Romans and Corinthians with a reference to the holy kiss, which makes them uniquely distinct from secular letters. Nevertheless, they contain some phrases typical of private letters. *I beseech you, (brethren)* is very prominent in the Paulines: Rom 12¹¹ 15³⁰ 16¹⁷ 1 Cor 1¹⁰ 4¹⁶ 16^{15f} 2 Cor 10¹¹ 1 Thes 4^{10b-12} 5¹⁴ Eph 4¹⁻³. C. J. Bjerkeund establishes that this phrase is found not so much in rhetorical writings, as in official and private letters (*Parakalô: Form und Sinn der parakalô-Sätze in den paulinischen Briefen*, "Bibliotheca Theologica Norvegica," 1, Oslo 1967. Cf. also P. Schubert, *Form and Function of the Pauline Thanksgiving*, Berlin 1939, also based on Pauline form-criticism). Other phrases of secular letters are: *I would have you know, I would not have you ignorant, I rejoice, making mention of you* (in prayer) (G. Milligan, *St. Paul's Epistle to the Thessalonians*, London 1908, 55). Yet Paul's letters do not lack the eloquence of the formal epistle which belongs especially to Asia Minor: oratory of the first order occurs very often (Rom 6 7 8³¹⁻³⁵ 9 10 11, 1 Cor 3 4 8 9 12 13 15, 2 Cor 2 3 4 5 8 10 11 13), as do several of the literary devices of the epistle: irony (1 Cor 4⁸, 2 Cor 11¹⁹), aposiopesis (Rom 7²⁴ Phil 1²², perhaps 2 Thes 2^{3f}), prodiorthosis and epidiorthosis (Rom 3⁵ 8³⁴, 2 Cor 7³ 11^{1ff. 16ff. 21. 23} 12¹¹, Gal 4⁹), paralipsis (he pretends not to say something but nevertheless says it: Phm 1⁹), and the rhetorical question closely paralleled in the diatribes of Epictetus (Rom 3¹ 4¹⁰, 1 Cor 7^{18ff}). Other literary devices are the allegory, metaphor, ellipse and the parallelism. Indeed, Paul's letters seem to be intended to be read aloud, like formal lectures and literary epistles. Not that this renders them any less spontaneous, nor on the other hand does their undoubted rabbinic dialect.

§ 2. THE CONTRAST BETWEEN PAULINE
AND EPHESIAN'S STYLE

Ephesians has very long periods, especially 1³⁻¹⁴, 2¹⁴⁻¹⁸, 3¹⁴⁻¹⁹, and lacks Paul's usual flexibility of expression. Probably some of the clearest Semitisms occur in this epistle, e.g. *son of* (2² 3⁵ 5⁶), *everyone* . . . *not*=no one (4²⁹ 5⁵), and ἵστε γινώσκοντες the Hebrew infinitive absolute (5⁵).

Jülicher long ago felt the difficulty of the stiffness of style, the heavy catenae of sentences, the numerous particles and relative pronouns (another Semitism). Dibelius rejected Pauline authorship. Dr. Mitton concluded that Ephesians was written c. 90 by a discerning student of Paul in order to summarize and spread his gospel (C. L. Mitton, *The Epistle to the Ephesians*, Oxford 1951, 9-11, 31f). It may possibly be an apostolic homily, intended like 1 Peter for baptismal services, a revised edition of Colossians for the purpose (R. R. Williams, "The Pauline Catechesis," *Studies in Ephesians*, ed. F. L. Cross, London 1956, 89-96). Another suggestion from a liturgical angle is that if the artificial epistolary material be removed, a *berakah* for public worship, a Christian covenant-renewal, is arrived at, the word *blessed* no doubt promoting the idea: 1³⁻¹⁴ 2 3¹⁴⁻²¹. Everything in the style of Ephesians fits the pattern of Qumran's covenant-renewal service at Pentecost; there are links with the Pentecostal cycle of readings, assuming that they existed before A.D. 70, and with the rabbinic exegesis upon them: Eph 4⁸ 5²²⁻³³ 6². It is suggested that later on this constituent of Christian worship was made into a letter: cf. J. C. Kirby, *Ephesians, Baptism and Pentecost: An Inquiry into the Structure and Purpose of the Epistle to the Ephesians*, Montreal 1968, passim.

The difference in style between the Paulines and Ephesians may be accounted for in part by the employment of a different amanuensis, in part perhaps because the tone of Ephesians is that of prayer and meditation in place of reasoning elsewhere. As the end drew near, perhaps, Paul wrote more serenely, as J. N. Sanders suggested ("The Case for Pauline Authorship," *Studies in Ephesians* 16). However, several stylistic features are common to Ephesians and the other Paulines: antithesis (cf. below under parallelism), *men* . . . *de* (Romans 12 times, Corinthians 20, Galatians two, Philippians four, Ephesians once, Pastorals three), a simple rhythm (cp. Rom 8 and Eph 3), paronomasiae (Rom 1^{29,31} 2¹ 5¹⁶ 8²³ 11¹⁷ 12¹⁵ 14²³ 1 Cor 2¹³ 13⁸ 15^{39f} 2 Cor 1^{4,13f} 3² 4⁸ 8²² 9⁸ 10¹² Gal 5⁷ Phil 1⁴ Eph 3⁶), his rich use of the genitive, both subjectively and objectively (everywhere in the Paulines, and also Eph 1⁴ 2¹⁴ 4⁹), the Semitic circumlocution with *mouth* (Eph 4²⁹ 6¹⁹ and Paulines), the Semitic redundant *elthōn* (1 Cor 2¹ al. Eph 2¹⁷), a predilection for *ara oun* (Romans eight times, nowhere else except

Galatians, 1, 2 Thessalonians and Ephesians), *διο* (Paulines 22 times, Ephesians five times), and the use of metaphor, usually urban metaphors or metaphors connected with architecture, games, finance and the army; when Paul enters rural areas his metaphors are not so successful, e.g. grafting olive trees in Rom 11¹⁶⁻²⁴.

Besides these, there are some other recurrent matters of style which need further discussion: e.g. the use of ellipse, such as *faithful [is] God* (1 Cor 1⁹ 10¹³ Phil 4⁵ 2 Thes 3² Eph 1¹⁸ 4⁴ 5¹⁷), *wives [must be subject] to their husbands* (Eph 5²⁴), cf. also Rom 11¹⁶ 1 Cor 11¹. There is also a play on words, where the meaning as well as the sound is similar: Rom 1²⁰ 5¹⁹ Phil 3²¹ Eph 4¹, and the particularly fine example in Rom 12³ (*μη ὑπερηφρονεῖν παρ' ὃ δεῖ φρονεῖν, ἀλλὰ φρονεῖν εἰς τὸ σωφρονεῖν*), almost too perfect for one who discounted this world's wisdom. This may be due the work of the amanuensis; it scarcely seems like Renan's "une rapide conversation sténographié et reproduite sans corrections" (*Saint Paul*, Paris 1869, 231). Also common to Ephesians and the rest of the Paulines are the digressions on account of word-association, as T. K. Abbott points out, quoting Paley (*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians and Colossians*, ICC Edinburgh 1887, xxif): *salvation* Eph 2⁶, *went up* 4⁸⁻¹¹ *light* 5¹³⁻¹⁵, *aroma* 2 Cor 2¹⁴, *epistle* 3¹, *veil* 13. Paul's asyndeton is effective in all his letters, whether emphasizing a new section (Eph 1³ 3¹ 5^{6, 22, 25, 32} 6^{1, 5, 10} Rom 9¹ 10¹ 11¹ etc.), leading successively to a climax (Eph 4^{5, 6, 12, 13} 6¹² 1 Cor 4⁸ 2 Cor 7² 1 Thes 5¹⁴ Phil 3⁵), marking contrast (Eph 2⁸ 1 Cor 15^{42f}), or otherwise making for stylistic liveliness (Eph 1¹⁰ 3⁸ 4^{4, 28, 29, 31} 6¹¹ Rom 1^{29ff} 2¹⁹ 1 Cor 3² 13⁴⁻⁸ 14²⁶ al.).

§ 3. HARSHNESS OF STYLE

Some characteristics of Paul's style are harsh, particularly parenthesis, e.g. Eph 2⁵. In 2 Thes 2⁷ there may be a harsh parenthesis or trajection depending on the position in which *he who now restrains* is to be understood; it is usually taken, "the mystery of lawlessness already works; only he who now restrains will do so until he be taken from the midst," whereas it makes better sense when understood, "the mystery of lawlessness already works only until he who now restrains be taken from the midst." Perhaps also there is a parenthesis in 1 Cor 10¹¹: *they are written for our learning* is parenthetical, and thus "the ends of the ages" were come upon "them," not "us." Just as harsh a feature is trajection, the removal of words from their logical order: Rom 11⁸ 1 Thes 2¹³. In Rom 5⁶ there is a misplaced *εἰ γάρ* for which one variant substitutes *εἰ γέ*, others *εἰ δέ*, *εἰ γάρ*, and *εἰς τι γάρ*. Another trajection is the misplaced *ὁμως* (*nevertheless*) in 1 Cor 14⁷ Gal 3¹⁵, unless it be

accented *ὁμῶς* (*likewise*). There is a possible trajection of the negative in Rom 3⁹ (*Have we an advantage? Not altogether*), and the order should perhaps be reversed to read *πάντως οὐ* (*certainly not*), as in 1 Cor 16¹², but probably the confusion comes through dictation. Perhaps Paul made a pause in the voice between the two words, "No! Absolutely!" It is likely that Paul was given to trajection, doubtless because of the turmoil of his thoughts, and that scribes consistently sought to correct this stylistic solecism.

Despite the rhythmic quality of some passages in his letters, it is unlikely that he attended a Hellenistic teacher of rhetoric, for his anacolutha and solecisms are too numerous. There is direct object in the nominative case (Rom 2⁸), the antecedent of *ho* (neuter) can be masculine (Eph 5⁵) or feminine (Col 3¹⁴). We find extraordinary grammar in 2 Cor 12¹⁷ and *casus pendens* in Rom 8³. Paul's periods are rarely finished off neatly, a fault which Abel ascribes to forgetfulness as to how the period began, rather than to disdain of grammatical rules; Paul allows himself to be drawn along on the wings of his thought in sharp bursts, resulting in parentheses and discords, while particles and participles are brought in to weave over gaps in the diction (*Grammaire* § 80f). His sentences became so involved that at a certain point he would close them and begin again. Good examples are Gal 2⁶ 1 Tim 1^{3ff} (where there is one addition after another). Scribes have attempted to smooth out the anacolutha, e.g. Rom 9^{23B} 16^{27B} Gal 2^{4fD}.

§ 4. JUDAISM OR HELLENISM IN PAUL?

Stylistic features which can be paralleled in Hellenistic literary works cannot rule out the fact that Paul was at heart a Jew. Norden found Paul's style to be "on the whole, unhellenic." Paul was a writer "der wenigstens ich mir sehr schwer verstehe . . . ist auch sein Stil, als Ganzes betrachtet, unhellenisch" (*Die Antike Kunstprosa* 499). Paul's work was almost exclusively among his co-religionists, in the synagogues of the Greek world, very seldom among the non-proselyte Gentile Greeks and barbarians, and only for brief spaces when the Jews refused him a hearing (e.g. in the school of Tyrannus). It is argued that for his work in "the West," no other language was possible than Greek or Latin. But the variety of Greek should be distinguished and specified. To maintain that Paul "was not likely to import into it words and constructions that would have a foreign sound" (*Grammar* II 21) is to overlook the possibility that for Jews the Semitic constructions of the Greek Old Testament would not have a foreign sound.

Even the so-called "literary" parts of Paul's letters owe their style mainly to Hebrew or to the LXX. Thus, even the neuter adjectives

with dependent genitive (e.g. *the impossible things of the Law*) (Rom 8³) which is not found in the papyri, but in the higher Koine of Strabo and Josephus, is a feature of the free Greek of the LXX (2-4 Maccabees) and of the Apostolic Fathers (*Grammar* III 13f). It is now being appreciated that there was in the first century A.D. a body of Jewish and Christian writings in Greek which had the style of a Jewish-Hellenistic homily, of which Hebrews is a good example, which made good use of the OT and yet were influenced by the secular diatribe (cf. H. Thyen, *Der Stil der Jüdisch-Hellenistischen Homilie*, FRLANT, NF 47, Göttingen 1955). N. W. Lund complained that rarely had the Hebraic element been acknowledged in Paul's literary style, which is too often described as exclusively Greek, only modified by his method of dictation and his clumsy, repetitious sentences, the marks of his own temperament. Lund considered that allowance should be made for Paul's rabbinical training, his methods of argument, OT quotation, and his extensive use of allegory (*Chiasmus in the New Testament. A Study in Formgeschichte*, N. Carolina 1942, 139).

Allegory indeed is quite characteristic of Paul's style, and this rhetorical device, which is something more than a series of metaphors, was used by the Jews no less than the Greeks. Philo is an example, compared with whom "St. Paul's allegorism was firmly anchored to history, and thereby preserved from extravagance" (K. J. Woolcombe, in *Essays on Typology*, ed. G. W. H. Lampe and K. J. Woolcombe, London 1957, 56). Instances of Paul's allegory are his use of Sarah and Hagar in Gal 4²¹⁻²⁷, of unleavened bread in 1 Cor 5⁶⁻⁸, of the Law's forbidding to muzzle the threshing ox in 9^{9f}. Very close to allegory is Paul's use of typology, which some define as a development of allegory, wherein he sees Adam as a type of Christ (1 Cor 15²² Rom 5¹⁴) and the Exodus as a type of conversion (1 Cor 10¹⁻¹³).

Lund moreover suggested that Paul's style was liturgical, and since Lund's book there has also appeared an article by J. M. Robinson ("Die Hodajot-Formel in Gebet und Hymnus des Frühchristentums," in *Aphophoreta*, ed. W. Eltester, Berlin 1964, 194-235), who argues that *I give thanks* and *Blessed* introduce liturgical elements, as also in Jas 1. "Since Paul's letters were written to be read often, he gave them a literary form suitable for reading in wider circles than the local church to which they were first addressed. Their character as public liturgical writings is accentuated by the fact that they were cast in the well-known Old Testament liturgical forms" (Lund, *Chiasmus* 224). Lund's is an important thesis, less convincing perhaps because his elaborate analyses may be overdone.

Since that period, *Gattung*-criticism has been applied to Paul's letters, affecting larger literary groups than form-criticism; thus 1 Cor 1-3 is seen as a kind of Jewish haggadic homily (W. Wuellner, in *JBL* 89

[1970] 199-204), and an underlying homily-pattern is discerned in Gal 3⁶⁻²⁹ and Rom 4¹⁻²² corresponding to something in Philo (*Leg.all.* III 65-75a; 169-173; *Sacra* 76-87. Cf. P. Borgen, *Bread from Heaven*, Leiden 1965, 46-50). It is noted that "homily-genres" appear in Palestinian midrashim of NT times, at first as separate units, later to be inserted in larger compositions. These homily-patterns seem to have the same characteristics as the above-mentioned Cynic-Stoic diatribe, viz. quotations and paraphrases of key-words (Bultmann, *Der Stil* 94-96). The main theme of the Corinthian homily (1 Cor 1-3) is the judgment of God on human wisdom (1¹⁹) and the advantage of regarding it as a homily-*Gattung* is that 2¹⁻⁵ is no longer seen as a pointless digression but rather as a characteristic feature of halakic discussions, intervening between the second and third treatment of the homily theme (the first treatment being 1²⁰⁻²⁵, the second 1²⁶⁻³¹, and the third 2^{6ff}). The climax of the homily, future judgment, occurs at 3¹⁰⁻¹⁵ which is thus no longer seen as a diatribal digression (as Bultmann thought, *Der Stil* 98). It may be that Paul derived this theme of judgment from sermons which he had heard in the synagogue.

In a parallel way, form-criticism has been applied to Paul's letters, and an underlying judgment-form has been discerned (e.g. Rom 1¹⁸⁻³² 1 Cor 5¹⁻¹³ 10¹⁻¹⁴ 11⁷⁻³⁴ Gal 1⁶⁻⁹ 5¹⁸⁻²⁶ 6⁷⁻¹⁰ 1 Thes 1⁵⁻¹² 4³⁻⁸ 2 Thes 2^{1-8, 9-15}). Whether consciously or not, Paul appears to be following the prophetic form of the OT pre-exilic prophets, modifying it with the purpose of warning and rebuking the Church (C. Roetzel, "The Judgment Form in Paul's Letters," *JBL* 88 [1969] 305-312).

One other interesting development in the Semitic direction has come from Qumran studies. Dr. Stachowiak is of opinion that *paraenesis* is a stylistic literary form with definite characteristics of its own, which he maintains is similar to and barely distinguishable from *paraklesis*. He maintains that the paraenetic parts of Paul's letters are comparable with the paraenetic parts of the Manual of Discipline, both being mutually independent yet both depending upon a common basic tradition (L. R. Stachowiak, "Paraenesis Paulina et Instructio de duobus spiritibus in 'Regula' Qumranensi," *Verbum Domini* 51 [1963] 245-250).

§ 5. PAUL'S BIBLICAL GREEK SYNTAX

"The grammar shows little Semitic influence," it has been alleged (A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament*³, London 1919, 129), but the search could not have been carried very far. The Semitisms may be "secondary" in Moulton's sense that their deviation from the secular language is due to the over-literal rendering of a

Semitic original "defensible as Greek and natural to a Greek ear" (*Grammar* II 21), and to their being derived from the LXX. We need not suppose that the Semitisms and Aramaisms are due to his thinking in Aramaic while writing in Greek, for he was probably brought up to speak Greek from childhood (*Grammatical Insights* 83-85). There is very strong evidence for LXX influence, despite Moulton's surprising opinion that it did not exert much influence on Paul's style, much less was its diction copied. Nägeli, Guillemond and others, on the contrary, saw the Pauline Hebraisms as entirely due to Paul's use of the LXX. Everywhere there are verbal similarities with it, and there can be little doubt that he used a Bible closely resembling our present LXX texts or, perhaps, because the quotations are elaborately composite, it was a collection of Greek OT proof-texts.

Syntax of the Verb. 1. *Impersonal plural.* Certain texts of 1 Cor 10²⁰ (BDG Old Lat Marcion) reflect this Septuagintism: *they sacrifice*, but scribes sought to remove the Hebraism by adding a subject. It has been claimed as an Aramaism, but it is not exclusively so.

2. *Co-ordination of finite verb with Participle or Adjective* (e.g. LXX Ps 17^{33ff}) is not characteristic of non-Biblical Greek but is frequent in Paul: 1 Cor 7¹³ (adj) 2 Cor 5¹² 6³ 7⁵ 8^{18ff} 9^{11,13} 10^{4,15} 11⁶ Col 1²⁶ Eph 1²⁰⁻²².

3. *Infinitive as substitute for imperative* may be derived from the Hebrew infinitive absolute, a more probable hypothesis than to suppose that vestiges of Homeric usage or the very slight precedent to be found in prayers in poetical classical Attic have any significance: Rom 12¹⁵ Phil 3¹⁶ (also Luke-Acts).

4. *Imperative participle*, used as a main verb, may well be a Hebraism (*Grammatical Insights* 165-168), but more probably *ἐορέ* is in ellipse (especially Rom 12⁹), so that it is simply an instance of periphrastic tenses (*Grammar* III 303) and thus another Semitism; it is not sufficient evidence for a Hebrew *Vorlage* to Rom 12.

Rom 5^{10,11} 12^{9-13,16} 2 Cor 17 8^{24v.l.} 9^{11,13} 10⁴ Phil 1^{29f} Col 2³ 3¹⁻⁶ Eph 3¹⁷ 4². Paul does use periphrastic tenses, although Moulton held that he always used them in the emphatic way of class. Greek (*Grammar* II 23). Without emphasis they are characteristic of latish Hebrew and Aramaic and abound in the LXX, although the periphrastic imperfect may have real emphasis, signifying duration or repetition. So in Paul: Gal 1^{22f} (*they kept hearing?*) 2 Cor 5¹⁹ (*God kept on reconciling*) Phil 2²⁶ (*he kept on longing*). But not always: there is no emphatic force in Gal 4²⁴ (*are spoken allegorically*) 1 Cor 8⁵ (*are spoken of*) 2 Cor 3³ 9¹² Col 1⁶ 2²³ 3¹ (Common in Mk).

5. *Redundant participles* (*elthōn, etc.*). There is not as much call for these in didactic material as there is in the gospel narrative, but Eph 2¹⁷ seems to indicate that the author would have used this

Semitism, given the opportunity (*he came and preached*). Other possible instances are 1 Cor 2¹ 2 Cor 12²⁰ Phil 1²⁷.

6. *Articular infinitive*. The excessive use of infinitival construction after *τῷ* (= *to*), although paralleled in small degree in non-Biblical texts, is Septuagintal (Radermacher 189). Paul's use is too extensive to be secular.

Consecutive: Rom 1²⁴ 6⁶ 7³ 8¹². Final: 1 Cor 10¹³ 2 Cor 7¹² Phil 3¹⁰. After other verbs: Rom 15^{22,23} 1 Cor 16⁴ 2 Cor 1⁸. Other constructions: 1 Cor 9¹⁰ 2 Cor 8^{11bis} Gal 2¹² 3²³ Phil 3²¹.

This is true of *eis to*, which belongs to the LXX and to some extent to secular Greek and is frequent in all the Pauline groups except Eph and Past: *Group* (1) 1 Thes 2^{12,16} 3^{2,5,10,13} 4⁹ 2 Thes 1⁵ 2^{2,6,10,11} 3⁹. *Group* (2) Rom 1^{11,20} 3²⁶ 4^{11bis,16,18} 6¹² 7^{4,5} 8²⁹ 11¹¹ 12^{2,3} 15^{8,13,16} 1 Cor 8¹⁰ 9¹⁸ 10⁶ 11^{22,23} 2 Cor 1⁴ 4⁴ 7³ 8⁶ Gal 3¹⁷. *Group* (3) Phil 1^{10,23} (*Grammar* III 143).

It is true of *ἐν τῷ* (= *in*), expressing time during which with the present infinitive as in the LXX, very rarely in the papyri: Rom 15¹³ *in believing* Gal 4¹⁸ *while I am present* 1 Cor 11²¹ *in eating*.

7. The difficult adverbial expression *εἰς τὸ σωφρονεῖν* Rom 12³ is best explained on the basis of the LXX as an adverb formed by literally rendering *to* with noun (Jer 4³⁰ 6²⁹); here Paul has made the infin. into a noun (also on the LXX model) by prefixing the article.

8. The Semitic phrase *ποιεῖν ἵνα* occurs at Col 4¹⁶ (Heb. causative hiphil, Aram. aphel), shared with Mk Jn Rev T Abr.

9. The way Paul heaps up participial clauses, concerning the nature of God, especially in Eph and Col, was characteristic of the synagogue's liturgical style (E. Percy, *Probleme der Kolosser- und Epheserbriefe*, Lund 1946, 38f).

Syntax of the Noun. 1. The phrase, *son of*, used qualitatively, is good Greek, according to Deissmann (*Bible Studies* 161), who nevertheless conceded its LXX origin for Paul: Eph 2² 5⁶ Col 3⁶ v.l. (*sons of disobedience*) Col 1¹³ (*son of his love*) 1 Thes 5⁵ (*sons of the light and sons of the day*) 2 Thes 2³ (*sons of perdition*).

2. The correct interpretation of the Pauline genitive is controversial: we believe it to be the Hebrew genitive of quality. The LXX translators so often faced the problem of the construct state in its adjectival function (Thackeray, *Grammar* 23) that apparently the habit of using a genitive of quality had been caught by Paul, leading to ambiguity of interpretation, whether it is subjective or objective. It is not found in non-Biblical Greek to the same extent as in Paul: e.g. Rom 1²⁶ 2⁵ (*day of wrath*) LXX, a sure Hebraism) 6⁶ 7²⁴ 8²¹ Phil 3²¹ Col 1²² 2¹¹ Eph 1¹⁴.

3. The phrase, *words taught by human wisdom*, διδασκτοῖς with the genitive (1 Cor 2¹³), betrays direct influence of LXX Isa 54¹³ (*limmūdhe Yahweh* = διδασκτοῦς θεοῦ).

4. The dative, *to God*, may be dativus commodi but is more clearly an imitation of the LXX rendering of the Hebrew device to produce a

superlative by means of *lêlôhîm*: Jon 3⁸ (*a great city to God = a very great city*). Thus 2 Cor 10⁴: *mighty to God = very mighty*.

5. It is a Semitic construction to append the personal or demonstrative pronoun to the noun in the genitive rather than to the noun to which it really belongs: Rom 7²⁴ *the body of this death = this body of death (= this dead body)*, Phil 3²¹ *the body of our low estate = our body of low estate*, Col 1¹³ *the son of his love = his son of love (= his beloved son)*. *Grammar* III 214.

Syntax of the Article. Paul is the most consistent breaker of Colwell's and indeed of any other rule regarding the article (*Grammar* III 183f), and it is seldom clear how far any noun is intended to be definite. The ambiguity is characteristic of Biblical Greek, as we found in the gospels, and corresponds to the disappearance of any formal distinction between definite and indefinite in Aramaic (cf. p. 21).

Syntax of Number. 1. Contrary to non-Biblical Greek, Paul often has the singular to denote something shared by a group of people, as in the Semitic idiom, e.g. *heart* (Rom 1²¹ 2 Cor 3¹⁵ Phil 1⁷ Col 3¹⁶ v.l. Eph 1¹⁸ 4¹⁸ 5¹⁹ 6⁵) or *body* (Rom 8²³ 1 Cor 6^{19,20} 2 Cor 4¹⁰).

2. The Hebrew plural *'ôlāmîm* is probably behind Paul's use of plural *aiōnes* (*eternity*): Gal 1⁵ Eph 2⁷ 3¹¹, and behind the plural *ouranoi* which, on the analogy of Hebrew *shāmayîm*, means the Jewish seven heavens in 2 Cor 12² Eph 4¹⁰.

3. *One* (cardinal) for *first* (ordinal) is Hebraic and is natural to Paul in 1 Cor 16², no less than to the evangelists. It is Septuagintal for *yôm 'ehād* (Gen 1⁵).

Syntax of the Pronoun. Paul has the Biblical Greek *antrōpos* for the indefinite pronoun: 1 Cor 4¹ 7²⁶ 11²⁸, but his subject-matter, not being narrative, does not call for the other prominent Biblical Greek feature concerning the pronoun, viz., the use of oblique cases of *autos*. Thus it is not found so often as in the gospels, but is frequent enough to place Paul's style in line with Biblical Greek, especially in Ephesians.

Groups (1) and (2): the occurrence is one in ten lines. *Group* (3): the occurrence is one in eight lines. In Ephesians, it is one in five lines, which is very Semitic. Whereas the papyri have one in 13 lines, the narrative books of the LXX have one in three lines (Gen 1-4), or one in two lines (4 Kms 1-4).

Syntax of Conjunctions. 1. The importance of Semitic influence for specific exegesis appears in Gal 2¹⁶, where a great deal of theology is involved in the question whether or not Paul confuses *ei mē* and *alla*. If he has not confused them, then we should read, as in non-Biblical Greek: "A man is not justified by the works of the Law, *unless* it be by way of faith in Jesus Christ," which is scarcely Paul's soteriology

(for man is *in no way* justified by the Law), but it becomes more characteristically Pauline if, in common with the LXX and Biblical Greek usage, he equates *ei mē* with *alla*, and thus we render, "A man is not justified by the works of the Law, *but* by faith in Jesus Christ." The confusion arises in Biblical Greek because *kī'im* (= *ei mē*) is usually rendered by *alla* (e.g. Gen 32²⁹ 1 Kms 8¹⁹ Ps 1⁴). The equation of *ei mē* with *alla* is seen in Mark and Matthew (Mk 13³² = Mt 24³⁶, Mt 12⁴).

2. The interrogative *ei* is an undoubted Semitism (a Septuagintism for *hā* or *'im*), and Moulton-Geden give 1 Cor 7¹⁶bis 2 Cor 13⁵ as direct interrogative.

3. The meaning of the idiom *ti gar moi* (1 Cor 5¹²) is best explained by Hebrew influence (*Grammatical Insights* 43-47, 102): *how does it concern me?*

4. The compressed use of *ἤ* (*than* for *rather than*) is a borrowing from the LXX, conscious or otherwise, the few non-Biblical parallels being less convincing than the LXX: 1 Cor 14¹⁹ LXX Num 22⁶ 2 Mac 14⁴² (*Grammar* III 32).

5. Imperative *hina*: 1 Cor 5² Eph 5³⁸. Our views in *Grammatical Insights* 147 and *Grammar* III 95 are endorsed by W. G. Morrice, *Bible Translator* 23 (1972) 328f.

Syntax of the Adverb. 1. A distributive adverb might be expressed in Hebrew by duplication of a noun (e.g. *yôm wāyôm* = *daily*) and Paul has resorted to this duplication in 2 Cor 4¹⁶, which though not directly Septuagintal, follows the analogy of several other distributive duplications there, and it has found its way into modern Greek.

2. Adverbial *loipon* (= *ceterum*) (1 Cor 1¹⁶ 4² 7²⁹ 2 Cor 13¹¹ Phil 3¹ 4⁸ 1 Thes 4¹ 2 Thes 3¹ Eph 6^{10D} 2 Tim 4⁸) may have come in by way of Aramaic and then found its way into the post-Ptolemaic papyri (A.D. 41); it is doubtful whether it has this meaning in the Ptolemaic papyri (Mayser II 3, 145). 3. Adverbial *polla* may also be Aramaic (*Grammar* II 446): Rom 16^{6,12} 1 Cor 16^{12,19}.

Syntax of Prepositions. 1. *Physiognomical and similar expressions.* As in the LXX, Paul uses certain nouns as circumlocutions in the Hebrew fashion: *mouth* (Rom 3¹⁹ 10^{9,10} 15⁶ 2 Cor 6¹¹ Col 3⁸ Eph 4²⁹ 6¹⁹ 2 Tim 4¹⁷) and *hand* (2 Cor 11³³ *escaped their hands* Gal 3¹⁹ *by the hand of a mediator*).

Such expressions belong to Biblical Greek, in the LXX and elsewhere, and so do the compound prepositions of like nature: *katenanti* (Rom 4¹⁷ 2 Cor 2¹⁷ 12¹⁹), *enōpion* = *qōdām* (a favourite of Paul: Rom 3 times, 1 Cor 11 times, 2 Cor three, Gal once, 1 Tim six, 2 Tim two), *opisō* (Phil 3¹³ 1 Tim 5¹⁵), *emprosthen* (2 Cor 5¹⁰ Gal 2¹⁴ Phil 3¹³ 1 Thes 1⁸ 2¹⁹ 3^{9,13}), and *kata prosōpon*, which the LXX frequently use to translate the physiognomical *liphné* and *b^eēnē* (*Grammar* I 42).

2. Paul is influenced by the LXX in the use of *en* (*b^e*, meaning *because of, for the sake of*) Rom 1^{21.24} 5³ 1 Cor 4⁶ 7¹⁴ 2 Cor 12^{5.9} Phil 1¹³, in the use of *pros* with verbs of saying (Rom 10²¹ *to Isaac he says* 15³⁰ *prayers to God* 1 Thes 2² *speak to you*: thus, without special emphasis), and in the use of *ek* which in its causal sense is not characteristic of non-Biblical Greek, where its occurrence is negligible compared with that of the LXX or Paul, recalling the LXX rendering of *min* by *apo* or *ek* when *hupo* or the simple dative would have been appropriate (Rom 1⁴ 1 Cor 1³⁰ 2 Cor 2² 7⁹ 13⁴ Rev 2¹¹). The use of *pros* meaning *with* (1 Cor 16^{8.7} 2 Cor 5⁸ 11⁹ Gal 1¹⁸ 2⁵ 4^{18.20} 1 Thes 3⁴ 2 Thes 2⁵ 3¹⁰ Phil 1²⁶ Phm 1³) was probably encouraged by the Aramaic *l'wath* (Burney, *Aramaic Origin* 29). The use of *pros* with accus., answering the question *where?*, must be understood as a Semitism, as it has dat. only in the papyri in this sense (Bultmann, on Jn 1¹⁻²).

3. After *logisthēnai* (Rom 2²⁶ 9⁸) and *hamartanein* (1 Cor 16¹⁸ 8^{12bis}), Paul retains the LXX *eis* (*l^e*), and *en* (*b^e*) after *pistis*, *pisteuein*, which constructions are extremely rare outside Biblical Greek. To be *well-pleased in* (*en*) is also from the LXX and is unparalleled in non-Biblical Greek (influence of *hps b^e*): 2 Cor 12¹⁰, cf. Mk 1¹¹=Mt 3¹⁷. The phrase *exousia epi* (for the Semitic, cf. below p. 157) occurs at 1 Cor 11¹⁰. The phrase *ēdeu ēv* is a Hebraism (*b^e*), as we see from Ps 137 (138)⁵ *sing OF the ways of the Lord not IN the ways of the Lord*. Therefore, in Col 3¹⁶ it may be *sing OF grace in your hearts*, rather than *sing WITH grace*. . . .

4. Whenever a series of nouns presents the opportunity to repeat the preposition, Paul will accept it 58% of the time (Rom, 1 Cor), 37% (Eph) and only 17% (Pastorals), as compared with LXX Ezek (B-text) 84%, Rev 63%, Jn 53%, Mk 38%, Mt 31%. Paul is in line with the rest of the NT and somewhere between the literal translation Greek of the LXX and the almost complete absence of repetition in classical and contemporary non-Biblical Greek (*Grammar* III 275).

5. Biblical Greek favours compound prepositions, e.g. *en mesō* (1 Thes 2⁷), *heōs ek mesou* (2 Thes 2⁷), *ana meson* (1 Cor 6⁵).

Sentence Construction. The prolepsis of the subject of a subordinate clause is a Biblical idiom (cf. pp. 16, 33, 36, 69, 151): Gal 1¹¹ *I make known the gospel . . . that it is not . . .* 1 Cor 3²⁰ *the Lord knows the thoughts of the unwise, that they are . . .* 14³⁷ 16¹⁵ 2 Cor 12^{3f} 1 Thes 2¹ 2 Thes 2⁴.

§ 6. BIBLICAL GREEK VOCABULARY

We give but a few examples. In Rom 7³ "being" with a man (= marrying him) is reminiscent of the LXX rendering of *kī thiyē l'e'ish* (Lev 22¹²; cp. Num 30⁷ Jg 14²⁰ Ezek 23⁴), because merely living with another man is not Paul's point: he speaks of freedom to marry again. *Kai idou* and *idou gar* also occur as a Semitism (2 Cor 6⁹ 7¹¹) and so does *splangchna* (2 Cor 6¹² 7¹⁵ Phil 1⁸ 2¹ Phm 7.12.20). In Rom 2²⁵ the meaning of *ōphelei* (*is of value*) is confined to Josephus, and in Rom 4²⁰ Phil 4¹³ Eph 6¹⁰ 1 Tim 1¹² 2 Tim 2¹ 4¹⁷ we find the Biblical word *endunamoun*, but it overflowed from the LXX or the NT into Poimandres (c. i-iii/A.D.). The word *walk* (*peripatein*) is used, in Hebrew fashion, of moral behaviour, some thirty times,

§ 7. BIBLICAL GREEK WORD-ORDER

Although Paul observes a characteristically Biblical word-order on the whole, yet he makes frequent exceptions in the interests of rhetoric, in order to emphasize a prominent thought, as do the authors of Hebrews and James. Prominent words or thoughts affecting the word-order are : " you " (Rom 11¹³), " revealed " (Rom 8¹⁸ Gal 3²³), " each " (Rom 12³ 1 Cor 3⁵ 7¹⁷), " mundane matters " (1 Cor 6⁴), " weaker " (1 Cor 12²²), " tongues " (1 Cor 13¹), " love " (2 Cor 2⁴), final clause precedes for effect (2 Cor 12⁷), " the poor " (Gal 2¹⁰), " the Lord " (1 Thes 1⁶), " the Devil " (1 Tim 3⁶). Sometimes Paul brings closely connected words together : " he has *authority, the potter over the clay, from the same lump to make* " (Rom 9²¹), " we were *children by nature of wrath* " (Eph 2³). He brings forward the predicate in the interests of euphony : Rom 13¹¹ Phil 2¹¹ 3²⁰.

Paul's word-order within the sentence is remarkably flexible, but it goes beyond this to clause-order, and trajection of clauses seems to occur at 1 Cor 15² (" if you hold it fast " may be misplaced for emphasis, and scribes attempted to correct), 2 Cor 8¹⁰ (" not only to do but also to wish " is scarcely logical in view of the next verse, " so that your readiness to wish it may be matched by your completing it "), Phil 1^{16f} (KL correct the illogical order).

Position of the Verb. The primacy of the verb, next to parallelism of clauses, is the surest Semitism in the NT, especially when it occurs in a series (E. Norden, *Agnostos Theos : Untersuchungen zur Formengeschichte religiöser Rede*, 4th ed. Leipzig 1923, 365). Paul is not a whit behind the gospels in preferring this position, whereas in contemporary non-Biblical, as in the modern language, the predominant order is the middle position for the verb. In main declarative clauses, excluding the verbs *to be* and *speaking*, the verb usually comes right at the beginning of the clause, after the connecting particle, e.g. Rom 1^{11,13,16,18,21,22,24,26,28} 1 Cor 1^{4,10,11,16,17} Gal 1^{11,13}. In the same stretch, the subject comes before the verb only at : Rom 1^{17,19,20} Gal 1¹². The object precedes the verb only at 1 Cor 1²⁷. Rhetoric upsets the primacy of the verb in Rom 11¹³ 1 Cor 13¹.

Position of the adjective. Paul places the adjective or adjectival phrase after the noun, with repeated article, far too often for there to be any resemblance with secular practice. In iii/B.C. papyri there are only ten instances in this position, as opposed to twenty between article and noun ; in ii-i/B.C. papyri the difference from Paul is even more marked 5/140. The LXX has predominantly Paul's position (*Grammar* III 8). The kind of phrase in which Paul follows the secular order is *διὰ τῆς ἐν ἀλλήλοις πίστεως* (Rom 1^{12,15} Gal 1¹⁷), *ἡ ἀσύνητος αὐτῶν καρδία* (Rom 1^{21,23,26} 12¹ Gal 2^{3,13}), *τὰς ἐαυτῶν ψυχὰς* (1 Thes 2^{7,8,12,14})—i.e. a pre-

positional phrase, a single adjective, and *ἐαυτῶν*, or *ιδίῶν*. The phrases involving the Biblical practice of repeating the definite article are: *τοῦ Υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ τοῦ γενομένου* (Rom 1³ 12^{3,6} Gal 1^{4,11} 2⁹ 1 Thes 1¹⁰ 2^{12,14}), *τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ τὸ ἀγαθὸν καὶ εὐάρεστον καὶ τέλειον* (Rom 12²), *ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν ἢ πρὸς τὸν θεόν* (1 Thes 1⁸), *ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῆς Ἰουδαίας ταῖς ἐν χριστῷ* (Gal 1²²)—participles, prepositions, and a chain of adjectives. The occurrence in seven chapters of Romans, Galatians, 1 Thessalonians was twelve, far higher than anything we have met in secular Greek. In the first two chapters of 1 Corinthians there were five; in two chapters of Philippians there were two; in the final chapter of Ephesians, two examples. Cf. pp. 23f.

Position of the demonstrative adjective (houtos, ekeinos). This invariably is post-positive in Biblical Greek and pre-positive in secular (only *houtos*, for *ekeinos* in the papyri has lost its attributive use: Mayser II 2, 80), and it is overwhelmingly post-positive in all Paul's letters, with the exception of the Pastorals.

Position of πᾶς. Mayser (II 2, 102) disclosed four possible positions in the Ptolemaic papyri: 1) *πᾶς ἄνθρωπος*, 2a) *πᾶς ὁ ἄνθρωπος*, 2b) *ὁ ἄνθρωπος πᾶς*, 3) *ὁ πᾶς ἄνθρωπος*, with the plurals of each type. The figures in *Grammar* III 202–205 included LXX quotations. Without the quotations, the figures are as follows:

	Type 1		Type 2a		Type 2b		Type 3	
	s.	pl.	s.	pl.	s.	pl.	s.	pl.
(1) 1 and 2 Thes	9	1	2	7	—	1	—	—
(2) Rom-Cor-Gal	39	9	17	15	—	9	1	2
(3) Phil-Col-Phm	27	1	6	5	—	1	—	—
Ephesians	19	1	3	6	—	1	—	—
Pastorals	21	5	1	7	—	2	—	—
Hebrews	13	1	2	7	—	—	—	—
Papyrus iii/BC	17	2	14	40	18	56	22	5
Papyrus ii-i/BC	23	11	11	20	5	90	19	3

The enormous number of type 1 stands out at once; it is a Semitic type. Whereas non-Biblical Greek favours types 2b and 3, Biblical Greek follows the Hebrew constructions represented by types 1 and 2a (further figures for the LXX appear in N. Turner, "The Unique Character of Biblical Greek," *Vetus Testamentum* 5 [1955] 208–213, and *Grammar* III 202–205).

Position of the attributive genitive. In Biblical Greek and increasingly in the papyri as time went on (cf. Mayser's figures in *Grammar* III 217), the attributive genitive followed its governing noun without repetition of the article, but Biblical Greek still sometimes retained the method of repeating the article: 1 Cor 1¹⁸ 2 Cor 4¹¹ p⁴⁶ Tit 2¹⁰.

Position of heneka (-en). Paul follows the Biblical Greek way of placing it before its noun, in accordance with all LXX books, the very reverse of that of the Ptolemaic papyri and Polybius (*Vetus Testamentum* 210f).

Position of pronouns and particles. Hebrew has no second-position particles, and the tendency of Biblical Greek is either to ignore them or to place them first, as it does with *ara* (Rom 5¹⁸ 7^{3,25} 1 Cor 15¹⁸ 2 Cor 5¹⁵ 7¹² Gal 2²¹ 5¹¹ 2 Thes 2¹⁵ Eph 2¹⁹ al. cf. Lk 11⁴⁸), *menounge* (Rom 9²⁰ 10¹⁸), which may have passed into the secular Koine by the time of Phrynichus (cf. M. Thrall, *Greek Particles in the New Testament*, Leiden 1962, 36), indefinite *tis* (1 Cor 8⁷ Phil 1¹⁵ 1 Tim 5²⁴) although *tis* often has some stress when it is the first word, immediately following the word to which it belongs in sense. The position of *men* in 1 Cor 2¹⁵ seemed to scribes unnatural and it was omitted by p⁴⁶ ACD* al. In Tit 1¹⁵ it comes after an irrelevant word and has been omitted by some, and altered to *gar* by others.

§ 8. BIBLICAL GREEK STYLE

Hebraic parallelism. This, including considerable chiasmus, occurs throughout Paul's style; it is clearly derived from Hebrew, partly through the LXX, and need not be attributed absolutely to the influence of the Stoic diatribe. Some of the instances of parallelism cited here may well be fragments of early Christian hymns (especially Eph 5¹⁴). Sometimes there is rhyme (1 Tim 3¹⁶). As the Paulines were written to be read aloud, it is difficult to judge when Paul quotes a hymn and when he freely composes. The same problem arises at Jude 2⁴¹ and at possible hymns in Revelation (e.g. 5¹²⁻¹⁴). Menander is quoted (1 Cor 15³³), and Epimenides of Crete (Tit 1¹²). The only other example of a Greek metrical pattern seems to be in 1 Cor 10¹² (an anapaest), but it is probably quite accidental and without significance.

In a world torn by violence, it is little wonder if authors took naturally to an antithetical style and contrasted heaven and earth, light and darkness, life in Christ and death in sin, spirit and flesh, faith and unbelief, love and hate, truth and error, reality and appearance, longing and fulfilment, past and present, present and future. But besides the contrasts which form an *antithetic* parallelism (e.g.

“put to death for our sins: raised for our justification,” Rom 4²⁵; cf. also Rom 2^{7f} 1 Cor 1¹⁸ 4^{10ff} 2 Cor 6^{4ff} 1 Tim 3¹⁶), there is *synonymous* parallelism (e.g. “when the corruptible shall put on incorruption: when this mortal shall put on immortality” 1 Cor 15⁵⁴): cf. also Rom 9² (“sorrow is great; unceasing is pain”: chiasmus), 11³³ 1 Cor 15^{42f} (“sown in corruption: raised in incorruption. Sown in dishonour: raised in glory. Sown in weakness: raised in strength”), 2 Thes 2⁸ Col 3¹⁶ Eph 5¹⁴. There is *mixed* parallelism too: 2 Tim 2^{11f} (“if we suffer with him, we shall also reign with him. If we deny him, he will also deny us. If we are unfaithful, faithful he remains”). All these are after the Hebrew pattern.

Chiasmus. Lund maintained that the application of the chiasmic principle solved the problem why in many passages the style seemed to be “verbose and repetitious”; rather, he thought, it was conformable to certain laws of its own and ought not to be judged by Greek stylistic canons (*Chiasmus in the New Testament* 142). The style was based on the Old Testament and was part of the creative activity of Christianity in the Apostolic Age (p. 144). However, it should be noted that Paul’s Bible was usually the LXX, where the chiasmus of the original is often (but not always) ignored. Some examples (e.g. 1 Cor 4¹⁰) are far-fetched, but a Semitic pattern of chiasmus does seem to be established in many instances (*Grammar* III 345ff): e.g. Rom 1²² (ABBA) 1 Cor 5²⁻⁶ [AB (ABBA) C (ABBA) B (ABCCBA) A], 1 Cor 12^{1-31a} [A]^{31b}-13¹³ [B] 14 [A]. On this pattern, cf. J. Collins, “Chiasmus, the ‘ABA’ Pattern and the Text of Paul,” in *Studia Paulinorum Congressus Internationalis Catholicus*, Rome 1963, vol. II 575-584. Col 3^{3f} (ABCDDCBA), 3¹¹ (ABBA) Phm⁵ (love for, faith in :: Jesus, the saints), Phil 1^{15f} (ABCCBA) 3^{10f} (ABBA). Dr. Bligh (in *Galatians: A Discussion of St. Paul’s Epistle* [Householder Commentaries 1] London 1969) maintains that Galatians is one large chiasmus, centred on a smaller one (4¹⁻¹⁰): A. Prologue, B. Autobiography, C. Justification by faith, D. Scripture argument, E. Central chiasmus, D. Scripture argument, C. Justification by faith, B. Moral section, A. Epilogue. Philippians too is full of chiasmic patterns, e.g. 2⁵⁻¹¹ (ABCBA. ABCDCBA. ABCDDCBA. ABCDCBA). Dr. Bligh observes that Philippians “from beginning to end, is one long chain of chiasmic patterns” (cf. his review in *Biblica* 49 [1968] 127-129). Thus Phil 2⁵⁻¹¹, for instance, may have an Aramaic original (as Lohmeyer), and the matter is well discussed by R. P. Martin, *Carmen Christi*, Cambridge 1967, 38-41. Although the theory of an Aramaic original is not generally acceptable, Matthew Black holds this section to be “the oldest piece of Aramaic tradition in the New Testament” (*Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, 45 [1962] 314f), and indeed the verses would link together in a perfect chiasmic chain like this:

God's form	A				
Grasping	B				
LIKE GOD	C				
Emptying	B	Himself	A		
Servant's form	A	Emptied	B		
		Servant's form	C		
		LIKE MAN	D		
		Man's form	C		
		Humbled	B	Humbled	A
		Himself	A	Himself	B
				Obedient	C
				Death	D
				Cross	D
				Obedient	C
				Him	B
				Exalted	A
				Name	B
				Every knee	C
				CHIASTIC TRIPLET	D
				Every tongue	C
				Kurios-title	B
				Glory	A

Moreover, Eph 2¹¹⁻²² forms an elaborate triple chiasmus: (1) verses 11-13 (A. once, B. gentiles, C. flesh, D. uncircumcision, D. circumcision, C. flesh, B. strangers, A. now in Christ). (2) verses 13-17 (A. far-off: near, B. blood of Christ, C. both one, D. middle-wall, E. hostility, F. his flesh, G. Law, G. commandments, F. new man, E. peace, D. reconcile, C. one body, B. cross, A. far-off: near). (3) verses 18-22 (A. Spirit, B. Father, C. strangers, D. house of God, E. built, F. foundation, F. corner-stone, E. building, D. holy temple, C. built *together*, B. God, A. Spirit). Professor G. Giavini also sees a chiasm in the passage, but views it rather differently ("La Structure Litteraire d'Eph.II.11-22," *NTS* 16 [1970] 209-211).

It is said that Col 1¹⁵⁻²⁰ may be a Christian hymn (E. P. Sanders, "Literary Dependence in Colossians," *JBL* 85 [1966] 36f, and the names cited there: Norden, Käsemann, J. M. Robinson). There is a deliberate allusion to the Day of Atonement, in Jewish fashion, and there is certainly a chiasmic pattern there but it starts at 1¹³; G. Giavini starts it even earlier at verse 12 ("La struttura letteraria dell'inno cristologico di Col. 1," *Revista Biblica* XV [1967] 317-320. Cf. also N. Kehl, *Der Christushymnus im Kolosserbrief: Eine motivgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu Kol. 1, 12-20*, Stuttgarter Biblische Monographien 1, Stuttgart 1967). The chiasmus would run as follows:

We are brought from darkness into the Kingdom (13)	A
Redemption (14)	B
Image of God (15)	C
First-born (15)	D
Creation (16)	E
The heavenly hierarchy (16)	F
ALL IN CHRIST (17)	G
The Church below (18)	F
Beginning (Gen 1 ¹) (18)	E

First-born (18)	D
God dwelt in him (19)	C
Reconciliation (20)	B
Making peace by the cross (20)	A

Parataxis. If Rom 1-5¹¹ be sampled (about 270 lines in Nestle) we find 117 main verbs and 80 subordinate verbs; the sentences are much longer, and thus more "literary" than anything in Luke-Acts, even the We sections (which have as many as 147 main verbs in the same amount of text). The Pauline proportion is not like that of vernacular Greek, where the unliterary papyri have main and subordinate verbs in about equal proportion. Nevertheless, taking 1 Thes 1-2 Thes 2¹² instead of Rom 1-5¹¹, there is little difference from the unliterary papyri texts (103 main : 117 subordinate). Earlier Greek, however, has many more subordinate than main verbs.

Genitive absolute. Excluding Ephesians and the Pastorals, Paul has one genitive absolute in 77 verses, the same proportion as the Fourth Gospel and the Epistle of Jeremy, very much less than most NT books, even non-narrative books, and in all but the translated books of the LXX (*Grammatical Insights* 178f). An ungrammatical genitive absolute in 2 Cor 12²¹ is corrected by scribes to the accusative, but not in 2 Cor 4¹⁸.

§ 9. THE AMANUENSIS

In assessing the style of Paul, account must be taken of the possible part played by an amanuensis, for secretaries, besides being in general use (of which a great many instances are given by Norden, *Die Antike Kunstprosa*, 954ff), were employed by some NT authors, viz. Tertius in Rom 16²², and Silvanus in 1 Pet 5¹². We need not go so far as to suppose that Luke was the amanuensis of the Pastorals. Paul could certainly speak Greek, for never is there mention of an interpreter in Acts, but he often hints that he did not regularly write it (1 Cor 16²¹ Gal 6¹¹ Col 4¹⁸ 2 Thes 3¹⁷ Phm¹⁹). The question is, how much help the secretary might have given to Paul. The secretary may have helped to choose the vocabulary, and would obviously modify the author's style if it were too eccentric. G. J. Bahr goes further: only the mind of Paul, and then only in part, is revealed by the main body of the letter, for the secretary composed it "on the basis of general guidelines laid down by Paul." So only in the postscript (as Lightfoot had suspected) is either the language or thought exactly Paul's. This is what Bahr calls the "subscription," and he claims that in Romans the subscription begins at chapter 12, in Philippians at 3¹, in 1 Corinthians at 16¹⁵, in 2 Corinthians at 10¹, etc. Although the detail is somewhat

hypothetical, the thesis is probably correct in principle ("The Supercriptions in the Pauline Letters," *JBL* 87 [1968] 27-41).

On the other hand, J. N. Sevenster was more complacent. He argued that although some people for one reason or another could not write a letter at a certain moment and so gave instructions to a secretary who composed and wrote the letter, nevertheless there was no indication that this was a general practice (*Do You Know Greek? How much Greek could the first Jewish Christians have known?* Leiden 1968, 12). Josephus nevertheless admits to having "assistants," who helped him in Greek (*Contra Apion* I 50), and it seems probable that such men were the semi-professionals, or perhaps an educated friend (not necessarily a tachygrapher), who brushed up the Jewish Greek of Jews and Christians into the slightly atticizing efforts of James and Peter.

Other Literature :

- T. Nägeli, *Der Wortschatz des Apostles Paul*, Göttingen 1905.
 C. E. Compton, *The Metaphors Used by the Apostle Paul in His Description of the Christian Life* (unpublished dissertation, Southern Baptist Seminary, 1948).
 H. H. Rowley, *ET* 61 (1950) 154, review of J. Nélis, *Les Antithèses Littéraires dans les Épîtres de St. Paul*.
 A. Roosen, "Le genre littéraire de l'Épître aux Romains," ed. F. L. Cross, etc., *Studia Evangelica* II, Berlin, 1964, 465-471.
 J. D. H. Downing, "Possible Baptismal References in Galatians," *ibid.*, 551-556.
 R. Jewett, "The Form and Function of Homiletic Benediction," *Anglican Theological Review* 51 (1969) 18-34.
 A. M. Harmon, "Aspects of Paul's Use of the Psalms," *Westminster Theological Journal* 32 (1969) 1-23.
 A. W. Argyle, "M and the Pauline Epistles," *ET* 81 (1970) 340-342 (vocabulary-links between M and Paul).

THE STYLE OF THE PASTORAL EPISTLES

§ I. HIGHER KOINE STYLE

The style of the Pastorals is almost universally recognized to-day as distinct from the other ten Paulines in many important respects. P. N. Harrison, in his notable work, thus summarizes the genuine Pauline style with its irregularities and abruptness: "the tendencies to fly off at a tangent, the sudden turns and swift asides, the parentheses and anacolutha" (*The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles*, Oxford 1921, 41). The style of the Pastorals, on the other hand, is said to be "sober, didactic, static, conscientious, domesticated," lacking Paul's energy and impetus, intellectual power, and logic. Harrison admitted the use of Pauline prepositions but complained of the way they were used, loosely and vaguely. Moreover, he admitted the anacolutha which are characteristic of Paul (e.g. 1 Tim 1³) as well as the parentheses, excepting some of these on the grounds that they came in genuine Pauline "fragments" (1 Tim 2⁷ 2 Tim 1¹⁸ 4^{7.14.16}). Harrison pointed out (42f, 44) that the Pastorals have no trace of the Pauline *oratio variata*, in which pairs of sentences run parallel without grammatical subordination: e.g. 1 Cor 7¹³ *the woman who has an unbelieving husband, and he is pleased to live with her, let her not leave her husband* (characteristic of Paul's Jewish Greek: cf. R. H. Charles's rendering of this phrase back into idiomatic Hebrew in *Studies in the Apocalypse*, Edinburgh 1913, 90 n.1).

The style of the Pastorals is largely exhortatory. The arguments are not sustained as long as they are in Paul, and in place of Paul's reasoned pleas comes assertion. Compared with Paul's, it is rather an ordinary style, lacking his energy and versatility; it is slow, monotonous and colourless; it is abstract with fewer concrete images. There are true Pauline echoes and a certain Pauline flavour about the Pastorals, and they have Pauline opening and closing formulae, but these are not enough in the opinion of some "to outweigh the impression made by the style as a whole" (Moffatt, *ILNT*³ 407).

However, Pauline parallelism is there, both synonymous and antithetic parallelism within the same verse: *If we suffer with him, we shall also reign with him. If we deny him he will also deny us. If we are faithful, faithful he remains* (2 Tim 2^{11f}). For antithetic parallelism, cf. 1 Tim 3¹⁶).

The style of the Pastorals should not be compared with the more

excitable and emotional parts of Paul's letters but rather with the parts which are most practical (Rom 10-15, 2 Cor 8-9). As W. Lock pointed out, there we shall find a similar adaptation of OT language and the use of rabbinical material, as well as quotations from Greek writers, a fondness for oxymoron (1 Tim 5⁶ *living she is dead*) and play on words (e.g. 1⁸ *nomos . . . nomimōs . . . anomois*, 1 Tim 1¹¹⁻¹⁶ *episteuthen, piston, apistia, pisteōs, piston, pisteuein*, 1 Tim 6^{17,18} *plousios, ploutou, plousiōs, ploutein* (*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles*, ICC Edinburgh 1924, xxviii).

The vocabulary of the Pastorals contain 901 words (of which 54 are proper names); 306 of them are not found elsewhere in Paul, and 335 are NT hapax which is a very high figure for Pauline letters. Thus, the vocabulary is richer than Paul's, but we are not convinced by the computerized methodology of measuring the average number of letters in a word. Of the NT hapax, most are fairly literary words, nearly all of them however in use before A.D. 50 (cf. F. R. M. Hitchcock, "Tests for the Pastorals," *JTS* 30 [1929] 278). The vocabulary, by and large, is not that of Paul. Indeed, the vocabulary of the Pastorals is nearer to Hellenistic literary writers, such as Epictetus, and especially to the Hellenistic-Jewish wisdom books. The Pastorals use LXX words to a less extent than Paul.

Characteristic words of Paul which never appear in the Past. are *eleutheros* and cognates, *akrobusia*, *apocalypse*, *testament*, *righteousness of God*, *body of Christ*, *to abound*, *to boast*. Moreover, characteristic words of the Past. are not found elsewhere in Paul: cognates of *sōphron-* (self-control), *euseb-* (piety), *semnos* (respectable), *hosios* (holy), *a good conscience*, *faithful is the saying*, *good deeds*, *epiphancia* (for Paul's *parousia*), *charin echein* (for Paul's *eucharistein*). Often the Past. use a different word for the same Pauline idea: *parathēkē* for *paradosis*, *hupotupōsis* for *tupos*, *the now-age* for *this age*, *despotes* for *kurios*.

In vocabulary, it can be shown that the Pastorals have a family likeness one with another and a distinction from the other ten Paulines. Not everyone has felt happy with Harrison's statistical demonstrations, and some have urged that the difference with the earlier Paulines merely proves that Paul had changed his style somewhat. Perhaps the differences are too serious for that. That the Pastorals differ widely from the other Pauline epistles has been demonstrated by a sophisticated modern technique which tests the relation between vocabulary and length of text, and finally concludes that they cannot be Pauline because "the style is the man" (K. Grayston and G. Herdan, "The Authorship of the Pastorals in the Light of Statistical Linguistics," *NTS* 6 [1959] 1-15).

With regard to the hapax legomena, however, which are held to indicate a second-century date because some of them are not attested

before the Apostolic Fathers, Apologists, and secular writers of that date, by the same method it would be legitimate to show that 1 Corinthians belonged also to the second century. As Lock observed, some of the hapax are "semi-quotations from faithful sayings, from liturgical doxologies and hymns, very possibly from existing manuals on the qualifications for various offices" (*op. cit.* xxix).

Turning to smaller, grammatical phrases, Harrison observed the absence of some characteristic features of Paul (38ff).

E.g. the absence of the Pauline *ho men . . . ho de*, of artic. infin. (125 instances in Paul), and of "the series of prepositions in a single sentence with reference to some one subject": e.g. Rom 1⁷ *from faith to faith*, 11³⁶ *from him and through him and unto him*. The nominative for vocative (of Paul) is avoided, and the article with adverbs is avoided.

Certain of Paul's prepositions are absent: *anti* (5 times in Paul), *emprothen* (7), *sun* (39).

Small particles are rare in the Past., and some that Paul uses freely are entirely absent: *an* (Paul 20, excluding quotations), *ara* (27), *dio* (28), *eite* (38), *epeita* (11), *eti* (15), *mēpōs* (6), *nuni* (18), *hopōs* (6, excluding quotations), *ouketi* (13), *palin* (28).

The table below, showing the comparative frequency of particles (one per number of lines), puts the Past. in perspective with Paul and other NT authors.

	<i>alla</i>	<i>de</i>	<i>gar</i>	<i>oun</i>	<i>men . . . de</i>
Matthew	54	3	15	35	100
Mark	30	6	16	16	212
Luke-Acts	65	4	24	40	10
John	15	8	24	7	264
Paul	13	7	9	35	79
Pastorals	15	7	13	61	144
Hebrews	38	8	7	46	39
Jas. 2 Pet. Jude	31	6	13	204	Jude 23
1 Peter	13	7	21	31	43
Johann. Epistles	14	29	41	96	—
Revelation	99	185	72	216	—

In the case of *alla*, the frequency in Paul and Past. is closer than that between Paul's Roman-group (one in 12 lines) and his Captivity-group: Phil. Col. Phm (one in 25). The case with *de* is exactly the same in both (one in seven). There is a difference in the use of *gar*, but again nothing like the difference between the two genuine groups of Paulines, viz. Romans-group (one in seven) and Philippians-group (1 in 22). Admittedly, Paul uses *men . . . de* twice as often as the Past., but it is not used in 1 and 2 Thes, and barely used in Eph. In the case of *oun* also there is a greater use in Paul (mainly in the Rom-group).

The Past. make less use of conjunctions: *hōsper*, *hōste*, *ti oun*, *ouchi*, *te*, and *plēn* never occur in them (but 14, 39, 14, 17, 23, 5 times respectively in Paul).

In view of these striking differences in vocabulary and style, the question has been raised as to whether they are sufficient to rule out Pauline authorship. In defence of the unity of authorship, two considerations may be urged: 1. After staying at Rome for some time, may not the influence of Latin be seen in the enlarged and somewhat different vocabulary, particularly in the partiality for compound words, and in the smoother syntax, with less room for particles? Latin may be reflected in the transliteration of *paenula*, *membrana* (2 Tim), use of *charin echein* (=gratiam habere); cf. E. K. Simpson, *The Pastoral Epistles*, London 1954, 20f. But not all the Latin parallels are very convincing. 2. May not Paul have used an amanuensis, e.g. Luke or Tychicus? This is something for which there is little evidence in either direction, and 2 Tim 4¹¹ is not decisive (*only Luke is with me*). However, there are 34 non-Pauline Lukan words in the Pastorals, e.g. *for which cause, the way in which, at a greater measure of, to make alive, to make an appearance, sōphrosunē, philanthrōpia*, and these may be significant. J. N. D. Kelly argues cogently for the amanuensis, urging that in the case of the Pastorals he may have been given a freer hand than he was with the Paulines, due to special circumstances, such as imprisonment which rendered the apostle less able to take any part himself in the writing; even so, many true Pauline touches are apparent. Differences in style may be accounted for by the fact that it was a different amanuensis from that of the Paulines, no longer Timothy as perhaps in the earlier epistles. "This new secretary may have been a Hellenistic Jewish Christian, a man skilled in rabbinical lore and at the same time a master of the higher koine" (*The Pastoral Epistles*, London 1963, 26f).

§ 2. RELATIVE FREEDOM FROM SEMITISM

The style of the Pastorals is not completely free from Semitisms but, compared with the rest of the NT, that element is fairly slight.

En after *pistis/pisteucin* (Heb. *bē*) is shared with Paul (1 Tim 3¹³ 2 Tim 3¹⁵). The use of *opisō* is shared with Paul (Phil 3¹³ 1 Tim 5¹⁵), and so also is *enōpion* (Rom three times, 1 Cor eleven times, 2 Cor three, Gal once; 1 Tim six times, 2 Tim twice). The Hebraic use of *mouth* with a preposition: Rom four times, 2 Cor once, Col once, Eph twice, 2 Tim 4¹⁷. Adverbial *loipon* (which is in the Rom-group four times, the Phil-group twice, Thes twice, and Eph once) occurs also in 2 Tim 4⁸.

The position of *pas* is exactly in accord with the rest of Paul (cf. p. 95): type 1) is more prevalent than 2a) (the two Semitic positions) and there are only two instances of type 2b) (the position in non-Biblical Greek). The article is repeated with attributive genitive, in Semitic fashion, in Tit 2¹⁰, and the indefinite *tis* is the first word in the sentence: 1 Tim 5²⁴. As to vocabulary, we observe the exclusively Jewish word *endunamoun* (Josephus, Paul) at 1 Tim 1¹² 2 Tim 2¹ 4¹⁷. However, the Semitic repetition

of the preposition with a succession of nouns or pronouns is indulged in much less often by the Past. than by Paul, and shows that the Past. is least Semitic in respect of this feature of style of all NT authors (repetition where there is opportunity to do so, is carried out in 58% of the opportunity in the Rom-group, 37% in Eph, but only 17% in the Past.

Beyer compares the ratio of Greek and Semitic conditional sentences and finds that the Past. have an overwhelming number of Grecisms as compared with Paul (Beyer 232, 295, 298).

We cannot say that the Greek style is the most elegant in the NT, but it is the least Semitic, most secular, and least exciting. It is commonplace.

Other Literature :

- F. Torm, "Über die Sprache in den Pastoralbriefen," *ZNW* 18 (1917) 225-243.
 F. R. M. Hitchcock, "Latinity in the Pastorals," *ET* 39 (1927) 347-352.
 "Tests for the Pastorals," *JTS* 30 (1928) 272-279.
 W. Michaelis, "Past. und Wortstatistik," *ZNW* 28 (1929) 69-76.
Die Pastoralbriefe und Gefangenschaftsbrieife zur Echtheitsfrage der Pastoralbriefe, Göttingen, 1930.
 F. R. M. Hitchcock, "Philo and the Pastorals," *Hermathena* 56 (1940) 113-135.
 C. Spicq, *Les Épîtres Pastorales*, Paris 1947.
 D. Guthrie, *The Pastoral Epistles*, London 1957.
 B. M. Metzger, "A Reconsideration of Certain Arguments against the Pauline Authorship of the Pastoral Epistles," *ET* 70 (1958) 91ff.
 C. F. D. Moule, "The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles; a Reappraisal," *BJRL* 47 (1965).

THE STYLE OF THE EPISTLE TO THE
HEBREWS

§ I. LITERARY FEATURES

Moffatt gave full credit for the author's skilful oratory, sense of rhythm, and avoidance of monotony by the mingling of metres of varying kinds (*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*, ICC Edinburgh 1924, lvi-lxiv). Although there is a literary resemblance with the Book of Wisdom without its artificiality and striving for effect, and though the author is well acquainted with the Wisdom literature, yet he avoids the regular metrical verse patterns of Wisdom and maintains the free "prose" nature of his work. There is however a hexameter line 12¹³ if we read *poiēsate*, but *poieite* (breaking the rhythm) is read by p⁴⁶ S* al. Moffatt thought that the author was acquainted with the recommendations of Isocrates concerning prose rhythms, but that he adopted them in his own peculiar way, with favourite rhythms of his own, particularly the U U U — with which he opens his book. He likes to begin a new sentence with the very same rhythm which closed the preceding one. He cares less for Aristotle's closing U U U — than his own U U — —, and some others, such as the effective U — U — — — (*Rhet.* iii 8, 1409⁹ 18). However, all kinds of rhythms are mingled, as they should be in prose, according to Isocrates. It is possible that in some instances consideration of rhythm may affect the correct MS reading, but this author is not enslaved to set rhythms.

He avoids all roughness. Norden contrasted the style with that of Paul in this respect and testified, "wenigstens ich den sog. Hebräerbrief . . . von Anfang bis Ende ohne jede Schwierigkeit durchlese" (*Antike Kunstprosa* II 499f). He avoids the hiatus of a word ending in a vowel and he loves parallelism of sound and sense (the *schemata* of Isocrates), though this could be a Jewish feature too. He uses the genitive absolute well, and varies the word-order considerably. He often inserts material between adjective and noun (e.g. 1⁴ 4⁸ 10^{12,27}), and between article and noun (e.g. 10¹¹ 12³); and his periods are often long and contrived (1¹⁻⁴ 2^{2-4,14,15} 3¹²⁻¹⁵ 4^{12,13} 5^{1-3,7-10} etc), approaching the style of classical Greek, as with Luke-Acts. Indeed, his stylistic relationships are closest with Luke-Acts (as Clement of Alexandria observed), 1 Peter, and the Pastorals, but not perhaps sufficiently so to have significance for authorship. There are reminiscences of Paul, but no more than that. In the opinion of H. Thyen, the style resembles that of Stephen in Acts 7, and the Epistle of Barnabas (*Der Stil der jüdisch-hellenistischen*

Homilie, FRLANT NF 47, Göttingen 1956, 23). As Moffat recalls, this author can use even short sentences effectively ("Where there is remission of these, there is no more offering for sin" 10¹⁸ *ILNT* lx). The style of the opening four verses is less Pauline and Septuagintal than classical (J. Héring, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, ET London, 1970, 129). Unique in the NT are the classical phrases ἡ μίη 6¹⁴, δῆπον 2¹⁶, πού 2⁶ 4⁴, πρὸς τὸν θεόν 2¹⁷ (accusative of respect), and the infinitive absolute (7⁹), rare in the papyri but frequent in literary work (*Grammar* III 136). The vocabulary and style are "more vigorous than that of any other book of the New Testament" and the style is that of a practised scholar, exact and pregnant in expression (B. F. Westcott, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, London 1889, xlv, xlvi). He has indeed a wide vocabulary and seems to have been familiar with philosophical Hellenistic writers as well as with the Jewish Wisdom literature: he borrows the following philosophical terms: *moral faculty*, *Demiurge*, *moderate one's feelings towards*, *bring to perfection*, *nemesis*, *model* (all from Philo), *will* (Stoics), *the final goal* (Epictetus, Philo). Moffat felt strongly, after a "prolonged study of Philo, that our author had probably read some of his works" (lxi). He is thoroughly literary in his love of the pure nominal phrase and avoidance of the copula, more so than Paul and John and the Pastorals. He has ellipse of the copula nearly twice as often as not (remarkable for Biblical Greek: *Grammar* III 299, 307). Perhaps the worst lapse towards vernacularism is his sharing of the Hellenistic indifference to nice distinctions between perfect and aorist (e.g. 7⁶).

The author to the Hebrews has the instincts of an orator in other ways besides the feeling for rhythm. There are oratorical imperatives: *Take heed* 3¹², *Consider* 3¹ 7⁴ (borrowed from the diatribe), *Call to remembrance* 10³². There are rhetorical questions, recalling the diatribe: *How shall we escape* 2³, *To which of the angels said he. . . ?* 1^{5,13}, *Are they not all. . . ?* 1¹⁴, *With whom was he grieved? . . . Did he not swear? . . . ?* 3¹⁶⁻¹⁸, *How much more. . . ?* 9¹⁴ 10²⁹ (cf. also 7¹¹ 11³² 12^{7,9}). Thyen sees other echoes of the diatribe in the constant repetition of *by faith* in ch. 11 (Thyen 50, 58f). The author affects parentheses: not only short ones (*think you*), but long ones as in 7^{20f} (and cf. 7¹¹). Like an orator, he will repeat a phrase for the benefit of his hearers' attention: *He did not take on the nature of angels, but he did take on the seed of Abraham* 2¹⁶. There are rhetorical flourishes: *What more shall I say? The time will fail me if I tell. . .*; parallels exist in classical authors and Philo. He has alliterations, a regular device in oratory where it specially concerns the letter p: e.g. 1¹ six times, 11²⁸ five, 12¹¹ four, 2² 7²⁵ 13¹⁹ three. It concerns other letters too: k 4³ three times, p and k 9²⁸ twice each. Play on words is often striking: 3¹⁸ παρακαλεῖτε . . . καλεῖται, 5⁸ ἔμαθον . . . ἔπαθον 5¹⁴ καλοῦ τε καὶ κακοῦ 12¹ περιεκείμενον ἡμῶν . . . προκειμενον 13² ἐπιλανθάνεσθε . . . ἔλαθον. This was a Pauline characteristic. An unusual word-order seems often designed to arouse the readers' attention: *to whom Abraham gave a tithe of the spoils—the patriarch!* 7⁴, *Jesus Christ, yesterday, and to-day the same—and for ever* 13⁸ (cf. also 2⁹ 6¹⁹ 10^{1,84} 12¹¹). A long

chain of asyndeta is often effective: *they were stoned, they were sawn asunder, they were tempted, they were slain with the sword, they wandered . . .* 11³⁷. Moreover, as Westcott noted (xlviii) the imagery is sometimes beautiful: the Word as a sword, hope as an anchor, the vision of a distant shore, coronation after suffering, healing the lame.

We conclude that, if the author was a Jew (a Hellenistic Jewish Christian, according to Thyen, *Der Stil* 17), he has at least succeeded in eliminating many of the characteristic features of Jewish Greek. We now examine the remaining ones.

§ 2. THE UNDERLYING TRACES OF JEWISH GREEK

Semitic Quality in General. It has been suggested that Hebrews is a Christian midrash formed on Jewish models, based in this case on certain synagogue lections, e.g. Pss 94, 109, 110, Gen 14-15 (Melchizedez), Exod 19 (Sinai), Num 18 (Aaron's rod). One writer ingeniously suggests that these Pentateuchal lections would occur at Pentecost each year in a three-year cycle, and that this has significance for Hebrews as "a piece of Christian *didache*" (A. Guilding, *The Fourth Gospel and Jewish Worship*, Oxford 1960, 72). All this work is discounted by W. G. Kümmel (*Introduction to the New Testament*, ET London, 1966, 279), who remarks, "The suggestion that this sermon is a homily on a specific passage of Scripture, such as Jer: 31: 31-34, cannot be proved." Certainly, Hebrews describes itself as "a word of exhortation" 13²², i.e. a homily, a literary genre of which there were many Jewish examples: e.g. Philo's commentary on Genesis, 1 Clement, James, Epistle of Barnabas, *Shepherd* of Hermas, and parts of other books, e.g. the *Didache* and the part of the Zadokite Damascus Rule known as the Exhortation, c. 100 B.C. (C. Rabin, *The Zadokite Documents*, Oxford 1954). Like the Epistle of Barnabas, Hebrews is given to allegorizing. Its oratory therefore is probably Hellenistic or Palestinian rabbinical rather than secular Hellenistic, and its nearest parallel may be in Hellenistic synagogue addresses, such as 4 Maccabees. In Jewish Hellenistic homilies in particular, much use was made of the Pentateuch and Psalms, as here (Thyen, *Der Stil* 67). On the other hand, according to some critics, Hebrews may be Palestinian rather than Hellenistic. Cf. the one or two instances of this, listed by J. Swetnam, "On the Literary Genre of the 'Epistle' to the Hebrews," *Nov.T.* 11 (1969) 261-269, especially 268f.

The Semitic bent of the author's mind is shown in several ways. His opening concept, "at the end of these days," is probably a reference to *this present age* (*hā'ōlām hazzē*); "sachlich ist damit die Zeit des Messia gemeint" (S.-B. III 671). Moreover, the impersonal *he says* 8⁵, *he has said* 4⁴ 13⁵ is "Jewish" phraseology, according to Winer-Moulton (656, 735), and we should note that in 13⁵ the pronoun "he"

is added. Alford referred to Delitzsch's note that in post-Biblical Hebrew *hû* (=he) and *'anî* (=I) are used as the mystical names of God. This impersonal use of "he says" is quite rabbinical and also Pauline (1 Cor 6¹⁶ 15²⁷ 2 Cor 6² Gal 3¹⁶ Eph 4⁸); numerous examples of rabbinical precedent are quoted by S.-B. III 365f, e.g. *w'e'ômër* (Aboth 6,2.7.9.10.11).

The use of the argument *a minore ad maius*, a rhetorical figure (syncrisis), is held by some authorities to be the Jewish *a fortiori* argument ("light and heavy," as it was called), "so dear to the rabbis" (Héring 13; cf. also J. Bonsirven, *Exégèse rabbinique et exégèse paulinienne*, Paris 1939, 83ff). In Hebrews the argument takes the form of, *by so much better . . . as*, or *how much more* 1⁴ 2³ 3³ 8⁶ 9¹⁴ 10³⁸⁻³¹ 12⁴. There are parallels in Philo as well as the rabbis (C. Spicq, *L'Épître aux Hébreux*, I Paris 1952, 53).

Like Paul, this author is inclined to model his sentences on OT poetic sense-parallelism, e.g. *By faith Abraham, when he was tried, offered up Isaac: He that received the promises offered up his only-begotten Son* 11¹⁷ (cf. also 4^{15.16}).

The careful straining after vocal impressiveness, by means of unconventional word-order, is not always quite successful and sometimes runs into ambiguity (e.g. 12²³ where the free rhetorical order makes it impossible to tell whether the author means "God the judge of all," or "the Judge, the God of all"). Even the stilted classical affectation of antiptosis is paraded, reversing the natural (and indeed the LXX) word-order in the phrase *prosthesis artōn* 9², creating needless ambiguity again ("shewbread" or "setting forth of the loaves" ?).

Semitisms. Moffatt quoted with evident approval the opinion of Simcox that the whole language of the author is "formed on the LXX, not merely his actual quotations from it" (lxiv). Good use is made of the LXX, especially perhaps the A-text, but not certainly. G. Howard seems to disagree with this widely held opinion, and to think that the Qumran discoveries indicate that the author occasionally used the text of a Hebrew recension more ancient than the Massoretic text ("Hebrews and the Old Testament Quotations," *Nov.T.* 10 [1968] 208-216). It seems more likely that the recensions of the LXX were not standardized by the date of Hebrews. In Hebrews, the OT quotations may even be at second-hand from a liturgical source (S. Kistemaker, *The Psalm Citations in the Epistle to the Hebrews*, Amsterdam 1961, 59). Even so, the language is full of Septuagintisms. One of them is the articular infinitive, with *en tō* 3¹⁵ and *tou* 5¹² 11⁵. At 2¹⁵ the articular infinitive with an adjective qualifying is quite classical (cf. 2 Mac 7⁹), but these many examples of articular infinitive are probably evidence of the author's desire to make a compromise

between Jewish Greek (the language of the early Christians) and an imitation of pagan oratorical style, for this infinitive belongs to the higher Koine as well as to Jewish Greek (*Grammar* III 140; cf. p. 117). Other Septuagintisms are 1¹ ἐπ' ἐσχάτου (Gen 49¹ etc.), 3¹² *heart of unbelief* = "unbelieving heart" (Hebrew genitive of quality, cf. 9⁵ *cherubim of glory*), 4¹⁶ *throne of grace* (cp. LXX *throne of glory*, and note Hebrew genitive of quality, and construct state), 5⁷ δέξοις τε καὶ ἰκετηρίας (Job 40²²⁽²⁷⁾ A). There are further Septuagintisms: the omission of the article thrice in 1³ "is an imitation of the 'construct state' of Hebrew syntax" (Héring 6), and *the word of power* is probably a Hebraism for *powerful word*. In 1² 11³ *aeon* is largely Biblical in its sense of *world* (Wis 13⁹ 14⁶ 18⁴); the plural, corresponding to Hebrew 'olāmām, Aramaic 'āl^emayyā, may indicate the seven "worlds" in e.g. Enoch and Tob 13¹⁸.

The author cannot always maintain his apparent literary style, and even with his deliberately eccentric word-order, he seems to relapse into Jewish Greek over the position of the genitive in relation to its noun, and other items of word-order. Authors like Thucydides, and even Philostratus, place the genitive before its noun at least as often as after it, yet Hebrews has only 16 instances at most of the preceding genitive (6² 7⁵ 9^{8,13,15} 10³⁶ 11^{1,7,25,36} 12^{2,9,17,27} 13¹¹), including those enclosed between article and noun, and it has 105 instances of the only possible Semitic order, that of the construct state (cf. Mark 0 : : 50). The position of *pas* has been examined for other NT authors and found to be quite Semitic. With this distinctively Biblical Greek word-order, Hebrews is quite in line (figures on p. 17).

The position of participial and adjectival phrases, qualifying an articular noun, is regularly between article and noun in non-Biblical Greek, unless there is special reason. However, in Jewish Greek the tendency is to place the adjectival phrase after the noun, as in Semitic languages, with the article repeated.

In Hebrews the usage is comparable to Luke's in his We sections.

	Between-position	After-position
Hebrews	6 ^{4,7} 7 ²⁷ 9 ^{6,11,12,15} 15 10 ¹ 11 ^{10,29} 12 ^{1,1,2} 13 ¹² [15]	2 ⁵ 6 ^{4,7} 8 ² 9 ^{2,4,8,9} 10 ¹⁵ 13 ²⁰ [10]
We	Ac 16 ¹³ 27 ³⁴ 28 ^{2,16} [4]	16 ¹⁷ 21 ¹¹ 28 ^{2,9} [4]

Heb may seem to be in advance of other Jewish Greek in this respect (cf. pp. 23ff), but still it is far away from all secular Greek where the proportions are :

Contemporary papyri (selection)	35 : 0
Papyri (Mayser II 2, 54)	140 : 4
Philostratus (selection)	27 : 1
Lucian (selection)	9 : 0

Indeed, Heb and Lk-Ac stand much nearer to Mk's usage than to secular Greek, and Jas is nearer still (7 : 8).

It is true that the author of Hebrews makes wide use of particles : *gar* 91, *oun* 14, *men* 19, *te* 20, *dēpou* 1, *dio* 9, *alla* 16, *toigaroun* 1, *toinun* 1, *ara* 2. At the same time he is drawn by the Semitic tendency to seek only first-place particles or to place the others in first-place, as in Biblical Greek. So *toinun* 13¹³, *toigaroun* 12¹, and *ara* 4⁹ 12⁸ are placed first. *Toinun*, although occasionally first-place in poor secular Greek, is rarely so in good Greek (cf. Lk 20²⁵). Although his particles still occur in second place more than twice as often as in first place, the situation is not so literary as in some non-Biblical writers (Philostratus has second place *five* times as often), nor does it reach even the standard of II Acts or of Lucian (*three* times as often) but is about the same as in 2 Maccabees and the Testament of Abraham (rec.A), and the Ptolemaic papyri (cf. p. 119). All his particles are in use in the LXX.

In 9¹² the aorist participle (*having obtained*) is used, although the action is not antecedent, the final salvation being not yet a fact but future (cf. Phil 2^{6ff}). This use of aorist participle may be an Aramaism (Héring 77). In 2¹⁰ the point has some theological importance (*in bringing*, not "having brought"). The participle in 13⁵ (reading plural, not singular with p⁴⁶) appears to stand on its own as an imperatival participle. I am not convinced that this indicates that a Hebrew "code" or *Vorlage* lies behind this passage, or behind Rom 12 or 1 Pet 2 ; nevertheless, the participle could well be an echo of Jewish Greek (*Grammatical Insights* 166f).

The Biblical *enōpion* 4¹⁹ 13²¹ is found occasionally in the Koine but it is more likely to be used here under the influence of *liphné* (cf. pp. 49, 69, 92, 156). Moreover, to use *pros* with verbs of speaking (17^{7,8,13} 5⁵ 7²¹ 11¹⁸) is a rarity in the Koine and characteristic of Biblical Greek. Use of causal *apo* (= causal *min*) 5⁷ is another Hebraism. In 1¹ *en* = *dia*, which is a Semitism often occurring in the LXX and NT, reflecting Hebrew *bē* and Aramaic *dē* (Héring 2).

There is a crux, which may be resolved on the ground that it is a Semitism, *kath' hēmeran* 7²⁷, for if this refers to the Day of Atonement, as seems obvious, the action took place *yearly*. The phrase then cannot mean *daily*. The suggestion is that it renders the Hebrew *yôm yôm* (Aramaic *yômā yômā*), understanding the Hebrew *day* in this context

to signify "the Day [of Atonement]"; hence, *yôm yôm* would be *every Day of Atonement* and in 7²⁷ we would render, "who needeth not on one Day each year, as those priests, to offer any sacrifice" (Héring 63, quoting J. H. R. Biesenthal, *Das Trosts Schreiben des Apostels Paulus an die Hebräer*, Leipzig 1878).

Finally, there is the question of the Hebrew circumstantial clause introduced by a *waw*, raised by Dr. Matthew Black at 11¹¹ (reading the p⁴⁶ text). The difficulty of exegesis would disappear if we could so take it: "By faith, even although Sarah was barren, [Abraham] received strength for procreation" (Black³ 87-89). I would not claim this particular case as strong evidence that the author of Hebrews wrote in Jewish Greek, but it may be a small pointer towards it. It occurs in Luke thus and provides a further link between the style of Hebrews and of Luke-Acts. Other instances in Hebrews, outside LXX quotations, are 2¹⁴ 4¹⁰ 5². It is very frequent in Revelation.

The influence of Hebrew over the meaning of words is possible in 12⁷ *εἰς παιδείαν ὑπομένετε* (usually assumed to mean *endure with a view to discipline*), but the verb several times in the LXX translates *qāwāh* which has the meaning of *wait for, look eagerly for, endure*, and in Ps 129 (130)⁵ and Jer 14¹⁹ the verb is followed by *eis* (for Heb. *lē*). In the Psalm the meaning is: *my soul waited patiently for thy word*; in Jeremiah it is: *we looked eagerly for peace*. The verb with this particular preposition is thus a Hebraism in Hebrews, and might be correctly rendered: *wait patiently for discipline*, so indicating that the author used Biblical Greek (Helbing 104).

Then again, the phrase in 6¹⁸ *in which God cannot deceive*, contains a Hebraism (Helbing 106), i.e. *pseudesthai* with *en* of the matter of deception (cf. LXX of Lev 6² [5²¹] when *be* is used three times of the matter). It is not a secular Greek phrase, as far as I can discover.

§ 3. SIGNIFICANCE OF AUTHORSHIP

The question of authorship is relevant inasmuch as the author seems stylistically to have been a Jew or proselyte. Were he Luke, and were Luke a Gentile proselyte, the secularisms in Hebrews may be due, as in the "diary" (the We sections), to its being written in the early days of Luke's Christian life before he had acquired much Jewish Greek. Kümmel is unwarrantably dogmatic. "Hebrews . . . diverges so strikingly from Acts in style . . . that the author of Acts is not to be considered as the author of Hebrews" (*Introduction* 281). But there is no reason why the author should be anyone whose name is familiar, nor even a vague disciple of Stephen (W. Manson), nor even the Alexandrian Jew Apollos (Luther and many moderns). Supposing the

author were Apollos, "who can say whether some Semitisms in this work may not be Coptisms?" (Héring 129). I would say that the NT period was too early for Coptisms, and it does not really matter in any case whether we refer to Coptic Greek or Jewish Greek for both probably owe their peculiarities in this respect to the same source. Moreover, Egyptian, the precursor of Coptic, was another Semitic language and had much of its syntax in common with Hebrew and Aramaic. For this point, close study of Egyptian is necessary, as R. McL. Wilson points out ("Coptisms in the Epistle to the Hebrews?" *Nov.T.* 1 [1956] 324).

As to the controversial chapter 13, which is a typical ending for a NT epistle, but a little strangely placed at the close of a work like Hebrews; which lacks a comparable opening, it has a unity of style with the rest of the epistle. The chapter is concerned with ethical and practical exhortation, and the whole book is an exhortation in letter-form, despite the absence of an epistolary opening. Dr. F. F. Bruce rightly censures the attempts of those who in various ingenious ways would detach this chapter (Wrede, Spicq, Badcock, etc.), and "their theories can be given no higher status than that of curiosities of literary criticism" (*Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*, London 1965, 386f).

For all its oratory, Hebrews is no more than an epistle written in the exhortatory style, mingling theology and paraenesis in alternating sections, as distinct from Paul's method of keeping the theology and paraenesis apart. Nevertheless, Hebrews begins as a sermon and ends as an epistle.

Other Literature :

- J. Cabantous, *Philon et l'Épître aux Hébreux*, Montauban 1895.
 W. Wrede, *Das literarische Rätsel des Hebräerbriefs*, Göttingen 1906.
 R. Perdelwitz, "Das literarische Problem des Hebräerbriefs," *ZNW* 11 (1910) 59ff.
 J. Dickie, "The Literary Riddle of the Epistle to the Hebrews," *Expositor* VIII (1913) 371ff.
 E. K. Simpson, "The Vocabulary of the Epistle to the Hebrews," *Evangelical Quarterly* 18 (1946) 38.
 Y. Yadin, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Epistle to the Hebrews," *Scripta Hierosolymitana* IV (1958) 36ff.
 J. Coppens, *Les Affinités Qumrâniennes de l'Épître aux Hébreux*, Paris-Bruges 1962.
 "Les affinités qumrâniennes de l'Épître aux Hébreux," *Nouvelle Revue Théologique* 94 (1962) 128ff, 257ff.
 A. Vanhoye, *La Structure Littéraire de l'Épître aux Hébreux*, Paris-Bruges 1963.

THE STYLE OF THE EPISTLE OF JAMES

§ I. AUTHORSHIP

Questions of authorship are relevant since it is widely felt that the style of Greek is too schooled for the Jerusalem James, the brother of Jesus. Many see the author of this brief epistle as a Hellenistic Jew, and one critic at least has urged that his use of *nomos* was not so much in accord with rabbinic Judaism as with wider Hellenistic ideas, arguing that a Greek would throughout his reading of this epistle be capable of understanding the conception apart from any thought of the *Torah* (C. H. Dodd, *The Bible and the Greeks*, London 1935, 39f). Although some will not accept a first-century date, e.g. K. Aland ("Der Herrenbruder Jakobus und Jakobusbrief," *TL* 69 [1944] 97-104), nevertheless others hold to the traditional authorship and to a date prior to the meeting of Paul and James described in Galatians (G. Kittel, "Der Geschichtliche Ort des Jakobusbriefes," *ZNW* 41 [1942] 71-105). Although the author seems well acquainted with the LXX and with Greek ideas and illustrations and Greek modes of preaching (e.g. J. H. Ropes, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle of James*, ICC Edinburgh 1916, 50), yet the following scrutiny of the style of the epistle permits an early date and apostolic origin.

§ 2. FORM-CRITICAL ANALYSIS: A DIATRIBE?

Ropes argued that James has many characteristics of the Stoic-Cynic diatribe (ICC 10-18). The author begins with a paradox, in the diatribe fashion (joy: temptation). There are short questions and answers: *Who is a wise man? Let him show . . . 3¹³, What is your life? It is even a vapour 4¹⁴ Is any man among you afflicted? Let him pray. Is any merry? Let him sing psalms. Is any sick among you? Let him call . . . 5^{13f}. There are also rhetorical questions, with no answers: *Are you not become evil-thinking judges? 2⁴, Hath not God chosen the poor . . .? 2⁵, What doth it profit . . .? 2¹⁴, Doth a fountain gush out sweet and bitter? 3¹¹, Can a fig-tree bear olives? 3¹², Know you not that the friendship of the world is enmity with God? 4⁴. Do you think the Scripture says in vain . . .? 4⁵. Other questions are ironical: *a man says he has faith, and yet he dismisses a destitute brother 2¹⁴, Ye rich men, weep***

and howl 5¹. Other shorter formulae are taken verbatim from the Hellenistic diatribe, e.g. *Do not err* 1¹⁶, *Ye know this* 1⁹, *Wilt thou know?* 2²⁰, *What doth it profit?* 2^{14,16}, *Seest thou?* 2²² *Ye see then* 2⁴, *Behold!* 3^{4,5} 5^{4,7,9,11}, *Wherefore he saith* (before quotes) 4⁶, *Go to now!* 4¹³ 5¹. Some comparisons are shared with the diatribe: *rudder, bridle, forest fire*, and other natural phenomena; and, in common with the diatribe, James quotes examples from lives of famous men. He quotes some verse: a hexameter line appears at 1¹⁷. Perhaps the most characteristic feature is the dialogue, whereby an imaginary objector (as in Romans) is introduced by the formula, *But someone will say* 2¹⁸, *he says*, etc., as in the Epistle of Barnabas 9 (*But thou shalt say*). Norden specially notices Jas 2¹⁸ (*Antike Kunstprosa* 556f).

On the other hand, Ropes conceded: "Of course, any one of these traits . . . could be paralleled from other types of literature. What is significant and conclusive is the combination in these few pages of James of so many. . . ." (14f). He noted that, by comparison with the diatribe, nothing in James is flippant, nothing bitterly humorous, merely gently ironical.

Most critics have observed the high literary character of this epistle. M. Dibelius noted the pleonasm of rhetorical style in the phrase, *is tamed and hath been tamed* 3⁷, and rhyme at 1^{6,14} 2¹² 4⁸, and the jingle that was perhaps not the work of our author in 3¹⁷ (*Der Brief des Jakobus*⁷, Göttingen 1921, 36).

According to J. B. Mayor, the author comes nearer to the classical standard than any NT author, except perhaps Hebrews, which has a larger variety of constructions (*The Epistle of James*³, London 1913, ccxlv). But that is an exaggeration. The author was an unimaginative, well-educated man, more devout than the diatribe writers; alongside the genius of Paul he was "quiet, simple, and somewhat limited" (Ropes 15). Some of the vocabulary, it is true, belongs to the higher reaches of the literary Koine: *give birth to* (Plutarch, Lucian), *entice* (2 Peter, Josephus, Philo), *gloominess* (Plutarch, Philo). But there are limitations. He does not take the same care as Hebrews to avoid hiatus, which is found six times in one verse 1⁴ (Mayor ccvii). We may agree with Mayor that the rhythm is harmonious and sonorous (ccxvif), but sometimes as in Hebrews the erratic word-order results in confusion: 3^{3,12} 4^{13f}. Indeed, we are led to ask whether an author with only moderate pretensions (or none) to classical Greek style may not have received some assistance. Kittel, in the article referred to above, suggested that the brother of Jesus might have had help from a Hellenistic Jewish member of the Jerusalem church, someone in Stephen's circle perhaps (ZNW 79f), and Mayor granted that the use of rare compounds is most easily explained by the employment of a "professional interpreter." "He may have availed himself of the

assistance of a Hellenist 'brother' in revising his epistle" (cclxv). The help of a secretary need not necessarily be publicly acknowledged in the epistle, but it would need to have been a fairly extensive revision, as the literary features are widespread.

§ 3. FORM-CRITICAL ANALYSIS: AN EPISTLE?

Form-critics further observe that, rather than a genuine formal epistle (for it has no epistolary ending), the epistle of James is an essay or a tract in the shape of an epistle, addressed to a wider circle of readers than a local community. It is a didactic composition, a collection of short discussions and proverbs and precepts (paraenesis), after the manner of the Wisdom literature, rather loosely connected. There are no clear instances of chiasmus, but there is certainly a "chain" of words proceeding throughout the book; always one word provides the link between two short discussions or sentences. Thus, right from the beginning, the chain is formed by the following links: *temptation, patience, perfection, lacking, asking, wavering* (1²⁻⁶), *lust, sin, slowness, wrath, word, hearer, beholding, doer*, (1¹⁴⁻²⁵), and so throughout the book; details are given in Mayor ccl, and Dibelius 92f. These connecting-words seem to be designed for didactic purposes, to render the teaching easy to memorize. As a piece of Christian paraenesis, it belongs to the class of Hebrews, 1 Clement, Barnabas, the *Didache*, *Shepherd* of Hermas, but it has also strong parallels with 1 Peter (Jas 1^{2f} = 1 Pet 1^{6f}; Jas 4^{1f} = 1 Pet 2¹¹) with which it may share dependence on a common paraenesis.

§ 4. JEWISH AFFINITIES

However much it may resemble the Hellenistic diatribe in style, it much more resembles the Jewish Wisdom literature in subject-matter, and the Greek is not dissimilar, though James has more prosaic and varied rhythms than the Wisdom verse books. Like Paul and Hebrews, the author of James knows the LXX and quotes from it, and his vocabulary resembles that of other Jewish authors: Philo, 4 Maccabees, Clement of Rome, Hermas (who are Hellenistic), and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs (Palestinian). So Ropes pointed out (20f), but Ropes felt that the language was not so literary as that of Hebrews and Philo; the grammar not so complex, nor his periods so long. Only two sentences are longer than four lines (2²⁻⁴ 4¹³⁻¹⁵), whereas Hebrews has one sentence of ten lines, 1 Peter one of 12, Ephesians one of 20 (Mayor cclv). The author of James never strays far from Jewish Greek,

for all his apparent education. The epistle is so generally Semitic that some critics have suggested that it is a thoroughly Jewish book, only made Christian by a few additions (1^{18,21,25} 2⁷ 5^{8,12}). To A. Meyer it has appeared like a Hellenistic Jewish allegory, similar to Hebrews, based on Jacob's blessing of his sons (Gen 49) and later christianized (*Das Rätsel des Jakobus Brief*, Giessen 1930).

The epistle is unlikely to have a Semitic *Vorlage* (as some once suggested), for there are too many paronomasiae (1^{1f} 2^{4,20} 3¹⁷ 4¹⁴), alliterations (on the sound p: 1^{2,3,11,17,22} 3², on m: 3⁵, on d: 1^{1,6,21} 2¹⁶ 3⁸, on d and p: 1²¹, on l: 1⁴ 3⁴, on k: 1^{26f} 2³ 4⁸), and a parechysis (1²⁴). It is doubtful whether a translator would reproduce all these characteristically Greek devices.

§ 5. ARAMAISMS

Almost the only exclusive Aramaism, in the sense we have been using it in this book, is the use of asyndeton (Mayor ccliv) which is very frequent: 1^{16-18,19-27} 2¹³ 3^{8f,15,17} 4⁷⁻¹⁰ 5^{1-6,8-10}. It may be a kind of didactic asyndeton, as in the Sermon on the Mount, the Fourth Gospel and 1 John: this seems to be so in Jas 1¹⁶⁻¹⁸, but it is no less Semitic for all that. Or it may be a rhetorical asyndeton, merely the staccato of emphasis: 5^{3,6}.

Another likely Aramaism is the adverbial *polla* (3²) which appears in other NT writings (cf. pp. 13, 92). Moreover, some of the instances under Semitisms might in fact be due to Aramaic influence and Aramaic may well have had its formative influence upon the language of James, especially if he were the brother of Jesus. However, this circumstance cannot indicate an Aramaic *Vorlage*, for that is ruled out by the presence of so many exclusive Hebraisms too. Rather, it accords with the phenomenon of a Jewish Greek to which Aramaic and Hebrew have contributed.

§ 6. HEBRAISMS

The Verb. 1. The articular infinitive is much used: a. *Tou* with infinitive after *proseuchesthai* 5¹⁷ (*Grammar* III 142ff). In Luke-Acts and James, we must consider *tou* with infinitive as a Hebraism when it occurs after a verb which takes the simple infinitive in secular Greek. b. *Eis to* (LXX=*le*) 1^{18,19} 3³. c. *Dia to* (LXX and papyri) 4³. d. *Anti tou* 4¹⁵. These are Septuagintal idioms.

2. The use of the anarthrous participle (4¹⁷) used as a substitute for a nominal subject or object is characteristic of Biblical Greek, following the LXX, and foreign to secular Greek. It appears in the language of Mark, Matthew, Luke and Revelation (Mk 1³ Mt 2⁶ Lk 3¹⁴ Rev 3^{11f} v. 1).

The Noun. 1. There are indications of the influence of the construct state on the language of James, as often in the LXX, Paul and Hebrews: 1 Cor 1¹ 2¹⁵ 6⁹ 10²¹ Heb 10^{28,39} 12²² Jas 1^{18,20} 2¹².

2. The Hebrew genitive of quality is again in evidence, as it is in Paul (p. 90) and Heb 1⁸. Recognition of this fact would illuminate not a few dark places for commentators: the difficult phrase *shadow of turning* thus becomes a *changing* (or moving) *shadow* 1¹⁷; there is then no need for the emendation of Dibelius⁷ *ad loc.*, and we need not adopt (with Ropes) the variant of BS*. *The face of his birth* = *his natural face* 1²³, *hearer of forgetfulness* = *forgetful hearer* 1²⁵, *our Lord Jesus Christ of glory* = *our glorious Lord Jesus Christ* 2¹, *judges of evil thoughts* = *evil-thinking judges* 2⁴ (Bauer seeks to disperse the Hebraism by citing *thought* as a legal technical term for *decision*, cf. W. Bauer, *Wörterbuch*⁴ 1952, col. 337). *World of injustice* = *unjust world* 3⁶ v. l., *cycle of birth* = *natural cycle* 3⁶, *meeckness of wisdom* = *sober meekness* 3¹³, *prayer of faith* = *faithful prayer* 5¹⁵.

3. In view of this other evidence, we must probably understand *pray with prayer* 5¹⁷ as a Hebraism under the influence of the infinitive absolute (Mayor ccxlii), although Ropes (ICC 26) thought "probably not." Dibelius too regarded it as doubtful ("umstritten") since similarly strengthened phrases occur outside Jewish Greek circles, citing Radermacher (Dibelius⁷ 237). Cf. pp. 47f, 142f, and *Grammar* III 241f.

Word-order. Like the rest of the NT and LXX, James stands out from non-Biblical Greek in the position of *pas* (*Grammar* III 202–205).

§ 7. SEMITISMS

Parataxis. *Kai* is very frequent in the linking of sentences (1^{11,24} 4^{7–11} 5^{2–3,4,14–15,17–18} etc., about 32 times). James makes small use of subordinating particles, "never doubles the relative, never uses genitive absolute, does not accumulate prepositions, or use the expegetic infinitive—in a word, never allows his principal sentence to be lost in the rank luxuriance of the subordinate clauses" (Mayor ccvi gives the statistics: 140 sentences without finite subordinate verbs; 42 sentences with single subordinate clause; seven sentences only with two subordinate clauses; three with more than two). It is characteristically Semitic.

Parallelism. Nearly every verse echoes the thought of the previous verse or of the following one.

The Verb. There are periphrastic tenses with the verb *to be*: *is coming down* (for *comes down*) 1¹⁷ 3¹⁵, subjunctive *if he have committed* 5¹⁵, where there is no special force; and a periphrastic future with *mellein*, *intending to be judged* (meaning only *about to be judged*) 2¹².

Noun. 1. As in the LXX, the article is dropped when a noun has the pronominal genitive $\iota^{26} \varsigma^{20}$ (also Jude ¹⁴).

2. The nominative stands in apposition to an accusative (3^a), as often in Biblical Greek (p. 147).

Pronoun. Redundant oblique cases of *autos* occur at the rate of one in $8\frac{1}{2}$ lines of Nestle, about the same as Paul and ι Peter, in distinct contrast with Mk and Jn, and Rev.

Preposition. The semitic *enōpion* 4^{10} and the instrumental *en* 3^9 both appear (*in* the tongue, must be *with* the tongue : = b^e).

Word-order. 1. The genitive tends to follow its noun, as in Biblical Greek, i.e. 50 after : 3 before.

2. The position of attributive adjectives and participles relative to an articular noun tends in Jas to be nearer to Jewish Greek than even Heb and Lk-Ac (pp. 23f, 110f).

Between article and noun	New articular phrase
Jas $\iota^{5,14,21} 27^{15} 3^{13} 5^7$ [7]	$\iota^{9,21} 2^{3,7} 3^{7,9} 4^1 5^4$ [8]

3. Particles connecting clauses in second place still tend to be rather more frequent than in first, to a proportion of 57 : 37. Second-place particles, with number of occurrences are : *de* 36, *gar* 51 (a Hebraism for *kî* ?), *oun* 5, *mentoi* 1. First-place : *kai* 32, *dio* 2, *age* 2, *alla* 1. In this respect, James is not so literary as Hebrews, nor does he even come up to the papyri, as the following table will show, giving approximate proportions in the reverse order of Semitic character :

	1st place	:	2nd place
Philostratus	1	:	5
Josephus	1	:	5
Lucian	1	:	3
Acts : We	1	:	3
II Acts	1	:	3
Hebrews	1	:	2+
Papyri	1	:	2
T Abr : rec. A	1	:	2
2 Maccabees	1	:	2
James	1	:	1,6
I Acts	1	:	1
Markan sections of Lk	1	:	1
L	1	:	0,8
Lk's Q	1	:	0,76
Wisdom	1	:	0,66
Lk 1-2	1	:	0,25
Tobit B	1	:	0,18
Genesis	1	:	0,16
Revelation	1	:	0,05

§ 8. A CHRISTIAN BIBLICAL VOCABULARY

As was the case with Luke-Acts, in James there are traces of the beginnings of a unique Christian style based on the LXX, or at least on the OT, and on Aramaic. It may have been a deliberate affectation, but these two writers in particular are not given to flamboyance of style; they have every appearance of sober and simple writers, educated but with no highly rhetorical pretensions. Since therefore a deliberate cult is out of the question, the following features were all constituents of the Biblical Greek dialect, especially as used by Christians.

1^{8,11} *in (all) his ways*, 2² *doers of the Word*, 2²³ *reckoned for righteousness* (LXX Gen 15⁶: "Hebraistic," Mayor ccxlii), 2⁹ *work sin*, 2¹³ *make mercy* (cf. Luke), 2¹⁶ *go in peace*, 2^{1,9} *accept the face*, 3¹⁸ *make peace* (cf. the compound *peacemaker* Mt 5⁹, compound verbs Col 1²⁰, based on the Aramaic: Black³ 300), 4¹¹ *doers of the Law*, 5⁸ *for a witness*, and many other Biblical phrases, including the frequent *Behold!* (Semitic). Perhaps there should be included the pleonastic *man* at 1^{7f.12.19} 5¹⁷, of which Black³ 106f gives examples from the gospels and Lk-Ac, and claims it as "almost certainly Aramaic." Perhaps also should be included the abrupt style of the imperative, *Submit . . . resist . . . draw nigh . . . cleanse . . . purify . . . be afflicted, mourn, weep . . . humble yourselves . . . speak not . . .* (4^{7ff}), as well as the accusations in 5^{5ff} (Dibelius⁷ 35).

Other Literature :

- J. Chaine, *L'Épître de St. Jacques*, Paris 1927.
 H. Songer, "The Literary Character of the Book of James," *The Review and Expositor* 66 (1969) 379-389.
 F. O. Francis, "The Form and Function of the Opening and Closing Paragraphs of James and 1 John," *ZNW* 61 (1970) 110-126.

THE STYLE OF I PETER

§ I. THE INTEGRITY OF THE EPISTLE

At first sight, this is the usual Jewish and Christian epistle, opening with address and salutation 1¹⁻² and closing with formal greetings 5¹²⁻¹⁴. It appears to be an exhortatory letter addressed to several communities, especially resembling, according to C. Spicq, the "Epistle of Barnabas" in the Syriac *Apocalypse of Baruch* (*Les Épîtres de Saint Pierre*, Paris 1966, 13). It may incorporate a "catechesis," but so many NT epistles, as is observed not only by Spicq, but also by J. Couatts ("Ephesians I 3-4 and I Peter I 3-12," *NTS* 3 [1956] 115-127).

On closer study, the situation of the readers appears to change at 4¹¹: before that, these Christians are apparently awaiting persecution (1⁶ 2²⁰ 3^{14,17}), but in the second part of the epistle they have already tasted it (4^{12,14,19} 5^{6,8}).

This is argued, among others, by F. W. Beare, *The First Epistle of Peter*², Oxford 1958, 7. But it is questionable grammatically, as far as 4^{12ff} is concerned, for the present participle of *become* is a vivid present with future meaning, as often in the NT. It is, as the Authorized Version has it, *the fiery trial which is to try you*. Moreover, in the first part of the epistle, *present* suffering, not future, seems to be presupposed by the aorist participle in 1⁶, and by the wording of 2¹² 3¹⁶ 4⁴, which implies present accusations.

On account of the sudden change of tone at 4¹¹, it is suggested that the first part of I Peter, which is not like an epistle, with its long and balanced sentences, is rather a (baptismal) sermon ending in "succinct general exhortations" and a doxology at 4¹¹ (Beare 6). From that point onwards, however, it is said to resemble an epistle, addressed to a particular community in a definite situation, having a direct, simple style, without rhythm and antithesis, "the quick and nervous language of a letter written in haste" (Beare 7. Cf. the whole argument, Beare 6-9, and R. Perdelwitz, *Der Mysterienreligion und das Problem des I Petrusbriefes*, Giessen 1911, 26. But Perdelwitz and Beare, as I understand them, hold to unity of authorship). Thus, perhaps a *Taufrede*, a baptismal sermon because of the baptismal references in 1^{3,23} 2² 3²¹, and a *Mahnschrift*, an exhortatory epistle, have been

combined: these form respectively 1³-4¹¹ and 4¹²-5¹⁴. The "epistle" is evidently designed to give rules of conduct to a church undergoing persecution. The "sermon" is not altogether about baptism, and it is suggested that pieces of paraenetic material have been inserted at 2¹⁸-3⁷ 4⁷-11.

Other critics suppose two sermons to have been combined in 1 Peter, one before the baptismal service perhaps, and one after (R. P. Martin, "The Composition of 1 Peter in Recent Study," *Vox Evangelica*, London 1962, 29ff). Others suppose that two epistles have been combined, one to those about to be, the other to those being, persecuted (C. F. D. Moule, "The Nature and Purpose of 1 Peter," *NTS* 3 [1956], 1ff). There is no lack of speculation. Thus, another guess is that a number of hymns, borrowed more or less literally, have been inserted (for some reason) into the epistle, for 1³-1² has a flowing rhythmical arrangement, and so perhaps to a lesser degree 2⁶-8, 21-25 3¹⁸-22 (M.-E. Boismard, *Quatre Hymnes baptismales dans la première Épître de Pierre*, Paris 1961).

H. Preisker held that the whole of 1 Peter was a liturgical composition forming a report of an assembly of the Roman church (c. A.D. 80), consisting of the various parts of a baptism service 1³-4¹¹, the actual baptism not being mentioned because the rites were secret, taking place at 1²¹; the baptism service was followed by a service for the whole church 4¹²-5¹¹, and the different occasion thus explains the different circumstances of the hearers (some about to face persecution, and the others having suffered). Preisker concludes this speculative analysis by suggesting that it was Silvanus, a Christian of the second or third generation, who drew up this liturgical report, made it into an epistle, and sent it to churches in Asia which Peter had once visited. Cf. the appendix in H. Windisch, *Die katholischen Briefe*³, Tübingen 1951, 156ff., criticized by Beare 197-199.

W. Bornemann held that 1³-5¹¹ was a baptismal sermon by Silvanus, delivered in a city of Asia c. A.D. 90, based on Psalm 34, which was then given an epistolary framework. He held that the stylistic differences on each side of 4¹¹ were not significant ("Der erste Petrusbriefe—eine Taufrede des Silvanus?" *ZNW* 19 [1919] 143-165).

Also impressed by the baptism-motif were Cross and Strobel. Cross thought that 1 Peter was a liturgy ("the Celebrant's part for the Paschal Vigil") based on instructions for the bishop's baptism during Passover-tide, because of the repeated emphasis on *pasch-* (suffering), suggesting *Paschal*, and because of parallels with baptism, confirmation, and eucharistic rites in the *Apostolic Traditions* of Hippolytus (F. L. Cross, *1 Peter. A Paschal Liturgy*, London 1954). Cross was answered by T. C. G. Thornton, "1 Peter, a Paschal Liturgy?" *JTS NS* 12 [1961] 14-26) Strobel too was impressed by the connections with

baptism and passover in I Peter, which was "Passafest-Rundbrief" (F. A. Strobel, "Zum Verständnis von Mat. XXV 1-13," *Nov.T.* 2 [1958] 210 n.1). M.-E. Boismard held that I Peter, Colossians, Titus, James and I John are all based on a baptismal liturgy. I Peter has the theme of "exile," made by a "redactor" to embrace all the various liturgical fragments (hymns and pieces of homilies); cf. "Une liturgie baptismale dans la Prima Petri," *Revue Biblique* 63 (1956) 182-208; 64 (1957) 16ff.

So little of the epistle is concerned exclusively with baptism, for it just as much concerns suffering (in both parts) or general paraenesis. Lohse denied that it was a baptismal sermon, but saw the stylistic differences in many parts of the epistle as due to the employment of different sources (E. Lohse, "Paränese und Kerygma im I Petr.," *ZNW* 45 [1954] 68-69). Thus, it is a very widely-held opinion that the epistle is a composite work based on exhortatory and liturgical scraps. Beare, however, in his second edition, speaks not of direct use of liturgical fragments but of the free composition of a sermon with the liturgy in mind, with perhaps sometimes a quotation from a credal formula, and with the letters of Paul in the background of his memory (Beare 202). But we presume, from pp. 6f, that Beare is still referring only to part of the epistle, viz. 1³-4¹¹.

§ 2. THE PART OF AN AMANUENSIS

So unsuitable is the type of Greek felt to be for the fisherman apostle, that the part of Silvanus in writing the epistle, or in revising it, with Peter perhaps concluding it himself (cf. 5^{12ff}), has been seriously considered. How far did Silvanus, *through* whom the epistle purports to be written, have freedom to mould the apostle's thought, or was he merely represented as bearer of the letter to its destination? The word *through* can designate the actual writer, as when I Clement is referred to as *written through Clement* (cited by C. Bigg, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude*², ICC Edinburgh 1902, 5), and Selwyn supported this thesis by arguing that Silas, Paul's fellow-worker of Ac 15^{22,32}, the Christian prophet, had the same role in writing to the Thessalonians, and that I Peter has links with those epistles. That would account for certain Pauline features in the doctrine of I Peter but there is not sufficient resemblance in style between it and Thessalonians. Beare (189) justifiably stigmatized Selwyn's views as "romantic" and found no grounds for supposing that this Silas was cultured enough to write I Peter. There was no indication that he was a Hellenist of the group of Stephen and Philip. Indeed, if Silas could have written I Peter, why not Peter himself? In his commentary (*The First Epistle of St. Peter*², London 1947, 26f),

E. G. Selwyn had admitted that a classical Greek lexicon was more helpful than a Koine lexicon, and while there is no trace of "Atticistic affectation" the style is that of "a well-read Jew of good social standing" (Bigg 2f). The epistle, urged Beare (189), is far too literary to be written before the second or third Christian generation. But there seems to be no reason why an amanuensis *had* to belong to that particular generation, and he need not have been Silas. Beare was reasoning on the basis of his own assumptions about a post-Petrine date. However, if we must resort to the hypothesis of an amanuensis, his help might have been given at any time, and the following examination of the language makes it tenable that a Semitic style of Greek has been incompletely revised.

§ 3. ALLEGED LITERARY STYLE

The style of this epistle is generally felt to be less Semitic in colouring than Paul's, while it is less elegant than that of Hebrews or James. However, there are some strong Semitic features, and it will be observed that the style is too uniform throughout the epistle to support the view that 1 Peter has been compiled from two sermons or epistles by different authors or from various liturgical material, or that epistolary additions have been inserted at the beginning and end in a different hand. The kaleidoscope of subject-matter does not affect the style appreciably. Beare observes the attractive rhythm of the prose, and the "quiet warmth of feeling" which are not really consistent with the "patchwork" into which some critics (e.g. Preisker, Lohse) would slice the epistle (200).

Rhythm. 1 Peter shares with Hebrews and James a tendency to use rhythm and similar rhetorical devices. The relative clause prolonging the sentence is a conspicuous item of the rhythmic style. These extensions occur at 1^{6, 8bis, 10, 12}ter 2^{4, 8bis, 10, 22, 23, 24} 3^{3, 6, 19, 20, 21, 22} 4^{4, 5, 11} 5^{9, 12}. Sentences are correspondingly drawn out by means of the linking participle: 1^{3, 5, 9, 11, 18} 2^{12, 16} 3² 5^{7, 9}. Such rhythmic devices are found on both sides of 4¹¹. The rhythm of the Psalms is present in 2³:

Who being reviled: reviled not again.

Suffering: he threatened not.

4¹¹: *If anyone speaks: as the oracles of God.*

If anyone ministers: as of the strength which God supplies.

The words *unto you* in 1¹⁰ are balanced by *unto Christ* in 1¹¹. There is chiasmus, too, reminiscent of the Psalms: 2²¹ *Christ died for you: to you he has left an example . . .* (ABBA). Bigg (4) noted the agreeable refinement at 1¹⁹, citing Philo and Josephus as models, viz. the phrase with *ὡς* having the proper name at the close; he found it elsewhere in

the NT only at Heb 12⁷, and he conceded that even the author of I Peter failed to follow it up when there was another opportunity to do so (cf. 2¹²).

There is an oratorical jolt in the word-order of 1²³, reminiscent of Hebrews: *through the Word of the living God—and the abiding*. In 3¹⁶ is a sensitive word-order in which the verbs *speak evil of you* and *may be put to shame* are brought effectively together and in which *behaviour in Christ* is emphatically placed at the end of the clause. An orator appears to be speaking at 1⁴ *ἀμάρτων καὶ ἀμάρωντων*, 1¹⁹ *ὡς ἀμνοῦ ἀλώμον καὶ ἀσπίλου χριστοῦ*. The epistle reads very well in public, and the English Authorized Version has happily captured many of its ringing cadences: 1⁸ *whom having not seen, ye love*, 1¹¹ *the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow*, 1¹⁵ *so be ye holy in all manner of conversation*. The antitheses are those of Hebrew poetry, especially the Psalms, as well as of Greek rhetoric: 1^{18f} *ye were NOT redeemed with corruptible things . . . but with the precious blood of Christ*, 2¹⁶ *as free, and NOT using your liberty as a cloke of maliciousness*. Such antitheses transcend the division of the epistle at 4¹¹, for they appear again at 5² *taking the oversight, NOT as by constraint*, 3 *NOT being lords, but being examples*. The rhythm of the opening ten verses so much recalls Hebrew poetry (1³⁻¹²) that the passage may be a Christian hymn; and yet the whole epistle is nearly at the same level: 1³ *Blessed . . . abundant mercy*, 4 *inheritance . . . kept for you*, 6 *rejoice . . . heaviness*, 8 *not seeing . . . believing*, etc. The author may have quoted hymns and the LXX, and known Paul and James, but he blends together beautifully all that he uses.

Phraseology. One reason for the attractive solemnity of style is, I believe, that the author has studied the language of the Greek OT and reproduced it to perfection, blending such LXX phrases as *Blessed be God* (Ps 66²⁰ 2 Mac 15³⁴), *taste that the Lord is gracious* (Ps 33 [34]⁹), *elect and precious* (Isa 28¹⁶), *stone of stumbling and rock of offence* (Isa 8¹⁴), *a race elect, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people for his possession* (Exod 19⁶). Once he harnesses the phrase *gird up the loins* (LXX Pr 31¹⁷) with the new mental image: *gird up the loins of your mind* 1¹³. But this splendid use of the LXX is found not only in the first part of the book (cf. especially 2¹⁻¹⁰), but all the way through: e.g. 4¹⁷ *judgment shall begin from (apo) the house of God* (Ezek 9⁶), 4¹⁸ *if the righteous scarcely be saved, where shall the ungodly and the sinner appear* 9 (Pr 11³¹), 5⁵ *God resists the proud and gives grace to the humble* (Pr 3³⁴), 5⁷ *casting all your care* (Ps 54 [55]²³), 5⁸ *as a roaring lion* (Ps 21 [22]¹⁴). If these phrases were all inserted by a final redactor, on varying material, then he was a very able craftsman.

Vocabulary: LXX influence. The vocabulary, as well as the phraseology, is based largely on the Greek OT, especially the Maccabees

books. Here are found 62 NT hapax, of which 33 are found in the LXX and five others in the other versions of the Greek OT.

Some are found fairly widely through the LXX:—*unrighteously* 2¹⁹ (in the Pss and Wis literature 20 times), *pass one's life* 4² (Wis literature and 4 Mac), *feminine* 3⁷ (Pent, Tob, Jdt, Est), *enquire carefully* 1¹⁰ (Pent, Jg, 1 Kms, 1 Chr, Jdt, Est, Pss, Wis literature, Minor Prophets, 1 Mac), *remaining* 4² (Pent, Jg, 2 Kms, 1 Esd, Min Proph, Isa, Jer, Dan Th, 1, 3 Mac), *carousal* 4³ (Pent, Jg, 1, 2, 3 Kms, Jdt, Est, Wis literature, Jer, Dan Th, 1, 3 Mac), *live with* 3⁷ (Pent, Jdt A 1 Esd, Wis literature, Isa, 2 Mac). Some are LXX words, but much less extensive:—*an appeal* 3²¹ (Sir, Dan Th), *veil* 2¹⁶ (Pent, 2 Kms, Job), *well-doer* 2¹⁴ (Sir), *beget again* 1^{3, 23} (Sir), *gird up* 1¹⁹ (Jdt B, Pr), *show honour to* 3⁷ (Dt, 3 Mac), *a putting on* 3³ (Est, Job), *proclaim* 2⁹ (Pss, Wis literature), *priesthood* 2^{5, 9} (Pent, 2 Mac), *credit* 2²⁰ (Job), *wound* 2²⁴ (Pent, Jdt, Pss, Sir, Isa), *terror* 3⁶ (Wis literature, 1 Mac), *dirt* 3²¹ (Job, Isa), *sowing* 1²³ (4 Kms, 1 Mac), *sympathetic* 3⁸ (Job, 4 Mac), *perfectly* 1¹³ (Jdt, 2, 3 Mac), *pattern* 2²¹ (2 Mac), *loving the brethren* 3⁹ (2, 4 Mac). The above are found only in the first part of the epistle; the following only in the second part:—*unfading* 5⁴ (Wis), *bear witness* 5¹³ (3 Kms, Neh, Sir, Min Proph, Jer, 1 Mac), *powerful* 5⁶ (Pent, Josh, Jg, 1, 2, 3 Kms, 2 Chr, 2 Esd, Neh, Pss, Wis literature, Min Proph, Jer, Ezek, Dan Th), *Creator* 4¹⁹ (2 Kms, Jdt, Sir, 2, 4 Mac), *eagerly* 5² (2 Chr, Tob, 2, 4 Mac), *to roar* 5⁸ (Jdt, Pss, Wis, Min Proph, Jer, Ezek). In both parts:—*brotherhood* 2¹⁷ 5⁹ (1, 4 Mac). Then there are the two LXX words, NT hapax, which have a meaning unique to Biblical Greek:—*virtues* (plural) with the meaning of *praise* 2⁹ (because it renders *hōdh* and *ʿhillā* in Min Proph, Isa), and *humble* 3⁸ (= *fainthearted* in non-Biblical literature): Pr and early Christian literature. NT hapax which are found in Symmachus are:—*chief shepherd* 5⁴, *observe* 2¹² 3², *arm oneself* 4¹, *putting on* (περιθεῖν) 3³. In Theodotion:—*be dead* 2²⁴ (ἀπογενεῖν).

It will be observed that the chief number of these NT hapax, which are drawn from the Greek OT, occur in 3⁶⁻⁸, which I suppose to be a paraenetic section. But otherwise they occur consistently throughout the epistle and on both sides of 4¹¹.

In addition to the NT hapax there are other words, found elsewhere in the NT, which may be claimed as belonging exclusively to Biblical Greek: *spiritual inheritance* (LXX for *nahalā*), *to walk* in the sense of *behave* 4³ gains its new meaning through the influence of the Hebrew *hālak* (which has both senses); *vessel* in the peculiar sense of rabbinical Hebrew (S.-B. III 632f): *wife* 3⁷. *Agitator* 4¹⁵ occurs nowhere else in literature, but it is derived from common enough words, meaning *an overseer of other people's affairs*, and it may be this author's own coinage; *rejoice religiously* (*agallian*) is a Biblical Greek word, confined to the LXX, the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, the Gospels, Acts and Church writers, but found in both parts of 1 Peter (1^{6, 8} 4¹³). On this word, cf. R. Bultmann in *TWNT* I 18–20.

Vocabulary: Christian influence. In another way the vocabulary is typical of Biblical Greek; not only is it strongly coloured by the

LXX but it embraces many words with a peculiarly Christian meaning, some of them entirely new words: *baptism*, *Christian*, *Devil*, *elect*, *faith*, *humble* (*tapeinos*), *love*, *preach the Gospel*, *predict* (1¹¹, a hapax, at least before the eighth century A.D., and probably Christian coinage), *presbyter*, *prognosis* (predestination), *sanctification*, *sharers of an inheritance*, *spirit*, *temptation*, *truth*, *wood* (=cross), *without respect of persons*, based on a Hebrew phrase *nāsā pānīm*, an exclusively Christian word, "an instance of the creation of religious and moral vocabulary through the medium of the Septuagint" (Beare 75). Paul has a similar Christian vocabulary, not always coinciding with this, but at least he shares the phrase, *believe in* (*eis*) 1⁸ (a Hebraism).

Choice of words. One of the stylistic weaknesses of this author is that he cannot always be said to be following any clear standard in his choice of words. He has within one verse two verbs for *seeing* 1⁸, the one moreover negated with *mē*, and the other with *ou*, pointlessly it would seem. Hort's plea that the change "is not capricious," I find unconvincing and almost meaningless (F. J. A. Hort, *The First Epistle of St. Peter, I-II* 17, London 1898, 45). Is the first negated participle *although* and the second *because*? (Bigg 105). Neither Selwyn nor Beare are helpful. Indeed, I suspect that there is no rational answer.

NT writers almost universally favour *mē* with ptc. 1 Pet, Heb, Paul and Lk, Mt and Jn (once), are the only exceptions, and even there it is rare. The NT has gone much further than the Koine in the elimination of *ou* with ptc. (*Grammar* III 284f).

Further, the author of 1 Peter seems not to use *dokimion* in the normal literary sense of *testing* but in the sense of the vulgar Fayum papyri: *something tested* (*Grammatical Insights* 168f). Bigg had already suspected that the word was "incorrectly used" (3). The choice of the form *hupolimpanein* betrays eccentric and not very acceptable speech.

Lack of Synonyms. Alongside the use of a synonym pointlessly in 1⁸ there must be set this author's monotonous habit of often failing to find any synonym at all. Certain key-words are repeated all through the epistle with careless iteration. Bigg found in this phenomenon some significance, for the same is true of 2 Peter, but I do not see his point about such a feature escaping the revision of an amanuensis, for an amanuensis could easily enough supply synonyms (Bigg 225-227).

The re-iterated words are: *faith* 1^{5.7.9.21} 5⁹, *apocalypse* (and verb) 1^{5.7.12.13} 4¹³ 5¹, *rejoice* 1^{6.8} 4¹³, *salvation* 1^{5.9.10} 2², *glory-glorify* 1^{7.8.11.21.24} 2¹² 4^{11bis.13.14.18} 5^{1.4.10}, *conduct* (and verb) 1^{15.17.18} 2¹² 3^{1.2.18}, *do(ing) good* 2^{14.15.20} 3^{6.17} 4¹⁹, *κόσμος* 1³⁰ 3³ 5⁹ and five times in 2 Pet, *pasch-* (suffer) 2^{19.20.21.23} 3^{14.17.18} 4^{1bis.15.19} 5¹⁰, *humble-humility* 3⁸ 5^{5bis.6}, *holy* 1^{12.15.16} 2^{5.9} 3⁵ and five times in 2 Pet, *obedience* 1^{2.14.22}, *evil-doer* 2^{12.14} 3¹⁷ 4¹⁵, *be*

subject 2^{13,18} 3^{1.5.22} 5⁵, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ 1⁸ 3²¹. Many of these instances cut across the epistle's dividing-line at 4¹¹, far too often for the theory of diverse authorship to be feasible.

Moods of the Verb. 1. The optative mood survives comparatively often in 1 Peter, perhaps as a literary feature.

In main clauses it occurs twice as a wish: 1² *may grace and peace be multiplied* (the phrase, "grace and peace," is Pauline, but the addition of the words, "be multiplied," is more characteristic of Jewish letters: Dan LXX 3⁹⁸ 4³⁴; cf. Beare 48). 5^{10v.l.} *may he renew, stablish, strengthen you*. This optative is used once in Heb and 2 Pet, twice in Jude, often in Paul, four times in Lk-Ac, and as a v.l. in Mk. This optative is characteristic of "the pompous and stereotyped jargon of devotion" in Biblical Greek (LXX references in *Grammar* III 120ff).

The other kind of optative is more literary: 3¹⁴ *even if you were to suffer, 17 should the will of God require it* (the fact that there are variant readings here and at 5¹⁰ may be due to scribal confusion of like-sounding word-endings). This kind of optative is not so frequent in the NT, being found in Ac and Paul only. Here it may be due to the writer's gentle tactfulness: persecution is present, but the writer says only, "if you were to suffer" (M. Zerwick, *Graecitas Biblica* § 228d). On the other hand, it may be due to the fact that this part of the epistle was indeed a solemn exhortation in rather archaic language. Before we ascribe the optatives to literary prowess we should heed Bigg's warning that the absence of *an* is enough to "show that the writer was not a Greek" (5). Rather, that he was not a Gentile Greek. "In neither LXX nor NT is there an instance of *ei* c. opt in the protasis and opt. c. *av* in the apodosis" (*Grammar* III 127).

2. Good Greek would surely have avoided *ei* with present or future indicative on the first occasion in 2²⁰, for the Christians were *not* suffering through wrong-doing; rather, the optative of the hypothetical condition is required. In 3¹, *ei* with indicative is not the classical construction.

3. 1 Peter prefers the aorist imperative to the present; the aorist reflects conduct in specific instances, usually a command to begin some action or a prohibition against beginning it. However, in 2¹⁷ there is a puzzling change of tense: *start to honour all men* (aorist), *start to love the brotherhood* (aorist), *continue to fear God* (present), *continue to honour the King* (present). One cannot pretend to see any principle behind the choice of tenses, and the lack of it militates against the author's supposed literacy.

4. Another noteworthy feature concerning moods in 1 Peter is the use of a participle as an apparent substitute for imperative in 1^{14,22} 2¹⁸ 3^{1.7.8} 4⁸. It is conceded that these examples occur in the first part, the part often alleged to be a "sermon", although *knowing* 5⁹ may be a further instance of participial imperative. The participle may, however, be part of a periphrastic construction, with *be* (imperative) in ellipse, or it may be a Hebraism in the author's Greek. That such a

feature reveals a Hebrew code of morals as a *Vorlage* of I Peter is most unlikely (discussion in *Grammatical Insights* 165-168).

The Impersonal verb. 1. A scribe has corrected the less acceptable Hellenistic impersonal construction in 2⁶ (*it is written in Scripture*) to the better personal form (*scripture writes*), but the whole quotation may be understood as subject (*Grammar* III 52, 292). 2. The impersonal *it is preached to the dead* 4⁶ is a Latinism rather than good Greek.

Ellipse of the Verb. The author is literary in that he tends towards the ellipse of the verb *to be*. Besides the imperatival ellipses just noted, there are many others. But the ellipse fails to be observed on several occasions, and these too are all in the first part: 1²⁵ 2^{15,25} 3^{3,4,20,22}.

Noun. 1. The Hebrew genitive of quality shows its influence several times: 1¹⁴ *children of obedience*=*obedient ones* is objective genitive, according to Beare, 71; but it is still a Hebraism ("children of"). 2¹² *day of visitation*=*judgment day* (LXX), 4¹¹, 5¹¹ *the ages of the ages*=*eternal ages* (the phrase occurs in both parts of the epistle); this plural (*ages*) is Semitic, cf. *Grammar* III 25. So also is the plural of *heaven* in 1⁴, corrected by S to secular usage. 5⁴ *crown of glory*=*glorious crown*.

2. The Hebrew infinitive absolute seems to appear in I Peter as in a great many NT authors: 3⁶ *afraid . . . with terror*, 3¹⁴ LXX 4¹³ *be glad with exceeding joy*.

Definite Article. 1. The usage on the whole is in accordance with good Greek, reminiscent in 3⁸ of Thucydides, according to Bigg (4), separated often very far from its noun, with a genitive phrase in between: 1¹⁷ 3^{1,3,20} 4¹⁴ 5^{1bis,4}. Thus the use of the article in this way does not differ on either side of 4¹¹.

2. However, there are occasions when a possible reviser (the amanuensis?) nodded and allowed what seems to be the original Jewish Greek to appear: especially in the omission of the article by influence of the Hebrew construct state 1^{2,3,7,9,25} 2¹² (but a borrowed LXX phrase) 1⁴ 3^{7,20,21} 4^{14ter} 5¹².

3. The omission of the article is not good Greek at 3^{19,20} when the participle follows a definite antecedent. There are times when no good reason is evident for the omission (Bigg 4).

Pronoun. 1. The relative *what kind of* has in the Koine come to mean no more than *what*, so that our author can for the sake of emphasis indulge in meaningless tautology: 1¹¹ *enquiring at what or what kind of time*. 2. The redundant pronoun after a relative is a sure Semitism: *of whom by his stripes* 2²⁴S*LP.

Preposition. The pregnant construction 3²⁰ is quite classical: *into which a few were saved* (i.e. *in which*, after entering *into*). But *into* is incorrect in 5¹² *into which you stand*; it is part of the Hellenistic degeneration of prepositional usage. In 1²⁵, taken literally, the gospel is preached *into* you, a Semitic (perhaps Aramaic) construction. The

dative is on its way out, and in later Greek as well as 1 Peter 1⁴ *eis* is an instance of non-classical usage (*for you*). The prepositions used with two verbs call for notice: (1) *elpizein* with *epi* (acc.) 1¹³ occurs frequently in LXX Psalms and early Christian writers; it is an exclusive feature of Jewish and Christian Greek (including Philo). (2) Another Hebraism is *oneidizein en* 4¹⁴ which is due to the influence of *be*, e.g. 2 Kms 23⁹ (Helbing 22).

Conjunction and Particle. 1. The *hina* of 4⁶ seems only to be understood causally, as in later (2nd c. A.D.) Greek (*Grammar* III 102). In other places the use of *hina* is no more satisfactory: it is followed in 3¹ by the future indicative, and in other places by the subjunctive, whatever the sequence, not at all in keeping with good Greek (Bigg 4). 2. There is a paucity of connecting particles and too many asyndeta (on both sides of 4¹¹) for good Greek.

There are but ten connecting particles. A few occur in the first part (1³-4¹¹) alone: *alla* 1¹⁵ 2²⁰ 3¹⁴, *dio* 1¹³, *dioti* 1^{16,24} 2⁶, *men . . . de* 1²⁰ 2⁴.(14) 3¹⁸ 4⁶.(14), and *hōste* in the second part alone (4¹⁹). The rest occur in both parts: *gar* 2^{19,20,21,25} 3^{5,10,17} 4^{3,6,15}, *de* 1²⁵ 2^{7-9,10bis} 3^{8,11,14bis} 4^{7,16,17(19)} 5^{5bis,10}, *kai* 1¹⁷ 2⁵ 4¹⁸ 5⁴, *hoti* 2¹⁵ 3^{12,18} 4¹⁷, *oun* 2^{1,7} 4^{1,7} 5^{(1),6}.

3. *Kathōs* is an unfortunate choice for any author attempting good Greek, strongly disapproved as it is by Phrynichus and very largely confined to Jewish Greek.

Word-order (cf. p. 129). 1. In the secular Greek order, the adjectival or participial qualifying phrase, usually comes between the article and noun. In 1 Peter this happens at 1^{8,13} 2^{2,9,11,12} 3^{1,4,5bis,16} 4³ 5^{1,4,6,10} (i.e. both sides of 4¹¹). The prepositional phrase in this position also occurs: 1^{10,11ter,14,21} 3^{2,15,19} 4^{8,12} 5^{2,13}. The Semitic position (the article close to the noun) occurs at 1²⁵ (τὸ ῥῆμα τὸ εὐαγγελισθέν). 2. 1 Peter is in line with Biblical rather than secular Greek in the word-order with *pas*, i.e. a relatively large proportion (17%) of the type 2 (a) (*Grammar* III 194-205). 3. It is worth observing that the characteristic word-order involving the unemphatic pronoun in the middle position is found on both sides of 4¹¹ (1³ τὸ πολὺ αὐτοῦ ἔλεος, 5¹⁰ τὴν αἰώνιον αὐτοῦ δόξαν).

We must conclude that 1 Peter wears a veneer of good stylistic revision upon a basic draft of the same kind of Greek that is found elsewhere in the NT. It is tempting to ascribe the veneer to an amanuensis, not necessarily Silvanus.

Other Literature :

A. Stegmann, *Silvanus als Missionar und Hagiograph*, Rottenburg 1917 (he is the Silas of Acts).

- L. Radermacher, "Der erste Petrusbrief und Silvanus," *ZNW* 25 (1926) 287-299.
- B. H. Streeter, *The Primitive Church*, New York 1929, 123f.
- R. Bultmann, "Bekenntnis—und Liedfragmente im ersten Petrusbrief," *Coniectanea Neotestamentica*, 1947, 1ff.
- H. G. Meecham, "The Use of the Participle for the Imperative in the New Testament," *ET* 58 (1947) 207f.
- C. L. Mitton, *The Epistle to the Ephesians*, Oxford 1951.
- C. L. Mitton, "The Relationship between 1 Peter and Ephesians," *JTS* NS 1 (1950) 67-73.
- J. Michl, *Die katholischen Briefe*, Ratisbonne 1953.
- M.-E. Boismard, *Quatre Hymnes baptismales dans la première Épître de Pierre*, Paris 1961.
- A. R. C. Leaney, "1 Peter and the Passover: an Interpretation," *NTS* 10 (1964) 238-261.

THE STYLE OF THE JOHANNINE EPISTLES

§ 1. UNITY OF AUTHORSHIP

All three epistles come from the same hand, 2 and 3 John resembling each other in style and phraseology, and both resembling 1 John, e.g. in the following phrases: *a commandment from the beginning* 1 Jn 3¹¹ 2 Jn⁶, *confess Jesus Christ coming in the flesh . . . this is Antichrist* 1 Jn 2²² 2 Jn⁷ etc. (Antichrist only in 1 and 2 Jn), *not a new commandment* (only in 1 and 2 Jn). In form, 2 and 3 John are Hellenistic private letters, except that they deal with themes rather more solemn.

§ 2. UNITY OF AUTHORSHIP WITH FOURTH GOSPEL

A. E. Brooke showed that the Epistles and Gospel were closely related in style and vocabulary (*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Johannine Epistles*, ICC Edinburgh 1912, v-vii), as Moulton also thought (*Grammar* II 31). Dibelius, C. H. Dodd, and others differ, Dodd urging that 1 John has few prepositions, particles and conjunctions, and fewer verbal compounds than John, and noting that much of John's vocabulary is missing from 1 John (e.g. *oun* 194 in John, *gar* 63 in John, but only three in 1 John, *krinein* 19 in John, *doxa* 18 in John): "The First Epistle of John and the Fourth Gospel," *BJRL* 21 (1937) 129-156. The Fourth Gospel, it was claimed, had an "intensity" and "inward glow" missing from 1 John, and the language of 1 John was not always lucid; "it does not suggest the pen of a ready writer," but is in contrast with the "genuine power of style" of the Gospel despite the latter's small vocabulary and limited grammar (*The Johannine Epistles*, London 1946, xlix). The language of 1 John was said to be nearer to that of Hellenistic philosophy, but the difficult question of relative dates was not considered. The presence of some rhetorical questions in 1 John and the absence of them in the Gospel lacks significance, if it is considered that 1 John is an epistle, speaking to the readers more personally. In very careful critiques, W. F. Howard and W. G. Wilson showed that Dodd's arguments were inconclusive. Among other things, Howard pointed out that "the vastly wider range of subject-matter in historical narrative gives the Gospel unquestionably a richer vocabulary" ("The Common Author-

ship of the Johannine Gospel and Epistles," *JTS* 48 [1947] 12ff). Wilson demonstrated that undoubted Pauline epistles showed greater grammatical and lexical differences than any which Dodd alleged between John and 1 John ("An Examination of the Linguistic Evidence adduced against the Unity of Authorship of the First Epistle of John and the Fourth Gospel," *JTS* 49 [1948] 147-156). Kümmel could thus summarize the position: "Even if a certain linguistic difference between John and 1 John cannot be denied, it hardly goes further than is conceivable in the same writer at two different times sufficiently far apart" (*Intr.* 311).

The stylistic considerations in favour of unity are indeed overwhelming. The following phrases, though rather theological than stylistic, occur only in John and the Epistles: *to bear the sin, to have sin (life), to do the pleasing things, to do the Truth, lay down one's life* (Hebrew *šim nephesh*), *to be of God (of the world), to abide in God (love), to walk in darkness (light), the only-begotten Son, the Saviour of the world, Paraclete* (NT hapax), *spirit of truth, born of God, children of God, from death into life, overcome the world, walk in darkness*. This is not to mention a host of words which they have in common, some of them used repeatedly: *abide, commandment, flesh, know, lie, life, light, love, manifest, murderer* (NT hapax), *witness*. Many of John's characteristic words, it is true, are absent from 1 John: *glory (glorify), the Holy Spirit* (cf. above). And some of 1 John's words are absent from John: e.g. *chrism, Antichrist, God's seal, koinonia, parousia, expiation, false prophet*. Nevertheless, the unity is remarkable, considering that both have a limited vocabulary, comparatively free from synonyms.

Moreover, they have common stylistic features; repetition of the same grammatical construction, a paucity of particles, frequent asyndeton or connection mainly by means of *and, kai . . . ou* for *oude* (Jn 1⁵ 1 Jn 1⁵), *pas ho* with participle (Jn 3^{8,15,16} etc. 1 Jn 3⁴ 5⁴ etc.), *pan to* with participle (Jn 6^{37,39} 15² 1 Jn 5⁴), synonymous and antithetical parallelism (Hebraism), a practice of using the demonstrative pronoun (*in this* or *this*) to introduce a subordinate clause: that is to say, a conditional clause (Jn 13³⁵ 1 Jn 2³), a final clause (Jn 6²⁹ 15^{8,12} 18³⁷ 1 Jn 3^{8,11} 4¹⁷), and one introduced by *that* (Jn 3¹⁹ 5¹⁶ 9³⁰ 1 Jn 3¹ 4⁹ 5⁹). Moreover, they have in common the *kathōs . . . kai* construction (Jn 13¹⁵ 1 Jn 2¹⁸), the *ou kathōs* (Jn 6⁵⁸ 1 Jn 3¹²), the *all' hina* (Jn 1⁸ 9³ 1 Jn 2¹⁹), and *kai . . . de* (Jn 6⁵¹ 8¹⁶ 15²⁷ 1 Jn 1³).

It is a little remarkable that *para c. accus.* (comparatively flourishing in Biblical Greek) never occurs in the Johannine literature, including Rev, though there are 31 examples with gen. and ten with dat. Cf. the comparative table in *Grammar* III 272. Certain prepositions are absent from the Gospel and Epistles: *achri, mechri, heōs* (exc. Jn 8^{9S}), not including the adv, *heōs arti*.

Brooke's list of over 50 phrases in common between John and 1 John, as Howard said, "overwhelms the examples of contrast" (Howard, *Fourth Gospel*⁵, 287).

1 John is not likely to have been a linguistic imitation of John, for the last thing its author aims at is literary effect.

§ 3. INTEGRITY OF 1 JOHN

Externally 1 John lacks the shape of a Hellenistic epistle, with no greetings or usual conclusion, and it is thought to be rather in the genre of the religious tract, like Jude, intended for the whole Church. In spite of lack of formal greetings, it still reads like an epistle addressed to certain groups of readers (cf. 2^{1,7f,12ff,18,21,26}). The literary form of 1 John is unique. The other two Johannine epistles conform perfectly to the pattern of a Hellenistic private letter. Cf. R. W. Funk, "The Form and Structure of II and III John," *JBL* 86 (1967) 424-430.

Some critics have thought they could see a contrast between short solemn didactic sentences (1⁵⁻¹⁰ 2^{4,5,9-11,23,29} 3^{4,6-10,14,15,24} 4^{5,7,8,12,16} 5^{1,4,10,12}) having pairs of parallel clauses, and other longer exhortatory paraenetic discussions (e.g. 2^{1f}). From this they assume that a non-Christian *Vorlage* has been revised and incorporated. In fact, all the sentences in 1 John have a stylistic unity and all are of the very simplest construction, except for the complex opening sentence which occupies eight lines of Nestle: 1¹⁻³. After that, the only sentences to extend over three lines are so rare as to lack any significance: 1⁷ (3½ lines), 2¹⁵⁻¹⁶ (4 lines), 3¹⁷ (3¼ lines), 19-20 (4 lines), 4¹⁰ (3¼ lines), 1⁷ (3¼ lines). Most of the remainder vary from a line to two lines in length. As for complex sentence-structure, the sole methods of subordination, not including participles, are by *that* (*hoti*), *hina*, the relative, *if*, *hōs*, *kathōs*, *hotan*. It will be seen from the following table that these clauses occur regularly through the Epistles, not in certain sections only.

<i>That</i> (<i>hoti</i>)	1 Jn 1 ^{5,6,8,10} 2 ^{4,5,8,12,18} bis.22,29 bis 3 ^{2,5,14,15,19,24} 4 ^{3,13,14,20} 5 ^{1,2,5,11,15} bis.18,19,20 2 Jn ⁴ 3 Jn ¹²
Relative	1 Jn 1 ⁵ 2 ^{5,7} bis.8,25,27 3 ^{2,11,17,22,24} 4 ^{2,3} bis.15,16,20 bis 5 ^{10,14,15} bis 2 Jn 1,5,8 3 Jn ^{1,5,6} bis.10

<i>Ij: ei</i> <i>ean</i>	1 Jn 2 ^{19,22} , 3 ¹⁸ 4 ^{1,11} 5 ^{5,9} 2 Jn ¹⁰ 1 Jn 1 ^{6,7,8,9,10} 2 ^{1,3,15,24,28,29} 3 ^{2,20,21} 4 ^{12,20} 5 ^{14,15,16} 3 Jn ¹⁰
<i>Hōs</i>	1 Jn 1 ⁷ 2 ²⁷ 2 Jn ⁵
<i>Kathōs</i>	1 Jn 2 ^{18,27} 3 ^{2,3,7,12,23} 2 Jn ^{4,6} 3 Jn 2 ³
<i>Hotan</i>	1 Jn 5 ²
<i>Hina</i>	1 Jn 1 ^{4,9} 2 ^{1,19,27,28} 3 ^{1,5,8,11,23} 4 ^{9,17,21} 5 ^{8,13,16,20} 2 Jn ^{5,6,bis,8,12} 3 Jn ^{4,8}

We conclude with Kümmel that the thesis of these critics is "improbable," and, "as for the differences in style, we may trace them back to the use of traditional material" (*Intr.* 309).

The style of the Epistles, together with that of the Gospel, is one of extreme simplicity all through, with some monotony of construction. No serious grammatical mistakes are made, but the author's sentences are very brief (except 1¹⁻³). Like the fourth evangelist, he is a cultured man but his Greek is elementary (*Grammar* II 33), and repetitive (e.g. the numerous *I write to you . . . 2¹²¹*), as if it were the style of an old man.

§ 4. HEBRAISTIC STYLE

Although 1 John has no OT quotations, there is evidence that the Greek is Jewish, without however being exclusively Aramaic or Hebrew.

To do the Truth (cf. above) is a Hebraism: 'āsā 'emeth, *to show one's faithfulness, then to act uprightly*.

There are traces of the Hebrew infinitive absolute: *sinning a sin* 5¹⁶, and of the Hebrew genitive of quality: *Word of life=living Word* 1¹, *the desire of the flesh=fleshly desire* 2¹⁶ (but perhaps an objective genitive: *desire for the flesh*?). Besides, there is a good showing of the Hebrew construction (Davidson, *Hebrew Syntax* § 99) whereby the participle with article is used as a relative clause (*he who*) often in the

gospels, including John (1²⁹ etc.) and 1 Jn 2^{4.9.10.11} etc. The position of attributive *pas* is exactly that of Biblical Greek, in contrast to secular (*Grammar* III 205).

The imperatival *hina* (*they must be manifest* 2¹⁹ and possibly one or two others) is a Hebraism due to LXX influence (*Grammar* III 95) but the idiom would be in his Greek already, for the author of 1 John does not show many other signs of using the LXX. He does, however, use *φυλάσσω éavtón ápó* (as LXX uses the middle) in place of the accusative of secular Greek 5²¹ (Testament of Reuben 4⁸), and shows further LXX influence by his exclusively Biblical expression *αἰσχύνομαι από* 2²⁸ (=LXX Isa 1²⁹B Jer 12¹³).

§ 5. ARAMAIC STYLE

Some influences are exclusively from Aramaic, and asyndeton is one that is prominent. Approximately 98/161 main clauses of 1 John are asyndetic (13/17 in 2 John, 11/19 in 3 John), and this strongly indicates Aramaic with its lack of connections, as it has also prompted scholars to ponder an Aramaic original to the Gospel (cf. pp. 70f). Connecting particles are not very profuse in the Epistles: *kai* is the most popular (41 in 1 John, two in 2 John, three in 3 John), followed by *de* (10 in 1 John, one in 3 John), and less often by *alla*, *gar*, *dia touto*, *hoti* (causative, *gar*), *holthen* and *oun*. The didactic asyndeton is much used by John and 1 John, to a less extent by James (cf p. 117).

Burney claimed that the excessive use of *hina* was due to Aramaic influence in John. Why not also in 1 John where it is just as prevalent, having 25 instances in 12 pages? (cf. p. 73). T. W. Manson⁷ declared that a seminar in Manchester had found that Burney's Aramaisms were absent from 1 John (not mentioning *hina*) and that the most striking differences between 1 John and the Gospel were really between 1 John and the Aramaizing part of the Gospel. On such evidence he put forward the hypothesis that 1 John was by an author who composed freely, and that the Gospel was by the same author when his style was affected by his material (*BJRL* 30 [1946] 323f).

The presence of Aramaic influence, in Gospel and Epistles, raises the question whether the author was bilingual and whether his Aramaic were affecting his Greek. The supposition is a fair one, but it founders on the fact that some of the Semitic influence upon his Greek is exclusively Hebraic, and the only hypothesis which adequately explains the double influence of Hebrew and Aramaic is the use of a native Jewish Greek, formed from spoken Aramaic and perhaps spoken Hebrew and from the influence of the synagogue and Greek OT.

§ 6. SEMITIC STYLE

Some features may be due to Hebrew or Aramaic influence.

Parataxis is conspicuous, as in John (1/12 lines of Nestle). In 1 John there are 160 main clauses in 240 lines of Nestle, and where they are not asyndetic they are usually connected by *and*.

Other Semitic features are periphrastic tenses: 1⁴ 4¹² 2 John¹² (cf. pp. 20f), partitive *ek* without article (*some of*) Jn 7⁴⁰ 16^{14,15,17} 2 Jn⁴ (Black³ 108; cf. below, pp. 15, 46, 151), participle co-ordinate with a main verb 2 Jn²: *the truth abiding in you and it shall be with you* (cf. pp. 72, 155), and casus pendens followed by resumptive pronoun (frequent in John): 1 Jn 2⁵ *whosoever . . . in him, ²⁴ what you have heard . . . in you*.

In word-order, the position of the qualifying phrase is important.

1. The secular "compact" genitive (between article and noun) is never found in the Epistles, while the genitive following the articular noun, as in Jewish Greek, occurs quite often: 30 times in 1 John three times in 2 John. The nearest we come to the secular use is in one or two phrases: *αὐτοῦ οἱ μαθηταί, δύο ἀνθρώπων ἡ μαρτυρία*, which is not even then the "compact" construction.

2. Unlike the "compact" genitive, the "compact" adjective does occur, but is rare: 4¹⁸ 5²⁰ 3 Jn⁴, while the regular practice is that of Jewish Greek, viz. the adjective occurring in a following articular phrase: 1^{2,3} 2^{7,8,25} 4⁹ 5⁴ 2 Jn^{2,11,13}.

3. It is not true that there are no Semitisms in the Johannine Epistles; there are both Hebraisms and Aramaisms, and a certain Christianization of language too.

There is a Christian use of *en* which we cannot properly ignore, a development of the spatial *en*, in a spiritual sense. This is the mystical doctrine of the Christian's life *in* Christ, inside a new sphere of experience. In the same way, Christ is *in* believers. It is a doctrine common to Paul and John, and it was probably important to all early Christians. *In* God is no darkness. Men walk *in the sphere of* (= *in*) darkness or of light, of truth or of lies, of love or of hate. His Word is *in* believers. His love is made perfect *in* them, if they abide *in* God and he abides *in* them. *With* is a possible translation of some of these instances, but on the whole it is inadequate. It is not the instrumental *en*, common to the Koine and to Semitic Greek (*Grammar* III 263).

Other Literature :

- R. Bultmann, "Analyse des ersten Joh.," *Festgabe für A. Jülicher*, Tübingen 1927, 138, 158.
 J. Braun, "Literar-Analyse und theologische Schichtung in i Joh.," *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, 48 (1951) 262-292.

- A. P. Salon, "Some Aspects of the Grammatical Style of 1 John," *JBL* 74 (1955) 96-102.
- J. Héring, "Y-a-t-il des aramäisms dans la Première Épître Johannique ?" *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie religieuses* 36 (1956) 113ff.
- W. Nauck, *Die Tradition und der Charakter des ersten Johannesbriefes*, Tübingen 1957.
- E. Haenchen, "Neuere Literatur zu den Johannesbriefen," *Theologische Rundschau* NF 26 (1960) 1-13.
- A. J. B. Higgins, "The Words of Jesus according to St. John," *BJRL* 49 (1967) 363-386.

THE STYLE OF JUDE AND 2 PETER

§ I. LITERARY CHARACTER OF JUDE

C. Bigg, 311, described Jude's language as "strong, dignified, and sonorous." Jude is not epistolary in form, though it has an address at the beginning, but is rather a tract or manifesto, closing with a liturgical form of words.

Vocabulary. Jude has thirteen words found nowhere else in the NT, three of them found also in the Greek OT: *without stumbling* (*aptaistos*)²⁴ (3 Mac), grumbler (*goggustēs*)¹⁶ (Symmachus and Theodotion: Prov), *to convict* (*elegxai*)¹⁵ (Wisdom literature, Minor Prophets, Isa, 4 Mac): Bigg 310. Of the remaining ten words, four appear in classical Greek and a further three in Aristotle. The most popular sources for the Hellenistic words are Plutarch (five words), Philo (four words), Josephus (three words). There are no words exclusive to Jude, as there are in 2 Peter. Though he was probably a *Jewish* Christian, he has a distinctly Hellenistic style. Nevertheless, the unique character of Biblical Greek is illustrated in Jude: *hagios*³ = a Christian (unlike 1 and 2 Peter, but as in Paul), *psuchikos* (*carnal*)¹⁹ is an unusual, perhaps a Gnostic-Christian term (also in James and 1 Corinthians), *klētos*¹ a Christian (as in Paul).

Rhythm. J. B. Mayor instanced fine rhythm in Jude^{20,21} and he noted the rhyme in ^{8,10,11} (*The Epistle of St. Jude and the Second Epistle of St. Peter*, London 1907, lix). Another peculiar literary feature noted by Mayor (lvi) was Jude's fondness for triplets: *mercy, peace, love*², *ungodly, turning . . . , denying*⁴, three punishments³⁻⁷, *defile . . . , despise . . . , speak evil . . .*,⁸ *Cain . . . , Balaam . . . , Korah*,¹¹ etc. He compares Jas ^{14,19} ²²³ etc.

Word-order. Three times (^{1,12,23}) Jude allows the prepositional phrase in good Greek fashion, to obtrude between article and noun; he allows an adjective between article and noun six times (³bis-^{7,10,20,23}), but he does have the Jewish Greek method of repeated article once (¹⁷). Twice he allows a genitive to obtrude between the article and its noun (^{4,9}), but he places the genitive phrase after the articular noun at ¹¹ter-^{13,17,21}.

Redundancy of style. In good Greek *to you* would be superfluous at ³, so would *you*⁵, and *men* added to *some*⁴.

§ 2. JEWISH CHARACTER OF JUDE

Jude is well acquainted with the LXX (*katenōpion*²⁴ occurs in the LXX seven times) and with the Jewish haggadah and apocalyptic (the *Assumption of Moses* and *Apocalypse of Enoch*). Even so, his Greek is relatively un-Biblical and the Semitisms, though real, are merely occasional. Bigg thought that Chase was overstating the case when he said that the writer was steeped in LXX language (311), as the words which may be thought Septuagintal are probably from the *Assumption of Moses*. G. H. Boobyer argues, not very convincingly, that the verb, *to go in the way*¹¹, means "go to death," but the LXX references only mean "go to death" because of the obvious context (as we say, "He is gone!") Lk 13³³ is very doubtful, as Boobyer admits ("The Verbs in Jude 11," *NTS* 5 [1959] 47). Even so, it would be a Hebraism, but it is more natural to take it as a Hebraism for *behave*. *Woe unto*¹¹ is obviously Jewish; the occasional references in Epictetus and the papyri are not significant.

The influence of the Construct State. The article before a genitive, even though required by secular Greek standards, is omitted at ⁶ (*the*) *judgment of (the) great Day*, ²¹ *in (the) love of God*, but it is more frequently omitted in 2 Peter.

Parataxis and Asyndeton. Though Jude uses a connecting particle 17 times, there are 27 main sentences, and his connection is almost limited to *de* (eight times), *kai* (four times), *gar* once, *mentoi* once, *men . . . de* (three times). Verse ¹¹ is an example of parataxis.

§ 3. LITERARY CHARACTER OF 2 PETER

Rhythm. Mayor instanced examples of fine rhythm 1^{16,17}, where there is also alliteration in m and p, 1¹⁹⁻²¹ with alliteration in p and l, and 2⁴⁻⁹ 3¹³; he also observed iambic fragments in 1¹⁹ 2^{4,8,22} (lix). Bigg (227) noticed that 2 Peter tends to use an iambic rhythm in 2^{1,3,4}, and pointed out that some Jewish writers in Alexandria imitated the classical Attic tragedians and then passed their work off as classical fragments. "Such extracts were collected in anthologies, and were probably widely known among educated Christians at a very early date." Thus, Paul knew a verse of Menander. Bigg suspected that 2 Pet 2²² comes from a Jewish setting of Proverbs in iambic verse (Pr 26¹¹), combined with a secular proverb, but he could not rule out the possibility that our author took both proverbs from an Alexandrine Jewish collection of proverbs, Biblical and secular (228, 288). However, there is a Jewish parallel here too (S.-B. III 773). We find the synonymous (2³) and antithetic parallelism (4⁶) of Greek and Jewish rhetoric.

Word-order. In good secular fashion, the prepositional phrase is allowed to obtrude between the article and noun (usually very close together in Jewish Greek, as we have seen throughout the NT) : 1⁴ τῆς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ φθορᾶς. Other instances occur at 2^{13,18} 3¹⁰ (they are relatively more frequent in Jude). Whereas the genitive phrase comes between article and noun eight times (1^{8,16} 2^{7,18} 3^{5,12,15,17}), in nine instances it follows the articular noun (1^{3,11,14} 2^{2,15,17,20,21} 3⁴) as in Jewish Greek. But it is true that the qualifying adjective or participle is always compact between the article and noun (1^{3,11,12,17,18,19} 2^{1,21} 3^{1,2bis,15bis,16}). In this way, "the style of 2 P. is more classical than that of most of the books of the N.T." (Mayor lix). Genitive absolute occurs three times, about the same as Hebrews.

Hellenistic religious terms abound in 2 Peter, especially in the first chapter : *theia dunamis* "belongs rather to Hellenism than to the Bible" (Biggs 255). Others are *eusebeia*, *epignōsis*, partakers of *theia phusis*, *egkrateia*, *epoptai*, *phthora*, *philadelphia*, and *aretē*. But 2 Peter's phrase, *doxa kai aretē*, may well be an echo of LXX Isa 42⁸, thus reducing the force of the argument that Plutarch happens to use the two words together. All the above words doubtless have a new Christian meaning and are not used with their pagan connotations. In view of so much evidence, however, they too would seem to reflect literary pretensions.

Weakness of Style. 1. 2 Peter is even less lavish than 1 Peter in his use of co-ordinating particles, depending like Jude on *de* (21 times) and unlike Jude on *gar* (14 times), but also on *kai* (11 times), and to a smaller extent on *oun* (3¹⁷) and *hopou* (2¹¹), *alla* (1²¹ 3⁹) and *dio* (1^{10,12} 3¹⁴); *men* is not used at all. What we observed under 1 Peter concerning the use of *kathōs* applies here too (1¹⁴ 3¹⁵). There is a good deal of parataxis in 2 Peter, alongside the use of some long cumbersome periods. 2. In these periods, the unusual and often pointless order of words as in Hebrews (cf. above), makes for ambiguity : e.g. in 2¹⁸ *of the flesh* is difficult to fit into the sentence ; it may be the *lusts of the flesh* or *through the licentiousness of the flesh*. Other passages, singled out as ambiguous by Mayor, a not unsympathetic critic, are 2¹⁰⁻¹³ 3^{5,7} (lxvi). 3. There is a meagre use of prepositions : it is enigmatic that, in 1² 2²⁰ the author writes *in knowledge*, but *through knowledge* in 1³, and *unto knowledge* in 1⁸ (Mayor lxxv). There is, moreover, the tiresome iteration of four phrases introduced by *dia* in 1³¹. 4. There is vagueness and ambiguity in the use of pronouns : it is not clear to what *to whom* refers in 1⁴, and in 2¹¹ *against them* was felt to be so vague that versions altered the rendering to *against themselves*. *In their corruption* 2¹² is just as vague. The pronoun is superfluous on at least two occasions : we do not need *their* after *their own* 3^{8,16}. 5. Moreover, in spite of echoing literary models, the author has rather a poor command of

vocabulary, e.g. *oligōs* 2¹⁸AB *scarcely* (only elsewhere Strato, ii/A.D., and Aquila's Isaiah) is "characteristic of the writer's bookish style—Aquila and the Anthology appear to be its only supporters" (*Grammar* II 163). Much of his vocabulary is drawn from Hellenistic literary authors and, as in the case of Jude, Aristotle apparently is the quarry for many of his words (of the 28 words which do not appear elsewhere in the NT and Greek OT, twelve are classical, and all of them are literary Hellenistic: Philo (ten words), Josephus (nine words), Plutarch (eight words); twelve occur in the papyri. But of these words, some are not found elsewhere, although they are of easy formation: *mocking* (*empaigmonē*), *insanity* (*paraphronia*), *false teacher* (*pseudodidaskalos*), and one is an exclusively Christian word: *be shortsighted* (*muōpazein*). Always there is a striving after the pompous phrase. As Bigg remarked (225), "The vocabulary of 1 Peter is dignified, that of 2 Peter inclines to the grandiose." He instanced *vomit*, *initiates*, *roaringly*, *to Tartarize*, *cover with ashes* . . . But all is not pompous, as the delightful metaphors of 1¹⁹ show: *until the Day dawn and the Daystar arise in your hearts*. Nevertheless, the author has this in common with 1 Peter, that he is lazy in his search for a synonym and prefers to let the same word stand, often in more than two places. Here Jude has supplied synonyms wherever possible, for he has a greater sense of style and seeks to avoid meaningless repetition (Bigg 226). Among the iterations are: *his own* 1^{3,20} 2^{16,22} 3^{3,16,17}, *escape* 1⁴ 2^{18,20}, *supply* 1^{5,11}, *sure* 1^{10,19}, *diligence* 1^{10,15} 3¹⁴, *remembrance* 1^{12,13,15} 3¹, *reward of unrighteousness* 2^{13,15}, *imminent* 1¹⁴ 2¹, *follow* 1¹⁶ 2^{2,15}, *parousia* 1¹⁶ 3^{4,12}, *prophecy* 1^{20,21}, *knowing this first* 1²⁰ 3³, *damnation* 2^{1,3} 3^{7,16}, *way* 2^{2,15,21}, *long ago* 2⁸ 3⁵, *spare* 2^{4,5}, *reserve* 2^{4,9,17} 3⁷, *gloom* 2^{4,17}, *unprincipled* 2⁷ 3¹⁷, *railing accusation* 2^{10,11,12}, *entice* 2^{14,18}, *speak bombastically* 2^{16,18}, *commandment* 2²¹ 3², *elements melting with fervent heat* 3^{10,12}, *look for* 3^{12,13,14}.

6. There is anacoluthon at 2⁴, for the protasis, *if God spared not angels*, has no apodosis, which would have come in 2⁸. There is another anacoluthon at 3¹⁻³, where the nominative, *ginōskontes*, appears for the more grammatical accusative.

§ 4. JEWISH CHARACTER OF 2 PETER

Again we have the phenomenon of a Hellenistic vocabulary and certain literary constructions alongside assured Hebraisms.

The most conspicuous Hebraism is the genitive of quality, which has been identified as normative in all NT authors. *Heresies of destruction* = *destructive heresies* 2¹, *desire of corruption* = *corrupting desire* 2¹⁰, *children of cursing* = *accursed children* 2¹⁴, *way of righteousness* = *righteous behaviour* 2²¹. Next is the use of a reinforcing cognate noun, which abounds in Biblical Greek by the analogy of the Hebrew infinite

absolute : *destroyed with destruction* 2¹², *scoffers shall come with scoffing* 3³; both these Hebraisms are avoided in the parallels in Jude, which suggests either that Bigg was right and that Jude depends on 2 Peter, correcting him, or that in spite of his model's more secular idiom, the author of 2 Peter lapses into his more familiar Jewish Greek. The phrase, *going after the desire of corruption* 2¹⁰, has a double Hebraism; in secular Greek it would be worded, *behaving according to corrupted desire*.

Usually the article is correctly used, according to secular standards, in both Jude and 2 Peter, but the author of 2 Peter falls back into Jewish Greek by his occasional neglect of the article with a definite noun before a genitive, reflecting the Hebrew construct state: 2⁹ 3⁷ (*the*) *day of judgment*, 1¹ *in (the) righteousness of our God*, 1² *in (the) knowledge of God*, 2⁵ (*the*) *world of ungodly men*, 2⁶ (*the*) *cities of Sodom*, 2¹⁰ (*the*) *desire of corruption*. The expression in 1² (*the* [*knowledge*] of God) is written in the regular Greek way at 1^{3.8} 3¹²; presumably a redactor has revised the initial Jewish Greek composition (cp. 1 Pet 4² *by (the) will of God*, and often in Paul). The use of *pas . . . ou* for *oudeis* 1²⁰, and of *ou . . . pote* for *oupote* 1²¹ is infallibly a Hebraism, and so is the phrase *shall they be found* 3¹⁰, for the passive of the verb *to find* is in Hebrew the equivalent of the verb *to be* (cf. Rev 16²⁰, Ps 36¹⁰ Pr 20⁶). The avoidance of the divine name by the use of Magnificent Glory 1¹⁷ is ingenerate Jewish style, rather than a Hebraism of syntax.

LXX influence. Twenty-four of 2 Peter's 55 NT hapax derive from the Greek Bible (Bigg 224). Of these the following occur in the Wisdom literature: *apopheugein* (escape) 2^{18.20}, *elegxis* (rebuke) 2¹⁶, *exakolouthein* (follow) 1¹⁶ 2^{2.15}, *tachinē* (imminent) 1¹⁴ 2¹, *tartaroun* 2⁴, *mōmos* (blemish) 2¹³, *homichlē* (mist) 2¹⁷, *hus* (sow) 2²², *katakluzein* (to flood) 3⁶. The following are in the books of Maccabees: *epoptēs* (eye-witness) 1¹⁶, *megaloprepēs* (magnificent) 1¹⁷, *toiosde* (such as this) 1¹⁷, *athesmos* (unprincipled) 2⁷ 3¹⁷, *miasma* (corruption) 2²⁰, *strebloun* (distort) 3¹⁶. The following occur both in the Wisdom literature and in the books of Maccabees, the author's favourite sources: *lēthē* (forgetfulness) 1⁹, *mnēmē* (memory) 1¹⁵, *argein* (be idle) 2³, *entruphān* (revel) 2¹³, *miasmos* (corruption) 2¹⁰, *tēkesthai* (dissolve) 3¹². The pseudonym he adopts, Sumeōn, is the LXX version of Hebrew *Sim'ōn*.

Thus the author is more influenced by the Greek OT than is the author of Jude, but in Jude too the Wisdom literature and 3,4 Maccabees (i.e. Hellenistic Judaism) call for notice, indicating the impact of Hellenized Jewish writers on both Jude and 2 Peter.

Literary genre. It is sometimes claimed, in view of 1¹²⁻¹⁵, that 2 Peter belongs to a type of "will" literature, professing to be a last will and testament, which was in vogue among Jews and Christians; books of this kind, like the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, sometimes

threatened penalties against immoralities in the "last days", in the same manner as 2 Peter.

§ 5. LANGUAGE OF 2 PETER AND JUDE COMPARED

As 19 out of 25 verses of Jude are also in 2 Peter and because of dependence of subject-matter, we conclude that 2 Peter depends on Jude. Jude ^{2,3,5,17f} are especially significant for literary relationship.

Stylistic relationship with 2 Pet is shown as follows: Jude² optative (2 Pet 1²), Jude³ *all zeal* (2 Pet 1⁵), *beloved* (2 Pet 3^{1,8,14,17}), Jude⁵ *put you in remembrance . . . though you knew* (2 Pet 1¹²), Jude ^{17f} *but beloved, remember the words which were spoken before of the apostles of the Lord. . . . "There shall be mockers in the last time who shall walk after their own lusts"* 3^{1,2,3}.

Two of the words which Jude and 2 Peter share are not found elsewhere in the NT: *empaiktēs* and *huperogka*. Another word is not found elsewhere in Biblical Greek: *suneuōcheisthai*, and the following are very rare in Biblical Greek: *zophos*, *spilas/os*. Both authors use Biblical words, but neither quotes the OT directly, unlike 1 Peter. The proportion of NT hapax in Jude and 2 Peter is the highest in the NT.

2 Peter has a more vibrant, excited style than Jude's and he is also more pretentious and artificial than either Jude or 1 Peter. He is probably more consciously stylistic. Both authors have a rhythmical and rhetorical style, but more of the underlying Jewish Greek appears in 2 Peter than in Jude.

Other Literature :

- M. R. James, *2 Peter and Jude* (Cambridge Greek Testament), Cambridge 1912.
 B. H. Streeter, *The Primitive Church*, London 1929, 178ff.
 J. Chaîne, *Les Épîtres catholiques* (Études bibliques), Paris 1939 (Hebraisms on p. 18).
 U. Holzmeister, "Vocabularium secundae epistolae S. Petri erroresque quidam de eo divulgati," *Biblica* 30 (1949) 339-355.
 G. H. Boobyer, "The Indebtedness of 2 Peter to 1 Peter," *New Testament Essays in Memory of T. W. Manson*, London 1959, 34ff.
 E. M. B. Green, *II Peter Reconsidered*, London 1961.
 E. M. Sidebottom, *James, Jude and 2 Peter* (Century Bible), London 1967.

THE STYLE OF THE BOOK OF REVELATION

§ I. THE QUESTION OF SOURCES

It is an important question, how far the style of Revelation may be affected by the sources employed. It seems to some critics like a book of sources, not well disguised, woven loosely together. First, we may eliminate what seem to be hymns or liturgical quotations, for it has been maintained in very recent times that Revelation contains material taken from earlier liturgical works, for example, by E. Siegman ("Apocalypse," in *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, New York 1967). They have been more precisely identified as liturgies of Asia Minor, by S. Läubli ("Eine Gottesdienstruktur in der Johannesoffenbarung," *Theologische Zeitschrift*, 16 [1960] 359-378). Such quotations have been classified as Doxologies (1⁶ 5¹³ 7¹²), "Worthies" (4¹¹ 5^{9,12}) and the Trisagion (4^{8b}), by J. J. O'Rourke ("The Hymns of the Apocalypse," *CBQ* 30 [1968] 399-409). G. Delling however thinks that these are not taken from previous material, but were specially written for the book, and he notes that they are full of OT matter which helped the seer to understand the visions ("Zum Gottesdienstlichen Stil der Johannes-Apokalypse," *Nov.T.* 3 [1959] 107-137).

A notable feature of some passages is Semitic parallelism: 2⁸ 12¹⁰⁻¹² look like fragments of Semitic song, and there is parallelism in 3⁷ 7¹⁵⁻¹⁷; 11¹⁷⁻¹⁸ 19^{8b-8} look like hymns, 15^{3b-4} professes to be a song, and 18 is nearly all poetic.

Besides the liturgical, much of the material is mythological, whether Babylonian (Gunkel), Persian (Bousset), Mandaean Gnostic (Lohmeyer) or Hellenistic astrology (Boll). The OT is never quoted, but much material derives from there and from later Jewish tradition, and this is bound to account in part for the Semitic quality of the language. There are differences of opinion concerning the way this material has been used. On the one hand, it is held that redactors have been at work on the original composition, making interpolations, re-arrangements, and corrections, as indeed has happened to many books in the Bible. On the other hand, the original author himself may have woven the different sources together, Jewish and Jewish Christian.

For instance, the view of Dr. Charles was that the Greek and Hebrew sources include the material in 7¹⁻⁸ 11¹⁻¹³ 12-13 (15⁵⁻⁸?) 17-18. (R. H. Charles, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Revelation of St. John*,

2 vols. ICC Edinburgh 1920, I lxii.) Dr. Charles's more complicated views on authorship (II 144f) were early criticized, justifiably, by Lohmeyer, to the effect that Charles shatters the connection between sources, and then tries to fit them together again in a different way, in order to make a new connection between them (*in loc.* 21⁴).

However, some critics maintain that when the author wove his sources together he imposed upon his book a meaning quite different from that of his sources. Whereas his sources are directed against Rome, I have urged that the final author transferred this attack to faithless Judaism, sometimes omitting to alter his material sufficiently (N. Turner, "The Church's Attitude to the State in the New Testament," *Journal of Theology for Southern Africa*, no. 2, March 1973, 41-52).

There are many doublets in Revelation; cp. e.g. 13^{1-3.8} with 17³⁻⁸; there are parallels between 4-9 and 12-16, and between 12 and 20. If we would argue for the literary unity of the book, we must suppose that the same author drafted two versions which he later welded into a single text. The theory of M.-E. Boismard was along these lines; he held that there had been conflation of two sources, both of them by the apostle John at different times ("L'Apocalypse ou les Apocalypses de S. Jean," *Revue Biblique* 56 [1949] 507-541). The unity of style throughout the book would support such an hypothesis. At any rate, however many the sources and the redactors, the final redactor has been expert enough to weld the material together so as to make it virtually impossible for critics to agree on the size and nature of the various sources. With few exceptions, the style is uniform, but there are signs that 1-3 stand apart from 4-21; for instance, all six of the occurrences of *oun* are in that part of the book, and the figures for the proportion of *de* : : *kai* are quite remarkable, for in 1-3 the proportion is 4 : : 69 (i.e. 1/17), but in 4-21 it is quite otherwise, 8 : : 586 (i.e. 1/73). Dr. Charles regarded chapters 1-3 as an earlier work of the same author. On the whole, the peculiarities of style cut across all hypothetical source-barriers. Thus, no part is exempt from the characteristic "solecisms" of the final author, and his characteristic tendency to redundancy of expression appears everywhere, as will now be shown.

§ 2. SO-CALLED SOLECISMS

Semitisms will be considered later; what are now in question are either errors which are due to the author's failure to revise, or perhaps the foreshadowing of later Greek (cf. A. N. Jannaris, *A Historical Greek Grammar*, London 1897, § 1181 b).

1. Masculine in place of feminine (11⁴ 14¹⁹ 17³) and neuter (4^{8A} 5^{6S})

17^{4S*} 13¹⁴ 21¹⁴ 22^{2A}); feminine in place of masculine (1¹⁵ 14¹); feminine for neuter (19²⁰), but probably the latter is a Hebraism, since *fire* is feminine in Hebrew.

2. Accusative in place of nominative (4⁴ 6¹⁴ 7⁹ 10⁸ 11^{3S*}A 13³); and nominative for accusative (2²⁰ 14¹⁴ 20²); nominative for genitive (2¹³ 3¹² 7⁴ 8⁹ 14¹²); genitive for dative (1¹⁵) and for accusative (21⁹); accusative for genitive (1²⁰); nominative for genitive (1⁵) or for dative (6¹ 9¹⁴). However, the nominative in apposition to genitive, accusative, or dative was reckoned a Hebraism by Charles, despite Moulton's efforts to justify it from the Koine (I cxlix). It might be an Aramaism too.

3. There are the two sense-constructions: "I heard a voice as of a trumpet saying" (*saying* agreeing with *trumpet*) 1¹⁰, and "a reed was given to me saying" (but there is LXX precedent) 11¹.

4. There is the modern Greek use of *gemein* with accusative 17⁴. Most of the "solecisms" have textual variants reflecting the desire of scribes to correct. However, in course of time, some Greek usage followed the author in his use of participles in discord, always the masculine being preferred, until in modern Greek the participle becomes indeclinable.

"An uneducated writer, like the author of Rev, is foreshadowing the language of the future" (*Grammar* III 315). In some papyri texts also, congruance in apposition is neglected: papyri of A.D. 39, 128, 250.

§ 3. REDUNDANCY OF EXPRESSION

While there may be deliberate emphasis in some instances, here are some of the more striking examples of redundancy: 3¹² *to go-out outside*, 18²² v.l. *every craftsman of every craft*, 9⁷ *the appearances of locusts like horses*, 14² *I heard a voice from heaven . . . and the voice which I heard*, 9²¹ *they did not repent of their . . . neither of their . . . neither of their . . . neither of their*, 16¹⁸ *lightnings and voices and thunders*, 9^{1π} *the pit of the abyss*, 8^{7.12} *the third part . . . the third part*, 8⁵ *took . . . and filled*, 14⁸ v.l. *another angel, a second*, 18² *Babylon . . . is fallen, is fallen*, 3⁹ *calling themselves Jews and are not, but they lie*, 16¹⁹ *fury of wrath*, 2⁵ *if not, I will . . . if you do not repent*, 10³¹ *he cried . . . and when he cried, they spoke . . . and when they spoke*.

Instances of polysyndeton are very marked: 5¹² *and . . . and* (six times), 7¹² ditto, 9⁴ *neither any tree nor any flower*. We may consider 2¹³ an example of Hebraic parallel redundancy also, and it has in addition a Hebrew chiasmic pattern of the ABCCBA type:

. . . *where the throne of Satan is,*
and thou keepest my name (martyrdom)
And hast not denied faith in me,

*In the days of Antipas my witness, my faithful one,
Who was slain among you (martyrdom)
Where Satan dwells.*

Ten of these characteristic features are found in the sections which Dr. Charles accepted as various sources (7⁴ 11^{1.3.4} 13^{3.14} 17^{3.4} 18^{2.22}), and they, and other features, indicate the thoroughness with which the final editor, redactor or author has imposed his mark everywhere.

§ 4. GENERAL NATURE OF THE GREEK

The style of Revelation provokes many questions. Do the "solecisms" account entirely for the peculiarity of style? Was the language a translation, or was it Jewish Greek? Or is it not translation Greek so much as Greek influenced by the OT and by Semitic sources, together with "a strong feel for memorable titles, epithets, and phrases of a slogan-like nature" which the author worked into his style, as suggested by P. Trudinger (*Nov.T* 14 [1972] 277-279)?

Was this kind of Greek unique to this particular author? In writing the article on Revelation in the New Peake Commentary, I was of opinion that "he might have been Semitic-speaking, with a very uncertain grasp of Greek; or he may have been feeling his way towards a kind of diction more suitable than the normal kind to the impressive nature of his subject" (*Peake's Commentary on the Bible*, ed. Matthew Black, H. H. Rowley, London 1962, § 915 b). The following evidence makes the second alternative more plausible and tends to show that this new kind of diction was one shared by all the NT writers basically, but to an exaggerated extent in this book.

In one point I find it easy to agree with Dr. Charles, namely, when he discovered Moulton's judgment to be not only extravagant but wrong (I cxliii), for Moulton claimed that "apart from places where he may be translating a Semitic document, there is no reason to believe his grammar would have been materially different had he been a native of Oxyrhynchus, assuming the extent of Greek education to be the same" (*Grammar* I 9). But the style of Revelation is much more distinctive than the papyrus letter: the play on words, e.g. 22^{18f} ἐπιθῆ . . . ἐπιθήσει ὁ θεός, belongs to a natural orator, rather than to the language of the papyrus letters. Howard appears to have followed Moulton in the opinion that this Greek was a mixture of "wealth of diction" and "grammatical solecism," used by its author all his life as a second language and never from choice, yet still somehow retaining the main elements of the unliterary Greek of the papyri, just as "relaxed" as the papyri in its standards of Greek (*Grammar* II 33f). Howard added the thought that the author's mother-tongue was

Aramaic and that he cast his ideas in that language (as witness the resumptive pronoun after a relative, the co-ordination of a participle and a main verb, and *casus pendens*). Howard could not have realized that all these were Hebrew features too. However, Howard did see the influence of the LXX and thus thought that three factors solved the mystery of the language of Revelation: (a) the author thought in Aramaic and wrote in vernacular Greek, (b) he used Hebrew sources, (c) he knew the LXX (*Grammar* II 484f). But since Dr. Charles's studies, one must protest that the Greek of Revelation is not "un-literary," but sophisticated, and that it is not full of solecisms but obeys at least his own self-imposed laws, although these laws need not be interpreted so strictly as Charles does, for he tends to relegate to a source all deviations from these strict rules. The Greek of Revelation may need some mastering, but it can be achieved, especially if the valuable assessment of the grammar by Charles is studied (I cxvii-cxlii). We must therefore ignore all previous grammarians and base our own study on that of Dr. Charles.

I do, however, dissent from Dr. Charles's view that the language of Revelation is absolutely unique in Greek literature. He found it difficult to believe that any other Greek *literary* document "exhibits such a vast multitude of solecisms" (I cxliii). The explanation of the solecisms was said to be, that "while he writes in Greek, he thinks in Hebrew" (I cxliii, just as Howard had claimed for Aramaic), besides the fact that his use of Hebrew sources influenced the style. The author renders some Hebrew expressions quite literally. "He never mastered Greek idiomatically" (I cxliv). But Charles proceeded to admit that the author has a better Greek idiom than the Fourth Gospel. "It is more Hebraic than the LXX itself (cxliv). That is so, but the author has some exclusively Aramaic idioms too, which render it more probable that he used a language in which some Hebrew and some Aramaic idioms were already mingled.

What made the style of Revelation appear unique to Dr. Charles and others is a Semitic quality of Greek, which however is only a matter of degree, not kind, in its difference from that of other Biblical Greek authors. The author uses the idioms more frequently, and I suggest that in his case the services of the usual amanuensis, or some other kind of reviser, were not available, especially if he really were on the remote island of Patmos. The part played by the amanuensis is important in all NT letters. Probably such a helper (in the sense that Josephus uses it) normalized the Greek of the Jews who dictated to him, and in particular this may have been the case with the Gospel and the Epistles of John (cf. J. N. Sanders and B. A. Mastin, *A Commentary on the Gospel according to St. John*, London 1968, 26-29, esp. 28). Burney thought that the Epistles may well have been dictated to an amanuensis

with good knowledge of Greek, who also translated the Fourth Gospel from Aramaic; Revelation was dictated by the same person, but in such Greek as he could muster, after he had gone to live in Asia. We need not be so speculative, but it is well to ponder the rôle of the amanuensis (*Aramaic Origin*, 149-152, esp. 149n.).

Burney pointed to numerous resemblances between the Greek of Revelation and of the Fourth Gospel, but as Charles showed, there are significant differences too, especially in the field of word-order, where Rev has its own rigidly observed rules; thus, as distinct from the F.G., genitives and participial and prepositional phrases never appear between the article and noun. Unlike the F.G., *houtos* always follows its noun (Charles I clvi).

§ 5. ARAMAISMS

There are few Aramaisms which might not also be Hebraisms, although Torrey claimed that Revelation was translated from Aramaic (*The Apocalypse of John*, New Haven 1958, 27-48). Improbable as that may be, some of the sources of the book may have been Aramaic originally. However, the Semitic influence in Revelation is mainly Hebrew.

There is the question of asyndeton to be considered on the other side and it is fairly frequent, especially in the hymns and towards the end of the book: "Thou hast given them blood to drink. They deserve it" (16⁶) is a harsh asyndeton. On the other hand, the only instance of "he answered" (7¹³) has "and" prefixed, which is uncharacteristic of Aramaic (*ānē*), and so too "he/they say" very rarely lack "and" 22²⁰ (C. F. Burney, *Aramaic Origin* 52-54).

The transition-formulae are confined to the very simplest: (*and*) *after this* (7¹ 15⁵; 4¹ 7⁹ 18¹ 19¹ 20⁸), *and* and *and behold*. Asyndeton is frequent enough in Paul and Hebrews; undoubtedly it is a feature of Biblical Greek, even if the vernacular is tending gradually in that direction too (*Grammar* III 340ff). It seems to have entered Biblical Greek from Aramaic, since Hebrew regularly uses "and."

There is a clear Aramaism in the confusion of *ei mē* and *alla* (Black³ 114; *Grammar* III 330; cf. pp. 13, 92, 150). Aramaic *'illā* was sufficiently like Greek *alla*, to become a homonym, and that must have resulted in a blurring of distinctions in Greek. *But* adversative is required in 21²⁷, not *except*, for "those written in the Lamb's book of life" are not "unclean."

The use of 3rd pers. active impersonal may reflect an Aramaism: 12⁶ (cf. pp. 12, 32).

Two cases of some difficulty and doubt should be noted here: 1. *Homoios* followed by accusative instead of the dative, a solecism in Greek: 1¹³ 14¹⁴ and there are scribal corrections to dative in both instances. It was, according to Bousset, "einer der besten Beweise für den gleichmässigen

Sprachcharakter der Apokalypse"; (W. Bousset, *Offenbarung Johannis*: Meyer's Komm. XVI⁶, Göttingen 1906, 388. Cf. also 159-179 "Die Sprache der Apokalypse"). Charles explained it as the equivalent of *hōs*, not only in sense but in construction (I 36f). It cannot be, as is probably often the case, an unrevised mistake of the author's, for he knew well enough the normal construction, but it seems already to have entered the Biblical language, being found in 1 Enoch 21³ exactly parallel. It may be due to Aramaic influence, since that was probably the initial language of this part of 1 Enoch.

2. Burney thought that the common recurrence of *hina* and *hina mē*, which Rev (11 times) shares with Jn, reflected the Aramaic particle *dē* or *dē*, which is often the conjunction *in that, inasmuch as, because, in order that*, and hence the confusion; and he thought that *hina mē* (for *mēpote*) reflected the Aramaic *dēlā that . . . not*, since the LXX retains *mēpote* for the Hebrew *pen* (C. F. Burney, *Aramaic Origin* 69f; cf. p. 13). Reviewers of Burney's work hastily pointed out that *hina* was rapidly replacing the infinitive as time went on, and that *hina mē* for *lest* is tolerable Greek, without however weakening Burney's contention that its spread in Biblical Greek is out of all proportion to that in secular. The consecutive *hina* was admittedly increasing in Greek as a whole; F. Boll believed the phrase *to conquer* (6²) was emphatic and consecutive, as frequently in later Greek: "having conquered and so that he did (in the future) conquer" (also 13¹³). Cf. *Aus der Offenbarung Johannis: hellenistische Studien zum Weltbild der Apokalypse*, Leipzig 1914, 88 n.1. But among Rev's 42 instances of *hina* are some which are truly final and others imperatival (14¹³). Semitic influence cannot be ruled out in view of "the difficulty of finding anywhere but in Biblical books such a variety in the use of *iva*, imperatival, causal, consecutive, exegetical, within so small a space" (*Grammar* III 9). Cf. *Grammatical Insights* 48. W. G. Morrice approves our attribution of 14¹³ and 22¹⁴ to imperatival *hina*: *Bible Translator* 23 (1972) 330.

§ 6. HEBRAISMS

These are more numerous, providing some basis for the theory of a Hebrew original (e.g. R. B. Y. Scott, *The Original Language of the Apocalypse*, Toronto 1928; A. Lancellotti, *Sintassi ebraica nel greco dell' Apocalisse: I. Uso delle forme verbali*, Assisi 1964).

There are some Biblical idioms in sentence construction: 1. One of them is prolepsis of the subject of a subordinate clause (e.g. "I know thee, who thou art"), which though it can be faintly paralleled in secular writers is a clear Hebrew idiom: Gen 1⁴ *God saw the light, that it was good*, 1 Kgs 5³ 11²⁸ 1 Mac 13⁵³ 2 Mac 2¹ al. In Revelation we have 17⁸ *seeing the Beast, that it was and is not*, 3⁹ *I will make them that they. . .*. The idiom is not peculiar to Revelation, but is in Mark, Matthew, Luke-Acts, John and Paul.

2. Another idiom, possibly also Aramaic (Black³ 108), and foreign to non-Biblical Greek, is the partitive expression appearing as subject (11⁹) or object (2¹⁰ 3⁹ 5⁹) of a sentence, and a further Hebrew idiom is the anarthrous participle, without any appositional noun or pronoun,

as object of the sentence (2¹⁴); cf. Lk 3¹⁴, but elsewhere in NT only in quotations. It occurs in Test Abr 109¹⁰ ἰδὼς ἐσθλιόρρα. Cf. Hebrew *mōshīa'* = saviour Isa 19²⁰.

3. There is the question of the Hebrew circumstantial clause (Black³ 87–89), introduced by *waw*, and rendered in Biblical Greek by *kai autos*; it is very frequent in Revelation (3²⁰ 14^{10,17} 17¹¹ 18⁶ 19^{15bis} 21⁷), and also in Luke-Acts and Paul. Rev 3²⁰ *while he sups with me*, 17¹¹ *while he is the eighth*.

4. Typical of the antithetical parallelism of Hebrew poetry is 3⁹ (*calling themselves Jews and are not: but they lie*), like much in the OT, e.g. Dt 28¹³ (*Yahweh will make you the head and not the tail: and you shall tend upwards only and not downwards*).

Verb. 1. There are two passages where what seems like an anacoluthon is understood on the basis of the LXX Ps 24(25)¹⁴. The idiom *tau* with infinitive is a Biblical Greek alternative for the imperative mood, following *le* "jussive" (Hos 9¹³ 1 Chr 9²⁵ Ps 24[25]¹⁴ Eccl 3¹⁵), and so Dr. Charles rendered 12⁷ "Michael and his angels *must* fight" (I 321f), although another suggestion is that a main verb has dropped out. Without the article, we find infinitive for a future finite verb in 13¹⁰ (Hebrew *le* with infinitive again): "If any shall be slain by the sword, by the sword he shall be slain."

2. Moreover, aorist appears for the future in 10⁷, on the basis of the Hebrew *waw* converting the normal perfect to the imperfect, and so it is not "it was fulfilled," but "it shall be fulfilled."

3. The future appears as reflecting the Hebrew frequentative imperfect (4⁹⁻¹⁰ 13⁸ *all the dwellers upon earth kept worshipping him*).

4. The influence of the Hebrew infinitive absolute is seen in 16⁹ (*scorched with a great scorching*), 17⁶ (*I marvelled with great marvelling*), 18⁶ (*double her double*), forming a Biblical Greek idiom not peculiar to Revelation (i.e. Isa 6⁹, Matthew, John, James, 1 Peter), which Burney confessed was not an Aramaism (*Aramaic Origin* 13; also W. B. Stevenson, *A Grammar of Palestinian Jewish Aramaic*, Oxford 1924, 53: infrequent in Palestinian Talmud and Midrashim).

5. There is a striking sentence of only two words in 22⁹, ὄρα μή, as the angel rebukes the seer for worshipping him. No doubt following Blass-Debrunner, R.S.V. supposes *ποιήσης* to be understood ("You must not do that!"). There are no Greek precedents, Biblical or secular, for such an ellipse, and the two words can only be explained as a Hebrew phrase introduced by 'ak = *absolutely*, etc. The LXX rendering of 'ak is ὄρα (-ατε) in Exod 31¹³ Num 1⁴⁹. The brief exclamation is dramatic and means, "Absolutely no!"

Nouns. 1. The singular to denote an object which all people possess is a Hebrew idiom, found also in Paul: *their name for their names* (Rev 13⁸ 17⁸; cf. p. 91). 2. The idiomatic *le* must be considered in

21⁸ where the Biblical Greek dative seems to introduce a new subject after the LXX model (cf. the evidence in Charles II 216). Render, "as for . . ." (R.S.V.). 3. The Hebrew genitive of quality: 13¹ *names of blasphemy* = *blasphemous names*, 3 *wound of death* = *death-blow*, 16³ *soul of life* = *living soul*. 4. The Hebrew superlative is expressed by a genitive: 17¹⁴ 19¹⁶ *lord of lords, king of kings* (OT Dt 10¹⁷). G. Mussies hesitates to accept these as such, referring to Rev 1⁵ 1 Tim 6¹⁵ (where it cannot be superlative) and refers to common practice in the Near East, e.g. "king of kings," "lord of all the gods." But Mussies admits as superlative Lk 1^{50D} Heb 9³ Rev 1¹⁸ etc. (*ages of the ages*), (*The Morphology of Koine Greek*, Leiden 1971, 96f).

Definite Article. Dr. Charles was of the opinion that sometimes Semitic influence (by which he meant Hebrew) may account for breaches in the author's usually careful use of the definite article. The rule is said to be that phrases are anarthrous when they first appear, then articular, except for "conceptions assumed to be familiar in apocalyptic" (especially 10^{1.3}). When this is upset, it is due (according to Charles I cxx) either to the author's use of sources or to his lack of adequate revision. Charles gave instances where he thought that the Hebrew construct state had had some effect: 1²⁰ 6^{7.16} 7^{2.4} 15² 21^{12.14}. However, there are sufficient instances in Revelation where a noun in the construct state retains the article, and many other instances where it is omitted for no good reason (except perhaps rhythm). Thus it is only with reservation that one can find definite rules for the use of the definite article in Revelation. The use is as arbitrary as in all Biblical Greek literature.

Particle οὐ μή. Cf. pp. 33, 69. Rev 2¹¹ 3¹² 7¹⁶ 9⁶ 15⁴ 18^{14.21.23} etc.

Vocabulary 1. The persistence of *gar* (17 times) is a Hebraism (*hê*), not an Aramaism. 2. *Hōs* = *like the sight of* (*hêmar 'ê*) is laboured in Greek: Rev 9⁷ 19¹ LXX Num 9¹⁵ Dan 10¹⁸ where LXX has *hōs*. 3. *ἀπό προσώπου* = *because of*, as very often does the Hebrew *mipp'ne*: Rev 12¹⁴ (Charles I 330). 4. *μετανοέω ἀπό* or *ἐκ* is a Hebraism (*shûbh min*). With *apo*: LXX Jer 8⁶ (quoted in Ac 8²²). With *ek*: Rev 2^{21b.22} 9^{20.21} 16¹¹. 5. *ἐνί* with *κατοικέω* is peculiar to Biblical Greek: Rev 3¹⁰ 6¹⁰ 8¹³ 11¹⁰ 13^{8.14ab} 17⁸ Ac 17²⁸ Herm S 1⁶ Test Abr 79²⁷. It emanates from the Hebrew preposition 'al used with *hā'ares* (note *ἐνί τῆς γῆς* in Rev, LXX Num 13³³⁽³²⁾B al), secular Greek confining itself to the transitive use or to *en, kata*; *en* with *omnumi* is also exclusively a Hebraism: Rev 10⁶, Hebrew *bê* LXX Jg 21⁷ etc. (Helbing 72).

6. *Sōtēria* (=victory) as a translation of *ye'shū'á* (=salvation, victory), is admitted a Semitism by Bauer, since the Hebrew stem has the double meaning, an idea which B. G. Caird pursues (*A Commentary on the Revelation of St. John the Divine*, London 1966, roof).

7. *υἶόν ἄρσεν* (12⁵) recalls the Hebrew idiom of Jer 20¹⁵: *bēn zākār*, *a son, a male*. 8. *To be found* (niph, of *māšâ*) can mean simply *to be*, so that

in Rev we have "no place was found" (12⁸ 20¹¹), "mountains were not found" (16²⁰), "she shall be found no longer" (18²¹). 9. Three meanings of Hebrew *nāthan* appear in the non-secular use of *didonai*, *requite*, *set*, and *appoint*. Thus, *requite*: Ps 27(28)⁴ Rev 2²³ Set: 3⁸ 13¹⁶. *Appoint*: Exod 31⁶ Num 14⁴ Gen 17²⁰ Dt 28¹ Rev 9⁵ (pass: "orders were given"). Cf. Liddell and Scott s.v. Bauer gives P Lille 28, 11, but it is very little to the point, meaning (as normally) *to grant*.

10. *I will throw upon a bed* (2²²) seems meaningless till rendered into Hebrew: "to cause to take to one's bed," i.e. "cause to be ill" (Charles *in loc*).

11. There are two other phrases characteristic of Hebrew: "to avenge the blood of X on (*ek*) Y," unparalleled in secular Greek, is from the OT and was in Christian circulation: Num 31² 1 Kms 24¹³ Visio Pauli 40 Rev 6¹⁰ 19². The other phrase is *in her heart she says* (Rev 18⁷), exactly paralleled in the Greek of Isa 47⁸ (*who say in your heart*), while almost the same is "to know in the heart" (Test Abr 110²³), like the Hebrew *yāda' b'lēbhābh*.

12. Sometimes the secondary meaning of a Hebrew word is rendered by the Greek word which normally is equivalent only to the primary meaning: thus 10¹ *his feet* (for *legs*) *were as pillars of fire*, 1⁵ *firstborn* (for *chief*), 2²⁷ 12⁵ 19¹⁵ *he shall shepherd* (for *break*) *them with a rod of iron*.

Word-order. As in Hebrew, the verb is found in first position after the connecting word in nearly all clauses, main or subordinate, in chapters 1-3 (proportion 79 : : 39), but there is an appreciable difference in the rest of the book, where as often as not the verb fails to be in first position (ch. 4-6 29 : : 21; ch. 18 22 : : 21).

§ 7. SEMITISMS

A large number of constructions appear both in Aramaic and Hebrew.

Parataxis. Dr. Black concedes that "the redundant 'and' introducing the apodosis of a conditional sentence, is almost unknown in Aramaic" (Black³ 67, n.1). There are several constructions involving *kai* which seem to reflect idiomatic uses of *waw*: i.e. *seeing that* (12¹¹ 18³ 19³), adversative *but* (2^{13.21} 3^{1.5.8} Fourth Gospel), introducing the apodosis (3²⁰SQ 10⁷ 14¹⁰), consecutive (3⁷); incidentally here is a chiasmus ABBA *he that opens so that no one shuts, and shuts so that no one opens*.

Parataxis is a mark of untutored speech, but it is also *literary* Semitic, and here we are dealing with literature and not speech. Revelation is addicted to it, and never once uses genitive absolute. Other examples of parataxis: 11³ *I will give my two witnesses, and (final) they shall prophesy*, 15⁵ *I saw, and (=that) the temple was opened*.

The Verb. 1. Burney (94f) noted that the present tense of *erchesthai* is used in Revelation and the Fourth Gospel as the equivalent

of the Aramaic and Hebrew participle, a *futurum instans*. Of other verbs, too, e.g. : Rev 1^{4,7,8} 2^{5,16} 3¹¹ 4⁸ 9¹² 11^{5,9,10,14} 14⁹ 16¹⁵ 22^{7,12,20}.

2. The almost superfluous participles and auxiliary verbs correspond to a Hebrew and Aramaic idiom (e.g. Hebrew *wayyēlēkū wayyēbō'ū* 2 Sam 4⁵. Aramaic *wā'āqūm wa'e'eseh* Dan 8²⁷). In Revelation there is the superfluous *came and* 5⁷ 8³ 17¹ 21⁹ and the superfluous *go (take)* 10⁸, exactly like *lēk qah* in Gen 27¹³; also 16¹ *go (and pour)*; also Matthew and the Fourth Gospel.

3. Then there is also an instance of the periphrastic tense *γίνου γρηγορῶν* (3²) in spite of Black³ 130, who would give the first verb full force, "become watchful"; the verb, however, never has this sense in Revelation.

4. The indeclinable *saying* (Hebrew *lēmōr*, Aramaic *lēmēmar* Ezra 5¹¹) comes here: Rev 4¹ 5¹² 11^{1v.l.} 15^{v.l.} 14^{7v.l.} 19^{6v.l.} Also the indeclinable *having*: 10² 21¹⁴.

5. *I have loved you* (3⁹) is a Hebrew-Aramaic Stative perfect for *I love you* (LXX Isa 43⁴).

6. Another idiom which Revelation shares with the Fourth Gospel is ellipse of the copula in *ὄνομα αὐτῶ* 6⁸ 9¹¹ Jn 1⁶ 3¹.

7. An infinitive or a participle becomes a finite verb in the subsequent clause: (a) infinitive 13¹⁵ (b) participle becoming finite is frequent (*the truth abiding in us and it shall be with us*, 2 Jn² AV, RSV, correctly, Col 1²⁶; Luke-Acts frequently, especially in Western readings), in Revelation "relatively of far more frequent occurrence than in the LXX" (Charles, *Studies in the Apocalypse*, Edinburgh 1913, 91): Rev 1^{5f.18} 2^{2,9,20.23} 3⁹ 7¹⁴ 13¹¹ 14^{2f} 15^{2f} 20^{(4).20}, but S corrects the text at 15^{2f} and 046 al at 1^{5f} 2²⁰. Modern editors often miss the point that this is a Semitism and punctuate differently. Charles cited the authority of S. R. Driver (Tenses § 117) that it was a common practice with Hebrew writers to continue a participial construction by means of finite verbs (*Studies* 89ff; *ICC Rev* I cxlivff). In the LXX, Isa 5^{8,23} Ezek 22³ are rendered into normal Greek, but in Gen 27³³ Isa 14¹⁷ Ps 17(18)^{33,35} the LXX reproduces the Hebrew idiom. In Hebrew, "this change to the finite is necessary, when the additional clause is negative" (Davidson, *Hebrew Syntax*³ 135). On the other hand, W. F. Howard noted that Holden (on Xenophon) cited nine passages in which this construction occurs in Greek (*Grammar* II 428). Howard was compelled to add that the classical examples were not sufficiently like those in Revelation as "to discount Hebraism." But it was C. F. Burney who pointed out that the construction appears in Biblical Aramaic too (e.g. Dan 4²²), so that it must be classed with Hebraisms that may equally well be Aramaisms (*Aramic Origin* 96; also Black³ 68ff, 130).

Case. The nominative is found in apposition to an oblique case very often in Revelation and the Fourth Gospel. It is a mark of

Biblical literature as well as of untutored speech: Rev 1⁵ 2^{13,20,26} (*he who keeps my words, I will give to him*), 3^{12,21} (*he who overcomes, I will give to him*), 6⁸ 8⁹ 9¹⁴ 14¹² 20² (also Matthew, Luke-Acts, John, LXX Exod 9⁷. Cf. Charles I cxlix).

Pronoun. 1. The pleonastic pronoun after a relative is a Semitic construction, rare in the Koine but common in the NT: *which no one is able to shut it, and where she is to be nurtured there* (the first kind: Rev 3⁸ 7^{2,9} 12⁶ 13^{8,12} 20⁸. The second: 12¹⁴ 16¹⁹ 17⁹. Cf. Thackeray, *Grammar* 46. Similarly, Rev 2²⁶ 3^{12,21} *he that conquers I will give to him*, 6⁸ *he that . . . his name*, 2⁷ *to him that conquers . . . to him*, etc.).

2. The oblique cases of *autos* (which except in the "source," ch. 18, never precedes the noun) are very numerous, once in three lines of the Nestle text, which is more than most books of the NT, but not remarkably so.

I Acts has one in one, the We sections one in seven, the rest of II Acts one in five, Paul one in nine, the papyri one in 13. Outside the NT, Jewish Greek has about the same proportion: T Abr one in three, T Sol one in four, LXX Gen 1-4 one in three, 4 Kms 1-4 one in two, lines.

Prepositions. 1. *Enōpion* which occurs 34 times, is found infrequently in the Koine, but its common recurrence here has obviously nothing to do with that, but is influenced either by the Hebrew *liphnē* or (less naturally) the Aramaic *qōdām* (Dan 2^{2,9,10,11,24,25} al). The distribution is uniform through the book, but it is to be noted that there are no examples in ch. 17 or 18 ("sources," according to Charles) while they are in nearly all the other chapters (cf. p. 145).

2. Also Semitic are ἀπὸ προσώπου (6¹⁶ 12¹⁴) and ἐμπροσθεν (4⁶ 19¹⁰ 22⁸).

3. The instrumental *en* is very frequent in Revelation. Moulton and Geden consider it to be present in 32 instances, as compared with the rest of the NT as follows: Mark 10, Matthew nine, Luke seven, Acts three, Hebrews three, 2 Peter one. Though reluctant to accept so arbitrary a selection, for I believe that Paul also has his share of instrumental *en*, yet the abundance in Revelation is remarkable (cf. N. Turner, "The Preposition *en* in the New Testament," *Bible Translator* 10 [1959] 118f). Both Hebrew and Aramaic have *bē* in this sense, and although the Koine was using it, too, to a less extent, this evidence must confirm the rest, to show that the author of Revelation writes the same kind of Semitic Greek as several other NT authors; the difference is in the degree to which he takes it.

4. A usage of *en* about which there can be little doubt is the Semitic construction which renders literally the *beth pretii* (Rom 3²⁵ 5⁹ Rev 5⁹): *at the cost of his blood* (N. Turner, 119).

5. The repetition, *between . . . between* 5⁶, is a Semitic idiom (*bēn . . . ūbēn*) found constantly in the LXX (e.g. Gen 1⁴).

Numerals. 1. The cardinal appears for the ordinal in 6¹ (*the first of*, not *one of* as RSV), 9¹² *the first woe*. "It is Jewish Greek" (Black³ 124), and it is not peculiar to Revelation (cf. p. 91). 2. "One" as the indefinite article may be Hebrew or Aramaic (Hebrew *'ahadh*, Aramaic *hadh*, Dan 2³ al) Rev 5⁵ 7¹³ 8¹³ 9¹³ 17¹ 18²¹ 19¹⁷ 21⁹.

Word-order. 1. In Revelation, as in Biblical Greek generally, the adjective may occur between the article and noun but more often after the noun with repeated article. In Revelation the prepositional phrase, like the dependent genitive and the participial phrase, never occurs between the article and noun. There is one instance (1¹⁰) and a further two in Charles's "sources," where the adjective does not follow its articular noun (13¹² 18²¹). So Revelation differs from Biblical Greek as a whole only perhaps in the extent of its Semitism, and not in the kind of Semitism.

2. Co-ordinating particles tend not to be in second place in Biblical Greek, following the Semitic order. The proportion of first-place particles to second-place in Revelation is impressive (1 : 0.05), much nearer to Semitic than even LXX Gen 1-4 (1 : 0.16), Tob B 1-4 (1 : 0.18). Contrast the secular Ptolemaic papyri (1 : 2) and Philostratus (1 : 5). Indeed, co-ordinating particles (apart from *kai*) are comparatively rare in Revelation: *gar* = Hebrew *kî* 17, *oun* 6 (all in Rev 1-3), *tote* 0, *men* 0, *te* 1, *alla* 13, total 37.

About the same length as Rev are Heb, Jas, 1 Pet, for which the figures respectively are 118, 24, 4, 24, 22, 37, total 229. Mk, which is slightly longer, has 67, 5, 9, 5, 0, 45, total 131.

Vocabulary. 1. *καρπὸς ποίεω* (22²) may be a Hebrew idiom, since *'āsāh* means *yield* as well as *make*, but the idiom is "found in Aramaic, perhaps in imitation of the Hebrew," or it may come from the Hebrew via the LXX (Black³ 138f).

2. Shared by Paul is *ἐξουσία ἐπί* a very unusual expression in Greek, clearly influenced by the construction with *memshālā* (Hebrew) or *shallit* (Aramaic).

With genitive: LXX Dan 3⁹⁷⁽³⁰⁾ 1 Cor 11¹⁰ Rev 2²⁶ 11^{6b} 14¹⁸. With accusative: LXX Sir 33¹⁹ (30²⁸) Lk 9¹ Rev 6⁸ 13⁷. With dative: LXX Dan 4²³ (Aram). The verb (not noun) has *epi* c. accus at LXX Neh 5¹⁶ rendering *shāl'tū 'al*. In these instances in Rev and two in Test Abr (87¹² 93⁹) the authors may be doing justice to the Hebrew *'al*. That *'al* was used with this stem (*shālat*) is shown by Neh 5¹⁵. For the possibility of Aramaic influence too, cf. Dan 2⁴⁸ (*'al*).

3. Shared by Mark, John and Colossians is *ποιέω* (c. infinitive or *īva*) causative (Hebrew hiphil, Aramaic aphel): Rev 3⁹ 13^{12,15,16} Test Abr 110²⁰ Mk 1¹⁷ and LXX. The verb in the causative sense is admittedly

found, rarely, in classical authors and papyri, but never, so far as known, with *hina*.

4. Semitic languages prefer the positive with simple *not* to a more complex negative expression (Burney, *Aramaic Origin* 98). Thus, *nās oš* expressed *no one*, like Hebrew *kōl . . . lō* and Aramaic *kōl . . . lā*: Rev 7¹⁶ 18²² 21²⁷ 22³. Cf. Paul (Rom 3²⁰ quot., Gal 2¹⁶ quot.), Eph 4²⁹ 5⁵ Mk 13²⁰ Lk 1³⁷ 2 Pet 1²⁰ 1 Jn 2²¹.

5. An obviously Semitic phrase is "and behold": Rev 4^{1.2} 6^{2.5.8} 7⁹ 12³ 14^{1.14} 19¹¹ 22⁷.

Other Literature :

- H. B. Swete, *The Apocalypse of St. John*³, London 1909.
 F. Boll, *Aus der Offenbarung Johannis : hellenistische Studien zum Weltbild der Apokalypse*, Leipzig 1914 (especially Anhang 1: "Zur eschatologischen Rede Jesu" 130-136).
 E. Lohmeyer, *Die Offenbarung des Johannes* (HZNT 16) 1926, 2nd ed. 1953.
 J. Freundorfer, *Die Apokalypse und die hellenistische Kosmologie und Astrologie* (B.St. XXIII 1) 1929.
 E. B. Allo, *St. Jean, L'Apocalypse*³, Paris 1935, CXXIX-CLIV (Language).
 R. J. Brewer, "The Influence of Greek Drama upon the Apocalypse," *ATR* 18 (1936) 74-92.
 J. J. Turmel, *L'Apocalypse*, Paris 1938.
 P. Gaechter, "Semitic Literary Forms in the Apocalypse and their Import," *Theological Studies* 8 (1947) 547-573.
 J. Schmid, *Studien zur Geschichte des griechischen Apokalypse-Textes*, II (Münchener Theologische Studien, 1 Supplement (1955) 173ff.
 A. Lancellotti, *Sintassi ebraica nel Greco dell'Apocalisse*, Assisi 1964.
 E. H. Peterson, "Apocalypse: the medium is the Message," *Theology Today* 26 (1969) 133-141.

Other General Works on Style

- M. Jousse, *Études de psychologie linguistique. Le style oral, rythmique et mnémotechnique chez les verbo-moteurs*, Paris 1921.
 A. Wifstrand, *Stylistic Problems in the Epistles of James and Peter* (Studia Theologica, Lund 1, 1947) 170-182.
 E. Pax, "Beobachtungen zum biblischen Sprachtabu," *Studii Biblici Franciscani Liber Annuus* 12 (1962) 66-112.
 E. Kamlah, *Die Form der katalogischen Paränese im Neuen Testament*, Tübingen 1964.
 E. Pax, "Stylistische Beobachtungen an neutralen Redewendungen im Neuen Testament," *Studii Biblici Franciscani Liber Annuus* 17 (1967) 335-347.
 L. Rydbeck, *Fachprosa, vermeintliche volkssprache und Neues Testament*,

Zur Beurteilung der sprachlichen Niveauunterschiede im nachklassischen Griechisch (Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, 5) Uppsala 1967.*

- H. Thesleff, "Besprechung des Buches von L. Rydbeck," *Gnomon* 42 (1970) 551-555.
- P. J. du Plessis, "The Meaning of Semantics for the Exegesis of the New Testament," (in Afrikaans), *Hermeneutica* 1970, 57-64.
- O. Linton, "Le *parallelismus membrorum* dans le Nouveau Testament," *Mélanges Bibliques en hommage au R.P. Bêda Rigaux*, Gembloux 1970, 489-507.

* This book deserves close study, especially as our two viewpoints are apparently at variance. Rydbeck refers to my raising the question whether NT Greek is a "Spezialsprache," and he seeks to demonstrate its close relationship with contemporary secular Greek. Using a somewhat choice selection of tests, he urges that each NT author stands more or less in a class by himself, and further, that all of them stand over against the non-literary Koine on the one hand, and the literary Koine on the other, forming part of a third class comprising (a) the not-so-unliterary papyri, (b) popular philosophic literature, and (c) technical writings, e.g. the Corpus Hippocraticum. While resisting anything more than a superficial resemblance of NT style with that of contemporary authors, I would still question whether, even on this basis, Rydbeck is justified in placing (e.g.) Luke-Acts and Hebrews in this middle category, for which they are too "literary," and in placing (e.g.) Mark and John there too, since they are too careless of even moderately "literary" standards. The range of NT styles, in fact, is too extensive for their classification together as one category of contemporary Greek, while their varying distinction from all contemporary styles is too great to be passed over.

This page intentionally left blank

SUBJECT INDEX

- adjective, position, 23f, 55, 94f, 110f, 119
- allegory, 87, 108
- alliteration, 107, 140
- amanuensis, 80, 82, 84, 88, 99f, 104, 127, 130, 149
- anacolutha, 86, 142, 146f
- antiptosis, 109
- antithesis, 96f, 101, 133, 140, 152
- Apocalypse of Enoch, 140
- Apologists, 103
- aposiopesis, 83
- Apostolic Fathers, 87, 103
- aorist for future, 152
- aorist imperative, 128
- article, definite, 21, 33, 119, 129, 153
- Assumption of Moses, 140
- asyndeton, 12, 31, 70, 85, 108, 117, 133, 136, 140, 150
- atticizing, 100
- atticizing scribes, 39
- attributive genitive, position, 17, 96, 137, 141, 143
- auxiliary verb, 20, 35, 52, 72
- B.&F.B.S. *Diglot*, 18
- believe in*, 16
- Bezae, codex, 30
- bilingual, 7, 136
- Bunyan, 57
- casus pendens, 21, 34, 53, 71, 86, 137, 149
- chiasmus, 3, 65, 87, 97f, 116, 147
- Christian language, 16f, 62f, 76, 110, 120, 126f, 137, 139
- circumstantial clauses, 152
- Clementine Homilies, 54
- colourful language, 40
- construct state, 33, 69, 110, 118, 129, 140, 143, 153
- Coptisms, 113
- dativus commodi, 90
- diatribe, 81f, 96, 107, 114f
- digressions, 86
- diminutives, 28
- doublets, 146
- ellipse, 83, 85, 107, 129, 155
- Ephesians, style of, 84f
- epidiorthosis, 83
- epistle, 83, 116
- Gattung*-criticism, 87f
- genitive absolute, 39, 59, 99, 141
- genitive before noun, 17, 110, 119
- genitive of quality, 48f, 90, 110, 118, 129, 142f, 153
- genitive, subjective or objective, 84
- Gospel of Thomas, 54
- Hellenistic religious terms, 141
- higher Koine, 101, 102, 115
- historic present, 20, 35
- homily, 82, 84, 87, 88, 108
- hymn, Christian, 87, 96, 101, 103, 123, 125, 145
- imperative *hina*, 23, 73, 136, 151
- impersonal plural, 12, 32, 35, 46, 89
- impersonal verb, 129, 150
- infinitive absolute, 15, 33, 47f, 69, 84, 89, 118, 129, 135, 142f, 152
- infinitive, articular, 16, 43, 47, 67, 90, 109f, 117, 152
- infinitive, imperatival, 48, 89
- instrumental *en*, 22
- irony, 83
- Latinisms, 29f, 104, 129
- letters, Hellenistic, 132, 134

- mannerisms, 26
 Matthew and Mark, Semitic quality
 compared, 37f
 metaphor, 83, 85, 87
 metre, 106, 140
 midrash, Christian, 108
Mischsprache, 78
 mistranslation, 11, 14, 74
moult, circumlocution with, 84, 104
- negative, strong, 33, 69, 153
 negatives, redundant, 26
 nominative, in apposition to accusative,
 119, 147
 nominative, indicating time, 17
 numerals, 54, 91
- optatives, 62f, 128
 ossuaries, 8
- paraenesis, 88, 113, 116, 122, 126, 134
 paraklesis, 83, 88
 paralipsis, 83
 parallelism, 82, 83, 96f, 101, 118, 133,
 134, 140, 145, 152
 parataxis, 19, 34, 50f, 71, 81, 99, 137,
 140
 parenthesis, 26, 85, 107
 paronomasiae, 117
 participle, anarthrous, as subject or
 object, 47, 117
 participle, for main verb, 12, 72, 137,
 155
 participles, heaped up, 26, 90, 124
 participle, imperatival, 89, 128
 participles, negative, 77, 127
 participles, co-ordinating, 17, 96
 particles in Hebrews, 111
 particles in John, 74f
 particles, Matthew's large use, 38
 particles in Pastorals, 103
 particles, position, 96, 111, 119
 partitive expression, 15, 46, 70, 137,
 151f
 passive voice, 12, 70
 periphrastic tenses, 20f, 34, 52, 72, 128,
 137
 physiognomical expressions, 16, 49, 69,
 92, 111, 156
 pleonastic *thus*, 23
 polysyndeton, 147
 positive degree, 22
 prepositions, compound, 93
 prepositions, John's use, 75f
- prepositions, Matthew's use, 36f
 preposition, repetition of, 21, 93
 prepositional phrase, between article
 and noun, 139, 141, 157
 prodiorthosis, 83
 prolepsis, 12, 16, 33, 36, 47, 69, 70, 93,
 151
 pronouns, personal and demonstrative
 confused, 53
 pronouns, reflexive, 16, 32, 36
 pronouns, resumptive, 21, 36, 53, 66,
 72, 156
 pronouns, superfluous, 35f
 Psalms of Solomon, 49
- question, for condition, 34
 Qumran, 7, 8, 68, 84, 88
- rabbinical parallels, 14, 21, 66, 68, 102,
 109, 140
 redundancy, 19, 26, 32, 39f, 52, 60, 89f,
 93, 139, 141, 147, 155
 reflexive, Aramaic, 32, 36
 reflexive *nepshesh* and *psuche*, 16
 relative attraction, 59
 rhythm, 80, 84, 106, 124, 139, 140
- sayings-source, 64
 Septuagint, *passim*
 signs-source, 65
 singular for general objects, 91, 152
 stative perfect, 33, 155
 Stoicism, 81f
 synchrisis, 109
 synonyms, 76f, 127, 133
- Targums, 6, 68
 tenses in John, 77
 Testament of Abraham, 13, 49, 52, 53,
 54, 67, 78, 111
 Testament of Solomon, 53, 78
 Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs,
 126, 143
 trajectory, 85, 86, 94
 typology, 87
- verb, position, 18f, 94
 vernacularisms, 38f, 58
- Western Text, 13, 21, 22, 30
 word-order, *passim*
- zeugma, 82, 83

INDEX OF NAMES

- Abbott, T. K., 85
 Abel, F.-M., 30, 54, 86
 Aland, K., 114
 Alford, H., 109
 Allen, W. C., 14, 16, 20, 38, 39
 Argyle, A. W., 9
 Aristotle, 106, 139, 142
 Arrian, 81
- Bahr, G. J., 99
 Barrett, C. K., 64, 67
 Bauer, W., 50, 60, 118, 153, 154
 Beare, F. W., 121, 122ff, 127ff
 Benoit, P., 56
 Beyer, K., 70, 105
 Bigg, C., 123f, 127ff, 139f, 142f
 Biesenthal, J. H. R., 112
 Bion, 82
 Birkeland, H., 9
 Bjerkehund, C. J., 83
 Black, M., 5, 12ff, 16, 19ff, 30ff, 36, 45,
 53, 64, 70ff, 78, 97, 112, 120, 137, 151,
 152, 154, 157
 Blass-Debrunner, 152
 Bligh, W., 97
 Bobichon, M., 6
 Boismard, M.-E., 122, 123, 146
 Boll, F., 135, 151
 Bonsirven, J., 109
 Boobyer, G. H., 140
 Borgen, P., 88
 Bornemann, W., 122
 Bousset, W., 135, 150
 Brooke, A. E., 132, 134
 Brown, R. E., 65
 Brown, S., 6
 Bruce, F. F., 113
 Burkill, T. A., 20, 27, 30
 Burney, C. F., 11, 13, 14, 34, 67, 71, 73,
 93, 136, 149, 150, 151, 152, 154, 155,
 158
- Butler, B. C., 5
 Bultmann, R., 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 71,
 73, 74, 80, 81, 88, 93, 126
- Cadbury, H. J., 57
 Caird, B. G., 153
 Chantraine, P., 21
 Charles, R. H., 61, 101, 146ff, 151ff,
 154, 155, 156, 157
 Cleanthes, 80
 Clement, of Alexandria, 82, 106
 Clement, of Rome, 48, 116
 Collins, J., 97
 Colwell, E. C., 6, 73, 91
 Couchoud, P. L., 30
 Coutts, J., 121
 Creed, J. M., 57, 59, 60
 Cross, F. L., 84, 122
- Dalman, G., 15
 Davidson, A. B., 19, 34, 135, 155
 Deissmann, A., 17, 83, 90
 Delling, G., 135
 Demosthenes, 4
 de Zwaan, J., 20, 62
 Dibelius, M., 84, 115, 118, 120, 132
 Dio Chrysostom, 81
 Dodd, C. H., 64, 114, 132
 Dover, K. J., 1, 18
 Driver, S. R., 19, 72, 155
- Emerton, J. A., 9
 Epictetus, 57, 66, 81, 82, 83, 102, 107,
 140
 Epicurus, 82
 Epimenides, 96
- Fitzmyer, J., 6
 Funk, R. W., 134
- Giavini, G., 98

- Grayston, K., 102
 Grundman, H., 61
 Guilding, A., 108
 Gundry, R. H., 8

 Harrison, P. N., 101, 103
 Helbing, J., 50, 112, 153
 Herdan, G., 102
 Héring, J., 107, 110, 111
 Herodotus, 18, 53
 Higgins, A. J. B., 9
 Hitchcock, F. R. M., 102
 Hort, F. J. A., 127
 Howard, G., 109
 Howard, W. F., 11, 13, 49, 56, 60, 71,
 72, 76, 132, 134, 148, 149, 155
 Hunkin, J., 20

 Irenaeus, 7
 Isocrates, 106

 Jannaris, A. N., 146
 Jerome, 5, 7
 Jewett, J., 80
 Johannessohn, M., 19
 Josephus, 8, 48, 55, 56, 87, 100, 115,
 119, 124, 139, 142

 Kahane, P., 8
 Kautzsch, E., 18, 19
 Kehl, N., 98
 Kelly, J. N. D., 104
 Kirby, J. C., 84
 Kistemaker, S., 109
 Kittel, G., 114, 115
 Kümmel, W. G., 56, 108, 112, 133, 135

 Lagrange, M.-J., 5, 12, 13, 19, 20, 71
 Lamsa, G. M., 5
 Lancellotti, A., 151
 Läuchli, S., 145
 Léon-Dufour, X., 65
 Lifshitz, B., 8
 Lightfoot, J. B., 82
 Lock, W., 102, 103
 Lohmeyer, E., 15, 135, 146
 Lohse, E., 123, 124
 Lund, N. W., 87, 97

 Malherbe, A. J., 81, 82
 Manson, T. W., 14, 67, 136
 Manson, W., 112
 Mastin, B. A., 149
 Martin, R. A., 57
 Martin, R. P., 97, 122

 Mayor, J. B., 115, 116, 117, 120, 139,
 140, 141
 Mayser, E., 24, 47, 59, 75, 95, 96
 McCown, C. C., 49
 Menander, 96, 140
 Meyer, A., 117
 Milligan, G., 83
 Mitton, C. L., 84
 Moffatt, J., 101, 106, 107, 109
 Morrice, W. G., 23, 73, 151
 Moule, C. F. D., 122
 Moulton, J. H., 13, 49, 57, 60, 88, 89,
 132, 147, 148
 Moulton and Milligan, 49
 Mullins, T. Y., 83
 Mussies, G., 7, 153

 Norden, E., 60, 81, 82, 86, 94, 99, 106,
 115

 Oepke, A., 17
 O'Rourke, J. J., 135

 Parker, P., 5
 Percy, E., 90
 Perdelwitz, R., 121
 Pernot, H., 66, 74
 Philo, 82, 107, 108, 115, 116, 124, 139,
 142
 Philostratus, 23, 24, 72, 110, 111, 119
 Phrynichus, 60, 96
 Plato, 80
 Plummer, A., 56, 57
 Plutarch, 57, 115, 139, 142
 Polemon of Ilion, 82
 Polybius, 57, 96
 Preisker, H., 122, 124

 Rabin, C., 108
 Radermacher, L., 16, 49, 90
 Rawlinson, A. E. J., 11, 28
 Rife, J. M., 24
 Robertson, A. T., 88
 Roetzel, C., 88
 Robinson, J. M., 87, 98
 Ropes, J. H., 114, 115, 116, 118
 Ruckstuhl, E., 66
 Rydbeck, L., 12, 157

 Sanders, E. P., 30, 31, 34, 35, 36, 40, 41,
 57
 Sanders, J. N., 84, 149
 Schenkl, H., 81
 Schlatter, A., 7

- Schubert, P., 83
Schweizer, E., 66, 67
Scott, R. B. Y., 151
Selwyn, E. G., 123, 124, 127
Seneca, 81
Sevenster, J. N., 8, 100
Siegman, E., 145
Simcox, W. H., 61, 109
Simpson, E. K., 104
Sophocles, 66
Sparks, H. F. D., 56
Spicq, C., 109, 113, 121
Stachowiak, L. R., 88
Stendhal, K., 36
Stevenson, W. B., 152
Strobel, F. A., 122, 123
Swete, H. B., 15, 27
Swetnam, J., 108
- Taylor, V., 10, 11, 12, 13, 16, 19, 20, 22,
26, 27, 30
Thackeray, H. St. J., 8, 15, 20, 46, 48,
90
Thornton, T. C. G., 122
- Thrall, M., 96
Thucydides, 16, 24, 53, 110, 129
Thyen, H., 106, 107, 108
Torrey, C. C., 5, 11, 13, 14, 150
Trudinger, P., 148
Turner, C. H., 12, 26
Turner, N., 17, 24, 56, 95, 146, 156
- Ullendorff, E., 74
- Wensinck, A. J., 14, 21, 22
Westcott, B. F., 107, 108
Wilcox, M., 12, 50, 56, 62
Williams, R. R., 84
Wilson, R. McL., 113
Wilson, W. G., 132
Winer-Moulton, 15
Woolcombe, K. W. J., 87
Wuellner, W., 87
- Xenophon, 53
- Zerwick, M., 17, 26, 43, 128

INDEX OF SEMITIC, GREEK AND LATIN WORDS

- 'ak, 152
 'āmar, 31
 'ašher lô, 21, 72
 'aḥadh, 35, 72, 157
 'illâ, 13, 150
- abba, 5, 9, 57
 agalliasis, 62
 aiōnes, 91
 aischunesthai apo, 136
 alisgēma, 62
 alla, 13, 74, 92, 103, 150
 alleluia, 9
 anēr (indef.), 35
 amen, 9, 57
 antapodoma, 62
 anthrōpos (indef.), 35, 72, 91
 ara oun, 84
 autos (oblique cases), 21, 53, 56, 64, 91,
 119, 156
- Barnabas, 9
 bayyāmīm hāhēm, 16
 Beelzebub, 33, 57
 berakah, 84
 Boanerges, 9
- Cananaean, 57
 Cephas, 9
 consilium facere, 29
- dābhār, 49
 dē, 14, 15, 70, 72, 73, 151
 dī, 52, 74, 151
 doxa, 69
 duci eum iussit, 29
- ean mē, 13
 egeneto, 47
 ei (interrogative), 54, 92
- ei mē, 13, 92, 150
 eis (great load in Mk), 28
 eis to, 90
 ek ("some of"), 15, 46, 137, 151
 ekeinos, 25, 66, 95
 eloi . . ., 5
 elpizein epi, 130
 elthōn (redundant), 84, 89
 en (Christian), 17, 22, 137
 en tō, 47, 90
 enōpion, 49, 69, 92, 111, 119, 156
 ephphatha, 5, 9
 epi to auto, 62
 erōtān, 69
 euthus, 29
 exousia epi, 93, 157
- gehenna, 57
 genua ponere, 29
 Golgotha, 57
- ḥadh, 35, 72, 157
 hamartanein, 60, 93
 hā'ōlām hazzē, 108
 ḥāphēš bē, 16, 93
 h*awā, 52
 heis, 35
 heis . . . heis, 36
 hen, 13
 heneka (-en), 96
 hina, 38, 73, 74, 130, 135
 hina (causal), 130
 hina (epexegetic), 23, 36
 hina (imper.), 23, 73, 92, 136
 hina mē, 13, 151
 hōs (like the sight of), 153
 hōs (when), 66, 70, 74
 hosanna, 57
 hōsper, hoste, 103
 hotan, 39, 74, 135

- hoti, 29, 45, 66
 hoti (recit.), 29, 52
 hoti (when), 70
 houtos, 66, 95, 150
 hupagein, 14

 idou, 53, 60
 incipere, 20
 iter facere, 29

 yāda' b'e'lēbhābh, 154
 y'l, 20
 yôm wāyôm, 92
 ysp, 15, 48

 kai autos, 152
 kata prosōpon, 92
 katenanti, 13, 92
 kathōs, 74, 130, 133
 katoikein, 50
 kī, 52, 153
 kī 'im, 92
 kōl . . . lô, 158

 lambanein, 71
 legion, 30
 lēlōhīm, 91
 lēmādhī, 13
 lēmōr, 52, 155
 l'e'ēnī, 49
 l'e'ōlām, 16
 l'equbhla, 36
 l'ewāth, 13, 71, 93
 limmūdhī Yahweh, 90
 liphnē, 16, 69, 92, 156
 lô . . . kol, 73
 logisthēnai, 93
 loipon, 13, 92
 lutrōtes, 62

 mah-lī wālāk, 17, 68
 mammon, 57
 marana tha, 5, 9
 m'ēla, 14
 membrana, 104
 men . . . de, 38, 59, 75, 103
 mēpote, 13, 151
 mikk' an, 13

 nāsā pānīm, 127

 omnium en, 153
 oros, 14
 ou mē, 33, 69, 153

 'āsā 'emeth, 135

 palin, 29, 32, 38
 pas, 95, 104, 130, 136
 pascha, 9, 57
 peripatein, 69, 93
 pist'e'qā, 14
 pistis/pisteuein eis/en, 74, 93, 104, 127
 plērōma, 14
 poiein, 14
 poiein hina, 73, 90
 polis, 74
 polla, 13, 38, 92, 117
 pro prosōpou, 16
 pros (with verbs of speaking), 28, 54,
 III
 pros (with), 13, 71, 93

 rabbi, 57
 rabboni, 5, 57
 rationes conferre, 30
 rhēma, 49
 rsh, 16

 satan, 57
 satisfacere, 29
 shāri, 20, 46
 shūbh, 60, 153
 sikera, 57
 sōtēria, 153
 splagchna, 93
 splagchnizesthai, 50, 60

 talitha cum, 5, 9
 thl, 20
 ti emoi kai soi, 68
 ti gar emoi, 92
 tote, 46
 țura, 14

 verberibus recipere, 29

 way'hi 'fsh, 68
 wayya'an w, 51, 69
 wayyēlek, 51

SELECTIVE INDEX OF NEW TESTAMENT REFERENCES

	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
<i>Matthew</i>		10 ²⁵	33, 33	20 ³¹	38
1 ¹⁸	39	10 ²⁹	42	21 ¹⁹	33, 35
1 ²⁰	33, 39	11 ¹	43	21 ²³	35, 39
1 ²³	34	11 ⁸	35	21 ²⁸	35
2 ¹⁰	33, 48	11 ¹⁹	35	21 ³²	43
2 ¹³	33, 43	12 ⁴	92	21 ⁴¹	38
2 ²³	43, 74	12 ¹¹	35, 35	22 ²	33
3 ⁴	36	12 ¹²	33	22 ⁴	32
3 ¹⁰	43	12 ²⁴	37	22 ¹¹	35
3 ¹²	21, 36	12 ²⁵	37	22 ²⁵	31
3 ¹³	43	12 ³⁵	33	23 ²	33
4 ¹	39	12 ⁴¹	35	23 ⁹	32
4 ³	36, 38	12 ⁴²	31, 33	23 ³¹	32
4 ⁸	32	12 ⁴³	35	23 ³⁴	32
4 ¹⁷	32	13 ¹⁹	37	24 ³⁶	92
4 ²⁵	43	13 ²⁰	37	24 ⁴⁰	36
5 ¹	39	13 ²⁴	33	24 ⁴⁵	34
5 ¹⁵	32, 33	13 ²⁶	43	25 ⁸	32
5 ¹⁸	33	13 ²⁸	35	25 ¹⁴	31
5 ²⁰	33	13 ³¹	35	25 ²²	31
5 ²⁶	33	13 ⁴⁴	35	25 ²⁴	33, 35, 69
6 ¹²	33	13 ⁴⁵	35	26 ²³	37
6 ¹⁴	31	13 ⁵²	35	26 ²⁵	45
6 ¹⁹	36	14 ²⁰	32	26 ⁵¹	35
7 ⁹	35	14 ³¹	33	26 ⁶³	38
7 ¹²	36, 43	14 ³⁶	38	27 ¹⁴	36
7 ²⁴	35	15 ⁵	33	27 ¹⁷	39
7 ²⁶	35	15 ¹¹	37	27 ³²	35
8 ¹	39	15 ²⁸	32	27 ⁴²	37
8 ⁵	39	15 ²⁹	33	27 ⁴⁴	43
8 ⁹	35	16 ¹⁸	38	27 ⁴⁸	35, 35
8 ¹⁵	39	16 ²²	33	27 ⁵⁷	35
8 ²²	39	17 ¹⁴	35	27 ⁶⁰	39
8 ²⁹	17	17 ¹⁸	32	28 ¹⁰	36, 38
9 ²	33	17 ²⁷	32, 36		
9 ⁹	35	18 ¹⁴	36		
9 ¹⁰	35	18 ¹⁵	36	<i>Mark</i>	
9 ¹⁷	35	18 ¹⁹	32, 33	1 ²	16
9 ¹⁸	39	18 ²⁰	32, 36	1 ⁷	21
9 ²²	32	18 ²³	30, 35	1 ⁸	16
9 ²⁵	39	18 ²⁴	32, 35, 39	1 ⁹	16
9 ³²	35	19 ³	40	1 ¹¹	16
10 ⁶	49	19 ²²	31	1 ¹⁵	16
10 ¹¹	21, 36	20 ⁸	32	1 ²³	22

	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
1 ²⁴	16, 16	8 ²	17	16 ⁸	26
1 ³¹	26	8 ³¹	22	16 ^{9,20}	11
1 ³⁴	21	8 ³⁶	16		
1 ⁴¹	26	8 ³⁸	22		
1 ⁴⁴	26	9 ⁸	13, 26	<i>Luke</i>	
2 ¹⁻¹²	11	9 ¹⁹	13	1 ¹⁵	57
2 ²	26	9 ²⁰	28	1 ²⁹	62
2 ⁷	22	9 ³⁷	15	1 ³⁶	53
2 ⁸	22	9 ³⁸	27	1 ³⁸	62
2 ¹¹	58	9 ⁴³	22	1 ⁴⁶	50
2 ¹³	26	10 ¹⁸	22	1 ⁵¹	50
2 ^{15f}	18	10 ²⁶	29	1 ⁵⁸	50, 50
2 ²¹	14	10 ⁴⁰	13	1 ⁶²	62
2 ²³	29	10 ⁵¹	23	1 ⁷⁰	55
2 ²⁴	22	11 ¹	22	1 ⁷²	50
3 ⁸	29	11 ¹⁴	26	2 ³	55
3 ⁷	21	11 ²⁸	23	2 ⁹	47
3 ¹³	14	11 ³¹	29	2 ²⁶	52, 59
3 ²⁰	26	11 ³²	16	2 ³¹	49
3 ²⁷	26	12 ²	15	2 ³⁸	53
3 ²⁹	16	12 ⁵	29	3 ¹⁴	47, 152
4 ²²	13, 14	12 ⁷	28	3 ¹⁵	62
4 ³⁰	22	12 ¹⁰	21	4 ⁴¹	46
4 ⁴⁰	22	12 ¹²	29	4 ⁴⁸	53
4 ⁴¹	15, 29	12 ¹⁴	26	5 ²²	22
5 ¹	21	12 ²⁴	16, 26	5 ²⁴	52, 58
5 ²	22	13 ¹¹	21	5 ³⁴	49
5 ³	26	13 ²⁶	22	5 ⁴¹	22
5 ⁷	17	13 ³²	13, 92	6 ²	22
5 ¹⁵	27	14 ¹	22	6 ¹¹	62
5 ¹⁸	27	14 ³	14	7 ²¹	53
5 ¹⁹	27	14 ¹⁹	23	7 ³⁴	49
5 ²⁸	23	14 ²⁰	22	8 ²	46
5 ^{35ff}	26	14 ²¹	14, 22	8 ⁹	62
5 ³⁷	22	14 ²³	15	8 ¹²	21, 53
5 ³⁷	26	14 ²⁵	15, 26, 48	8 ²⁵	45
5 ⁴³	29	14 ⁴¹	14, 14	8 ²⁸	17
6 ²	23	14 ⁴³	22	8 ³⁸	46
6 ³	13	14 ⁴⁹	13, 66	9 ⁴⁶	62
6 ⁵	26	14 ⁵⁰	26	10 ¹	50
6 ¹⁶	21	14 ⁵⁵	29	10 ⁶	49
6 ²⁶	19, 21	14 ⁵⁷	26	10 ⁷	53
6 ³⁸	22	14 ⁵⁸	14	10 ²¹	53
6 ⁴¹	13, 27	15 ¹	29	10 ³⁷	50
6 ⁴³	15	15 ⁵	26	11 ⁴⁹	46
6 ⁴⁵	14	15 ¹¹	40	12 ¹²	53
6 ⁴⁸	22	15 ¹⁵	29	12 ²⁰	46
6 ⁵⁶	22, 39	15 ¹⁹	29	12 ⁴³	21, 53
7 ²	16	15 ²³	27	13 ¹	53
7 ⁴	32	15 ⁴³	26	13 ²³	54
7 ¹¹	26	15 ^{44f}	27	13 ³¹	53
7 ²⁰	21	16 ³	22	15 ⁶	55
7 ²⁵	21	16 ⁹	28	15 ¹⁴	60

<i>Luke</i> (contd.)	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
15 ¹⁶	60	5 ⁷	73	16 ²⁰	70
15 ¹⁶	60	5 ⁹	68	16 ³²	74
15 ¹⁷	60	5 ²⁵	76	17 ¹¹	69
15 ¹⁸	60, 60, 60	5 ²⁷	69	17 ¹²	69
15 ²⁰	60, 60	5 ²⁸	76	17 ¹⁵	66
15 ²¹	60, 60	5 ³⁸	72	18 ⁹	21
15 ²²	60	5 ³⁷	76	19 ¹⁷	32
15 ²³	55	5 ⁴⁴	69	19 ³⁸	68
15 ²⁶	62	6 ³⁶⁻⁴⁰	65	20 ¹	72
15 ²⁷	55	7 ³⁸	74	20 ²	70
15 ²⁹	60, 60	7 ⁴⁰	70	20 ¹²	70
16 ⁸	48	7 ⁴⁶	72	20 ¹⁹	72
18 ⁶	48	8 ²	67	20 ³⁰	69, 77
18 ³⁶	62	8 ³⁴	71	21 ⁶	67
19 ¹¹	48	9 ³	66	21 ¹⁰	70
19 ³⁸	48	9 ⁵	69	21 ²⁰	67
20 ¹¹	48	9 ⁷	72		
20 ¹⁹	53	9 ⁸	70		
20 ³⁸	49	9 ¹³	70	<i>Acts</i>	
22 ¹¹	19	9 ¹⁸	70	1 ⁶	54
22 ¹⁵	47	9 ²²	66	1 ¹⁷	45
22 ²⁸	62	10 ³	76	2 ¹²	62
22 ⁴¹	29	10 ¹²	77	3 ¹⁰	47
22 ⁴²	48	10 ¹⁶	76	3 ¹³	49
22 ⁴⁹	54	10 ¹⁸	67	4 ¹⁷	47
23 ¹²	53	10 ²⁴	67	5 ¹⁸	50
24 ⁷	47	11 ¹	77	5 ²⁴	62
24 ¹³	53	11 ³	68	5 ²⁸	48
24 ³³	53	11 ⁷	19	6 ¹	8
		11 ³¹	71	6 ⁹	8
		11 ³⁷	73	7 ¹	54
<i>John</i>		11 ⁵²	66	7 ³⁹	45
1 ¹	71	11 ⁵⁶	68	7 ⁵²	53
1 ⁵	69	11 ⁵⁷	74	7 ⁶⁰	29
1 ¹⁴	68, 69	12 ⁹	66	8 ²⁰	62
1 ²⁷	21	12 ²⁸	74	9 ⁴⁰	29
1 ³²	69	12 ³⁸	68	10 ¹⁵	19
1 ³⁸	21, 66	12 ⁴¹	70	10 ¹⁷	62
1 ³⁹	71	12 ⁴²	66, 74	10 ⁴⁶	50
1 ⁴⁴	77	12 ^{46f}	77	11 ²⁷	53
1 ⁴⁹	69, 77	12 ⁴⁷	66	12 ³	48
2 ⁴	17, 68	13 ¹	74	13 ¹⁰	49
3 ⁸	76	13 ¹⁸	66	13 ²⁴	49
3 ¹⁷	66	13 ²⁶	21	13 ³²	47
3 ²¹	68	13 ³⁴	73	14 ¹⁰	9
3 ^{22f}	77	14 ²¹	66, 68	14 ²⁷	50
3 ²⁵	69	14 ³¹	66	15 ⁴	50
3 ²⁷	72	15 ⁶	70	15 ²³	48
3 ²⁹	48, 69	15 ¹⁷	73	15 ³⁶	47
4 ²	74	16 ²	66, 74	16 ³	47
4 ⁵	69	16 ¹⁴	70	16 ⁶	47
5 ⁴	74	16 ¹⁵	70	16 ¹⁵	52
5 ⁵	68	16 ¹⁷	70	16 ¹⁷	55

<i>Ephesians</i> (contd.)	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
4 ²	89	<i>Philemon</i>		6 ¹⁸	112
4 ⁸	84	5	97	7 ⁴	107
4 ⁹	84	19	83	7 ⁹	107
4 ¹⁰	91			7 ²⁷	III, 112
4 ²⁹	84, 84, 92	<i>I Timothy</i>		8 ⁵	108
5 ⁵	84, 86	1 ^{3π}	86	8 ⁷	109
5 ⁶	84, 90	1 ⁸	102	9 ²	109
5 ¹⁴	96	1 ¹²	104	9 ¹³	111
5 ²²⁻³³	84	2 ¹²	82	9 ¹⁴	109
6 ³	84	3 ⁶	94	10 ³²	107
6 ¹⁰	92	3 ¹⁶	104	11 ¹¹	112
6 ¹⁰⁻²⁰	81	3 ¹⁸	104	11 ¹⁷	109
6 ¹²	81	3 ¹⁶	96, 97, 101	11 ²⁸	107
6 ¹⁹	84, 92	4 ³	82	11 ²⁷	108
		5 ⁶	102	12 ⁴	109
		5 ²⁴	104	12 ⁷	112, 125
		6 ^{17f}	102	12 ¹¹	107
				12 ¹³	106
<i>Philippians</i>		<i>2 Timothy</i>		13 ⁵	108, 111
1 ²²	83	2 ¹	104	13 ⁸	107
1 ^{29f}	89	3 ¹⁶	104	13 ²²	108
3 ¹	92	4 ⁸	92, 104		
3 ²	80, 85	4 ¹¹	104	<i>James</i>	
3 ¹⁶	89	4 ¹⁷	92, 104	1 ¹	48
3 ²¹	90			1 ⁴	115
4 ⁸	92	<i>Titus</i>		1 ⁸	120
		1 ¹²	96	1 ¹¹	120
<i>Colossians</i>		2 ¹⁰	104	1 ¹⁶	115
1 ¹²	90, 91	<i>Hebrews</i>		1 ¹⁷	115, 118
2 ²	89	1 ¹	107, 110, 111	1 ¹⁹	115
3 ¹⁻⁶	89	1 ³	110	1 ²²	120
3 ³	97	1 ⁴	109	1 ²³	118
3 ⁶	90	1 ⁸	118	1 ²⁵	118
3 ⁸	92	2 ³	107, 109	2 ¹	118, 120
3 ¹¹	81	2 ⁶	107	2 ⁴	114, 118
3 ¹⁴	86	2 ¹⁰	111	2 ⁵	114
3 ¹⁶	93	2 ¹⁵	109	2 ⁹	120, 120
4 ¹⁶	90	2 ¹⁶	107	2 ¹³	120
		2 ¹⁷	107	2 ¹⁴	114
<i>I Thessalonians</i>		3 ¹	107	2 ¹⁶	120
1 ⁶	94	3 ³	109	2 ¹⁸	115
2 ¹³	85	3 ¹²	107, 110	2 ²³	120
3 ⁹	69	3 ¹⁵	109	3 ²	117
4 ¹	92	4 ³	107	3 ⁶	118
5 ⁵	90	4 ⁴	107, 108	3 ⁹	119
5 ¹¹	70	4 ¹⁶	110	3 ¹¹	114
		5 ⁷	110, 111	3 ¹²	114
<i>2 Thessalonians</i>		5 ¹²	109	3 ¹³	114, 118
2 ⁷	85, 93	6 ¹⁴	107	3 ¹⁷	115
3 ¹	92			3 ¹⁸	120
				4 ⁴	114
				4 ⁵	114

	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
4 ¹⁰	. . . 119	2 Peter		6	. . . 69
4 ¹¹	. . . 120	1 ^{8f}	. . . 141	10	. . . 68
4 ¹⁴	. . . 114	1 ⁴	. . . 141, 141		
4 ¹⁷	. . . 117	1 ¹⁴	. . . 141		
5 ¹	. . . 115	1 ¹⁷	. . . 143	<i>Jude</i>	
5 ³	. . . 120	1 ¹⁹	. . . 142	1	. . . 139
5 ⁵ⁿ	. . . 120	1 ²⁰	. . . 143	3	. . . 139, 139
5 ^{18f}	. . . 114	1 ²¹	. . . 143	4	. . . 139
5 ¹⁷	. . . 48, 117, 118	2 ¹	. . . 142	5	. . . 139
		2 ³	. . . 140	9	. . . 140
		2 ⁴	. . . 142	15	. . . 139
		2 ¹⁰	. . . 142	16	. . . 139
		2 ¹¹	. . . 141	17	. . . 139
<i>1 Peter</i>		2 ¹²	. . . 141, 143	19	. . . 139
1 ³	. . . 128	2 ¹⁴	. . . 142	24	. . . 96, 139
1 ³	. . . 125	2 ²¹	. . . 142		
1 ⁴	. . . 125, 130	2 ²²	. . . 140		
1 ⁶	. . . 121, 125	3 ³	. . . 143	<i>Revelation</i>	
1 ⁶	77, 125, 127, 127	3 ¹⁵	. . . 141	1 ^{5f}	. . . 155
1 ¹¹	. . . 125, 127, 129	4 ⁶	. . . 140	1 ¹⁰	. . . 147
1 ¹³	. . . 125, 130			1 ¹³	. . . 150
1 ¹⁴	. . . 129	<i>1 John</i>		2 ¹⁰	. . . 151
1 ¹⁵	. . . 125	1 ¹	. . . 135	2 ¹³	. . . 147
1 ¹⁹	. . . 124, 125	1 ²	. . . 71	2 ¹⁴	. . . 152
1 ²³	. . . 125	1 ³	. . . 133	2 ²⁰	. . . 155
1 ²⁵	. . . 129, 130	1 ⁶	. . . 68	2 ²²	. . . 154
2 ³	. . . 124	1 ⁶	. . . 66	3 ⁷	. . . 154
2 ⁶	. . . 129	2 ²	. . . 77, 137	3 ⁸	. . . 21, 60
2 ¹⁶	. . . 125, 129	2 ⁵	. . . 135	3 ⁹	151, 152, 152, 155
2 ¹⁷	. . . 128	2 ^{12f}	. . . 135	3 ²⁰	. . . 152
2 ²⁰	. . . 128	2 ¹⁶	. . . 135	5 ⁹	. . . 151, 156
2 ²¹	. . . 124	2 ¹⁸	. . . 133	6 ²	. . . 151
2 ²⁴	. . . 129	2 ¹⁹	. . . 66, 136	6 ¹⁰	. . . 154
3 ¹	. . . 42, 128, 130	2 ²¹	. . . 73	7 ²	. . . 21
3 ⁶	. . . 129	2 ²⁴	. . . 72, 137	7 ⁹	. . . 21
3 ⁸	. . . 129	2 ²⁸	. . . 136	7 ¹³	. . . 150
3 ¹⁴	. . . 48, 128	3 ¹	. . . 66	8 ⁵	. . . 60
3 ¹⁶	. . . 125	3 ⁴	. . . 71	8 ¹¹	. . . 70
3 ¹⁷	. . . 128	3 ⁵	. . . 66	10 ⁶	. . . 153
4 ³	. . . 126	3 ¹²	. . . 133	10 ⁷	. . . 152
4 ⁶	. . . 129, 130	3 ¹⁵	. . . 66	11 ¹	. . . 147
4 ⁹	. . . 42	3 ²²	. . . 69	11 ⁹	. . . 151
4 ¹¹	3, 121, 124, 125, 129, 130	4 ¹²	. . . 77	12 ⁵	. . . 153
4 ¹³	. . . 129	5 ⁶	. . . 66	12 ⁶	. . . 21, 150
4 ¹⁴	. . . 130	5 ^{16f}	. . . 76, 135	12 ⁷	. . . 152
4 ¹⁶	. . . 126	5 ²¹	. . . 136	12 ¹⁴	. . . 21
4 ^{17f}	. . . 125			13 ¹	. . . 153
5 ⁴	. . . 129	<i>2 John</i>		13 ³	. . . 153
5 ⁹	. . . 128	2	. . . 137, 155	13 ⁶	. . . 21, 152
5 ¹⁰	. . . 128			13 ¹⁰	. . . 152
5 ¹¹	. . . 129	<i>3 John</i>		13 ¹²	. . . 21
5 ¹²	. . . 99, 129	3		14 ⁴	. . . 39, 150
				14 ¹³	. . . 151

<i>Revelation</i> (contd.)		PAGE			PAGE			PAGE
15 ^{2f}	.	. 155	17 ⁸	.	61, 151, 152	19 ¹⁶	.	. 153
16 ³	.	. 153	17 ⁹	.	. 21	20 ⁸	.	. 21
16 ⁴	.	. 150	17 ¹¹	.	. 152	21 ⁸	.	. 153
16 ⁹	.	48, 152	17 ¹⁴	.	. 153	21 ²⁷	.	. 150
16 ¹⁹	.	21, 70	18 ⁸	.	. 152	22 ²	.	43, 157
17 ⁴	.	. 146	18 ⁷	.	. 154	22 ⁹	.	. 152
17 ⁸	.	. 152	19 ²	.	. 154	22 ¹⁴	.	. 151
						22 ^{18f}	.	. 148